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ABSTRACT

This paper is aiming at an analysis of Rural Development Programs (RDP) in Turkey with special reference to EU Rural Development Policies, Programs and implementations.

Concerning to Turkish Programs, it has been reported that over the last 30 years and more particularly during the planned Development Period, special efforts have been made to gain Rural development experience in Turkey.

In each five year Development Planning period (DPP), particular goals and instruments of policy for both agricultural development and that of rural areas have been specified and determined.

Integrated Rural development Projects and some other typical Rural Development Projects have also been implemented in line with the targets given in each planning period.

In brief evaluation of the agricultural development projects, the following points may be underlined:

- Their orientation towards agricultural extension,
- They were aimed at providing some extra off-farm income,
- There was a “Top to bottom” approach,
- Human factor and localities, local conditions have ignored.

Therefore, it can easily be observed that the target level determined at the beginning of the project has not been reached and has not provided to rural population with sufficient reward and welfare benefits for their efforts.
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Whereas in the EU, the rural development policies and programs were rather successful and provided various types of support to agricultural areas.

Therefore, some important measures have to be taken for Turkey her future possibility of EU membership, in accordance with their regulations.
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1. **INTRODUCTION**

The main purpose of this paper is an analysis of Rural Development Programs (RDP) in Turkey and in the EU and the examining of TURKEY’s situations for undertaking the EU regulations in this particular area.

It is intended also, to underline the main important possible problems in this future process and some suggested precautions for their solution.

Rural Development programs have special importance in Turkey due to their close relations with rural area and agricultural sector which still have various socio-economic problems.

Although there might be different approaches for studying this type of subject, previous literature review and summarize approach has been preferred for getting clear idea and picture.

In addition to Turkey and EU situation analysis, the outlines of the program contents prepared by the EU member Greece and member candidate Romania have been examined as being models.

2. **SOME SOCIO-ECONOMIC PARAMETERS FOR AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AREAS IN TURKEY AND THEIR PROBLEMS**

Despite the overall economic developments of recent years, agriculture still continues to hold its place and importance in the Turkish economy, and agricultural sector makes various contributions to the economy as a whole.

The relationship between agricultural land and population has suffered some setbacks due to a number of severe problems which have been faced in recent years e.g. lack of efficient planning for usage of agricultural land, the increasing rate of land use for non-farm purposes, erosion. Thus, the share of small farms in the total has increased. There are 4,106,983 farms and the great majority (about 80%) of them comprise 50 decars of farmland, or less. the
statistics in 2002 show that 96.4% of all farms were engaged in crop production and animal husbandry, while the remainder 3.6% engaged only in animal production.

Moreover, it must be stated that the higher rate of inflation in the overall economy, the rapid rise in the public sector borrowing requirements, and some other defects of macro-economic policies have squeezed rural incomes in Turkey. Though, in Turkey’s agricultural sector, the per capita income is only about $980. This figure counts for about 1/20 of the European Union (EU)'s average.

Given this explanations and in the light of some parameters of the Turkish economy (Table 1) it should be emphasized that rural areas and the agricultural sector still occupy a special place in the economy. Growth gaps persist between rural and urban areas.

Table 1: Some Parameters of Turkish Economy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population (Million)</th>
<th>70</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural Population (%)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Population (%)</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Area (%)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Area (%)</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita rural income ($)</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of agriculture in GNP (%)</td>
<td>13,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of industry in GNP (%)</td>
<td>28,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of services in GNP (%)</td>
<td>57,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth rate for agriculture (%)</td>
<td>1,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth rate for industry (%)</td>
<td>2,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth rate for services (%)</td>
<td>2,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total exports (million $)</td>
<td>31 623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural exports (million $)</td>
<td>2082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total imports (million $)</td>
<td>49 035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural imports (million $)</td>
<td>1748</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: http://www.dpt.gov.tr

In order to provide a clearer picture of Turkish agriculture, a comparison of some economic and social parameters has been made for Turkey, and the European Union, as follows:
Given the above facts, it should again be clearly stated that there are major growth gaps with urban and rural areas, between agricultural and other sectors, and most importantly in the relationship between agriculture and the Turkish economy. Although, higher potential exists in rural areas, it has not been exploited to maximum efficiency and thus new models and approaches are required in order to obtain a greater contribution of these resources to the economy in the future.

The following information is concerned with rural infrastructure developments in Turkey.

