



REPUBLIC OF SERBIA
IPARD PROGRAMME
FOR 2014-2020

27th June 2019

List of Abbreviations

AI - Artificial Insemination
APSFR - Areas with Potential Significant Flood Risk
APV - The Autonomous Province of Vojvodina
ASRoS - Agricultural Strategy of the Republic of Serbia
AWU - Annual work unit
CAO - Competent Accrediting Officer
CAP - Common Agricultural Policy
CARDS - Community Assistance for Reconstruction, Development and Stabilisation
CAS - Country Assistance Strategy
CBC - Cross border cooperation
CEFTA - Central European Free Trade Agreement
CGAP - Code of Good Agricultural Practices
CHP - Combined Heat and Power
CSF - Classical swine fever
CSP - Country Strategy Paper
DAP - Directorate for Agrarian Payment
DNRL - Directorate for National Reference Laboratories
DREPR - Danube River Enterprise Pollution Reduction
DTD - Dunav-Tisa-Dunav Channel
EAR - European Agency for Reconstruction
EC - European Commission
EEC - European Economic Community
EU - European Union
EUROP grid - Method of carcass classification
F&V - Fruits and Vegetables
FADN - Farm Accountancy Data Network
FAO - Food and Agriculture Organization
FAVS - Area of forest available for wood supply
FOWL - Forest and other wooded land
FVO - Food Veterinary Office
FWA - Framework Agreement
FWC - Framework Contract
GAEC - Good agriculture and environmental condition
GAP - Gross Agricultural Production
GDP - Gross Domestic Product
GEF - Global Environment Facility
GEF - Global Environment Facility
GES - Greenhouse gas emission
GHG - Green House Gas
GHP - Global Health Programmes
GI - General Inspectorate
GIS - Geographical identification system
GMO - Genetic modified organism
GMP - Good Manufacturing Practice
GO - Governmental Organization

GOS - Government of Serbia
GVA - Gross Value Added
GVA/FTE - Gross Value Added per full-time equivalent
HACCP - Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point
HMI - Hydro Meteorological Institute
HNV - High Nature Value
HNVF - High Nature Value Farming
HPP - Hydro-electric Power Plant
IACS - Integrated Administration and Control System
IAH - Institute for Animal Husbandry
IBA - Important Bird Area
IBRD - International Bank for Reconstruction and Development
ICPDR - International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River
ILO - International Labour Organization
IPA - Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance
IPA MC - IPA Monitoring Committee
IPARD - Instrument for Pre-Accession Rural Development
IPM - Integrated Pest Management
IPN - Institute for Science Application in Agriculture
IRENA - the International Renewable Energy Agency
ISAA - Institute for Science Application in Agriculture
ISO - International Organization for Standardization
IUCN - International Union for Conservation of Nature
JP - Joint Programme
KiM - Kosovo and Metohija
KTOE - Kilo Tons of Oil Equivalent
LAG - Local Action Group
LDS - Local Development Strategy
LEADER - French acronym, standing for - Liaison Entre Actions de Development de l'Économie Rural – meaning - Links between the rural economy and development actions
LFA - Less - Favoured Area
LFS - Labour Force Survey
LIS - LEADER Initiative Serbia
LSMS - Living Standard Measurement Survey
LSS - Life Standard Survey
M&E - Monitoring and Evaluation
MA - Managing Authority
MAEP - Ministry of Agriculture and Environmental Protection
MAFWM - Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Management
MDG - Millennium Development Goal
MoH - Ministry of Health
NAO - National Authorizing Officer
NARDS - National Agriculture and Rural Development Strategy
ND - Nitrate Directive
NGO - Non-governmental organization(s)

NIPAC - National IPA Coordinator
NPRD - National Programme for Rural Development
NRDS - Network for Rural Development of Serbia
NRN - National Rural Network
NSEDROs - National Strategy for Economic Development of Serbia
NUTS - The Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics
ODA - Official Development Assistance
OECD - Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
OF - Organic farming
OG - Official Gazette
PA - Paying Agency
PAU - Policy Advisory Unit
PBA - Prime Butterfly Areas
PDO - Protected Designation of Origin
PGI - Protected Geographical Indication
PLA - Participatory Learning and Action
PMG - Project Management Group
PPD - Plant Protection Directorate
PRA - Participatory rural appraisal
PRAG - Practical Guide to Contract Procedures for EU External Actions
PRSP - Serbia's Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
RD - Rural Development
RDCC - Rural Development Consultative Committee
RDNS - Rural Development Network of Serbia
RS - Republic of Serbia
SA - Sectoral Agreement
SAA - Stability and Association Agreements
SAPS - Simplified Area Payment Scheme
SCC - Somatic Cell Count
SEIO - Serbian European Integration Offices
SIDA - Swedish International Development Agency
SMC - Sectorial Monitoring Committees
SME - Small and Medium Enterprises
SORS - Statistical Office of Republic of Serbia
SPS - Single Application Scheme
SRDPPS - Support to Rural Development Programming and Payments System
SSF - Semi Subsistence Farming
SSI - Soil Science Institute
STAR - Serbian Transitional Agriculture Reform
SWG - Sector Working Group(s)
SWOT - Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats analysis
TA - Technical Assistance
TBC - Total Bacteria Count
TIC - Training and Information Centre
Toe - Tonne of oil equivalent
UAA - Utilized Agricultural Area

