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<td>Organization of civil society / Civil Society Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
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<tr>
<td>PRR / RDP</td>
<td>Program ruralnog razvoja / Rural Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPG / RK</td>
<td>Registar poljoprivrednih gazdinstava / Registar klijenata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>Ruralni razvoj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>Republic of Srpska / Republika Srpska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAA / SPP</td>
<td>Stabilization and Association Agreement / Sporazum o stabilizaciji i pridruživanju</td>
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<tr>
<td>SAPARD</td>
<td>Special Accession Programme for Agriculture &amp; Rural Development / Poseban pristupni program za poljoprivredu i ruralni razvoj</td>
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<td>SAPS</td>
<td>Single Area Payment Scheme / Shema jedinstvenih plaćanja po površini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SME / MSP</td>
<td>Small and medium enterprises / Mala i srednja preduzeća</td>
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<tr>
<td>SPP / SAA</td>
<td>Sporazum o stabilizaciji i pridruživanju / Stabilization and Association Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPS</td>
<td>Single Payment Scheme / Shema jedinstvenih plaćanja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWOT</td>
<td>S - strength, W - weaknesses, O – opportunities, T - threats / Analiza snaga, slabosti, mogućnosti i ograničenja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme / Razvojni program Ujedinjenih naroda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAP / CAP</td>
<td>Zajednička agrarna politika Evropske unije / Common Agriculture Policy EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZOPE / CMEF</td>
<td>Zajednički okvir za praćenje i evaluaciju / Common Monitoring and Evaluation Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZPP</td>
<td>Zajednička poljoprivredna politika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZoPPRR</td>
<td>Zakon o poljoprivredi, prehrani i ruralnom razvoju Bosne i Hercegovine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The project main objective was citizens’ awareness-rising on importance of synergy among sectors which have a huge impact on climate changes. One of them is the rural development sector, for which the currently relevant authorities in BiH, in January 2018, adopted the strategic document.

1.1. Analysis objective

This analysis is an informative document which may help understanding the importance of rural development policy for all citizens in BiH. Also, it points to importance of engaging the experts and all stakeholders in its creation, selection of an optimal methodology and valid data, selection of argued priority goals and measures according to analysis results (not according to wishes of an individual), sustainable and responsible application and its monitoring. At the end, it emphasizes the importance of harmonizing this document with the needs of BiH on its road towards integrating into the EU for a sustainable and responsible vision of BiH rural development sector.

Individual goals are:

- Summarizing all findings and recommendation for developing a responsible and sustainable strategy for rural development of BiH in the future;
- Creating a basis for further development of action plans and an array of following documents for securing a high sustainability of the current strategy implementation;
- Creating better understanding and support by all experts, stakeholders, international community and citizens of BiH for a higher level of transparency and inclusion;
- Connecting among all the interested who aim to enhance informing, educating and working on this policy in BiH, which provides more balanced prosperity to all citizens;
- Creating recognizable elements for innovation and possibilities for employment in the real sector and reducing brain-drain of young people from the country.

1.2. Target groups

The analysis is meant for these direct target groups:

- Potential and active agricultural producers;
- Rural communities;
- Trade chambers and other associations/institutions which gather business representatives and investors;
- Experts in the field of development and other relevant fields connected to rural development, circular economy and quality life assurance in the rural communities;
- Advisory Services;
- Industry;
- Banks;
- Academic community representatives;
- Representatives of all authority levels in BiH;
- Strategic partners – international organizations, foreign investros, the EU etc.;
- Civil Society Organizations (CSO);
- Media.

All citizens of BiH, who will have multiple benefits, represent the indirect target group

1.3. Methods used for the analysis

The analysis was conducted from March to September 2018. The process of creating analysis was divided into phases. Both primary and secondary data sources were used. At very beginning, those who developed the Strategic Plan were interviewed; similar, valid documents from the region and the EU were gathered and analyzed, and as well, existing reports and studies on implementation of the Common Agricultural Policy of the European Union (CAP EU). Information and knowledge, obtained in this phase, provided entry data for field research. In the course of the field research, institutions’ representatives of various authority levels, domestic and international experts and civil society organizations (CSO) were interviewed. In addition, the best practices’ examples of the countries in the region, as well as, the EU countries, were consulted. Furthermore, a preliminary research results were presented during the workshop, held in June 2018, where the interested from various fields’, through discussion reached framework conclusions and proposals for recommendations. This fruitfull discussion served for testing analysis results, presenting preliminary results and considering opinion of a wide scope of stakeholders.
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for testing analysis results, presenting preliminary results and considering opinion of a wide scope of stakeholders.

Fundamental principles, applied in the course of work, were: cooperation with business people, networking with other organisations from the field of agriculture, environment protection, health care, education, business and other relevant fields; and harmonisation with the EU requirements and standards, laws of sustainability and circular economy, employability, citizens’ life quality optimization, green public procurement and all other sustainability requirements.
The Strategic Plan for Rural Development of BiH (2018-2021) – Framework Document, as a state policy document, cannot be singled out and viewed without considering its place and significance in the context of the general development policy of the state. In this sense, it is beyond doubt that institutions and individuals engaged to develop the Strategic Plan had a tough task to “create” a document, using so-called „middle-up” approach regarding its vertical integration with other development documents, but, still, to make these documents, of higher or lower level, not corresponding with the goals of strategy development. The base for strategic document development were entity strategies of agricultural development and rural development, which were - in regard to their methodology, purpose and other elements – set in various ways. On the other side, Bosnia and Herzegovina has no general development policy and a state strategy with defined framework and roles of agricultural and rural development, respectively. Otherwise, goals of rural development policy, correlated with other macroeconomic policies, should be generated from these strategies.

However, in this Introduction, an emphasis has to be put on the “biggest” thing missed to be explained by Strategic Plan. It is the term „rural”, its etymology and its essence, which were not adequately elaborated. Due to this, Strategic Plan, with all other shortcomings presented in the following text, did not give answers to rural development challenges in BiH. The Plan, in its introductory part, speaks about the significance of agriculture for economy of BiH and, throughout the text, frequently equals agriculture with rural development. Rural development is unduly identified with agricultural development, specially in BiH, where a negligible percentage of 6,6% of rural households live from agriculture.

However, it is not clear why, during creation of Strategic Plan, which in its title contains the term „rurality”, even the minimal effort has not been invested, at least, just to indicate at what meaning of „rural” in BiH this document aims.

In BiH, any characterisation of rural space and important features of rural development has to take into account the historical, political, economic and natural & geographical and societal & social characteristics, which are specific for BiH. Current state in BiH is a result of social-economic and political changes that have happened primarily in the course of the last twenty years (post-war society, transition, political crises). Besides the war that radically changed the social and economic structure, the process of transition in BiH has not yet been ended. Due to what, a consensus has not been reached on priorities related to sustainable development issues. However, agriculture and rural development underwent radical changes even earlier, what caused rural development in BiH to be under a
strong influence of political decisions. Processes of urbanisation, deagrarization and industrialization, started at the beginning of the 50ies of the last century, changed the main features of rural areas. A social structure of former village was radically transformed and modernized. On the other side, unfavorable position of agriculture and ideological prejudices towards private property, and also inadequate development policy towards village, brought to distinct stagnation (falling behind) of many rural regions. Industrialization encompassed the whole BiH, so today there are many rural places with unused/abandoned industrial facilities and rural population, who, due to the break-up of the previous generation with the agricultural tradition, did not inherit knowledge and skills for an efficient agriculture. The majority of rural population live from industry, services, trade and state compensations. Rurality of BiH, also, is directly connected to climate and geographical features. Life conditions are connected to natural conditions. Due to that, in BiH, more developed regions are in valleys, including river valleys, where are situated settlements and cities, and there is the underdeveloped part, consisted of the mountainous region of BiH, which makes 4/5 of its territory.  

The objective of rural development policy in BiH has to be a balanced territorial development and a decrease in differences between favorable territories and territories with unfavorable life conditions. Rural development policy in BiH has to respect heterogeneity of business and life conditions. Complexity and multidimensionality of rural development in BiH, in any case go beyond capacities, available during development of the Strategy, and the lower resistance line affected the choice of the most comfortable option, consisting of making a simple sum of entities’ strategies of agriculture, what at the end was given the epithet of „rural development strategic plan”. In the practice, this meant on the basis of the Strategic Plan for Rural Development BiH, the lower authority levels will create operative rural development programs („Competent bodies of entities and Brčko District shall prepare programmes for rural development and send them for adoption to legislative bodies of entities”).  

