KONGRE DÜZENLEME KURULU ONURSAL BAŞKANLARI

Prof. Dr. İlker Hüseyin ÇARIKÇI
Rektör

Prof. Dr. Mevlüt TÜRK
Dekan

Dr. Nevzat BİRİŞİK
TAGEM Genel Müdürü

KONGRE DÜZENLEME KURULU

Prof. Dr. Bahri KARLI
Başkan

Arş. Gör. Dr. Deniz SARICA
Kongre Sekretaryası

KONGRE DÜZENLEME KURULU ÜYELERİ

Doç. Dr. Tufan BAL

Doç. Dr. F. Handan GİRAY

Doç. Dr. Mevlüt GÜL

Prof. Dr. Vecdi DEMİRCAN

Doç. Dr. Hasan YILMAZ

Doç. Dr. Hacer ÇELİK ATEŞ

Doç. Dr. Masum BURAK

Dr. A. Ahmet YÜCER

Dr. Şenay ÖZGER

İsa EREN

Dr. Hüseyin AKGÜL

Dilek KARAMÜRSEL

Meltem EMRE

Alamettin BAYAV

Fatma Pınar ÖZTÜRK

BİLİM KURULU ÜYELERİ

Prof. Dr. Cuma AKBAY	Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Göksel ARMAĞAN	Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Songül AKIN	Dicle Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. İsmet BOZ	Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Turan BİNİCİ	Harran Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Dilek BOSTAN BUDAK	Çukurova Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Erdal DAĞISTAN	Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi
Dr. Muhammet DEMİRTAŞ	GTHB TAGEM
Prof. Dr. İsmail Hakkı İNAN	Namık Kemal Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Bahri KARLI	Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi
Dr. Taylan KIYMAZ	Kalkınma Bakanlığı
Prof. Dr. Taner KUMUK	Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Cennet OĞUZ	Selçuk Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Ahmet ÖZÇELİK	Ankara Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Tayfun ÖZKAYA	TEDER Başkanı
Prof. Dr. Cengiz SAYIN	Akdeniz Üniversitesi
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Kasım ŞAHİN	Iğdır Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Hasan VURAL	Uludağ Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Fahri YAVUZ	Atatürk Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Murat YERCAN	Ege Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. İbrahim YILDIRIM	Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi

XII. ULUSAL TARIM EKONOMİSİ KONGRESİ

25-27 Mayıs 2016-ISPARTA

CİLT -1-

EDİTÖRLER:

Prof. Dr. Bahri KARLI
Doç. Dr. Tufan BAL
Arş. Gör. Dr. Deniz SARICA
Dr. Şenay ÖZGER

Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Ziraat Fakültesi Tarım Ekonomisi Bölümü, Isparta.

Telefon : +90 (246) 211 86 08 / 85 16
Faks : +90 (246) 211 86 96
E-posta : utek2016@gmail.com
Web : utek2016.sdu.edu.tr

Takım No: 978-9944-452-91-5
ISBN : 978-9944-452-92-2

Basım Tarihi: 10 Mayıs 2016

Basım Yeri: Ajans Özüm İstiklal Mah. 105. Cad. No: 62 Bodrum Kat. D.1 Isparta.

Çiftçi Gözünde Tarımın Türkiye Ekonomisinde Yeri ve Önemi: Manisa İli Soma İlçesi Örneği 393

Esen Oruç, Orhan Gündüz, Aysel Ergün

TARIMSAL PAZARLAMA

Türkiye'de Portakal Üreticilerinin Üretim ve Pazarlama Sorunları 405

Mükerrem Atalay Oral, Metin Göksel Akpınar

Türkiye'de Portakal Üreticilerinin Pazarlamaya Yönelik Tutumları 411

Mükerrem Atalay Oral, Metin Göksel Akpınar

Konya İli Taşkent İlçesinde Kiraz Üreticilerinin Kiraz Üretimine ve Pazarlamasına Bakışı 417

Murat Küçükçongar, Mustafa Kan, Fatih Özdemir, M. Naim Demirtaş, Mehmet Hüsrev Öz, Gül Ülke

Tokat İli Niksar İlçesi Ceviz Üretim ve Pazarlama Yapısı 427

Mehmet Kilci, Halil Kızılaslan

Gelişmekte Olan Ülkelerde Pamuk Üretimi, Sanayileşmesi ve Pazarlaması: Benin ve Türkiye 437

R. Figen Ceylan, Mouinatou Alidou, Metin Göksel Akpınar, Burhan Özkan

Baklagil Ürünleri Fiyatlarındaki Gelişmelerin Ekonomik Perspektifte Değerlendirilmesi 447

Metin Göksel Akpınar, Mısra Çakaloğlu, R. Figen Ceylan

Türk Kahvesi Tüketim Eğilimleri ve Tüketici Özelliklerinin Belirlenmesi 457

Emine Yılmaz, Yasemin Oraman, Gülen Özdemir, Sevcan Arap, İsmail Yılmaz

Samsun İli Çarşamba İlçesinde Yetiştirilen Kivinin Pazarlama Kanalları ve Pazarlama Marjı 465