Total Number of Village (000) 78,6
Total Number of Municipality (000) 3,2
Total Number of Location (000) 81,8

Drinking Water Service to Villages

- Sufficient (000) 60,2
- Insufficient (000) 7,6
- None (000) 10,8

Number of farm families (million) 4,1
Share of cultivated Land in Total (%) 33

Distribution of agricultural land in Turkey was summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. Agricultural Parameters in Turkey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER OF ENTERPRISES (million person)</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RURAL AREA ( million da)</td>
<td>669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-CULTIVATED LAND ( million da)</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNUSED LAND ( million da)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-USABLE LAND ( million da)</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER ( million da)</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTIVATED LAND ( million da)</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRRIGATED LAND ( million da)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• AREA SOWN ( million da)</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LONG LASTING PLANTS (da)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• VEGETABLE LANDS(da)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• FALLOW LANDS (da)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the light of these parameters and some other related statistical data the weak and strong (strengthen) points of rural area are given in the following:

**Weak points and problems**

- Small and fragmented residential units in rural area
- Small farms and fragmented farm land
- Lack of production planning, low productivity and higher production costs
- Insufficiency for health and education facilities
- More persons in the households
- Higher immigration to rural area and decreasing of young population
- There are no alternative employment opportunities
- Insufficiency for farmers organization
- Usage of land for non-farm purposes
- Insufficiency for input and products marketing system
- Lack of agricultural extension services and participation activities
- Pollution of natural resources
- Lack of stimulation for local production potentials
- Insufficiency for socio-cultural services in rural areas.

But, on the other hand, there are some strong points and sides for rural areas which are in the following:

**Strong Points for Rural Area**

- Existence of rich natural resources
- Existence of higher agricultural potential and biodiversity
- Higher amount of potential labor due to young population
- Existence of potential investment areas
- Rich cultural and traditional inheritance
- Relatively low level of environmental pollution to other countries.
Higher potential for employment opportunities through the local investments

Strong social relations among family member, neighbors and relatives

3. REVIEW OF PAST AND ONGOING RURAL DEVELOPMENT EXPERIENCES

3.1. Rural Development Projects In Turkey

It is reported that in the last 30 years and more particularly with in the beginning of Planned Development Period (1963), special efforts have been given for RD experiences, in Turkey. In each five years Development Planning Period, particular goals and instruments of policy for Agricultural Development and Rural areas development have been specified and determined.

Even for, in each of the political parties of Turkey and all old Turkish governments' programs rather detailed Rural Development Projects (RDP) and Experiences are stated, clearly. Indeed in the last 30 years, many Rural Development Projects (RDP) have implemented and some important success have already been realized. Some of the Rural Development Projects (RDP) implemented are financed only by Turkish governments and at the same time, some of them are also financed by International Donor Organizations, like World Bank and FAO.

Moreover, it is stated in the Development Plans separately that, special measures would be handled for "Village Development" programs and as an addition, this particular issue has been included in the Fifth Years Development Plan with the title of "Integrated Rural Development Projects", too.

Thus, some main principles for bringing important services to the rural areas, for cooperation of local people with the civil servants, setting up new Associations and Cooperatives for this particular purpose have been emphasized in The First Five Years Development Plan (1963-1967). Through some improvements, such as, providing an opportunity for local people to contribute in preparation of new rural programs and continuously assessment of Rural Experiences, supporting of new activities which would cause to change the behavior of local people for the innovations, six different pilot projects have been applied in Antalya, Çukurova, Marmara, Mus, and Black-Sea regions. Training of civil servants have got the priority in the programs.

Similarly, RD Studies have placed within the coverage of village and village development
problems in the Second Five Years Development Plan (1968-1972). Usage of agricultural lands, the land reform, land consolidation, tenants and share-cropping problems were the main issues handled in these five years period. Furthermore, training and educating of rural women and establishing of "central villages" for solution of rural areas problems have been underlined.

In the Third Five Years Development Planning Period (1973-1977), in order to realize the Rural Development, through the dominancy of physical and technical factors, specific rural area investments have planned. Regarding to these facts and the establishing of "central villages" has already begun before, 3544 central village have been selected and organized.

It is definitely stated in the Fourth Five Years Development Planning Period (1979-1983) that, an efficient Land Reform, Democratic Cooperation in Rural areas, Special Support Measures for Rural People and "Bigger Central Villages", would be the main instruments of Agricultural and Rural Development Policy. It was hoped that through these instruments improvements for income distribution among the sectors, supporting of agricultural industry and handcrafts and extending of some new opportunities to rural areas, could be realized.