The Strategic Plan for Rural Development of BiH was adopted in the beginning of 2018. The strategic plan adoption should have been a first-class news for the overall public while it represents a platform for transformation and improvement of natural, economic and societal characteristics of the, dominantly rural, country as is BiH. However, strategic plan adoption became breaking news for totally different reason, which is the fact that its adaption took almost ten years. Namely, although the Law on Agriculture, Food and Rural Development BiH from 2008, among others, prescribed creation of a strategic plan for rural development of BiH (Article 12 of the Law on Agriculture, Food and Rural Development BiH), the Strategic Plan was not adopted until 2018. The mentioned article defined the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Relations of BiH (MOFTER) to be in charge, in cooperation with the Competent bodies of the Entities, to develop a strategic plan for rural development of BiH within a year from entering into force of the mentioned Law. BiH Strategic Plan shall define rural development objectives, identify programmes, measures and other activities for achieving these objectives, establish mechanisms for monitoring and evaluation and the framework of financial requirements and procedures for usage of funds. Also, it is defined: “The BiH Strategic Plan shall provide the basis for guiding all rural development plans and programmes made at all administrative levels in Bosnia and Herzegovina.” In the practice, this meant on the basis of the Strategic Plan for Rural Development BiH, the lower authority levels will create operative rural development programs („Competent bodies of entities and Brčko District shall prepare programmes for rural development and send them for adoption to legislative bodies of entities”).
After a formal adoption of the document by the Council of Ministers (in this case the Strategic Plan), the document goes to the Parliament, and after adoption in the parliamentarian procedure, and publishing in the Official Gazette of BiH, the document enters into force.

Methodology for developing a document, as is the Strategic Plan (where many sectors have jurisdictions), implies creating working groups, which would consist of relevant institutions’ representatives. Working groups are divided into technical teams (if needed) and they are in charge of a technical part of document development. This approach would ensure an opportunity, to all those who have jurisdictions, and also responsibilities, in a relevant sector, to participate and contribute. After a working group makes a document, a harmonization phase starts and this document is to be sent to the relevant institutions, which in a reasonable time frame have to give their opinions. After all these opinions are gathered, the relevant ministry sends the document, together with opinions, to the Council of Ministers for adoption. After a formal adoption of the document by the Council of Ministers (in this case the Strategic Plan), the document goes to the Parliament, and after adoption in the parliamentarian procedure, and publishing in the Official Gazette of BiH, the document enters into force.

Unfortunately, due to political issues, not only in the case of the Strategic Plan, the procedure did not go as presented above. The adoption itself of the Law on Agriculture, Food and Rural Development, which regulates the field of rural development at the state level, went in a very “strained” atmosphere: while ones (the representatives of the Republica Srpska) insisted the agriculture is within an exclusive jurisdiction of Entities of BiH, the EU and FBiH and BD were FOR adopting the Law at the state level. The original proposal of the law, which was of a high quality, was weakened by later compromises. Disputes about jurisdictions went on, even after adopting the Law, and the most obvious example is the Strategic Plan. Although the MOFTER – Sector of agriculture, as the relevant sector for agriculture and rural development, several times tried to point out to the activities at the beginning of creating the Strategic Plan, mostly all ended by nominating representatives of institutions to working groups. Any further activity was not undertaken. In the meantime, RS did its Strategy for rural development, what contradicted the provisions of the Law on Agriculture, Food and Rural Development BiH. Since developing a state document could not be foreseen, the Federation of BiH started developing its own program for rural development of FBiH, in line with the Law on Agriculture, Food and Rural Development BiH. The program is finished and, currently, in the process of adopting. So, instead of making a document at the level of BiH first, documents at the level of Entities were done, and they were in the form of the Strategy of RS and the Program of FBiH.

New EU approach, regarding inclusion of individual sectors in pre-accession assistance programming, and the mid-term survey of the instrument of pre-accession assistance (IPA), which was a breaking point for inclusion of agriculture in the Assistance program till 2020, exerted pressure on national authorities to reactivate creation of a strategic plan. In the course of 2017, a campaign started for creating this document, and a consent for it was given (although the Law clearly stated who makes a strategic plan and how, and that no consent is needed). However, representatives of RS again posed conditions to making a strategic plan, and they insisted on making so-called Framework document, what would practically mean uniting all the already existing documents into one whole, what would be presented as a strategic plan for rural development BiH. In this way, the European Commission’s conditions, regarding inclusion of agriculture as a field for financing, would be fulfilled, but the quality of the document itself would be very questionable.

Many warnings said that methodologically was not possible to make a high quality document in this way, but they were disregarded, and at the end, with the USAID’s (FARMA II Project) financial help, creation of so-called Framework document started. By the way, practice of creating so-called framework documents, with the aim of obtaining help from IPA II, was not a new thing. Such documents were made for the Sector of environment and the Sector of transport, and after the Sector of agriculture, the Framework energy strategy was adopted. The paradox of creating documents in this way is seen best on the example of the Strategy of transport, where the strategies of entities were solely merged and it resulted in road communications ending...
with the borders of entities, i.e. do not continue further into territory of other entity. Something similar happened in the Sector of agriculture. Therefore, the objective of this document is to present some shortcomings of the Strategic Plan, not only for the purpose of sole criticism but, on contrary, to contribute to the institutions of BiH to make a better job concerning a mid-term survey, and creation of a new document.
Data access and analytical approach - an overview of the current document and recommendations for the following cycle of programming

A ny process of planning starts with considering a current situation and projection of possible turns of events, considering internal and external influences or without them. In order to consider a current situation, it is necessary to have data, primary or secondary ones, to present clearly that situation as the starting position. Having quality data at disposal becomes more and more important today, when, due to a fast pace of changes in development of individual sectors and market turbulences which shake even strong economies, planning refers more and more to small periods, and data have to be as fresh as possible, even refreshed on daily basis. Due to season cycles, present in agriculture, data from this sector conditionally do not have to be updated as often as in, for example, financial or IT sector, but a year-old data, or more, could cause problems in agriculture development planning.

The Strategic Plan for Rural Development BiH (2018-2021) – Framework document meant to be conservatively restricted on official data and documents of key institutions in this sector, along with all shortcomings brought by it, which were pointed out in some parts of the document. The greatest limitation of this approach is obsolescence, and also, inconsistency of data. The table gives a survey of key sources used for the Strategic plan and their dates of origin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document(s) / Source of data</th>
<th>Dates of origin of data sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The medium-term strategy of agricultural sector development in the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina 2015-2020</td>
<td>Data mostly until 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic plan for the development of agriculture and rural areas of Republika Srpska 2016-2020</td>
<td>Data mostly until 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO's Sector Analyses: meat, processing, milk and dairy products; fruits and vegetables, cereals (wheat and corn); wine; and diversified*</td>
<td>Data until 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments on competition of three value chains in agriculture, milk and dairy products, meat and meat and meat products, fruits and vegetables, wine and fish in BiH, FBiH and RS</td>
<td>Data mostly until 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Sector analyses for forestry was published in 2015, but it used data relevant until 2013.

It has to be emphasized that data for Brčko District (BD) are very scarce and, in most chapters, almost non-existing. BD has no strategy of its own, and most data in the documents are taken from the Registry of agricultural households and clients (RPG/RK), which provide data only for persons who obtained support in an individual year.

If we take into consideration this Strategy was prepared in 2017, and in regard to the relevancy of data, many changes occurred in agrarian sector (market turbulences, big seasonal oscillations in production, damages of climate catastrophes, more strong migrations of local population etc.), it is hard to expect these data can give answers to challenges coming within the next years.

The document, to a great extent, uses data of domestic institutions in charge of statistics, however, that data should very often be carefully considered, while the practice shows frequently that data does not give a real state. Besides, even though these data are current (document uses data from 2015, and somewhere from 2016), the available data mostly regards the general terms and facts, while a specific data comes from the samples (for example, Survey on labour force) and often is in collision with other reports from these institutions. It is interesting the document uses the FAOSTAT’s data, but in the moment of making this document, this data was available until 2014, although the domestic institutions should have updated this data and enabled access to it.

The document, to a very small extent, calls on data from the public institutions. A small number of sources comes form the UNDP (data for 2009-2013) and the USAID/Sweden FARMA (data for 2010). More fresh data was available by the Chamber of Foreign Trade BiH (potentially, the most credible data that domestic institutions currently have at disposal), and relatively updated data was gathered from BiH Mine Action Center (BiH MAC) on surface areas under suspicion of a potential presence of mines. Surely, there has to considered establishing a structure for gathering, analyzing and classifying useful data sources of all publications, which are regularly or non-ordinary made for various organisations or institutions in BiH. This data is not official, but gives a more precise picture on individual agrarian areas in BiH.

Data of crucial importance for this document, relating to the agricultural farms structure, is available in a very limited extent, and even referring to 1991. A pilot survey on agriculture, conducted in 2010 on approximately 1000 farms in five municipalities, was only mentioned, while any continuation of these activities nowhere has been clearly specified. Furthermore, almost all available data on the structure of agricultural farms mostly does not make difference among househol-
des regarding their agricultural activity intensity, but aggregate intensive and extensive activities into summed data.

Without acquiring precise and updated data on producers themselves and their activities, any planning in the course of coming years will only repeat errors from the past, regarding creation of aimed interventions and reaching significant development effects.

Therefore, the key presumption in this part of the document relates to strengthening capacities and tools for regular and continued data gathering, specially data related to the target group encompassed by interventions, which are precisely stated in the document as is the Strategic Plan. Steps in this direction would be: defining profiles of support/intervention users (agricultural production/rural entrepreneurship), defining necessary inputs for their evaluation and monitoring of support effects, and implementation of an agricultural (pilot-) survey. This activity should be finished by the beginning of the process of making document for the next time period (from 2022).