Selime Canan, Nur İlkay Abacı, Kürşat Demiryürek

Tüketicilerin Bölge Orijinli/Coğrafi İşaretli Elma Tüketim Tercihleri İçin Ödeme İstekliliği 475

Yavuz Topcu, Süleyman Yalçın

Ekolojik, Ekonomik ve Sosyal Açılardan Kent Tarımının Artan Önemi 485

Esin Sağlam

Coğrafi İşaretli Tarım Ürünü Gemlik Zeytininin Ekonomik Değerinin Karşılaştırılmalı Olarak İncelenmesi 491

Emine Arslan Pauli

Türkiye'de Meyve Fidanı Üreten İşletmelerin Pazarlama Yapısı ve Sorunları 501

Dilek Karamürsel, Fatma Pınar Öztürk, Cennet Oğuz, Meltem Emre, Alamettin Bayav, Ömer Faruk Karamürsel, Süleyman Akol, Emel Kaçal, Ayşegül Sarısu, Mesut Altındal

TARIM VE GIDA POLİTİKASI

Türkiye'de Yağlı Tohumlar Sektörü ve İzlenen Politikalar 763

Oya Sav, Cengiz Sayın

Türkiye'de Pamuk Arzını Etkileyen Faktörlerin Belirlenmesi ve Pamuk Arzında 2023 Vizyonu 771

Nihat Küçük, Abdülbaki Bilgiç

Ayçiçeği Üreticilerinin Mevcut Tarımsal Desteklerden Memnuniyet Düzeyini Etkileyen Faktörlerin Analizi: Edirne İli Lalapaşa İlçesi Örneği 781

Sibel Tan, Selin Bınarcı, Bengü Everest

Türkiye'de Bitki Koruma Ürünlerinde Reçete Uygulaması 791

Çiğdem Kurtar, Nevzat Birişik, Emine Olhan

Salamuralık Yaprak Üreten Bağlarda Kimyasal İlaç Kullanımı, Kalıntı Sorunu ve Üretici Bilinci: Tokat Kazova 801

H. Sibel Gülse Bal, Ali Çallı, Hatice Yavuz, Eda Buğancık

Gıda Güvenilirliğinin Sağlanmasında Üretici Risk Algısının Önemi: Domates Üreticileri Özelinde Temel Bulgular 809

Funda Kadim, Bülent Gülçubuk

Mer'a Topraklarının Korunması ve Yönetimi 819

Sema Gün

Türkiye'de Süt Sektörünün Mevcut Durumu ve Sektöre Yönelik Politikaların İrdelenmesi 829

Özge Can Niyaz, İ. Hakkı İnan

Türkiye'de Hanelerin 2002-2013 Döneminde Süt ve Süt Ürünleri Türleri Tüketim Harcamalarına Etki Eden Faktörlerinin Havuz Verileri İle Çok Terimli Tobit Model Yardımı İle Analizi 839

Mustafa Terin, Abdulbaki Bilgiç, İrfan Okan Güler, Fahri Yavuz

Türkiye'de Tarımsal Araştırmalarda Gıda Tarım ve Hayvancılık Bakanlığının Yeri ve Önemi 849

Muhammet Demirtaş, Reyhan Demirtaş, Celal Cevher

Türkiye Tarım Sektöründe Faktör Talebi ve Toplam Faktör Verimliliği 859

A. Ali Koç, Ahmet Bayaner, Peyman Uysal, Sedat Subaşı

Yeni Köylülük Tarımsal Sorunlara Çözüm Olabilir mi? 869

Tayfun Özkaya

Tarımsal Kuruluşlar – Nasıl Değişti? 877

Farangis Rahmonova, Figen Ceylan, Yavuz Taşçıoğlu, Cengiz Sayın

Coğrafi İşaretli Gıdalarda Etiket Korumasının Refah Etkisi 887

Mehmet Tarakcıoğlu

TARIM VE GIDA POLİTİKASI

Türkiye'de Yağlı Tohumlar Sektörü ve İzlenen Politikalar 763

Oya Sav, Cengiz Sayın

Türkiye'de Pamuk Arzını Etkileyen Faktörlerin Belirlenmesi ve Pamuk Arzında 2023 Vizyonu 771

Nihat Küçük, Abdülbaki Bilgiç

Ayçiçeği Üreticilerinin Mevcut Tarımsal Desteklerden Memnuniyet Düzeyini Etkileyen Faktörlerin Analizi: Edirne İli Lalapaşa İlçesi Örneği 781

Sibel Tan, Selin Bınarcı, Bengü Everest

Türkiye'de Bitki Koruma Ürünlerinde Reçete Uygulaması 791

Çiğdem Kurtar, Nevzat Birişik, Emine Olhan

Salamuralık Yaprak Üreten Bağlarda Kimyasal İlaç Kullanımı, Kalıntı Sorunu ve Üretici Bilinci: Tokat Kazova 801

H. Sibel Gülse Bal, Ali Çallı, Hatice Yavuz, Eda Buğancık

Gıda Güvenilirliğinin Sağlanmasında Üretici Risk Algısının Önemi: Domates Üreticileri Özelinde Temel Bulgular 809