UHT - Ultra – high Temperature
ULO - Ultra Low Oxygen
UN - United Nations
UNDP - United Nations Development Programme
USAID - United States Agency for International Development
UWWT- Urban Waste Water Treatment
VAT - Value Added Tax
VIMS - Veterinary Information Management System
VZ - Viticulture zoning
WFD - Water Framework Directive of the European Union
WTO - World Trade Organization
WWTP - Waste Water Treatment Plant

Table of content

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Table of content..... | 6 |
| 0. IPARD II PROGRAMME FOR 2014-2020 | 14 |
| 1. BENEFICIARY COUNTRY | 14 |
| 1.1. Geographical area covered by the programme..... | 14 |
| 2. DESCRIPTION OF THE CURRENT SITUATION, SWOT AND IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS | 14 |
| 2.1. THE GENERAL SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONTEXT OF THE GEOGRAPHICAL AREA..... | 14 |
| 2.1.1. Administrative system | 14 |
| 2.1.2. Demographic characteristics and trends | 15 |
| 2.1.3. Economic indicators and employment..... | 16 |
| 2.1.4. Farm structure | 17 |
| 2.2. Performance of the agricultural, forestry and food sectors..... | 18 |
| 2.2.1. General characteristics..... | 18 |
| 2.2.2. Milk and dairy sector | 20 |
| 2.2.3. Meat sector | 25 |
| 2.2.4. Fruit & Vegetable sector | 32 |
| 2.2.5. Other crops (cereals, oil crops, sugar beet) | 38 |
| 2.3. Environment and land management..... | 49 |
| 2.3.1. Biodiversity..... | 49 |
| 2.3.2. Water quality | 50 |
| 2.3.3. Climate changes and GHG emissions and their relation to agriculture..... | 51 |
| 2.3.4. Soil..... | 53 |
| 2.3.5. Usage of mineral fertilizers and pesticides | 55 |
| 2.3.6. Concept of high nature value farming in Serbia..... | 56 |
| 2.3.7. Organic production | 57 |
| 2.3.8. Bio energy sources and biomass | 59 |
| 2.3.9. Forests..... | 60 |
| 2.4. Rural economy and quality of life | 60 |
| 2.4.1. Rural economy | 60 |
| 2.4.2. Rural infrastructure | 61 |
| 2.4.3. Transfer of knowledge and information..... | 62 |
| 2.4.4. Small and medium sized enterprises..... | 62 |
| 2.4.5. Rural tourism | 63 |

| | | |
|--------|--|-----|
| 2.5. | Preparation and implementation of local development strategies – Leader 64 | |
| 2.6. | Table of context indicators..... | 65 |
| 4. | SWOT – SUMMARY OF THE ANALYSES ABOVE/ final..... | 70 |
| 4.1. | SWOT - Agriculture, forestry and food industry, (incl. separate table for each sector selected for support) | 70 |
| 4.1.1. | SWOT analysis of the milk and meat sector | 71 |
| 4.1.2. | SWOT analysis of fruit and vegetables and other crops sector..... | 71 |
| 4.2. | SWOT environment and land management..... | 72 |
| 4.3. | SWOT rural economy and quality of life | 74 |
| 4.4. | SWOT preparation and implementation of local development strategies - Leader | 74 |
| 5. | MAIN RESULTS OF PREVIOUS INTERVENTION | 75 |
| 5.1. | Main results of previous national intervention; amounts deployed, summary of evaluations or lessons learnt..... | 75 |
| 5.2. | Main results of EU assistance, amounts deployed, summary of evaluations or lessons learnt | 77 |
| 5.3. | Main results of multilateral assistance conducted, amounts deployed, evaluations or lessons learnt | 83 |
| 6. | DESCRIPTION OF THE STRATEGY..... | 86 |
| 6.1. | Description of the existing national rural development strategy | 86 |
| 6.2. | Identification of the needs and summary of overall strategy | 88 |
| 6.2.1. | Needs identified:..... | 88 |
| 6.2.2. | Summary showing main rural development needs and measures operating..... | 92 |
| 6.3. | Consistency between proposed IPARD intervention and country strategy paper (CSP) | 95 |
| 6.4. | A summary table of the intervention logic showing the measures selected, the quantified targets should be expressed in terms of common indicators 98 | |
| 6.5. | OBJECTIVES OF THE IPARD PROGRAMME..... | 100 |
| 7. | AN OVERALL FINANCIAL TABLE..... | 101 |
| 7.1. | Maximum indicative EU contribution for IPARD funds in EUR, 2014- 2020 | 101 |
| 7.2. | Financial Plan per measure in EUR, 2014-2020 | 101 |
| 7.3. | Budget breakdown by measure 2014-2020..... | 102 |
| 7.4. | Budget breakdown by measure 2014-2020..... | 103 |
| 7.5. | Per centage allocation of EU contribution by measure 2014-2020..... | 104 |