Defining users’ profiles is necessary for a clear segmentation of users on those who benefit from stimulations and achieve added values. Very often, all households, dealing with agriculture (commercially or non-commercially), are treated equally by similar documents and their analyses (including the analyzed document), and, in the same way, data on intensive and extensive production is aggregated and gives very inappropriate averages of agricultural activity, which is taken as an official status of producers in BiH. The same goes for rural entrepreneurs.

Defining data, that would be gathered from target profiles, should not be a problem, if is taken into consideration that in 2010 such pilot survey was done. Also, countries in the region, with similar agricultural circumstances, have already done that. Since a next document should be developmental, founded on commercial and economically profitable production, a focus should inevitably be put on registered agricultural households, and gathered data should upgrade data that is already a part of the registry. Besides, a serious data gathering from a critical mass of agricultural producers will enhance and potentially speed up the process of establishing other registries as are FADN, LPIS etc.

With no fast access to quality data, and quality analytics, is impossible to define efficient interventions, what causes loss of the expected results. The planning founded on insufficient, inaccurate and incorrect data can make more harm than not having a plan document at all.

The EU requirements for the sector within the process of the EU integration and the previous non/progress of BiH

5.1. Accession process - general information

The EU accession process is long and complex political and economic process, in which various phases can be indentified – from signing the Stabilisation and Association Agreement (SAA) to implementing the Accession Treaty. This accession cycle and phases of accession, respectively, did not change significantly from the first EU enlargements till today. Every candidate country, wishing to join the EU club, has to fulfill every of mentioned phases. The pre-accession phases, as well a time frame for their implementation, are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: A time frame of accession process, evaluated on the basis of previous enlargements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Stabilisation and Association Agreement with the EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Application for membership, questionnaire, avis (opinion of the European Commission)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>Beginning of the Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Screening: an analytical comparison of a country’s legislative with the accumulated legislation which constitutes the body of the EU law, Acquis Communautaire, (defining differences, steps for adaptation, individual negotiating positions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Formal negotiating positions: obligatory implementation, requests for derogation and transitional periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Final financial package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The EU financial position and political agreement on the EU enlargement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Technical meeting about a national envelope for the agricultural and rural development fund, direct payments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>Preparation of accession</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: European Commission
The strategic objective of Bosnia and Herzegovina, both economically and politically, is membership in the European Union. This economic and political objective, according to all relevant surveys, supports more than 75% of BiH citizens. Still, contrary to citizens, relevant surveys support more than 75% political objective, according to all representatives of the European Union. This economic and political objective, according to all representatives of the European Union, is membership in the European Union, i.e., negotiations about Stabilisation and Association Agreement (SAA) to formally step into the second phase.

If retroactively looked on the phases of process shown in Table 2, in the case of BiH it would look as follows. In 2005, BiH started its journey towards the EU, i.e., negotiations about SAA began. The Agreement was signed in 2008 and the temporary Trade Agreement entered into force. As a result of it, only in 2007 BiH formally went into the second phase, when received the Questionnaires, which was finished in the course of the same year. The membership application was officially submitted, but the EU still has not reached a decision on so-called candidate status.

5.2. Agriculture and rural development of BiH within the accession process

Regarding the agricultural sector, the situation is very similar. Our country is, as other countries in the region, from the establishment of IPA in 2007, a user of this pre-accession program. Still, due to its status of potential candidate, and due to not having a so-called decentralized system for implementation of the EU funds, BiH could not use sources from all five IPA components, including components for agriculture and rural development, so-called IPARD components. The means for technical assistance, which were available through the first component, were used to help building capacities necessary for adoption of the EU agricultural policy. However, the most EU projects, which were using these means, were not implemented as it was expected. Due to many issues and obstruction of representatives from RS, the majority of project tasks was not implemented. Due to that, the key elements for implementation of IPARD means, so-called IPARD structure, were not established. As a result of unsuccessful creation of this structure, during 2013 the EU first had suspended, and later on, it canceled technical support for the agricultural sector. After this, the sector practically had no technical assistance at all during the next four years. In the meantime, the EU brought a new set of regulations for the second IPA cycle. New rules terminated a political condition (a candidate country status) for obtaining IPARD II means, but technical preconditions, i.e., establishment of an IPARD structure, remained. A new thing was so-called a sectoral approach, that implied foundation of the programmed projects on the strategic documents of a sector. Due to not having a strategy for rural development of BiH, it was not possible to nominate the agricultural sector as an intervention field in the Country Strategy Paper (CSP). Adoption of this document created the preconditions for withdrawal of the EU means for technical assistance for agriculture and rural development. In the course of the year, technical documents „Sectoral planned document: Agriculture and rural development 2018-2020“ and „The action document“ were made, and it is expected the European Commission to provide its opinion on these documents in October of the current year.

5.3. Role of the Strategic Plan of BiH within the EU integration

Strategic plan for rural development of BiH was a first document, or better to say, the first of many conditions which the state has to fulfill regarding the EU pre-accession means for agriculture and rural development. All those, who are familiar a bit with the way how the EU rural policy functions, know the programming is one of key things of the EU rural development policy. Programming cycles start with creation of a comprehensive program document, i.e., a strategy, after what come program documents of lower level, so-called rural development programs. These operative documents elaborate in detail a rural development support with all its elements. A similar hierarchy is asked from the candidate countries for the EU membership, but their rural development plans are a bit more modest than those of the member countries, and often linked by prefix to the pre-accession document from where they draw support means. From 2000 to 2006, there were SAPARD programs and, in the next programming period, it was IPARD program etc. Strategy programming process became particular-
Adoption of the Strategic plan removed a first obstacle on the road towards the EU funds in the area of agriculture and rural development. A next step on this road, regarding program documents, is creation of IPARD plan for BiH, which will more closely define sectors, measures and conditions for using IPARD means. Regarding the institutional part, the main condition still is the establishment and accreditation of IPARD structure in BiH. Althought it seems BiH will not use IPARD means, it would be significant to start as soon as possible solving these two, mentioned tasks, specially because of a very complex procedure of accreditation of IPARD structure. It should be kept in mind that the region, even though it has far more abundant budget to support its agricultural producers and other actors in rural areas, and a better defined foreign trade policy, still it largely uses IPARD means. We could say in this way that the region, even though it has far more abundant budget to support its agricultural producers and other actors in rural areas, is harmed and subordinated, in comparison to their competitors form the region.

Adoption of the Strategic plan removed a first obstacle on the road towards the EU funds in the area of agriculture and rural development. A next step on this road, regarding program documents, is creation of IPARD plan for BiH, which will more closely define sectors, measures and conditions for using IPARD means. Regarding the institutional part, the main condition still is the establishment and accreditation of IPARD structure in BiH. Althought it seems BiH will not use IPARD means, it would be significant to start as soon as possible solving these two, mentioned tasks, specially because of a very complex procedure of accreditation of IPARD structure. It should be kept in mind that the region, even though it has far more abundant budget to support its agricultural producers and other actors in rural areas, and a better defined foreign trade policy, still it largely uses IPARD means. We could say in this way that the region, even though it has far more abundant budget to support its agricultural producers and other actors in rural areas, is harmed and subordinated, in comparison to their competitors form the region.

The Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) of the EU Member States is one of the fundamental EU policies. A high level of agricultural market regulation, special budgetary support schemes, and as well, a very complicated apparatus of implementation make this policy very complex. The mentioned features cause the chapter on agriculture to be the one of toughest in the process of negotiating with the EU.

Harmonizing with the EU Common Agricultural Policy demands extensive and thorough reforms of sectoral policy, legislative, and institutions in charge of implementing agricultural policies. Due to different definitions of policies and limited budgets, this is a challenge for countries aspiring to the membership in the EU. In addition, since reforms concern a very sensitive sector, as agriculture is, they are often very unpopular and it is necessary to implement them very carefully. Therefore, there is a question posed how and in what way to answer to the EU integration challenges in agriculture and, simultaneously, to fulfill the already defined strategic goals of the sector (Erjavec et al. 2009).

The process of integrating into the CAP consists of harmonizing legislative, building and strengthening institutions and reforming policy (Erjavec, 2004):

a) Harmonizing legislative. A candidate country has to be able, after accession, to apply the entire legal regulation in a particular area.

b) Institutional building. High standards of modern public policies are made part of the CAP implementation system. Paying agencies, information & administration control system, and other institutions and activities have to be set up before accession, what demands significant administrative, financial and personnel changes.

c) Policy reform and support to restructuring. The objective is a suc-
cessful adjustment for the purpose of decreasing negative and intensifying positive effects of the EU integration. As a rule, in every country, a significant part of measures is not compatible with the CAP, and if these measures would be kept until a very accession, it would send wrong signals to the users.

Given all the mentioned, it is clear countries, preparing to incorporate and implement the EU policies, have to have not only an official commitment but, also, resources and political readiness to make legislative changes.