Funda Kadim, Bülent Gülçubuk

Mer'a Topraklarının Korunması ve Yönetimi 819

Sema Gün

Türkiye'de Süt Sektörünün Mevcut Durumu ve Sektöre Yönelik Politikaların İrdelenmesi 829

Özge Can Niyaz, İ. Hakkı İnan

Türkiye'de Hanelerin 2002-2013 Döneminde Süt ve Süt Ürünleri Türleri Tüketim Harcamalarına Etki Eden Faktörlerinin Havuz Verileri İle Çok Terimli Tobit Model Yardımı İle Analizi 839

Mustafa Terin, Abdulbaki Bilgiç, İrfan Okan Güler, Fahri Yavuz

Türkiye'de Tarımsal Araştırmalarda Gıda Tarım ve Hayvancılık Bakanlığının Yeri ve Önemi 849

Muhammet Demirtaş, Reyhan Demirtaş, Celal Cevher

Türkiye Tarım Sektöründe Faktör Talebi ve Toplam Faktör Verimliliği 859

A. Ali Koç, Ahmet Bayaner, Peyman Uysal, Sedat Subaşı

Yeni Köylülük Tarımsal Sorunlara Çözüm Olabilir mi? 869

Tayfun Özkaya

Tarımsal Kuruluşlar – Nasıl Değişti? 877

Farangis Rahmonova, Figen Ceylan, Yavuz Taşçıoğlu, Cengiz Sayın

Coğrafi İşaretli Gıdalarda Etiket Korumasının Refah Etkisi 887

Mehmet Tarakcıoğlu

Ekolojik Ekonomi Perspektifinden Sürdürülebilirliğin ARIMA Yaklaşımı İle Projeksiyonu "BRIC Ülkeleri ve Türkiye" 1399

Arslan Zafer Gürler, Bekir Ayyıldız, Esra Gürel, Hasan Gökhan Doğan

Ziraat Fakültesi Öğrencilerinin Çevre Bilinci Düzeyinin Araştırılması 1409

Çiğdem Alp, Sibel Tan

Suriyeli Sığınmacıların Bölge Tarımı Üzerine Etkileri 1419

Erdal Dağıstan, Oğuz Parlakay, Bekir Demirtaş, Arif Semerci, Ahmet D. Çelik, Tuğçe Kızıltuğ

Akademisyenlerin Ekolojik Etkilerinin İncelenmesi: E.Ü. Ziraat Fakültesi Örneği 1427

Yarkın Akyüz, Ela Atış, Muhammed Çukadar, Ece Salalı

Tarımda İklim Değişimi Uyum Çalışmaları Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme 1437

Zerrin Çelik

İNGİLİZCE BİLDİRİLER

Exploring University Curricula in Agricultural and Extension Education: An Analytical Study 1449

Ahmad Rezvanfar

Food Hub Models Create Viable Linkages between Small and Mid-Sized Farmers, Consumers, and Distributors 1459

Rachael Kennedy, Ferhan Savran

Effect of Different Crop Management System on Technical Efficiency in Sugarcane Production in Faisalabad, Punjab Region of Pakistan 1469

Shamsheer Ul Haq, Vedat Ceyhan, İsmet Boz

Estimating Price Volatility Transmission between World Crude Oil and Selected Food Commodities: A BEKK Approach 1479

Osman Damba Tahidu, Abdülbaki Bilgiç, Tamer Işgın

Factors Influencing on Cigarette Consumption in Turkey: A Double-Hurdle Censored Model with Pooled Data 1489

Abdifatah Ali, Abdulbaki Bilgiç

Factors Affecting The Students' Environmental Awareness, Attitudes and Behaviors in Ondokuz Mayis University, Turkey 1497

Mehmet Bozoğlu, Abdulbaki Bilgiç, Bakiye Kılıç Topuz, Yüksel Ardalı

Financing Agriculture in Turkey, Germany and Romania 1507

Adriana Carmen Cazan, R. Figen Ceylan, Yavuz Taşçıoğlu, Cengiz Sayın

Türkiye ve Romanya'da Organik Tarımın Karşılaştırılması 1515

Cristian Viorel Popescu, R. Figen Ceylan, Cengiz Sayın

TARIMSAL KURULUŞLAR – NASIL DEĞİŞTİ?