Concerning with The Integrated Development Projects, special importance and priority have given for acceleration of cooperation among the rural people and for improving of agricultural structure and farm organisation in the Fifth Five Years Development Planning Period (1985-1989). Especially, some measures which could prevent the decreasing of farm size have got great attention. It has anticipated of setting up some joint-stock companies by rural people for retention of added value of agricultural products in the rural areas and supporting of cooperatives and agri-business in rural localities.

In Sixth Five Years Development Planning Period (1990-1994), the principle of balanced development among the regions has been accepted and regarding to this point, particular settlement centers have been selected and they are supported by different governmental measures. In determining and implementing of Regional Development Policies special attention has given to the European Union Regional Policies.

Finally, in Seventh Five Years Development Planning Period (1996-2000), it is underlined that, in order to provide higher development rate for the regions wherein have priority for Development, "Highest (First) Priority Regions would have dominancy and all the efforts would continue in the future".

Some studies have already done on the basis of sub regions for geographically similar areas of Eastern and Southeastern Regions. More particularly, services for The Southeast Anatolia
Project (SAP), which became basically multipurpose integrated development skim is still continuing and some important systems including, like instruction of Atatürk Dams, Hydroelectric Centers and Irrigation Channels, have already stimulated.

In addition to this type of integrated projects, there were, also, some other typical Rural Development Projects implemented with the direction of the targets given in different Five Years development plans, in Turkey. As some examples of these type of the typical projects, ÇORUM-ÇANKIRI, ERZURUM, BINGÖL-MUS, ADANA-SEYHAN, YOZGAT and GEDİZ VALLEY projects could be given. All of the projects stated above, have been prepared and implemented for getting higher benefit from local resources to the local rural people. Among the main targets of the projects, increasing of both of the yield and production for vegetal and animal products, improvement of agri-industry and agribusiness, stimulation of Rural population, training of all people in the area, and particularly specific improvements for Infra-Structure of the Region.

ÇORUM-ÇANKIRI is the first project, started in 1976 and the financing support have been provided by World Bank. Instruction of Village Roads, Drinking Water Centers, some Ponds for irrigation purposes, improvements of social Infra-Structure, providing of village electrification were the main targets of the project. The project cost was determined 161.6 million $, 75 million $ of this amount was supplied as loan by the world Bank.

It is reported that, yields and production increases of wheat, barley and potatoes, increasing of spray materials used, providing of some services for agricultural Infra-Structure have been realized and at the same time, the amount of fallow lands have decreased. Expanding of Agricultural Extension activities and financing for farmers were another success of the project. However, it is also reported that, some social investments have not been used by farmers as much as expected and so, total costs of project has reached to higher levels.

The rural infrastructure was developed by realization of the following:
-76 km of new roads, improvement of 164 km of roads, maintenance of 2450 km of roads,
-Driking water supply in 120 villages
-Electrification in 270 settlement ares,
-construction of social facilities in 63 villages.

After this project, Erzurum Rural Development Project started in 1984 and completed in 1989. It is supported and financed by World Bank and International Agricultural Development Fund. Total cost of the project is 137 million $, (60 million $ from foreign sources- World Bank and
IFAD and 77 million $ from local sources ). The aim of project is, to improve the socio-economic status of 76 000 farmer families living in the 1067 villages of the ERZURUM Province and to increase the agricultural production and consequently incomes of the small farmers by distributing the extension services all over the province.

This particular project was, also, covering, like the others, farming practices, farmers' training and education, financing of farmers' and improvement of agricultural Infra-Structure of the province. Yields increasing for wheat, pulses, potatoes and fodder crops, higher level of agricultural mechanization, increasing of seed and chemical fertilizer usage, farmers training and in service training of extension people, special programs for home-economics have been realized. But, in health and nutrition improvements of population were not reached to targeted goals and lack of coordination among the related institutions were the main problems already faced in the province.

Similarly, BINGÖL-MUS Development Project started in 1990 and supported by International Agricultural Development Fund. From the beginning of the project in first year till to present time, some developments in the areas, such as, Planning of Rural Infrastructure, Setting up Farmer Associations for Irrigation, participation of Farmers in managing of Irrigation schemes, training of Formen, providing of drinking waters in many villages, construction of village roads, supporting of weaving for carpets have been observed. Total cost of project is 52 million $. Of this figure, 20 million $ is met from the foreign sources and 32 million $ from local sources. With the implementation of project, 81 small irrigation units was established, 225 km of road was constructed, 52 village Group Extension Technician centers were established, 7650 ha of three forest were improved, 580 bee keeping unit were developed and 5700 sheep farms in mountainse areas were intensified.