Regarding BiH and harmonization with the European Union’s CAP, it could be said BiH is in an initial phase. Only a few laws and by-laws are fully or partially harmonized with the acquis in the field of agriculture. The food sector (veterinary, plant protection and food safety) did most in this field, in part for the reason of meeting the EU market export conditions. The other part of institution for policy implementation and harmonization of support measures is still in its earliest phase. It can not be said that nothing has been done, but given the significant number of years, that passed from expressing the official commitment to the membership, it is, nevertheless, very modest. Precisely said, fragments of the payment system were established, in the way that the registries of agricultural clients and households were formed. A replication of data to the state level still remained to be a problem. The animal registry is formally established, but not functional. Land Parcel Information System (LPIS) was planned as a pilot project, but, as other parts of the information system, it was terminated by suspension of projects in 2013. Within the framework of payment system, as already said, nothing has been done. IPARD Paying Agency, as a forerunner of real paying agencies, was not established. Additionally, there was not met the EU request, nor recommendations of experts in BiH, on establishing a unique ministry of agriculture, food and rural development of BiH with competency to create, develop and coordinate agrarian/agricultural policies and identify strategic objectives of agriculture and rural development of BiH (creating agricultural policy structural measures; market price, tariff and foreign trade measures; land, tax and support measures for agriculture in line with the EU standards; other jurisdictions agreed upon regarding agriculture, veterinary, health of plants, food safety, forestry, water management and rural development), and which would resume a strong role of a governing body in the IPARD structure.

It has to be emphasized a part of support for production is a lot less then a part for which any kind of production activities on farms is not required. (For the sake of illustration, direct payments to agricultural workers in the European Union amounts to approximately 70% of total agricultural budget. Out of 70% of this support, decoupled payments, i.e. payments with no connection to production, amount 90%, while remaining 10% represent other payments, connected to production). It has been pointed out that system of such payments (decoupled) is done in accordance with the SPS (for the old member states and some new ones, while the SAPSs are mostly for new member states - NMS).
The Rural Policy of the EU Member States

7.1. Objectives and nature of the EU Rural Policy

The EU Rural Policy resulted out of transformation of the EU CAP and aspiration for strengthening regional policy. Although, the first outlines of this policy were indicated in the early seventies of the past century, when first measures, which belong under the today’s rural policy umbrella, were introduced, this policy experienced its real expansion with the Agenda 2000, when it was officially promoted as the second pillar of the EU CAP (Bajramović, S., Butković, J. 2009). From this year, the Rural Policy is practically an inseparable part of the EU CAP. Objectives and methods evolve, but essentially they remain, more or less, same. The policy follows the so-called financial perspective, which relates to a seven-year period. The new EU Rural Policy was created for the period 2014-2020. A development process of such new policy for rural development of the EU was supported within a broad public debate on future of the CAP. In its release „The CAP towards 2020“, the European Commission presented three main political options for future of the CAP, closely connected to „Europe 2020: Europe’s growth strategy“. In order to increase the focus on the goals of this Strategy, a greater degree of integration of the EU policies into rural areas is foreseen. In line with „Europe 2020“, and the overall objectives of the CAP, the main mission of the EU rural development policy from 2014 to 2020 can be defined on the basis of three long-term strategic objectives, which have to contribute to:

- Competition of agriculture;
- Sustainable management of natural resources and climate measures;
- Spatially balanced development of rural areas.

The mentioned objectives are similar to the ones that shaped the existing rural development policy. For the needs of policy implementation management, through rural development programs after 2013, the above described framework long-term objectives are called „rural development program priorities“. Certain „focus areas“ correspond to these rural development program priorities. The rural development program priorities and focus areas will be the basis for providing support to the EU rural areas. Also, they will be used for determining quantified goals of rural development programs, which will be defined by the Commission and the Governing body of a rural development program. It is important to say that topics such as instigation of innovations, contribution to mitigation and adaptation to climate change impacts and care about the environment are considered to be the common objectives of all priorities and focus areas of rural development program.

As earlier, measures, related to application of rural development program, are specified by the EU legislation. The regulatory framework for implementation of rural development support in the period 2014-2020 is set by the Regulation (EU) No 1305/2013 on support for rural development. Proposals of the Commission for measures of rural development policy in the period after 2013 prudently upgrade the old and introduce new solutions. Measures, proved to be successful in the previous period, are kept and updated, in order to be more efficient, so they could even better mirror rural development policy priorities, and as well, certain measures are obligatory, considered solutions for at least four, out of six, following common priorities of the EU (DG AGRI):

- Instigating knowledge transfer and innovation in agriculture, forestry and rural areas
- Strengthening profitability and competitiveness of all kinds of agriculture and promoting innovative agricultural technologies and sustainable forest management
- Promoting food chain organisation, animal welfare and risk management in the period 2007-2013. In many cases, measures, applied in the period period 2007 -2013, are joined together, so the Member States could choose an implementation manner adjusted to their needs.

7.2. Main features of the new rural policy of the EU Member States

The Commission, as it was until now, provides the „menu of measures“ and the Member States, according to their needs, choose measures which suit best the needs. A new thing is that certain measures are obligatory to be included into plans. The Member States and the regions make their own rural development programs. Number of programs is not limited (although, at the beginning of program period, there were some attempts to limit this number). However, every Member State has to have one program where are the basic assumptions of all programs integrated. The Member States and the region make their rural development programs on the basis of the needs of their areas and they, along this process, consider solutions for at least four, out of six, following common priorities of the EU (DG AGRI):
agriculture
• Restoring and preserving ecosystems connected to agriculture and forestry
• Promoting resource efficiency and promoting low-carbon and climate-repliant economy in agriculture, food and forestry sector
• Promoting social inclusion, suppression of poverty and economic development in rural areas.

These six strategic objectives will be realized through implementation of eleven, more broad, strategic measures and through a specific implementation of adequate sub-measures. As earlier, measures, related to application of the Rural Development Program (RDP), are defined by the EU legislation. It should be emphasized that new measures, given the RDP, are defined mostly depending on kinds of support and users. The European Commission’s proposals for rural development policy measures for the period after 2013 prudently upgrade the old solutions and introduce the new ones. Measures, proved to be successful, are kept in the current period and updated, in order to be more efficient, so they could even better mirror rural development policy priorities, and as well, common topics on innovations, climate changes and care for environment. Every member of the European Union brings an individual rural development program. The most important parts of contents of rural development program are the following:

- Implementation of the SWOT analysis (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats) considering the field encompassed by the program,
- Introduction of quantified objectives, given the new RDP priorities and their focus areas, consistently using the target indicators contained in the Common Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (CMEF). The RDP indicators have to consider what is learnt during implementation of the 2nd pillar of the CAP. Indicators and entry data should be accurate and comprehensive, but also, specific enough, so it would be possible to measure a contribution of action within the RDP in comparison to a large group of external factors,
- Explanation, for every priority, of the modality that enables consideration of common topics on innovation, environment, mitigation and adjustment to climate changes,
- Combination of measures to be applied on priorities and common topics for reaching particular set objectives.

Financial means envisaged for implementation of the EU rural policy for the period 2014-2020, shown in table 3.

7.3. Rural development policy of the EU towards candidate countries – Pre-accession funds for agriculture and rural development

The pre-accession funds are the EU assistance programs meant for the candidate countries within the process of accession to the European Union. The objective of the pre-accession funds is to provide support to candidate countries regarding fulfilling criteria for membership, specially regarding harmonizing legislative of the candidate country with the legislative of the European Union, and to enable them to efficiently fulfill their duties as the EU member countries (DEI).

All countries, aiming at membership in the European Union, have to adopt and efficiently implement the EU legislation (acquis). On the other side, in the candidate countries, agriculture/agricultural policy, as well the accompanying institutions, are far from the EU. Given complexity of necessary processes, the EU provides help to candidate countries to establish needed structures and develop adequate institutional capacities for implementation of the acquis after membership. Support is provided on the basis of the so-called pre-accession funds for agriculture and rural development. Until now, there were, in total, three cycles of these funds, starting with SAPARD (2000-2006), followed by IPARD (2007-2014), and in the end, IPARD II (2014-2020), which is still ongoing. The EU pre-accession funds have two main objectives: sectoral restructuring through various forms of investments, with the aim of strengthening competition, in order to be enable sectors to cope with the competition on the common market. The second objective is preparation of administration, and also, agricultural workers, for the EU funding conditions, after accession to the EU. In this way, capacities are trained for increasing absorption, since the pre-accession funds are practically „exercise“ for much serious funds available after becoming the EU member. A good example is the neighbouring state of Croatia, which in the course of pre-accession period had a limited IPARD funds (approximately EUR 200 million for the seven-year period), but after the membership, at its disposal was the fund of approximately EUR 2.383 billion for rural development policy for the period 2014-2020. If the funds for direct payments in amount of approximately EUR 450 million annually are added to this, the benefits for Croatia from membership in the European Union are clear. For the period 2014-2020, support to the candidate countries for agriculture and rural development is planned through so-called IPARD II. The defined objectives of this fund are:

- Improving sustainability and competition of agricultural and primary food production households and their progressive harmonization with the EU standards,
- Preserving and enhancing ecosystems which depend on agriculture and forestry,
- Promoting social and economic inclusion, suppression of poverty and balanced development of territories in the rural areas,
- Increasing knowledge application and innovation in agriculture, forestry and rural areas,
- Strengthening administrative capacities for implementing rural development programs.