Farangis RAHMONOVA
rahmonova997@gmail.com

Figen CEYLAN
ceylan.figen@gmail.com

Yavuz TAŞÇIOĞLU
ytascioglu@akdeniz.edu.tr

Cengiz SAYIN[1]
csayin@akdeniz.edu.tr

Akdeniz University, Faculty of Agriculture, Dept. of Agricultural Economics

ÖZET

Toplumun tarımsal kurumların ne yaptığından haberdar olması ve böylece bu kurumlara kaynak geliştirme süreçlerinde ve faaliyetlerinde etkin olarak yer vermesi ve bu kurumların sağladığı desteklerden istifade etmesi artarak önem kazanmaktadır. Bu çalışma 2000 ve 2015 yılları arasında AB'nin yeni üyelerinden seçilmiş bazı ODAÜ –Orta ve Doğu Avrupa Ülkeleri (Macaristan, Polonya, Romanya ve Slovakya) ve Rusya ve Türkiye'de tarımsal kuruluşların gelişme ve değişme sürecini incelemeyi hedeflemektedir. Çalışma kapsamındaki tüm ülkelerin 2000 ve 2015 yılları belirlenen reformları tamamlama durumunun, kendi özerk kurumlarını, yönetim organlarını tanımlamalarını, finansman düzenlemeleri ve tarımsal araştırmaya özel atıfla destek programlarına göre kıyaslamaktadır. Bu gözden geçirme ile tarımsal kuruluşlarının ne yaptığı, yönetişim, idare ve operasyonel anlamda nasıl faaliyet gösterdiği ve ne gibi sorunlarla mücadele ettiğine dair açık bir görüşün oluşturulması istenmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Tarımsal kuruluşlar, polika, Avrupa Birliği, ODAÜler, Türkiye, Rusya

AGRICULTURAL INSTITUTIONS – HOW THEY EVOLVED?

ABSTRACT

It is increasingly important that the public are aware of what these institutions are doing so that they can more effectively take part in their resourcing, activities, and the effectiveness of the aid they provide. This paper aims to explain the development and evolution of modeling tools to simulate the effects of agricultural institutions in some selected CEECs (Hungary, Poland, Romania, Slovakia) the newer member states of the European Union and Russia and Turkey between 2000 and 2015. The paper describes and analyses almost all critical basic elements of reforms, rating each country in the study on the progress in completing each type of reform, their own separate identities, governing bodies, management structures, financing arrangements, and programs of assistance with specific reference to agricultural research. Basic element of reforms during 2000 - 2015, the CEEC countries have achieved considerably more success. The primary aim of this paper is to convey a clear idea of what these institutions do, how they act in terms of their governance, management, and operations, and what kind of problems confront them.

Keywords: Agricultural institutes, policy, the European Union, CEECs, Turkey, Russia

1.INTRODUCTION

Agricultural development is determinative to reduce poverty, hunger, and achieving food-security in many agricultural-based developing countries. The success and speed with which agricultural development is achieved, mostly depends in part on the productivity of organizations working to promote development of the agricultural sector. Both governmental and non-governmental organizations working in agricultural development are increasingly concerned with the need to estimate and understand their capacity, and to improve relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of programs/projects/policies. World agriculture in the twenty-first century is faced with three main challenges: 1) to improve food security, rural livelihoods and income; 2) to satisfy the increasing and diversified demands for safe food and other products; and, 3) to conserve and protect natural resources.

2.CEECs COUTRIES BEFORE AND AFTER ACCESSION TO THE EU

From the beginning of the European Union, EU policies has given emphasis to agricultural sector. To this end, COPA (Committee of Professional Agricultural Organizations) was established in 1958. One year later, the agricultural cooperatives of the European umbrella organization, COGECA (General Confederation of Agricultural Cooperatives) was created. COGECA is the main representative for all agricultural and fisheries cooperative sector at EU level. The most important priorities COGECA's first of all to represent specific and general interests of European agricultural, forestry, fisheries and agro-food cooperatives and promote to the development of those cooperatives. In addition, COGECA provides a platform for member organizations to keep political discussions and exchanging views and ideas on agricultural policy issues, as well as other representative organizations at EU and international level. Currently COGECA has 35 full members from EU member states, 4 affiliated members and 36 partner organizations, which include representatives of countries like Iceland, Norway, Switzerland and Turkey. Unlike COGECA, COPA mostly operates with farmers but also represents the general and specific interests of them. Since the establishment, the EU institutions have recognized COPA as the most important organization speaking on behalf of the European agricultural sector as a whole. The main working structure of COPA can examine any issues related to the development of the Common Agricultural Policy of EU and supporting developing relations between EU institutions and any other representative organizations or social partners established at European level. In addition, COPA is working on international level enabling representatives of the European Union and any other foreign organization to discuss existing problems and suggest solutions. COPA is made up of 60 organizations: 27 from EU and 36 partner organization from other European countries. It has 50 working parties, dealing either with specific, production-related topics (cereals, beef meat, etc.) nor with general questions (environment, rural development, farming and etc.) (Anonymous, 2014).

Each country in Eastern Europe is developing its own approach to extension, with differences in the relationships among extension, research and farmers and in the roles of key institutions including the ministry of agriculture, agricultural universities, and private industry and farmer organizations. Developing goal is a common thread in Eastern Europe.

The Program of Community aid to the countries of Eastern and Central Europe (PHARE) was created to prepare and support countries for accession to the EU, starting in 1989 in Hungary and Poland and expending in 1994 to other Eastern and Central Europe countries including Romania among others (Chan-Halbrendt and Fantle-Lepczyk, 2013).

2.1 Hungary Case

Agriculture is an important sector for the Hungarian economy and it has gone through a long and difficult development since the First World War. Hungary joined the European Union (EU) in May 2004. As a country with huge agro-potential and a high degree of export orientation, Hungary was looking forward to the EU accession, especially in the field of trade in agricultural products. As 12 years have now passed since EU accession and agricultural trade still plays a prominent role in the Hungarian economy (Kiss and Hegedüs, 2014).