| | | |
|-----------------|---|------------|
| 8. | DESCRIPTION OF EACH OF THE MEASURES SELECTED | 105 |
| 8.1. | Requirements concerning all measures | 105 |
| 8.1.1. | National minimum standards and national legislation relevant to the programme | 105 |
| 8.1.2. | Common eligibility criteria applicable to all or several measures | 105 |
| 8.1.2.1. | Eligible expenditures | 105 |
| 8.1.2.2. | Rules on origin of eligible expenditures | 106 |
| 8.1.2.3. | Ineligible expenditures | 106 |
| 8.1.3. | Controllability and verifiability of the measures | 107 |
| 8.1.4. | Targeting of measures | 108 |
| 8.1.5. | Packages of measures | 109 |
| 8.2. | INVESTMENTS IN PHYSICAL ASSETS OF AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS | 109 |
| 8.2.1. | Legal basis | 109 |
| 8.2.2. | Rationale | 109 |
| 8.2.3. | General objectives | 113 |
| 8.2.3.1. | Specific objectives | 114 |
| 8.2.4. | Linkage to other IPARD measures in the programme and to national measures | 115 |
| 8.2.5. | Recipients | 116 |
| 8.2.6. | Common eligibility criteria | 116 |
| 8.2.6.1. | Type of eligible holdings | 116 |
| 8.2.6.2. | National standards to be respected | 116 |
| 8.2.6.3. | Economic viability of the holding | 117 |
| 8.2.6.4. | EU standards | 117 |
| 8.2.6.5. | Other common eligibility criteria | 118 |
| 8.2.6.6. | Investments in renewable energy plants | 118 |
| 8.2.7. | Specific eligibility criteria (per sector) | 119 |
| 8.2.8. | Eligible expenditure | 123 |
| 8.2.9. | Selection criteria | 124 |
| 8.2.10. | Aid intensity and EU contribution rate | 125 |
| 8.2.11. | Budget 2014-2020 for the measure investments in physical assets of agricultural holdings | 126 |
| 8.2.12. | Indicators and targets | 127 |
| 8.2.13. | Administrative procedure | 127 |
| 8.2.14. | Geographical scope of the measure | 128 |

| | | |
|-------------|--|------------|
| 8.3. | INVESTMENT IN PHYSICAL ASSETS CONCERNING PROCESSING AND MARKETING OF AGRICULTURAL AND FISHERY PRODUCTS | 128 |
| 8.3.1. | Legal basis | 128 |
| 8.3.2. | Rationale | 128 |
| 8.3.3. | General objectives..... | 131 |
| 8.3.3.1. | Specific objectives | 131 |
| 8.3.4. | Linkage to other IPARD measures in the programme and to national measures | 132 |
| 8.3.5. | Recipients..... | 133 |
| 8.3.6. | Common eligibility criteria | 133 |
| 8.3.6.1. | Types of enterprises supported..... | 133 |
| 8.3.6.2. | Economic viability of the enterprise | 133 |
| 8.3.6.3. | National standards/EU standards | 134 |
| 8.3.6.4. | Other eligibility criteria | 134 |
| 8.3.7. | Specific eligibility criteria (per sector)..... | 135 |
| 8.3.8. | Eligible expenditure..... | 135 |
| 8.3.9. | Selection criteria | 138 |
| 8.3.10. | Aid intensity and EU contribution rate | 138 |
| 8.3.11. | Budget 2014-2020 for the measure “Investments in physical assets concerning processing and marketing of agricultural and fishery products” | 140 |
| 8.3.12. | Indicators and targets..... | 141 |
| 8.3.13. | Administrative procedure | 141 |
| 8.3.14. | Geographical scope of the measure..... | 142 |
| 8.4. | AGRI-ENVIRONMENT – CLIMATE AND ORGANIC FARMING MEASURE | 142 |
| 8.4.1. | Legal basis | 142 |
| 8.4.2. | Rationale | 142 |
| 8.4.3. | General objectives..... | 143 |
| 8.4.4. | Specific (s) objectives of the measure..... | 143 |
| 8.4.5. | Dissemination of results | 143 |
| 8.4.6. | Linkage to other IPARD measures in the programme and to national measures | 143 |
| 8.4.7. | Recipients..... | 144 |
| 8.4.8. | Type of operation..... | 144 |
| 8.4.9. | Common eligibility criteria for all type of operations | 145 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| 8.4.9.1. Baseline | 145 |
| 8.4.9.2. Relevant knowledge | 145 |
| 8.4.9.3. Eligible size of agricultural land/herd..... | 145 |
| 8.4.10. Commitments | 145 |
| 8.4.11. Eligible costs | 146 |
| 8.4.12. Aid intensity and EU contribution rate | 146 |
| 8.4.13. Budget 2014-2020 for the measure “Agri-environment – climate and organic farming measure” | 147 |
| 8.4.14. Indicators and targets..... | 148 |
| 8.4.15. Geographical scope | 148 |
| 8.5. IMPLEMENTATION OF LOCAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES – LEADER APPROACH | 148 |
| 8.5.1. Legal basis | 148 |
| 8.5.2. Rationale | 148 |
| 8.5.3. General objectives..... | 149 |
| 8.5.3.1. Specific objectives | 149 |
| 8.5.4. Linkage to other IPARD measures in the programme and to national measures | 150 |
| 8.5.5. Recipients..... | 150 |
| 8.5.6. Common eligibility criteria | 150 |
| 8.5.7. Eligible activities and eligible expenditure | 151 |
| 8.5.7.1. Eligible activities for activity 1 - "Acquisition of skills, animating the inhabitants of lag territories" for capacity building and animation of the selected LAGs: | 151 |
| 8.5.7.2. Eligible activities for activity 2 - "running costs and small projects" for running the selected lags and implementation of small projects: | 152 |
| 8.5.7.3. Eligible activities for activity 3 – “Cooperation projects for inter territorial or transnational projects” | 153 |
| 8.5.7.4. Non eligible expenditure..... | 153 |
| 8.5.8. Selection criteria | 154 |
| 8.5.8.1. Selection criteria will be used to evaluate local development strategies of LAGs and will be based on following: | 154 |
| 8.5.8.2. Minimum content of LDS | 154 |
| 8.5.9. Aid intensity and EU contribution rate | 155 |
| 8.5.10. Indicators and targets..... | 155 |
| 8.5.11. Administrative procedure | 155 |
| 8.5.12. Geographical scope of the measure..... | 157 |

| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| 8.5.13. | Other information specific to the measure | 157 |
| 8.5.14. | Budget 2014-2020 for the measure “Implementation of local development strategies – LEADER approach” | 158 |
| 8.6. | FARM DIVERSIFICATION AND BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT | 159 |
| 8.6.1. | Legal basis | 159 |
| 8.6.2. | Rationale | 159 |
| 8.6.3. | General objectives..... | 160 |
| 8.6.3.1. | Specific objectives | 160 |
| 8.6.4. | Linkage with the other IPARD measures in the programme and national measures | 160 |
| 8.6.5. | Recipients..... | 160 |
| 8.6.6. | Common eligibility criteria | 161 |
| 8.6.7. | Specific eligibility criteria | 161 |
| 8.6.8. | Eligible expenditure..... | 161 |
| 8.6.9. | Eligible activities | 162 |
| 8.6.10. | Selection criteria | 162 |
| 8.6.11. | Aid intensity and EU contribution rate | 162 |
| 8.6.12. | Budget 2014-2020 for the measure “Farm diversification and business development” | 164 |
| 8.6.13. | Indicators and targets..... | 165 |
| 8.6.14. | Administrative procedure | 165 |
| 8.6.15. | Geographical scope of the measure..... | 166 |
| 8.7. | TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE | 166 |
| 8.7.1. | Legal basis | 166 |
| 8.7.2. | Rationale | 166 |
| 8.7.3. | General objectives..... | 166 |
| 8.7.3.1. | Specific objectives | 166 |
| 8.7.4. | Support for the national rural development networkLinkage to other IPARD measures in the programme and to national measures | 167 |
| 8.7.5. | Recipients..... | 167 |
| 8.7.6. | Common eligibility criteria | 167 |
| 8.7.7. | Specific eligibility criteria (per sector)..... | 167 |
| 8.7.8. | Eligible expenditure..... | 167 |
| 8.7.9. | Selection criteria | 168 |
| 8.7.10. | Aid intensity and EU contribution rate | 168 |
| 8.7.11. | Budget 2014-2020 for the measure “Technical assistance” | 169 |