The IPARD II Fund is planned for...
six candidate countries: Turkey, Montenegro, Serbia, Albania, Kosovo and Macedonia. The mentioned countries in the period 2014-2020 have at their disposal EUR 1.45 billion, in total. Allocations of funds per countries, users of the IPARD II Fund, is given on the Graph 1 in the following.

It is evident all countries from the region are listed as potential users of the IPARD II Fund. Sadly, means from this fund are not planned for Bosnia and Herzegovina due to not fulfilling technical preconditions. The reason is not having an agreement on the IPARD operational structure. Namely, by the EU regulatory framework for IPARD II (and for previous instruments), the European Commission created a unique legal framework and introduced unique rules, rights and obligations concerning implementation of the EU pre-accession funds. These rules with no exception apply on all candidate countries for the EU membership. On the basis of this regulatory framework, candidate countries develop the IPARD implementation systems and establish necessary structures. Unfortunately, despite many attempts on establishing an adequate IPARD structure in the country, a solution is not found. Probably, the same situation and attitudes will remain in the future period, regardless of loosing necessary funds from the EU for agriculture and rural development. Assessments say the funds approximately go from EUR 170 to 220 million for a seven-year period (2014-2020), and they could have been already used as means from the IPARD II Fund. The main obstacle to establishment of a functional IPARD system are representatives from the RS, who insist on establishing several IPARD structures in BiH, regardless of the provisions of the EU Regulations. The European Commission has rejected these suggestions for several times, and for now, the domestic agricultural workers are harmed the most. Regarding using the IPARD II Fund, all countries in the region, including Kosovo, are ahead of BiH. Croatia, Turkey and Macedonia used IPARD I, and the last two countries also used IPARD II. Serbia and Montenegro are using the IPARD II Funds, but they have earlier used the IPARD like Fund, as a predecessor of IPARD. Albania is highly advanced in preparations and, most likely, next year will start using the Fund. Kosovo is already preparing for using the IPARD like Fund and, most likely, towards the end of this cycle it will start using the Fund. There is a question mark over Bosnia and Herzegovina. If insistence on impossible scenarios, which collide with the EU Regulations, continues, probably we will lose opportunity to use much abundant sources for agriculture and rural development.
Given the resources of the Project, and its duration, it is clear that a comprehensive and deep analysis of the Strategic plan for rural development BiH could not be done. Instead, the project team decided to focus on analysis of key aspects of the Strategic plan, i.e. on measures suggested by the authors of the Strategy. The analysis objective is to show to what extent the suggested solutions are following the EU guidelines, and as well, to point to the main shortcomings of the suggested solutions, comparing them with the ones of the EU. Therefore, the analysis of measures focused on three key points: a measure's definition and objective, a measure's implementation and monitoring, and a measure's financial aspect.

The analysis objective is not only to provide a critical overview but to point out to those parts, which the authors of the Strategy missed, and to try to include the provided solutions and recommendations into a next document.

8.1. Analysis of individual measures

8.1.1. Direct support to agricultural producers (Measure 6.1. of the Strategy)

This measure does not belong to the group of measures on rural development support, either in the EU or in other countries. Probably, the reason why this group of measures is on the list of measures within the Strategy lies in an attempt of authors to, due to lack of a strategy on agriculture development on the state level, encompass more broad aspects of support policy. Still, since it is in the document, it will be analyzed, as well as other measures, and followed, naturally, by a recommendation not to plan this kind of measures within future strategic documents on rural development.

When in question is the group Direct support measures to agriculture, it should be pointed out that the majority of agricultural budgets goes to this group. This is no wonder, while
Besides securing income and its have to be met preconditions for a cor-

minated animal head. This has already been done in Brčko District, within this group, there are only payments per animal head/hectare; in the Federation of BiH, all three administrative units, which provide support to agricultural pro-
ducers in BiH. In Brčko District, within this group, there are only payments per animal head/hectare; in the Federation of BiH, there is no regress for inputs; those in the RS, all three measures are present. Nevertheless, in the course of analysis of this document, and of the agricultura strategies, where are these measures described in more detail, it became clear the strategic commit-
ments in both units, the Federation of BiH and the Republika Srpska, and also, in Brčko District BiH, favored a gradu-
al transition from direct payments per unit of surface area and condi-
tioned animal head. This has already been done in Brčko District BiH, and in the Federation of BiH and the Republika Srpska has been postponed, since, first, have to be met preconditions for a cor-
rect distribution and efficient control of awarded sources.

Besides securing income and its stability, securing business operating and having equal business operating conditions for both domestic producers and those from the region, introduction of direct payments per unit of surface area aims at gradual adjustment to the EU regulations, i.e. it is a step towards harmonization of the agricultural pol-
icy of BiH with the CAP. Sub-measures within this group are:

- Direct payments for livestock and fish-
eries;
- Direct payments for plant production;
- Direct payments per input and output units;
- Direct payments for other agricultural and food products.

The end users of this measure are physical and legal persons, noted in the Registry of agricultural households and clients (RPG/RK). Administrative procedures and criteria for selection should be, as all other measures, de-

vised by by-laws (rulebooks which will be developed later on).

8.1.2. Support for investments for agricultural enterprises, producer groups & processors (Measure 6.2. of the Strategy)

This measure, jointly with the Measure 6.3. Support for vocational training, knowledge development and acquisition of advice & information, contributes to the second strategic objective „Strengthening competition of agriculture, forestry and rural areas for increasing level of investments and enhancement of knowledge transfer and innovation promotion“. According to definition, this measure directly correlate with the second pillar of the Common agricultural policy of the EU (EU CAP), i.e. with rural development measures relating to enhancement of competition in sectors of agriculture and forestry. The measure has eight sub-measures, out of what seven di-
rectly regard investments, while a part of the seventh measure and the eight measure reagard marketing and pro-
motion of agricultural products. Con-
cerning harmonization with the Entities’ strategies, sub-measures are copied from the Strategy Plan for development of agriculture and rural areas of RS (2016-2020), i.e. terminologically, they are identical, while have similarities with the Mid-term development strategy for agricultural sector in FBiH (2015-2019). Due to objectives of the Entities’ strate-
gies, both strategic ones and objectives of document development, this group of measures is not mutually harmo-

nized, i.e. it correlates with the Strategy of RS, while with the Strategy of FBiH has some common points, given it concerns a „classic“ measure of the CAP’s second pillar. However, when measures are considered in the context of reach-
ing strategic objectives, those at the lev-
el of the RS belong to the group of mea-

asures which functionally are policies on agriculture restructuring, not rural de-
velopment policies. Since, in the course of making this strategy, measures from one entity document are copied, it is not logical the Indicative action plan to contain institutional jurisdictions of the FBiH for implementation of measures, that are not in the Strategy of FBiH (for example, sub-measure 2.4. Support to building infrastructure for irrigation, drainage and flood protection).

8.1. Support for vocational train-
ing, knowledge development and acquisition of advice & informa-
tion (Measure 6.3. of the Strate-
gy)

This measure, jointly with the measure 6.2., makes a package of mea-
ures aimed at accomplishing the sec-
ond strategic objective. The measure contains three sub-measures intended for technical support through enhance-
ment and strengthening of system of advisory support and research in ag-

icultural, what should be in a function of rural development. Measure relates to strengthening the institutional ca-
 pacities for practical implementation of policies of rural development and agriculture. The measure, defined in this way, does not correlate with the Entities’ strategies, or with the EU CAP, while it represents a horizontal mea-
sure, i.e. considering the CAP, there are six common priorities (every member state has to work on solving at least four of them through its rural development programs). In regard to harmonization with the Entities’ strategies, in the Strateg-
ey of the RS, it is not defined as a mea-
sure but it is within the sixth strategic objective „System support to develop-
ment of sectors of agriculture and rural areas“, and in the Strategy of the FBiH is within the third pillar – General ser-

vices in agriculture. An issue regarding implementation of this measure relates to the fact that the existing system of advisory support is organized also at various levels of development and ca-
capacities in the RS comparing to the FBiH. In a short period, i.e. the Strategy implementation period, it is impossible to harmonize system and bring it to the targeted (preferred) state, as described in the Strategy. Since advisory service is a horizontal institution in the IPARD sys-
tem, and since the Strategy was created with the goal to fulfill conditions for withdrawal of pre-accession funds, advisory system (not only public but, also, private one) potentially is ‘the weakest link’ for implementation of this Strategy, while there is a huge gap between the current state and a preferred one, i.e. the needed level of capacity of advisory services.

8.1.4. Support for the rural development development and improvement of availability of services to rural population (Measure 6.4. of the Strategy)

This measure, which aims at improvement of availability of services and general conditions of life in rural areas, is a part of the fifth strategic objective of the measure has only four sub-measures, and it could be said it is harmonized with the Entities’ strategies. The difference occurs in the measures, defined in the Strategic plan for the development of agriculture and rural areas of Republika Srpska 2016-2020 (the fifth strategic objective “Rural development” has twelve measures divided into three specific objectives), that are more elaborated comparing to the measures in the Mid-term development strategy for agricultural sector in FBiH 2015-2019, that only mentions them in the second pillar “Rural development” (RD – II/1 Diversification of economic activities in rural areas; RD – III/3 LEADER Project and support to establishing LAG infrastructure). Sub-measures mostly rely on the needs, defined in the EU, but only in the segment of diversification of production in other economic sectors through development of innovation, introduction of new technologies etc.