Table 1: Hungarian total agricultural exports and imports, 2003-2013 (EUR billion)

	2003	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2011	2012	2013
Imports	1.49	2.52	3.00	3.50	3.20	3.35	3.68	3.99	4.43
Exports	2.85	3.59	4.70	5.00	5.00	5.20	7.00	7.60	8.09

Source: EUROSTAT, data retrieved: 15.03.2016

The balance of these 12 years of membership in the EU are clearly positive for agriculture and the rural economy of Hungary. Nowadays, there are governmental and non-governmental organizations, which are supporting and connected to agricultural movement. The Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development has overall responsibility for the "Farm Advisory System" that provides government consultancy services, and is an obligation for all European Union member states under the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) that gives 80 % of the required financial support. The Ministry is also responsible for the specialized consultancy services, which usually provide by the civil society including private individual consultants and advisors. Regional Advisory Centers (RACs) and Rural Development Advisory Service are examples of Institute of Training and Consulting (Anonymous, 2007).

HCA is an umbrella organization of COPA and the national public body of the Budapest chamber and 9 regional chambers. The chamber can represent more than 11.000 voluntary members and provide its services to all worldwide producers. HCA mainly has been working to give a new impact to the Hungarian agriculture and food economy and it supplies interests of representation for all rural area players, such as producers, processors, traders and those who are working in the rural field of development. The main duties of Hungarian Chamber of Agriculture are related to development, subsidies representation of general interests of the agricultural sector. It operates mainly The Farm Information Service with the network of 202 advisors throughout Hungary. The aim consists to ensure domestic and international opportunities of the lower sectors for support in the development of the Hungarian agriculture to be more effective (Chan-Halbrendt and Fantle-Lepczyk, 2013).

2.2. Poland Case

Poland's membership in the EU has completely changed the economic situation of functioning in the Polish agriculture and rural areas. The most important sources of these changes, of course, apart from the European Single Market and macro-economic conditionality, include Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) and structural funds.

Currently, CAP has caused an increase in support for agriculture, while structural funds have target of modernization of food economy and development of rural area. After Poland's accession to the EU, significant changes took place that were connected with the CAP instruments covering Poland resulted in doubling the actual income of farmers, which improved their economic situation and increased the opportunities to finance the current expenditure and to implement modernisation investments (Wigier, 2014).

Table 2: The amount of CAP funds transferred to Poland (data in EUR)

Year	Direct payments	RDP	Other CAP transfer
2004	0	286,640,000	0
2005	702,674,035	662,100,658	10,638,946
2006	811,580,923	1,149,555,478	11,100,858
2007	953,100,872	1,550,886,535	5,264,141
2008	1,037,600,783	1,846,530,427	12,400,573
2009	1,446,164,527	1,043,825,682	14,860,428
2010	1,827,719,773	1,571,940,488	12,586,168
2011	2,395,415,615	1,706,015,707	11,632,309
2012	2,702,781,649	2,024,767,952	11,376,612
2013	3,065,995,810	96,850,253	24,234,865

Source: EUROSTAT, data retrieved: 15.03.2016

Currently, The Ministry of Agriculture and Development has overall responsibility for providing public extension and advisory services to the farmers. This responsibility is carried out through the following organizational structure covering the national, provincial, and county and municipality levels: Board of Advisory Service, Agricultural Advisory Center, Brwinow, and Provincial (Voievod) Advisory Service Centers. The Council of Agricultural Chambers (Krajowa Rada Izb Rolniczych, KRIR) is operating under COPA organization and represents regional agricultural chambers in Poland. Agricultural chambers are usually self-governing membership structures, which are created by the farmers all over the country. The Council is a managing structure and a voice of farmers associated within the chambers. Like other partner organizations, KRIR also perceives agriculture as a key and strategic sector of European economy (Chan-Halbrendt and Fantle-Lepczyk, 2013).

2.3 Slovakia Case

After the breakup of Czechoslovakia in 1993, the Czech Republic and Slovakia formed a customs union. There were no barriers to agricultural trade between the two countries. EU accession led to significant changes in Slovak agricultural trade. The results indicate that 31.4% of the increase in agricultural imports from the EU15+CEECs between 2000 and 2005 was due to the discriminatory trade liberalization between Slovakia and the EU15+CEECs. The rest of the increase in respective agricultural imports was due to other reasons such as globalization, transformation of the economy, harmonization of regulatory policies, elimination of non-tariff barriers and others (Drabik, Pokrivcak, Ciaian 20017).

The Ministry of Agriculture of the Slovak Republic managed the Central Controlling and Testing Institute in Agriculture (ÚKSÚP), which is a national budget organization.