| | | |
|---------|---|------------|
| 8.7.12. | Indicators and targets..... | 169 |
| 8.7.13. | Administrative procedure | 169 |
| 8.7.14. | Geographical scope of the measure..... | 169 |
| 8.7.15. | Transitional arrangements | 170 |
| 9. | NATIONAL RURAL DEVELOPMENT NETWORK..... | 170 |
| 10. | INFORMATION ON COMPLEMENTARITY OF IPARD WITH THE MEASURES FINANCED BY OTHER (NATIONAL OR INTERNATIONAL) SOURCES | 172 |
| 10.1. | Demarcation criteria of IPARD with support under other IPA policy areas | 172 |
| 10.2. | Complementarity of IPARD with other financial instruments | 173 |
| 10.2.1. | Complementarity with the Area Based Development approach..... | 173 |
| 10.3. | Demarcation criteria and complementarity of IPARD measures with national policy | 174 |
| 11. | DESCRIPTION OF THE OPERATING STRUCTURE, INCLUDING MONITORING AND EVALUATION | 190 |
| 11.1. | Description of the operating structure and their main functions..... | 190 |
| 11.1.1. | Managing Authority | 191 |
| 11.1.2. | IPARD Agency | 193 |
| 11.2. | Description of monitoring and evaluation systems, including the envisaged composition of the Monitoring Committee | 194 |
| 11.2.1. | Monitoring..... | 194 |
| 11.2.2. | Evaluation..... | 196 |
| 11.2.3. | Reporting | 197 |
| 12. | SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL STRUCTURE..... | 199 |
| 13. | RESULTS OF CONSULTATIONS ON PROGRAMMING AND PROVISIONS TO INVOLVE RELEVANT AUTHORITIES AND BODIES AS WELL AS APPROPRIATE ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL PARTNERS | 203 |
| 13.1. | Provision adopted for associating the relevant authorities, bodies and partners..... | 203 |
| 13.2. | Designation of the partners consulted – summary | 206 |
| 13.3. | Results of consultations- summary..... | 210 |
| 14. | THE RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EX-ANTE EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAMME..... | 210 |
| 14.1. | Description of the process | 210 |
| 14.2. | Overview of the recommendations..... | 212 |

| | | |
|--------------|---|------------|
| 15. | PUBLICITY, VISIBILITY AND TRANSPARENCY IN ACCORDANCE WITH IPA LEGISLATION | 221 |
| 15.1. | Actions foreseen to inform potential RECIPIENTS, professional organisations, economic, social and environmental partners and bodies involved in promoting equality between men and women and NGOs about possibilities offered by the programme and rules of gaining access to funding..... | 222 |
| 15.2. | Actions foreseen to inform the recipients of the EU contribution..... | 222 |
| 15.3. | Actions to inform the general public about the role of EU in the programmes and the results thereof | 223 |
| 16. | EQUALITY BETWEEN MEN AND WOMEN AND NON DISCRIMINATION PROMOTED AT VARIOUS STAGES OF PROGRAMME (DESIGN, IMPLEMENTATION, MONITORING AND EVALUATION | 223 |
| 16.1. | Description of how equality between men and women will be promoted at various stages of programme..... | 223 |
| 16.2. | Describe how any discrimination based on GENDER, race, origin, religion, age, sexual orientation, is prevented during various stages of programme implementation | 224 |
| 17. | TECHNICAL AND ADVISORY SERVICES | 225 |
| 18. | ANNEXES | 230 |
| | ANNEX 1: PROJECT AND ASSISTANCE TO AGRICULTURE AND RD SECTOR..... | 231 |
| | ANNEX 2: DESCRIPTION OF THE METHODOLOGY FOR ASSESSMENT OF THE ECONOMIC VIABILITY OF RECIPIENTS | 237 |
| | ANNEX 3: NATIONAL MINIMUM STANDARDS..... | 238 |
| | ANNEX 4: AREAS WITH DIFFICULT WORKING CONDITIONS IN AGRICULTURE | 242 |
| | ANNEX 4.1: LIST OF SETTLEMENTS IN AREAS WITH DIFFICULT WORKING CONDITIONS IN AGRICULTURE | 243 |
| | ANNEX 4.2: LIST OF SETTLEMENTS IN MOUNTAIN AREAS..... | 246 |
| | ANNEX 5: DEFINITION OF SMALL AND MEDIUM ENTERPRISES..... | 311 |
| | ANNEX 6: RESULTS OF CONSULTATIONS – SUMMARY | 312 |
| | ANNEX 7: LIST OF SETTLEMENTS OUTSIDE THE RURAL AREAS | 337 |

0. IPARD II PROGRAMME FOR 2014-2020

Title of the document: IPARD Programme of Republic of Serbia for the period of 2014-2020.

1. BENEFICIARY COUNTRY

1.1. Geographical area covered by the programme

The IPARD Programme covers the territory of Serbia (excluding Kosovo and Metohia¹), with the following regions:

Table 1: NUTS regions (level I, II) covered by the programme

| NUTS level | Code if applicable | Description | Area km ² | Number of inhabitants | Density of population people/km ² |
|------------|--------------------|---|----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| I | | SERBIA - NORTH | | | |
| II | Region | Belgrade Region | 3,226 | 1,659,440 | 514.4 |
| II | Region | Region of Vojvodina | 21,603 | 1,931,809 | 89.4 |
| I | | SERBIA - SOUTH | | | |
| II | Region | Region of <i>Šumadija</i> and West Serbia | 26,495 | 2,031,697 | 76.7 |
| II | Region | Region of South and East Serbia | 26,246 | 1,563,916 | 59.6 |

Source: SORS

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE CURRENT SITUATION, SWOT AND IDENTIFICATION OF NEEDS

2.1. THE GENERAL SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONTEXT OF THE GEOGRAPHICAL AREA

2.1.1. Administrative system

There are 145 municipalities (*opštine*) and 27 cities (*gradovi*) and city of Belgrade, which form the basic units of local self-government. Serbia (excluding Kosovo and Metohia) is organized into 25 districts (*okruzi*). Districts are regional centres of state authority, but have no powers of their own; they represent purely administrative divisions. Belgrade constitutes a district of its own and it is a separate territorial unit established by the Constitution and law.