8.1.5. Support for diversification in rural areas (Measure 6.5. of the Strategy)

The purpose of this measure is to fulfil the fifth strategic objective, but, as it was mentioned in the measure description, its focus again is on development of non-agricultural activities or some other service, that will create only a small dependence of households incomes on solely agricultural production. This measure has five sub-measures, which support two different groups of activities. First three measures are in direct support of diversification and SMEs development, while two other measures are in support of social organizations and services, and local initiatives and the Local Action Groups (LAG).

This measure is a part of the third strategic objective and consists of nine sub-measures, aimed at harmonization of the legislative with the EU, support for introduction of standards, and establishment of control mechanism and quality infrastructure. This measure harmonized with the Entities’ strategic documents. What has been noted regarding this measure, is that it consists of two kinds of sub-measures: sub-measures of general or system support to creation of a favorable environment in agriculture and sub-measures of direct support to agricultural subjects. Grouping of these sub-measures do not happen either in the Entities’ strategies or the EU’s, where, due to specificity of the measure, the Republic of Croatia is taken into consideration. Therefore, a recommendation would be to separate these activities and to follow the logic either of the EU countries, as, for example, of Croatia, or to take a good example of the Republic of Serbia, that grouped all interventions into four areas: direct support, rural development, general services and institutional development. Further, administrative levels of participation, defined for every sub-measure, in some cases are not logical, in sense that the level of BiH is omitted, although the coordination should be placed at the state level, or apperance of the level of BiH in cases where the Entities have jurisdiction. One of sub-measures has to be specially emphasized. It is the “Support to producers to certify integral production”. Even though it is clear what kind of support is in question, it is not clear on what basis to do certifying, considering that integral production is not a standard, and
on the Entities’ levels or official levels of BiH there are no special rulebooks on this production concept.

8.1.7. Support for veterinary and phytosanitary systems and services (Measure 6.7. of the Strategy)

This measure is, also, a part of the third strategic objective and consists of nine sub-measures aimed at the harmonization of legislative with the EU, building of capacities and systems within institutions, and creation of registries and development programs. This measure, given its setting and themes, is very similar to the previous measure, so it would be even more appropriate to have these measures united in one. The measure is harmonized with the Entities’ documents, but regarding the level of FBiH, could be said, there is only framework harmonization, while documents at the level of this entity did not, precisely enough, define relevant measures for animal sector and production to be a part of this measure. Except for some sub-measures, and, foremost, this concerns the level of BiH. Regarding sub-measures, it has been noticed that all them, according to the Indication action plan, are implementing as individual sub-measures, but they should be completed before the end of validity. Also, this leads to a conclusion that it is necessary either to set sub-measures differently or to define milestones in the course of implementation, so in the process of monitoring, it would be possible to determine in what phase is a sub-measure/measure. Regarding the harmonization, as in case of the previous measure, this one too would be much more appropriate and better harmonized with the EU strategic lines if it was a part of enhancement of general services in agriculture.

8.1.8. Support for organic production, environment protection & reducing the impact of climate change (Measure 6.8. of the Strategy)

This measure contributes to the fourth strategic objective and has six sub-measures, aimed at support to the organic production, land preservation, definition of less favored areas, preservation and sustainable use of genetic resources and mitigation of impacts of climate changes. The measure has a framework harmonization with the Entities’ documents, but in case of Republika Srpska, a link with one sub-measure is not found. In the very setting of this measure, the greatest attention goes to organic production, which is its constituent part. Namely, it is not wrong a segment of organic production to be a part of this measure. However, given the structure of other sub-measures, it would be more appropriate either to make organic production a part of the current measure 6.6. where are encompassed other production constraints should constitute a separate measure. The same goes for measures on preservation and sustainable use of genetic resources. If we put aside the mentioned sub-measures, only a few of them - that really contribute to their objective - will remain within this measure. Even, sub-measure 6.8.6. has no clear link to the Entities’ documents, and, on the other side, the level of BiH has not been stated at all as the relevant level for it.

8.2. Financial Framework Analysis

Rural policy of Bosnia and Herzegovina, in a form currently valid in the EU, practically does not exist. Still, this policy is present in a more simple form in our country. Measures, represented within the domestic rural policy, are divided identically as the EU measures. In the frame of every priority axis, there is „Development and implementation of a pilot program on development and protection of less favored areas with natural constraints”. In compliance with results of a pilot, in the coming strategic period, development measures for Less favored areas or Areas with natural constraints should constitute a separate measure. In compliance with the previous measure, this one too would be possible to determine in what phase is a sub-measure/measure. Regarding the harmonization, as in case of the previous measure, this one too would be much more appropriate and better harmonized with the EU strategic lines if it was a part of enhancement of general services in agriculture.

Graph 2
Realized sources for rural policy in Bosnia and Herzegovina (KM)

Source: Office for Harmonization and Coordination of Payment Systems in Agriculture, Food and Rural Development of BiH

Graph 3
Sources for rural development (objectives 2-5) in Bosnia and Herzegovina, planned by the Strategic Plan for Rural Development of Bosnia and Herzegovina (objectives 2-5) in 2020-2021

Source: Strategic Plan for Rural Development of BiH

* Only sources for rural development were calculated in this Graph, and it was done according to the Financial Plan of the Strategic Plan, what encompassed objectives from the 2nd to the 5th
So, from 2012 to 2018, sources are becoming smaller year in, year out. What discourages even more is that the allocations for rural development measures are still variable. The following part brings the financial analysis of individual measures from the Strategic Plan for rural development of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

**Measure 6.1. Direct support to agricultural producers**

Direct supports to agricultural producers are financed through the first strategic objective: Securing income stability and making business operating conditions equal to the ones in the environment. For these measures, allocation of BAM 597,817,060 for the period 2018 – 2021 is planned. This amount represents 5% of total amount that will be allocated for six planned objectives. In the budget structure, participation of the Federation of BiH amounts 38.8%, and together with the Cantons is 49.5%. The second strategic objective, on the other side, a joint financial analysis is provided.

In the process of drafting a budget for this Strategy, the logic immanent to almost all development strategies in BiH was applied, meaning that, at the beginning, the own budget was overestimated and the missing part was forecasted on the basis of uncertain donor sources. When financing measures from the Strategy is in question, a problem generally relates to the budget allocations per objectives, since there can not be seen a clear allocation per measures, specially since measure 6.3. in the strategies of the Entities participates in a part of administrative budget (through financing advisory service). The second strategic objective, on the other side, is impossible to identify a financial connection with the Entities' strategies and their budgets, respectively.

**Measure 6.2. Support for investments for agricultural enterprises, producer groups & processors and Measure 6.3. Support for vocational training, knowledge development & acquisition of advice & information**

Measures 6.2. and 6.3. are presented jointly, while the budget allocations are done per objectives, not per measures. Since it is possible to determine a direct connection between measures 6.2. and 6.3., on the one side, and the second strategic objective, on the other, a joint financial analysis is provided.

In this part of analysis, measures 6.4 and 6.5 are presented jointly, while the budget in the document was arranged per strategic objectives, not per measures and sub-measures. Since it is possible to determine a direct con-
nection between measures 6.4. and 6.5., on the one side, and the fifth strategic objective, on the other, a joint financial analysis is provided.

Both measures financially are given within the fifth strategic objective, for which has been planned a total amount of BAM 80.275.600 for a four-year period, what makes only 7,5% of the total budget. As additional financial sources, with no clear indications, are stated percentages from private sector (25-30%) and donations (10-15%). According to projection of allocations in the four years, the amount should be doubled, but a look on sources shows this is expected to be on the basis of increase of sources from FBiH and Cantons, and a slightly one from the RS. As a result of this, participation of institutions from FBiH is in the amount of 81,7%, from RS 16,8% BD 1,5%, while the state level sources are not planned for implementation of this strategic objective. It is hard to find a stronghold for these amounts in the Entities' strategies and one of reasons for it lies in the fact that the budget for this strategic objective is not separated for each sub-measure. Besides, the Entities' strategies have been halfway through their implementation, but their financial implementation has not been done, although it was incorporated in this document. Further, the document did not present any stronghold in the current state analysis or how it defined these percentages for participation of private sector or donors.

The budgetary part for this strategic objective is only 7,5%, what is far below the EU average, where is on the basis of Regulation EC 1698/2005 defined that out of total amount for rural development for the third group of measures, or so-called Axes (improvement of life quality in rural areas and diversification of rural economy), has to be allocated minimally 10% and for LEADER approach at least 5%

Measure 6.6. Support for development of public food safety and agri-food quality infrastructure and service and Measure 6.7. Support for veterinary and phytosanitary systems and services

These measures jointly use financing from the budget for the third strategic objective, which allocation amounts BAM 58.913.000, with the additional 10-15% from donors (no precise indication for which activities) and 3-6% from private sources (no precise indication, but an assumption is this financing is for introduction of standards). In the budget structure, the greatest participation has FBiH with 70,2% (without Cantons), than the RS with 19,0% and U2V with 10,8%. It is interesting that BD has no planed participation in the budget, although, for example, every year co-finances introduction of GLOBALG.A.P standard for enterprises registered at its territory. The budget for the third strategic objective, and in the same way for the mentioned measures, hardly makes 5,5% of total budget for the strategic period, what is very modest, if is taken into consideration that the envisaged measures and their sub-measures aim at creating a favorable environment for activities in agriculture and, also, at direct support to quality infrastructure implementation. Regarding the budget concept itself, segmentation of allocations per measures and sub-measures is missing, and specially, an emphasis on measures and sub-measures, for which is expected participation of donors and private sources, is missing, too.