The basic task of the Institute is to execute professional state supervision and testing under the conditions of the agricultural sector, as well as professional state inspection of quality of inputs into agriculture. The activities of the Central Controlling and Testing Institute in Agriculture within the framework of plant production and animal production are thematically aimed at soil, varieties of agricultural crops, seeds and planting, plant nutrition, plant protection. The Central Controlling and Testing Institute in Agriculture cooperates with COPA/COGECA, with the Slovak national authorities (the Parliament, the Government, and the Ministry of Agriculture of the SR, the State Veterinary and Food Administration of the SR, Slovak Agriculture and Food Chamber. Slovak Agricultural and Food Chamber is also a member organization of COPA, which represents the common interests of its members in the process of the state socio-economic policy creation, support and protection of member's

enterprise activities, the food industry progress and improvement in Slovakia (Anonymous, 2015).

2.4. Romania Case

Romania became a member of the European Union (EU) on first of January 2007 following a difficult and painful transition process to a market economy. Prior to 1990, agriculture was considered the poor relation of the economy, with the communist regime focusing on industrialization, transition to a market economy has enhanced the role played by the agricultural sector.

The subsidies provided after EU accession include:

- Total support from the national budget; the main component is the complementary national direct payments;
- EU area payments provided under the Single Area Payment Scheme (SAPS);
- EU payments provided for agricultural land in the mountainous areas, less-favored areas and agro-environmental measures National Rural Development Program (NRDP)
- Subsidies for investments for co-financed from both EU and national funds measures under investments on farms and agro-processing units.
- Support for SAPARD (before and after accession) and the NRDP 2007-2013 (after the EU accession) (Hubbard et al., 2014).

Indeed, after having to implement SAPARD type measures and adoption of the CAP, the Romanian government has started to allocate more funds for rural development. However, their contribution to the national budget varies considerably from year to year, for example from 6 per cent in 2008, 30 per cent in 2011 and 18 % in 2012. Overall, total national support for agriculture accounted for EUR 8.1 billion between 2002 and 2012, of which almost two thirds (65 per cent) went directly to farmers in the form of income (direct payments) and commodity support (Anonymous, 2011).

The table above gives an overview of the total numbers of projects targeted in the SAPARD Program, approved by the SAPARD agency and finally implemented and paid out. The Ministry of Agriculture in Romania has several responsibilities for policy level decision making for public agricultural enlargement, advisory and consulting services, such organizations as County Centers for Agricultural Consulting and Local Centers for Agricultural consulting which are also considered as Agricultural Chambers under COPA membership (Metis GmbH, 2013).

Table 3: Number of approved and implemented/reimbursed projects per measure

Measures		Targeted	Approved	Reimbursed
I	Agro-investment	11.000	1.935	1.916
II	Processing Investment	1.900	459	450
III	Vet. and Plant health	20	20	19
IV	Agro-environment	600	1	0
V	Diversification	7.150	1.058	1.018
VI	Farm relief	-	-	-
VII	Producer groups	700	3	0
VII	Village renewal	-	-	-
IX	Land improvement	-	-	-
X	Land register	-	-	-
XI	Vocational training	305	5	5
XII	Rural infrastructure	724	847	843

Source: EUROSTAT, data retrieved: 15.03.2016

3. NON-EU COUNTRIES: RUSSIA AND TURKEY

3.1. Russia

The legal framework of the relationship between the European Union (EU) and the Russian Federation (Russia) is the EU-Russia Partnership and Co-operation Agreement (PCA) signed in 1994 (Hatipoglu, 1997). The PCA contains special provisions regarding the economic relations between the EU and Russia, with one of its main objectives being the promotion of trade and investment as well as the development of harmonious economic relations between the two parties. Dominated by non-agricultural commodities, Russia has become the EU's third largest trading partner. In turn, the EU is Russia's major trading partner regarding both exports and imports. Russia supplies the EU with large amounts of oil and gas, while the EU exports to Russia are more diversified, covering in addition to machinery, manufactured goods also food, and live animals (Corselli-Nordblad, 2012).

Table 4: Evolution of the EU trade with Russia, 2000-2007 (EUR billion)

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2011
Exports	22.7	31.6	34.4	37.2	46.0	56.7	72.3	89.1	104.8	65.6	108.4
Imports	63.8	65.9	64.5	70.7	84.0	112.6	140.9	145.0	178.1	117.7	199.4
Balance	-41.0	-34.3	-30.1	-33.5	-37.9	-55.9	-68.6	-55.9	-73.3	-52.1	-91.0

Source: EUROSTAT, data retrieved: 15.03.2016

Since 2008, the EU and Russia are negotiating a new agreement, which will update and replace the existing PCA and provide a comprehensive framework for bilateral relations. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, Russia became a single country in 1991, and embarked on transition from the centralized economy to a market economy (Salputra et al., 2013). In the 1990s, an Information Consulting Service (ICS) was created within the Ministry of Agriculture with the mandate to provide farmers with the information on improved technologies, innovative projects, agri-business and marketing. ICS Centers were established at various administrative levels, staffed by experienced agricultural specialists from research and other organizations.

A number of domestic and international projects that aimed at agricultural reforms and capacity building supported the ICS. One common output of these projects was a manual, "The Organization of Information Consulting Service in the Agricultural Sector" (Anonymous, 2016).