In addition to these projects, YOZGAT Rural Development Project of which total cost is 41 million $ (9.9 million $ from the foreign sources 31.7 $ from the foreign sources) has been prepared in order to carry out the services such as vegetal production, livestock, rural infrastructure, irrigation handicrafts and agricultural credits with vie to increasing income levels and living standards in the rural areas.

ORDU-GIRESUN Rural Development Project was initiated with an objective to assist male and female members of household in participating villages to improve the standard of living through sustainable utilization of natural resources. Some 320 villages benefited from village level development of infrastructure, improved communal grazing and forestry, and generating
Principal objective of SIVAS Rural Development Project and Rize-Bayburt-Gumushane Rural Development Project was to conserve and better utilize natural resources-range lands, genetic resources, soil, establish an effective linkage among Research-Extension and farmers for sustainable flow of information, improve home economics, promote cooperatives and small scale agro-industry, and increase agricultural production.

Apart from those of the project stated above, with enlarged coverage and sources the Southeast Anatolia Project (SAP) has been prepared for development of Southeastern part of Turkey as a whole. It is an integrated project covering of 13 sub-projects. The project which became basically multipurpose integrated has as a principal aim to supply integrates to the concerned plains, irrigation with other various services and development of soil and water sources of the region. SAP will include dams, hydroelectric centers, irrigation systems and many kinds of infrastructural investments, communications, industry, education and health centers and others emphasis in the fundamental development systems. SAP includes 22 dams and 13 hydroelectric power source over the region. Indeed, fundamental concerns of SAP are irrigation and hydroelectric energy systems which are intended to develop water resources.

With the implementation of this particular project, it is hoped that; irrigated areas will increase, cropping pattern of the area will change, in which grains and industrial crops would have highest share, horticultural production will increase and expanding of livestock in various parts of the region would be realized over the years. In addition, this will have important effects in the socio-economic structure of the region, production increment and increased job opportunities will encourage other sectors and services, accelerating and improving their growth. Thus, it would play an important role in the developments of Turkey's agriculture in the near future.

Furthermore, because of the main differences of natural potential sources and conditions between Eastern and Western Regions, in order to avoid the development gaps for these areas, special (PRD) development programs, namely "Priority Regions For Development” have been implemented in recent years. Priority Regions although with their higher potential were underdeveloped areas from the standpoint of socio-economic development status relatively to other regions. They were determined by the Council of Ministries decree on the basis of province* and announced in the official gazette of the State.

* First order of priority regions for development is covering Adiyaman, Agri Batman, Bayburt, Bingöl, Bitlis, Diyarbakir, Gümülfhane, Hakkâri, Kars, Mardin, Muş, Siirt, Sirnak, Tunceli, Van, Zonguldak, Ardahan, Artvin, Bartın, Igdir, Urfa provinces.
The goal and applications of PRD projects was not, solely, of course to cover agricultural
development of the region. Overall development of the provinces, including completion of
physical and social infrastructural deficiencies and providing some measures for higher level of
investment were the main approach.

The number of provinces in the beginning were about 28 whereas it has reached to 31 and 36
in 1990 and 1992, respectively. In order to increase the available social and economic
structural sources of priority regions, public investments has shifted to these areas and special
incentives have been given, also, to the investments of private sector in the provinces.

On the other hand, Agricultural Development Projects had great importance in Priority Regions
Development Program, too. In addition to Infra-Structural investments and services, some
typical measures in the land of juridical arrangements have been provided for acceleration of
rural development in this provinces.

3.2. An Evaluation of Rural Development Programs In Turkey
Briefly, in evaluation of Agricultural Development Projects aforementioned before, the following
points could be stated, generally: The first common feature of the projects were their
Agricultural Extension orientation. Secondly, they were aimed at providing some extra off farm
income to the farmers through the programs of weaving, Handcrafts, Apiculture and Sericulture,
in addition to special measures for Infra-Structural improvements. Apparently, instead of
farmers and local people initiative in decision making the approach was from top to bottom and
sufficient attention has not yet paid for the definition and coverage of differences between the
Agricultural Development and Rural Development. The latter covers some other issues like,
depending on local conditions and localities, participation of local people to the development
programs, providing of housing and education, social organisation of rural people, health and
environmental problems of rural areas etc., along with the rural development objectives.
Therefore, it was observed easily that, it has not been reached to the targeted level determined
in the beginning of the project, intensification of services has decreased in relation to duration
of program and more importantly there was not an understanding of the reality for development
that is continuously process.