Measure 6.8. Support for organic production, environment protection & reducing the impact of climate change

This measure use financing from the budget for the fourth strategic objective and this allocation amounts BAM 32.356.400, with the additional 10-15% from donors (no precise indications for which activities). It is interesting the private sources are not planned, although within this measure is a sub-measure aiming at direct support for introduction of organic production (standards) and the practice is for these activities to be co-financed by users of support. In the budget structure, the greatest amount comes from the RS 88%, while FBiH gives only 12% (no Cantons). BD allocates nothing to this objective and measures. Generally, this objective and measures received a small deal of attention and it can be seen on the total participation of the third objective's budget in the total budget of the strategic document, with only 3%. As in the case of previous measure, segmentation of allocations per measures and sub-measures is missing, and specially, an emphasis on measures and sub-measures where participation of donors is expected is, also, missing.

8.3. Analysis of planned activities on implementation and monitoring

Monitoring and evaluation as a part of the strategic process planning is done on the basis of quantified data, in an absolute or relative amounts, so-called indicators. This Strategy, as it has been mentioned at several places, lacks quality entry (basic) data. Also, a base year is not mentioned anywhere, what is a deficiency for progress measurement. Additionally, target values are not determined, either at the level of outputs or outcomes or impacts. Indicators are defined per measures, which are, according to their descriptions, mainly indicators of results (number, value etc.), but they are not quantified. The strategic planning basis is in logical matrix, where are, within hierarchy, connected results of measures with outcomes and impacts on the level of strategic objectives. This logic was neither applied to the strategic document nor it can be recognized. Institutional jurisdiction for
implementation of measures was de-


defined by the Indicative action plan and
the manner of implementation was de-

scribed within every measure.

A fundamental lack of imple-
mentation lies in „incompetence” of
the MOFTER for measures where it has
no budget allocations, so the MOFTER
is not responsible for implementation
of this Strategy, and within measures
6.2. and 6.3, it participates only in the
sub-measure 2.8 „Promoting agri-food
trade and export, including presence at
international fairs and exibitions”.

The implementation manner
for both measures is given as an „es-
sayistic” description, i.e. measure 6.2,
since it is copied form the Strategy of
RS, its description is almost identical to
descriptions in the Strategy of RS. Im-
plementation of measure 6.3. is set too
ambitiously, given the state and a short
period for reaching defined objectives.
Generally, the logic of intervention for
strategic measures implementation can
not be determined, since it begins from
an uncomplete analysis, than SWOT
analysis which has no stronghold either
due to state analysis or general informa-
tion and, in the end, measures which are
not directly connected to objectives.

Implementation of measures,
defined by the Strategic Plan for Rural
Development BiH, is executed by the
Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic
Relations of BiH, the Ministry of Agri-
culture, Forestry & Water Management
of the Federation BiH together with
cantonal ministries for agriculture, the
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry & Wa-
ter Management of Republika Srpska
and the Department for Agriculture,
Forestry and Water Management of the
Government of Brčko District of BiH. As
it can be seen, the greater part of im-
plementation is on relevant entity min-
istries and the Department for agricul-
ture, forestry and water management of
the Government of Brčko District. The
mentioned ministries bring one-
year programs on sources for agricul-
tural and rural development support.
These programs are subject to constant
changes. This manner of implementa-
tion of measures is not present in the
EU, because implementation in the EU
is done by other, separate, bodies, i.e.
accredited paying agencies, which are
not under direct influence of ministries
(current politics), while ministries are in
charge of creating agricultural policies.

Measure 6.1. Direct support to agricu-
tural producers

As said above, this measure
do not belong to the category of rural
development measures, and therefore,
monitoring and evaluation of the mea-
sure can not be compared to some-
thing. Here are only indicators given,
i.e. suggested within the Strategic Plan,
and they are: number of users of this
measure, number of sown hectares,
number of heads of cattle for which
the premium has been paid, quantity
of purchased products for which pre-
miums are paid; the amount of paid
subsidies (per individual sub-measure),
growth of volume and value of produc-
tion. All mentioned indicators can be
relatively easy implemented, since data
about them is available through various
forms of statistical data. The problem is
validity and reliability of the statistical
data itself in Bosnia and Herzegovina.
An agricultural survey as a basis for re-
vision of statistical data in the sector is
more than necessary, and without it any
talk on analysis or monitoring regard-
ing either agriculture or rural develop-
ment „does not hold water”

Measure 6.4. Support for the rural
infrastructure development and im-
provement of availability of services
to rural population

The implementation itself of
this measure is very poorly described
and, basically, explains that a balanced
territorial growth will be taken into ac-
count and that will be mostly financed
by non-refundable funds. When we
look at the Indicative action plan for
this sub-measure, it is obvious the hold-
er of the Strategic Plan has no responsi-

bility for this measure. Other entity min-
istries participate in all sub-measures, in
accordance with their jurisdictions. BD
does not support sub-measure 6.5.2. Support for invest-
ments for development of rural tourism.
Indicators for monitoring are, again,
general, have no starting point and ef-

tects are not quantified, i.e. objectives,
meant to be reached by implement-
ing these measures. The mentioned
indicators do not even cover all stated
sub-measures, while certain indicators
compense several sub-measures. Also,
within this measure, there are no indi-
cated milestones, that would serve as
guidelines for monitoring and evalua-
tion of outputs, outcomes and impacts
and later, on their basis, for changes/
enhancements.

Measure 6.6. - Support for develop-
ment of public food safety and agri-
food quality infrastructure and services

In the case of this measure, as
the previous one, the implementation
is very poorly described and, in the
first part, it emphasizes agricultural
households and young agricultural pro-
ducers. Additionally, it touches diver-
sification and support to other SMEs,
women, while other socially disadvan-
taged groups of rural population does
not mention at all. Again, as in the case
of previous measure, when we look
on the indicative action plan for this
sub-measure, it is obvious the holder of
the Strategic Plan has no responsibility
for it. Other entity ministries participate
in all sub-measures, in accordance with
their jurisdictions. BD does not support
sub-measure 6.5.2. Support for invest-
ments for development of rural tourism.
Indicators for monitoring are, again,
general, have no starting point and ef-

tects are not quantified, i.e. objectives,
meant to be reached by implement-
ing these measures. The mentioned
indicators do not even cover all stated
sub-measures, while certain indicators
compense several sub-measures. Also,
within this measure, there are no indi-
cated milestones, that would serve as
guidelines for monitoring and evalua-
tion of outputs, outcomes and impacts
and later, on their basis, for changes/
enhancements.

Measure 6.5. Support for diversification in rural areas

In the case of other measures, the
Indicative action plan is given in a
general way, so almost all activities, in
compliance with relevant jurisdictions,
are implemented from the beginning.
to the end of duration of strategic document. As for this measure, the only exception is the first sub-measure, which relates to harmonization of legislative, and Brčko District, in the last year of implementation, will not implement it. Implementation of measure and sub-measures in every year, on every relevant level, is understandable for direct support interventions, as are in case of this measure its sub-measures from the 3rd to the 6th (Support to introduction of standards). However, other certain measures should not be set as non-finite, but they should have a clear beginning and end, as - for example - Sub-measure 8: Strengthening capacity for crisis management in food safety through capacities for response and management of emergency situations. It would surely be helpful for both planning of implementation and monitoring of activities to define milestones or points of progress for every intervention. In this case, in any moment would be possible to determine in what phase is a certain intervention. Regarding this measure, mostly every sub-measure has one indicator for monitoring. But, these indicators are not quantified and have no start or target values for monitoring. In any way, this should not happen in the next document.

Measure 6.7. - Support for veterinary and phytosanitary systems and services

Again, the Indicative action plan for almost all sub-measuresdefines implementation in all years as long as the document is valid, with an exception of sub-measure 8, where - probably by mistake - the level of BiH for 2018 is missing and, also, BD for 2020. One of potential reasons for setting all sub-measures as non-finite could be generalization and augmentation of the scope of measures, for example, sub-measure 8, which relates to support program for plant protection, includes both preparation of program and its implementation. Without milestones, monitoring of implementation of such interventions is very challenging, because without a precise definition it is not clear when one part of intervention ends and when other parts start. Also, an interesting thing about this measure, contrary to the previous, where every sub-measure had at least one indicator for monitoring, here that is not the case. At least three measures had no indicator at all, while certain measures jointly use some indicators. Not only indicators themselves are not quantified but they are generally set, as for example „Number of trained inspectors” (with no other definition about inspectors to who this refers). Good examples of indicators can be found in relevant strategic documents of both the Republic of Serbia and the Republic of Croatia.