Currently, the foreign organization that is importantly influence the Russian agriculture is FAO (Food and Agricultural Organization of European Union). FAO-Russian cooperation comprises support to a wide area of development initiatives in the region and around the world as well as FAO assistance within the Russian Federation. What was already a strong partnership took a further step forward in 2015 with the opening of an FAO Liaison Office in Moscow. The importance attached by The Russian Federation to cooperation on food safety and international food standards programs is reflected in the concrete support provided to FAO food-related initiatives. Over the last five years, the country has contributed more than US$200 million to a variety of interventions, including school-feeding programs in North Africa, Asia and other areas. The Russian Federation also contributed to preparatory and follow-up activities of the 2014 Second International Conference on Nutrition (ICN2). Together with the World Bank, it organized a side event on the Transition from Safety Net Programs to Comprehensive Social Protection. The project, which is currently in the planning, will develop country capacities to establish an enabling environment for the food

security of the most vulnerable populations. It will use triangular exchange and capacity development as the main tools for achieving this objective. Target countries are Armenia, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan as well as Ethiopia and the United Republic of Tanzania. The global nature of the program will be complemented by close interaction among the countries, sharing an exchange of information and lessons learned and ensuring linkages with global food security governance mechanisms such as the Committee on World Food Security (CFS).

The Russian Federation is a member of FAO's Committee on Fisheries (COFI) as well as the European Inland Fisheries and Aquaculture Advisory Commission (EIFAAC). As a Black Sea country, it was also a player in the "BlackSeaFish" project, financed by Turkey, which lightened scientific cooperation and fisheries management among the six Black Sea countries. A second phase is now being developed to strengthen scientific, technical and institutional collaboration in support of responsible fisheries in the Black Sea. In addition, FAO and the Russian Federation are closely cooperating within the framework of the Agricultural Market Information System (AMIS) (Anonymous, 2015).

3.2. Turkey

The Republic of Turkey Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock is the official government agency in charge of the food and beverage and agriculture industries. The main mission of Ministry is to increase and improve standards of living in rural area, ensure the right way if using natural resources and to supply safe-food and high quality products to the world market. Due to achieve these goals there have been prepared some projects and plans with the EU funding. One of them is Rural Development Plan (2010-2013) has been prepared in order to develop the working and living conditions of rural population and to enable sustainable development. The measures and the activities needed to be implement in rural areas and the resources required were determined in coordination with 24 related institutions and organizations. Rural Development Plan (2010–2013) has been entered into force by High Planning Council decision dated 05 August 2010. The budget of the Plan has been identified as 27 Billion TL for which the areas of interventions and the responsible Ministries have been determined (Anonymous, 2007).

The Ministry of Food Agriculture and Livestock has been appointed as the Coordinator Ministry responsible for monitoring and evaluation of the Plan. Under the pre-accession support of European Union in the period of 2007-2016, totally 868 million euros has been allocated to Turkey to support rural development (Anonymous, 2015).

The rural development funds have been used in line with the Rural Development Program (IPARD Program) in which the sectors and measures to be supported have been identified. The sectors targeted by the Program are; milk, meat, fruit and vegetables and fishery sectors. The Program has been designed for implementation totally in 42 provinces out of 81 provinces of Turkey. The Central Union of Agricultural Credit Cooperatives is one of the member organizations of COPA. An organization meets all sorts of agricultural input needs and credit requirements of its approximately 1.1 million members. With 5.9 billion TL worth of assets, it is comprised of 16 regional unions, 1652 primary cooperatives, 188 services operation office and 6000 employees. The ACC constantly provides "on the job training" for its staff and members in order to equip them with the latest technological knowledge, modern application techniques and up to date information in cooperation with different universities and organizations concerned. It renders on site consultancy services for the producers by means of providing training tools with the help of its agricultural engineers and veterinaries (Anonymous, 2007). The program is of a seven-year duration, 2007-2013, but its financial envelope has been specified for three years only.

Table 4: The allocations for Turkey for this three-year period

Component	2007	2008	2009	TOTAL
Transition Assistance and Institution Buildings	252.2	250.2	233.2	753.6
Cross-border Co-operation	6.6	8.8	9.4	24.8
Regional Development	167.5	173.8	182.7	524
Human Resources Development	50.2	52.9	55.6	158.7
Rural Development	20.7	53	85.5	159.2
Total	**497.2**	**538.7**	**566.4**	**1602.3**

Source: MIFF, data retrieved: 15.03.2016

Turkey is a significant agricultural exporter. Turkey's main trade partners are the EU-27 countries. Turkey has a high trade surplus with the EU-27 (1.5 billion euros in 2009) mainly due to exports of edible fruits & nuts, preparations of fruit and vegetables as well as tobacco and tobacco products. Turkey has also important trade relations and a trade surplus with countries in the Mediterranean basin.

Table 5: EU-Turkey export and import for three-year period

Agricultural products	2007	2008	2009	Avg 2007/2009
EU-27 Imports (mio EUR)	2.670	2.682	2.500	2.617
EU-27 Exports (moi EUR)	1.023	1.219	1.015	1.086
Trade Balance for EU (mio EUR)	-1.647	-1.463	- 1.485	-1.531

Source: Eurostat, data retrieved: 15.03.2016

4. COMPARISON AND RESULTS

Agriculture always plays an essential role in the economy of every country. Not only, because it tends to provide food for the entire population of a country but agriculture helps to connect and interacts with all the related industries of that country. In recent years, many observers have suggested that agricultural and rural development strategies would benefit from increased collaboration between government research and extension organizations and non-governmental development organizations, hereafter called GOs and NGOs. Agricultural development is a complex process of interaction between national and international organizations. Therefore, any government organizations and NGOs are very important.