Indeed, due to this type of understanding and approach for rural development, the contribution
of rural sector and agriculture as a whole to The Turkish Economy have not reached to the
desired level and so it has not providing sufficient reward and welfare to the rural people for

Second order of priority regions is covering Amasya, Çankiri, Çorum, Elazig, Erzurum, Kahramanmarsas
their efforts.

All the development studies aimed at finding and adopting of new technologies which would get higher production in agriculture for several years. Although it was not right, the negligence of social variables particularly human factors could cause to get lower level of performance for the development projects implemented.

In addition to this fact, the majority and dominancy of urban development understanding along with the agricultural development studies and giving more importance to the macro level projects in agricultural sector without paying enough attention the micro (farm) level implementation were another reasons of failure for the projects.

Whereas, it is obvious that, higher level of development performance could be obtained by giving priorities to the developing regions and sub-regions, wherein higher potential exists, through the special peculiarities and conditions of main localities and locally oriented projects, revitalization of local resources and higher participation of local people to the studies.

Especially, higher participation of local people in all levels of the projects has caused changing of social structure as well as mobilization of local resources of the regions for development process.

In order to get higher economic and social development stability in any region, it was necessary the articulation of non-farm and farm sectors, revitalization of human and physical resources, setting up social and political framework for society by dynamic institutions, in addition to higher agricultural production, in the course of the project implementation.

Regarding to these facts and taking into account the special importance and problems* of agricultural sector in Turkish economy, realization of sustainable agricultural development requires both of macro and micro level of development studies in various region of Turkey. So, Turkish agriculture and rural sector severely needs Endogenous Development Projects and Studies, promptly.

*Kastamonu, Malatya, Sivas, Tokat, Yozgat.

* In recent years, Turkish Agriculture is faced to the following problems:
  a- Enlarged structural and organisational deficiencies, b- Higher level of erosion and non-farm usage of lands, c- Intensification of population and skewed distribution of lands, d- Lower level of yields and production for all subsectors and more particularly livestock production, e- More dependency of agriculture to natural conditions, f- Lack of research, training and extension relations, g- Insufficient and wrong agricultural policies, h- Many deficiencies for farms and farmers.

Meanwhile, higher amount of increase for agricultural imports than total imports and the contrary for exports are another parameter which shows non-use of agricultural resources as efficient as possible, in Turkey.
4. EUROPEAN UNION RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES

In the European Union, it has been aimed to modernize agricultural enterprises, improving vocational training, setting up producer groups, to improve the living conditions, and to bring encouraging measures into force to establish small and middle-scaled enterprises, and in this extent, rural development programmes

In the Union, while the agriculture sector was being arranged, handling rural economy as a whole, providing economic and social integration and the necessity of protecting the environment and natural resources were assumed as the fundamental targets.

Nevertheless, together with Agenda 2000 (March 25, 1999), the targets of the structural funds were decreased to three, being valid between the years 2000-2006. According to this, Target 1 has aimed to allowances in mountain and less favoured Areas that approximately two-thirds of the structural fund sources will be transferred to this target.

With Target 2, it has been aimed to support the regions that are faced with structural difficulties. Then with Target 3, the modernization efforts on education, vocational training and employment have been contained.

As it is known, the fundamental regulations on rural development policy is the Council Regulations nr.1257/99, which was published in direction with Agenda 2000, and article 33 aims to have an integrated rural development at the Union level and it consists of a series of precautions such as land improvement, increasing tourism and handicrafts, marketing agricultural products of good quality, the basic services carried into the rural area, renewing and developing the villages, protecting the rural inheritance, increasing the variety of agricultural and related facilities, management of water resources, improving the rural infrastructure related to agriculture, protection of environment in connection with agriculture, forestry and nature management and improving animal health, compensating the losses caused by natural disasters and introduction of new protection measures.

Within this context, sources have been transferred to the rural progress applications in the EU from FEOGA- Fund for European Orientation and Guaranatee in Agriculture, and from the Guarantee section of the fund, the lands of pre retirement, Less-favoured Areas and Areas with Environmental Restrictions, agri-environment measures, that are known as “the additional measures in rural development” have been financed. Among
the other rural development measures, the ones that are included in Target 1, have been financed by the Orientation Section of the fund and the ones excluded from Target 1 have been financed by the Guarantee Section.

The rural progress measures determined by the EU Council Regulations nr.1257/99 have been applied under the headings below:

- Investment in Agricultural holdings
- Setting up of Young Farmers
- Early Retirement
- Training
- Less-favoured Areas and Areas with Environmental Restrictions
- Improving Processing and Marketing of Agricultural Product
- Forestry

These regulations that were briefly summarized here need to be examined carefully as far as Turkey’s desire to become a full member of the EU is concerned.