According to the Law on Territorial Organization of the Republic of Serbia (Official Gazette No. 129/2007, as amended OG 18/2016 and OG 47/2018)*, the term "city" refers to a type of local government and it is defined as a "Territorial unit defined by this law, which represents the economic, administrative, geographic and cultural centre of the wider area and has more than 100,000 inhabitants, and

¹ This designation is without prejudice to positions on status, and is in line with UNSCR 1244/1999 and the ICJ Opinion on the Kosovo declaration of independence.

² This designation is related to all legislation and its subsequent amendments which are related to IPARD II Programme RS.

only exceptionally less". The territory of the city can be divided into city municipalities. The division of the city into urban municipalities is determined by the statute of the town, in accordance with law. Settlements that are not designated as "urban" are classified as "other", and by default are considered rural areas.

According to the OECD definition^[1] of rural areas, in Serbia the rural area accounts for 75.1% of the country's territory, encompassing about half of the total population (49.9%). The average population density in Serbia is about 93 inhabitants per km². In rural areas, it measures 62 inhabitants per km² and in urban areas 289 inhabitants per km²

For the purposes of IPARD, based on OECD criteria and in line with territorial classification of the Republic of Serbia, (Law on Territorial Organization, Official Gazette No. 129/2007 as amended OG 18/2016 and OG 47/2018)* all territory of Republic of Serbia can be considered as rural territory, excluding the territories of the settlements with density of population above 150 inhabitants per km² of the 27 cities and city of Belgrade (Annex 7 List of settlements outside the rural areas).

2.1.2. Demographic characteristics and trends

According to the census of 2012, Serbia has a population of 7,199,077. In total, during the period 2002- 2013, the population of Serbia declined by 4.15%, while the rural population decreased by 10.9%. Viewed by region, the largest decrease of the rural population was recorded in the Southern and Eastern Serbia (-18.7%). The major part of the rural population is concentrated in the region of *Šumadija* and Western Serbia, which is also the only region in where the rural population accounts for more than 50%. The unfavourable demographic trends are caused by numerous factors, such as limited access to quality services and public goods like infrastructure, access to quality education, health services, lack of social life in the rural community, as well as the dominance of primary agriculture and poor diversification of production and non-production activities, etc. As a result, the presence of migration of the non-agricultural population and young people is significant, which leads to aging of the rural population and an unfavourable educational structure of the rural workforce. At the same time, it reduces human capital needed for development of the economy and quality of life in rural areas.

One of the main characteristics of the demography of rural Serbia is the unfavourable age structure of the population. Every fifth resident of villages in Serbia is older than 65 years, while in the Southern and Eastern Serbia it is every fourth resident. The average age of the rural population in the period 2002-2011 increased from 42 to 43.6 years. The age structure of the population is most unfavourable in the Southern and South-Eastern Serbia, where the average age of rural population reached 45.7 years (for women even 47.1).

Educational characteristics of the rural population are less favourable compared to urban areas. The rural population has a considerably larger share of population with no education and those who have completed only primary school; also there is

^[1] Rural areas defined according OECD criteria at municipality level with a density of population less than 150 inhabitants per km².

very small proportion of people with higher education. The situation is especially unfavourable for the rural female population, of which nearly one-third have not attended any school, and more than half lack any qualifications (no education, unfinished and finished elementary school). This is a disturbing fact that has to be faced when it comes to empowerment of rural women.

2.1.3. Economic indicators and employment

The unemployment rate (21.3%) and inactivity rate (39.1%) of the rural population in 2012 were below those of the urban population (26.9% and 40.5% respectively). However, other performance indicators of the rural labour market, especially the share of vulnerable employment and the professional status of employees etc., are significantly worse among the rural population. The higher percentages of vulnerable employment among the rural population are caused by the high percentage of farmers and unpaid family members and a smaller share of wage-earning employees in the rural population compared to urban.

Total employment in agriculture, forestry and fisheries for working-age population is 18.3% and for the population over 15 years is 21.0%. Employment for working-age population in agriculture in rural areas in 2012 was 37.5%, which is much higher than most other European countries. In 2012, the highest share of persons employed in rural areas were skilled workers in agriculture and fishing (34.8%), followed by crafts worker (13.8%), service providers and traders (11.7%), while employment in other occupations recorded significantly lower participation. According to the national accounts statistics, the share of agriculture, forestry and fishing² in GDP in 2012 was 7.5% (9.7% of GVA).