Nowadays, in comparison with EU, Russia and Turkey, European Union countries have achieved more advance in creating agricultural organizations and being main implementers of international worldwide projects. The EU has a much more developed, wealthy and strong agricultural sector, EU reform processes have been much more gradual during many years.

The reviews of development in agriculture of the new EU member countries lead to a conclusion that the accession had a positive impact upon the sector. It resulted in a strengthening of production, higher current prices, higher export and import quantities, and especially higher farmers' incomes. There are significant differences among the countries and therefore there is a variety besides the overall positive picture. Variety such as:

- Initial conditions
- Pre-accession policies
- Post-accession policies and the way of implementing CAP
- Macro policy and institutional environment.

It is difficult to evaluate individual country performances in details but all the EU member countries have gained significant support in developing their agricultural sector

through joining to the EU. For the last 50 years, the EU Common Agricultural Policy has been the most important common policy of the union. For decades, the EU's CAP which aimed encouraging better productivity in the food chain, ensuring fair standard of living to the agricultural community, market stabilization and ensuring the availability of food supplies to EU consumers at reasonable price was based on the price and product supports and high custom tariffs in external borders. It had received a large part of the EU's budget and was functioning as a main implementer of any agricultural organizations and projects. It is a prime example, that any state will not succeed alone, there has to be support at the international level, they need to work with producer organizations, they need to cooperate in order to compete successfully, and hence they need leadership and analytical capacities at the level of their organizations. No country can now succeed alone in developing agriculture because there are too many international dimensions that have to be understood and supported. Thus, international support and coordination are essential and, for this, capacities have to be developed also at the level of international organizations.

It is also important that the state have a very significant role to play: you cannot have a successful agriculture-for-development program without an active and supportive state. The investment climate will be managed by the state but, for this, the state has to have a good understanding of what the private sector needs in order to be successful in investing in agriculture and agro-industry. If there is a need, governance for agriculture should be redefined and the role of ministries of agriculture should be rethought, otherwise the developing will not succeed.

REFERENCES

Chan-Halbrendt, C., Fantle-Lepczyk J., 2013, "Agricultural Market in Transitioning Economy", University of Hawaii, Manoa, USA, page 44-48.

Judit, K., Hegedüs, Z., "Studies in Agricultural Economics", 2014, Hungary, page 87-93.

Shaw, D. J., 2008, "Global Food and Agricultural Institutions", Routledge.

Drabik, D., Pokrivcak, J., Ciaian, J., 2007, "Effects of Tariff Liberalization due to EU Accession on Slovak Agricultural Trade", Slovakia.

Osborne, S., and Trueblood, M., Agricultural Economic Report, July 2002.

Wigier, M., 2014, "The Competitiveness of Polish Agriculture after Accession to The EU", Poland.

Hubbard, C., Luca, L., Luca, M., and Alexandri, C., 2014, "Romanian farm support: has European Union membership made a difference?"

Metis GmbH, 2013, "Synthesis of SAPARD ex-post evaluations – update Bulgaria, Romania, Croatia", Vienna.

Hatipoglu, E., 1997, "EU - Russia: Partnership and Cooperation".

Dragoi, A., E., 2013, "Russian Foreign Policy - Interests Vectors and Economic Impact".

Salputra, G., Myrna van Leeuwen, Salamon, P., Fellmann, T., Banse, M., and Oliver von Ledebur, 2013, "The agri-food sector in Russia: Current situation and market outlook until 2025".

Corselli-Nordblad, L., 2012, "Strong recovery of trade in goods between EU27 and Russia in 2011".

Anonymous, 2007, IPA Rural Development (IPARD) Programme for Turkey.

Anonymous, 2015, Ministry of Food, Agriculture and livestock of Turkey, http://www.tarim.gov.tr

Anonymous, 2014, COPA – COGECA, http://www.copa-cogeca.be/

Anonymous, 2016, Ministry of Agriculture of the Russian Federation, http://www.mcx.ru/

Anonymous, 2012, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development of Romania, http://www.madr.ro

Anonymous, 2015, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nation, http://www.fao.org/en,

Anonymous, 2016, Eurostat, http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat

Anonymous, 2007, Ministry of agriculture and rural development of Hungary, http://www.kormany.hu/en

Anonymous, 2015, Ministry of agriculture and rural development of Slovakia, http://www.mpsr.sk/en/ -

Anonymous, 2011, The Central Controlling and Testing Institute in Agriculture, http://www.uksup.sk/en

Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development Managing Authority for SAPARD Program, Final Report on SAPARD Program Implementation in Romania, 2011

Anonymous, 2016, Global Forum for Rural Advisory Services, GFRAS, http://www.g-fras.org