In this sense, the applications in member countries and candidate countries are of special significance. In the following section, this topic has been analyzed.

5. SPECIAL PARTICIPATION PROGRAMME ON AGRICULTURE AND RURAL PROGRESS FOR EU MEMBER CANDIDATE COUNTRIES IN CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE (SAPARD)

Within the framework of expanding strategy which was designed for 10 EU member candidate countries in Central and Eastern Europe, in order to re-form the agricultural structure in these countries, there exist programmes such as the Special Accession Programme for Agricultural and Rural Development called SAPARD financial programme, PHARE aid programme, which aims to develop the administrative structure called ISPA, that is similar to the Conformity Fund, and has been in operation since 1990 to finance investments and to improve the substructures of environment and transportation.

In this study, the examination of SAPARD programme and the contents of this programme in countries that make use of this fund has been considered fruitful due to the fact that it forms a
role-model for Turkey to be able to make use of the fund in order to solve the problems of rural sector and to conform to the Union Acquisitions when Turkey's membership becomes definite.

When the distribution of the fund among the candidate countries between 2000-2006 period was analyzed, Poland and Romania can be observed as the leading countries that make the most use of the fund (Table 4).

**Table 1: Distribution of SAPARD Fund Among Candidate Countries (milyon/Euro-yearl)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate Members</th>
<th>SAPARD FUND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>54,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZECH Republic</td>
<td>22,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esthonia</td>
<td>12,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litvania</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letonia</td>
<td>22,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>156,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>6,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungaria</td>
<td>39,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>175,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>540</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The outline of the procedure process of the SAPARD programme can be summarized as follows:

The most important condition for applying SAPARD programme is the necessity to establish a SAPARD Agency, which will apply the measures and make the payments to the ones who will benefit from the prepared projects.

The measures which are financed by SAPARD and included in the programmes of the countries in details can be exemplified as follows:

- Investments in Agricultural Enterprises,
- Improvement of Agricultural Products and Processing and Marketing of Water Products,
- Quality, Improvement of Controls in Animal and Plant Health,
- Feed Quality, and Consumer Protection Structures, Improvement of Production Methods Related to Environment Protection and sustainable of the Rural Area,
- Creating Alternative Income Opportunities and Improving the Variety of Economic Facilities,
Establishing Producer Organizations,
Renewing and Improving the Villages and Protecting the Rural Inheritance,
Improvement of land and Re-dividing into Parcels, Updating the Land Records,
Improving Occupational Education, Improving the Rural infrastructure, Management of Agricultural Water Resources, Afforesting the Agricultural Lands,
Investments on Forest Enterprises in Private Use,
Processing and Marketing the forest products.

In this context, when the programmes prepared by the countries have been analyzed, it is observed that the priorities in measures, therefore the programme contents, preferred by the countries in order to increase the living standards and to provide the continuity of the rural sector change from one country to another.

In this section, due to the possibility that Turkey might prepare such a programme, the outlines of the programme contents prepared by EU member Greece and member candidate Romania, to make use of the SAPARD fund have been examined as being role-models.

**Greece**
The horizontal rural development programme for Greece aims to strengthen the competitiveness of agriculture and at the same time safeguard the environment and promote the sustainable and integrated development of rural areas. The rate of agricultural employment in Greece is 17 %, with the average size holdings some 4.3 hectares and gross agricultural output of 8%. The agricultural sector in Greece enjoys a favourable climate, offers a wide range of quality products and benefits from proximity of potential markets such as the Balkans and the countries of central and Eastern Europe whose opening up will foster trade but also generate new competition. However, the small size of holdings and parceling are inhibiting returns on farming in the same way as vulnerable marketing structures, low skills levels and agening farming population (57%). In addition there are threats to environment: pollution water, soil ecosystem caused by intensive farming of plans and by agro industries, over-use of natural resources, fire hazards and erosion.

Early retirement, Allowances in mountain and less favoured areas, Agri-environmental measures and Afforestation of agricultural land have importance priorities for action in Greek Rural Development Programs for 2000-2006 (Table 5)
Romania

Romania is a predominantly rural country with rural areas representing approximately 90% of the land area where 45% of the Romanian population live. The population density at 48 inhabitants per square kilometre is relatively low. There are important regional differences within rural Romania, which are, in part, the result of differences in terrain.