A particular problem in Serbia, as in most of Southern European Countries is the limited access to finance. A considerable share of the management of SMEs, including farms, considers the obstacles which hamper access to finance as an extremely pressing problem prohibiting successful development of their enterprises. Share of agricultural loans in the total loans placed into the economy in 2013 was 2.8% (data from the third quarter of 2013). The financial sector in Serbia currently provides a low level of credit to rural businesses, mainly offered in the form of short-term loans. To a limited extent, medium-term bank loans are available, but they are predominantly intended for food processing rather than primary production. Other types of loans are provided by the State either directly or indirectly, with reduced interest rates. Most farmers provide land as an "ideal" collateral. Often, however, banks are unwilling to accept land as collateral because the ownership is usually difficult to prove due to the outdated registration system and because of the low value of land in some areas. The use of public warehouses for collateral is undeveloped. There is good potential for the public warehouse system to facilitate credit, allowing warehouse owners to use receipts as collateral. An additional problem is the weak administrative cooperation to obtain support (i.e. construction permits).

² Sector A according to the classification of activities from 2010, SORS

2.1.4. Farm structure

Serbia's farm structure is complex, consisting of small subsistence agricultural holdings, small semi-subsistence farms, large family farms, as well as large enterprises with a mixed ownership structure.

According to the 2012 Agriculture Census, the total number of holdings in Serbia is 631,552, and the area of utilized agricultural land (UAA) 3,437,000 hectares. The highest share in the total number of holdings (48.1%) have small farms (up to 2 ha of land, which are using only 8% of the area). The holdings of less than 5 ha are 77.4% of the total number of farms and they occupy about 25% of UAA. In contrast, the largest farms, over 50 ha, account only up to 1% of the total number of farms, and cultivate about one third of UAA (Table 2).

Table 2: Agricultural holdings in Serbia by utilized agricultural area (UAA), according to the 2012 Agriculture Census

| | Householders | | UAA | |
|-------------------------|--------------|------|-----------|------|
| | number | % | ha | % |
| Total | 631,552 | 100 | 3,437,423 | 100 |
| 0 ha | 10,107 | 1.6 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 - < 2 ha | 298,286 | 47.2 | 273,622 | 8.0 |
| 2 - < 5 ha | 182,489 | 28.9 | 596,052 | 17.3 |
| 5 - < 10 ha | 89,083 | 14.1 | 617,281 | 18.0 |
| 10 - < 20 ha | 32,313 | 5.1 | 435,499 | 12.7 |
| 20 - < 30 ha | 7,677 | 1.2 | 185,846 | 5.4 |
| 30 - < 50 ha | 5,352 | 0.8 | 203,666 | 5.9 |
| 50 - < 100 ha | 4,394 | 0.7 | 314,096 | 9.1 |
| ≥ 100 ha | 1,851 | 0.3 | 811,362 | 23.6 |

Source: 2012 Agriculture Census, SORS

The average plot of utilized agricultural area per farm in Serbia is 5.4 ha, which is about one third of the EU-27 average (14.5 ha). The UAA makes up about 43% of the total surface of Serbia, and in its structure, fields and gardens constitute up to 73%, meadows and pastures 21% and permanent crops around 6%.

Agriculture holdings are privatized. The most common challenge they face, is to raise operational capital to become more productive and attract investment capital for reinvestment in established fixed assets. Many of these enterprises have under - or unutilized assets such as buildings. There are also large-scale enterprises using modern production systems with levels of efficiency similar to those in the EU.

The number of annual work units (AWU) per farm in Serbia is 1.02, which is about 20% higher than the average for the EU-27, where the average farm uses 0.81 AWU. Having in mind the difference in size, this proves a low level of mechanisation and rationalisation.

One of the reasons for low agricultural productivity in Serbia is the poor level of relevant occupational skills, especially regarding farm management. According to the 2012 Agriculture Census of Serbia, only a small proportion of the rural

workforce obtains some form of education, whilst most farm managers acquire their knowledge of agriculture only by means of practice. One of the main reasons is the unfavourable age structure of farm households, which stems from a traditional model of property inheritance, whereby the holding is transferred to the eldest child of the deceased. As a result, younger siblings simply made up the household workforce or left to find jobs elsewhere, regardless of their level of education and skills. Inspire of the fact that the Government introduced measures to facilitate the transfer of households to younger siblings, the situation remains largely unchanged. Consequently, less than 5% of farm managers have completed secondary agricultural school, higher agricultural education or agricultural college; although the province of Vojvodina proves the exception.