Measure 6.8. - Support for organic production, environment protection & reducing the impact of climate change

The Indicative plan, also, in this case predicts implementation in all years as long as the document is valid. Also, four out of six sub-measures predict interventions which imply both the preparation and implementation, but with no clear definition on duration of preparatory phase. Therefore, it is confirmed once more that interventions have be either differently conceived or milestones for them have to be defined. Indicator for the second sub-measure is not defined at all, while three indicators are set for sub-measure 1. Indicators show same weaknesses, as in previous measures, with the addition that some indicators are redundant, i.e. have no effective importance, for example, Number of agricultural households, associations or co-operatives fulfilling conditions for this kind of support. As in case of previous measure, a recommendation is to use examples of good indicators from the relevant documents of neighbouring countries.
Conclusion
Developmental perspective
(a pessimistic and an optimistic scenario, and an overview of potential lossess)

The Strategic Plan for Rural Development of Bosnia and Herzegovina was adopted after many years spent on its development, which was frequently interrupted and brought to various kinds of standstill. Therefore, the Strategy’s adoption was a very positive step forward for BiH. Despite all its flaws and shortcomings, this document currently represents a basis for programming the EU technical assistance for sectors of agriculture and rural development in BiH. Furthermore, adoption of the Strategic Plan opens a window of possibility for solving other priority issues of the sector, as is creation and adoption of a plan for IPARD and establishment of the IPARD structure in Bosnia and Herzegovina. All these effects are positive, generated by fulfilling one of the EU conditions for re-enrollment of agriculture in the Country Strategy Paper (CSP) of BiH. On the other side, the analysis of similar documents in the region or the European Union makes clear this document did not fully encompass all elements, present in documents of a kind in the region and the EU.

After reading and analysing, there is an impression that this document is, still, adopted under the influence of political pressure and it was, even, created only to satisfy a certain formality on the basis of the EU request, and not really to bring enhancement and changes to rural development of BiH and its citizens’ welfare. It is very hard, and ungrateful, to analyze parts of such document, which was derived from the strategies of Entities’ ministries of agriculture and BD’s strategy. Specially, when it is known, this is a political document. The contents of document itself, its concept and elements are results of work of poor quality and an ad hoc approach to problem solving only for the reason of satisfying a formal side, not for producing a real impact by its implementation.

Considering under which circumstances the Strategic Plan for Rural Development in BiH was developed and adopted, a conclusion can be made that, at the first place, it is a political document, which maybe was the most acceptable option at the moment. The fact is that in BiH, after several years of negotiating, some kind of joint document in the field of agriculture and rural development was reached, what can be considered as a certain progress. Since the majority of strategies in BiH either can not be implemented or is highly paid or not even adopted, this document – if it manages to move BiH even one step forward in the pre-accession process (first and foremost towards the IPARD Fund) – will greatly exceed the range of other strategies and fulfil the purpose of its inception.
Recommendations for adaptation after 2020

It is necessary to start immediately preparing a process itself for development of a document, i.e. a preparation of action plan for creating rural development strategy of BiH, and defining methodology for document development. Primarily, this means the issue of missing data should be dealt with and the issue of more quality collection of statistical data, respectively. Therefore, first an agricultural survey has to be done. On the basis of new and reliable data, it will be possible to make a current state analysis of more quality, and that, solely, will lead to more reliable results.

From the very beginning, in the process of making strategy, it is necessary to include all key players, having an impact on life and development of rural areas. It means all authority levels, all relevant sectors, and significant participation of representatives of private and civil sectors, in order to jointly define problems and create a certain prioritisation for solving them. A novelty is a suggestion for hiring experts from the EU (as a technical help), who have experience in rural development programming. The contracted team of consultants would monitor a process of creating strategy.

After the document analysis, the recommendations can be summed as follows:

- Make regionalization of the state on the basis of the NUTS classification, what will serve for more quality statistical data gathering, more quality status analytics and more accurate problem definition;
- Make an agricultural survey, or a comprehensive analysis of the registered agricultural households, until the time comes for creating a next strategic document;
- Follow, analyse and consider data from research and analytical documents, not necessarily from public institutions;
- Include, significantly, all other institutions in preparation and development of a document (from the very beginning, for gatering data which will be as much relevant as possible; defining problems; and, making a joint proposal of measures). Environment protection, climate changes and circular economy as the joint focus in the work;
- Define rural areas in Bosnia and Herzegovina, according to the generally accepted EU criteria;
- Differentiate between intensively and extensively orientated agricultural households and their activities with a focus on intensive/commercial households and their intensive activities in the service of market, in line with the best EU practices for preservation of biodiversity and environment;
- In a state analysis and other parts of a plan, precisely define real expectations from the private sector and donors;
- Clearly define profiles of support users, both from agricultural & production & processing sector and rural development;
- On the basis of comprehensive analysis set strategic and operative objectives;
- Every measure has to have a stronghold in the state analysis, and contribute and fulfill at least one objective;
- Arrange measures, sub-measures and interventions in compliance with the EU CAP’s logic, what will make following harmonization with the EU, and the IPARD documents and scheme, more easy;
- Clearly separate direct support measures, rural development measures, and other general and/or administrative measures. Direct support measures should not be treated in strategic documents for rural development;
- Define, in a more quality manner, sub-measures, which are now grouped, i.e. increase their number due to their specificity;
- Prioritise measures and sub-measures within every objective, and segment according to sources of financing: BiH, EU/ IPARD or something else;
- Present budget according to measures and sub-measures;
- Increase (keep increasing) total amounts for measures and sub-measures in line with the EU guidelines;
- Precisely state measures that will be financed, amounts and sources of financing (budget, private sector, donors, projects);
- Clearly state interventions for which is expected/planned participation of private means, and exactly how much;
- Improve setting of indicators, specially considering good examples of neighbouring countries;
- Determine in more detail and define indicators for sub-measures; quantify indicators wherever possible, and define initial and target values, i.e. expected quantitative scales of change;
- Determine in more detail an implementation plan of measures/sub-measures with detailed time frame and concrete implementers;
- Key aspects of implementation method should be written concisely and in a more quality way;
- Develop a monitoring plan, including definitions of milestones, as a plan for evaluating the achieved results (in points of milestones and at the end of period);
- Since advisory services are becoming an inseparable part of the EU rural policy measures, use that practice in BiH;
- Specially nurture policies on environment protection, on green public procurements and circular economy;
- In the end, but maybe the most important task, through administration capacity building and establishment of institutions obligatory insist on establishment of functional IPARD structure for BiH.
Every written paper, regardless of its form, impacts more or less our values, way of thinking, behaving and acting. Strategic documents have a specific importance, since their main purpose is to encourage an organized response of social community for the reason of adjusting to changes in the environment and achieving goals that society considers important for its prosperity and progress.

In this context, the Strategic Plan for Rural Development BiH 2018–2021 should be viewed, since it is not only a strategic document, with which we are trying to improve the status of rural areas in BiH, but it also creates fundamental assumptions for reaching important objectives in the process of the EU integration. Due to an exceptional importance, given all steps done in the process of pre-accession process on the road to the EU integration, to analytically present where is BiH on this road, what are weak points and where they are in our system and how we should work to mend the system, so, in future would policies in BiH, strategic documents, objectives, measures etc. be as compatible as possible with the same ones applied in the EU.

A table of contents of this publication has eleven chapters and they are as follows: Chapter on the project, Introduction, Methodology of document creation, Data access and analytical approach, The EU requirements for the sector within the process of the EU integration and the previous non/progress of BiH, Objectives, measures and harmonization with the EU and the Common Agricultural Policy, The rural policy of the EU member states, Strategic document analysis, Conclusion – developmental perspective, Recommendations for adaptation after 2020 and Literature.

The manuscript has 37 pages of typed text, normal spacing, and several tables and graphs, corresponding to the text connected with the mentioned chapters. The stated chapters have a systematic approach to presenting facts and do it in an acceptable, reasonable and extremely instructive way. Each chapter is constituted to present a separate, but structurally, functional whole. Authors of text per chapters show an exemplary clarity in professional, linguistic and conceptual sense, remarkable skill in analysis, explanations and recommendations for creation a next strategic plan for rural development of BiH.

I want to believe this manuscript will serve as a new source of literature and information to future authors for writing future strategic plans for rural development in BiH. Also, this manuscript, by its actuality, concept, contents and way of interpretation, can be classified among excellent, professional publications. May this publication be a guiding star to all its users and may it show them a direction towards successful and prosperous agricultural production and development of rural areas. Authors invested a respectable and valuable effort and offered to a readership this publication as a worthy and understandable source of information.

On the basis of presented facts, I recommend the reviewed text titled Environmenal policies that carry the economic development of BiH – THE ANALYSIS OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA 2018 – 2021 by authors: Slavica Ašonja, Jakub Butković, Slaviša Jovanović, Sanela Klarić, Ivica Sivrić to be printed as a professional work – brochure.

Prof. dr. Hamdija Ćivić, Director of the Office for Harmonization and Coordination of Payment Systems in Agriculture, Food and Rural Development of Bosnia and Herzegovina
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