In contrast to normal migratory patterns, due to the severe economic hardships faced in Romania, overall the rural areas of Romania have incurred a net in-flow since 1996. The migratory pattern is, however, differentiated. As is usual net migration from rural areas is most intense among young adults and, in the most disadvantaged areas, in particular young female adults. In such areas the distribution of population is apparently resulting in social problems both related to the ageing of the rural population and the imbalance between genders.

Migration from rural to urban areas is of course a normal pattern especially amongst young adults and occurs for a number of reasons; access to advanced education and desirable job opportunities are both important, but the lack of services needed or wanted by young adults in rural areas is also important.

Agriculture was the largest employer providing nearly 37% of total employment – a share that has risen since the beginning of transition. In part the supposed importance of agriculture as an employer has been the nature of the land restitution process which resulted in a large number of small landowners who, with few or no other alternatives, have farmed on a largely subsistence basis. This pattern has been exacerbated by the overall economic decline and the role of agriculture as an employment refuge. Despite the low level of mechanisation, the small size farms and the supposed volume of labour employed thereon suggests that much of the labour is part-time and that considerable hidden unemployment exists in agriculture.
Although 45% of the population live in rural areas only 11% of the water supplied through public facilities goes to rural consumers. Less that 50% of rural communas are connected to the public water distribution network, less than % of the rural population lives in these communas and even then in these communas not all villages are connected to the water distribution network.

The measures proposed in the strategy are driven be those available under the SAPARD programme. Given the wide-ranging needs they are all relevant to the situation of Romania’s rural areas. There is, however, a concern that although following the first version of the plan there was a concentration of measures, the measures are still too dispersed. That said it is important to note that the majority of funding is concentrated upon four of the measures: processing and marketing of the agricultural and fisheries products (17% ); investments in agricultural holdings (15% ); development and improvement of rural infrastructure (28 %), forestry (10% )Together with rural diversification (10%)

Table 6. Financial Breakdown by Priorities in Romania (2000-2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priorities</th>
<th>Million Euro</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investments in Agricultural Holdings</td>
<td>156.6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving Access to Market and the Competitiveness of agricultural Products</td>
<td>175.5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development and Diversification of Economic Activities and Alternative</td>
<td>102.6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the Vocational Training</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the Rural Infrastructure</td>
<td>299.4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestration</td>
<td>108.3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>154.5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: http://www.europa.eu.int

Turkey was announced as an EU member candidate country at the statue among the other candidates in December,1999. Within this frame, the Participation Partnership Document was prepared by the EU; the document that states what our country is supposed to do in short-term and middle-term for membership , and unites the EU aids for our country within one frame, and Turkey prepared a National Programme in return.

In the Participation Partnership Document, the completion of regulation conformity in the land of rural development was treated as a middle-term priority, while the precautions on environmental, structural, and rural development were anticipated as short-term priorities. On the other hand, the topic was analyzed in the National Programme under the title of Rural Development Policies, and the experienced problems and studies that have been made in Turkey so far were explained. It was stated in the National Programme that it is necessary.
for an outlined rural development policy be drawn and its principles be determined in order that Turkey can solve these problems and undertake the EU regulations in the middle-term.

When Turkey’s membership becomes definite and there occurs a possibility of benefiting from the SAPARD programme, the framework of rural development policy will have to be drawn and its strategies will have to be determined. After determining the rural development policy and its strategies, it will be possible to profit from the fund but Turkey will have to make some preparations in order to make use of it. With this approach, the outlines of the preparations to be made by Turkey to benefit from the SAPARD fund have been given in the following section.

6. PREPARATIONS THAT NEED TO BE MADE BY TURKEY TO BENEFIT FROM THE SAPARD FUND IN CASE OF A LIKELY UNION MEMBERSHIP

EU member countries have prepared a Rural Development Programme related to the 2000-2006 period in order to make use of the FEOGA Fund and they have determined their priorities in rural development measures within the frame of EU regulations. Similarly, EU assigned a SAPARD Fund for candidate countries and these countries are required to provide a 7-year SAPARD programme. Turkey will also need to prepare a 7-year programme together with the membership. Hence, it is necessary to determine the prior measures in rural development, considering the weaknesses and potentials of Turkish rural sector and the measures put forward by the member countries in their programmes.

In this context, first of all, Turkey has to determine the target and strategies to be reached with the prior measures to be employed in rural development. During this programme preparation, it will be useful to follow the process summarized in following figure.
Determming the present situation by considering the problems and improvement potentials of rural sector and agriculture sector,

In order to determine the present situation of the sector, SWOT analysis should be made to analyze the strong and weak points, opportunities and dangers of the rural sector.

After the SWOT Analysis

- Improving the rural infrastructure
- Improving the living standards of the rural population
- Improving education and organization in the rural sector
- Making environment-sensitive agricultural production widespread
- Making land use and production planning
- Providing the rural sector with sufficient and balanced drinking water
- Creating alternative income and employment opportunities in the rural sector
- Improving small or agriculture-based industry in the rural sector
- Decreasing the migration from rural areas to urban areas
- Determining the optimum enterprise size for the rural sector and dealing with the necessary arrangements
- Creating marketing opportunity in the rural sector
- Improving the agricultural broadcasting services and participative (?) approaches
- Enabling the protection of natural resources and cultural inheritance
- Activating the present and possible production potentials

Related to Its Aims

Determination of Rural Development Policies and Strategies In Terms of Priorities

SAPARD AGENCY (Fund Finance Agent) should be formed to make use of SAPARD FUND

DETERMINATION, OBSERVATION, AND EVALUATION COMMITTEES SHOULD BE FORMED

Figure 1. SAPARD AGENCY (Fund Finance Agent) should be formed to make use of SAPARD FUND
7. COMPARISON OF THE RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES OF TURKEY AND THE EU: THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE TWO PROGRAMMES

Just in the beginning for comparison, it must be underlined that the Rural Area and the Agricultural Sector have vigorous differentiations due to their POLICY, structure, conditions, resources and priorities then the policy implementations within the two communities.

However, concerning the Turkey’s possible membership to the EU in future, these differentiations should be minimized through some especial efforts and precautions.

It is clear that, the subject matter has been handled efficiently in EU, through special rural development policy and program implementations.

Whereas in Turkey, it is indeed difficult to find an efficiently set and implemented rural development and agricultural development policy and programs. This situation, of course, brings and creates some important problems which are requiring promptly solutions.

When the fundamental regulations of rural development policy in the EU is the Council Regulation number 1257/99, which was revealed in direction of Agenda 2000, it can be said that there is not a similar legal regulation in Turkey, yet concerning the performance of rural development policies. This necessitates the improvement of rural development strategies suitable to the EU norms, and the re-structuring of the institutional structure in order to apply these policies. As a matter of fact, there are various institutions that serve in the rural area, and this both leads to a confusion in terms of authorization and prevents the services from being at the desired level and quality.

In the EU, Rural Development Policy is considered together with OTP, in other words, when agriculture sector was being arranged, rural economy was also considered as a whole. For Turkey, however, it is even hard to talk about a continuous Agriculture Policy, the aims, means, methods, and targets of which were efficiently determined.

The rural development applications in the EU are supported by FEOGA, European Agricultural Guarantee and Orientation Fund; the Guarantee Section of the fund supports the so-called “additional measures in rural development” such as pre-
The rural development projects in the EU are being managed by the ones who will profit from them within the LEADER programme. In Turkey, however, as in the Leader Project, it will be necessary to support the pilot applications by making the necessary arrangements to increase producer participation and producer organizations for an integrated rural development. As a matter of fact, it has been expressed that the use of a fund to be applied in candidate countries called INPARD, similar to LEADER, is being discussed in the EU Parliament.

There are funds such as Phare, Ispa, Sapard in the EU for both member and candidate countries to realize the structural and legal conformity and the rural development measures determined by the EU regulations are being supported. In Turkey, in order to make the utmost use of the EU rural development funds, it is necessary to establish the substructure of rural development and for every measure, detailed studies and analyses should be made. As a matter of fact, EU regulations call for the determination and notification of the disadvantageous lands to the commission. Therefore, Turkey has to determine the disadvantageous lands considering the geographical qualities in order to benefit from this aid measure along with the membership.

The differences that were briefly given above create certain influences and cause serious problems on both sides, of course. It has been anticipated that, the importance of these problems may increase especially when Turkey’s membership efforts to join the EU are concerned.

8. CONCLUSION

As a result of these explanations, it can be clearly observed that a large-scaled, stabilized rural development policy, which aims to increase the rivalry power of rural areas, to protect the environment and rural inheritance, exists in the EU settled with its application organs, financial supports and means serving the continuity of rural development and encouraging the rural population to remain in the sector.
For this reason, it is primarily important that the rural development regulations in Turkey should try to be conformed to that of EU in no time, and the preparations related to the administrative and application mechanisms, which will enable the system to function, have to be made in order to make use of the financial means provided by the Union, also to remove the negativities of being unprepared and to increase the living standards of the rural sector.
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