2.2. Performance of the agricultural, forestry and food sectors

2.2.1. General characteristics

Two thirds of agriculture production value comes from plant production. Maize is the most important product, constituting about 25% of the total value of agricultural production. The remaining one-third of agricultural production derives from livestock products, of which cattle breeding is the most common form with share of 13 to 17%. These levels have remained relatively constant throughout the last decade.

Production of fruit and vegetables accounts for approximately 20% of the agriculture production value and it has recorded positive trends in recent years. In contrast, the economic transformation process affected the livestock sector more significantly than the crop sector.

However, livestock sector has a great potential in Serbia, because of the very favourable conditions for production of animal feed and fodder. Around 1.5 million hectares are natural sources of feed and fodder (meadows and pastures) which at this present situation are not sufficiently used for animal feeding.

The agricultural sector is characterized by a dual structure:

- Enterprises (total 3,000) in the possession of legal entities (2,521) and entrepreneurs (479), comprising about 18% of the UAA³;
- Family farms comprising 82% of the UAA. They can be sub-divided into two categories: commercial farms and small private farms. Privately owned commercial farms, averaging about 2-20 ha, account for 48.0 per cent of the UAA. Only 8.3% producers cultivate more than 10 ha. Therefore, 569,858 households (90.1% of agricultural holdings - excluding those households without land) cultivates less than 10 ha of UAA. The majority of households under 5 ha often consists of several fragmented parcels of land, which produce agricultural products primarily for their own use and they depend heavily on non-farm income.

³ 2012 Agriculture Census

Table 3: Structure of AH by legal status of holder and UAA

| AH, UAA | Total | Utilized agricultural area, ha | | | | | | % |
|--|-----------|--------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|----------|-------|-------|
| | | ≤ 1 | 1.01-2 | 2.01-5 | 5.01-10 | 10.01-50 | > 50 | |
| Agricultural holdings (AH) | 631,552 | 184,674 | 123,719 | 182,489 | 89,083 | 45,342 | 6,245 | 100.0 |
| AH by legal status of holder, % | | | | | | | | |
| Family AH | 628,552 | 99.3 | 99.8 | 99.8 | 99.8 | 99.2 | 89.1 | 99.5 |
| LE and entrepreneur | 3,000 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.8 | 10.9 | 0.5 |
| Average UAA per holding, ha | 5.4 | 0.5 | 1.5 | 3.3 | 6.9 | 18.2 | 180.2 | - |
| Utilized agricultural area, % | | | | | | | | |
| Owned | 2,406,196 | 94.2 | 94.1 | 91.9 | 86.5 | 61.3 | 50.9 | 70.0 |
| Rented | 1,031,227 | 5.8 | 5.9 | 8.1 | 13.5 | 38.7 | 49.1 | 30.0 |

Source: 2012 Agriculture Census, SORS

Nevertheless, Serbia has significant comparative advantages in agriculture, thanks to the abundance of high quality agricultural land, a strategic trading location and good general educational background.

The food industry plays an important role in the Serbian economy and labour market. It contributed 3.4 % (4.1% in GVA) of GDP in 2012, and together with the production of beverages⁴ and tobacco⁵ products, it was about 4.3 % (5.3% in GVA) on average, during the period 2004-2012.

The food industry employed approximately 88,000 workers in 2012, which is 3.9% of the total workforce. This equates to 23% of employment in the manufacturing industry.

One of the basic characteristics of agro-industry is the large number of SMEs, and small number of large, modern enterprises. The majority of companies in the agro-industry are micro and small enterprises. 75% of all businesses employ less than 10 people, while 90% of companies have less than 50 employees and/or less than 10 million euro turnover. Industries, in particular with small capacities, did not receive considerable investments in technological innovations, and most of the facilities and equipment are below the required standards for export, especially to the EU market.

The main limiting factors for efficient participation in the international market are:

- Insufficient assortment of food products;
- Lack of market and product research for the better utilization of existing capacities by introducing production lines and products;
- Lack of standards or non-compliance with existing standards;
- Slow adaptation to market business criteria;

⁴ C11 according to the classification of activities from 2010, NSO

⁵ C12 according to the classification of activities from 2010, NSO

- Absence of long-term firm contracts between the food industry and raw material producers (farms, cooperatives, agribusiness companies).

Since signing the CEFTA agreement as well as bilateral free trade agreements (with Russia, Belarus, Kazakhstan and Turkey), Serbia drew closer to international markets several times larger than the domestic market, and this offers the opportunity for improved utilization of available capacities.

Table 4: Serbian agriculture and food trade partners

| Countries | 2011 | | 2012 | | 2013 | |
|-----------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | Exports | Imports | Exports | Imports | Exports | Imports |
| EU | 50.0 % | 46.8 % | 51.0 % | 52.3 % | 53.0 % | 63.0 % |
| CEFTA | 40.7 % | 21.6 % | 38.6 % | 20.4 % | 34.4 % | 13.5 % |
| Other countries | 9.2 % | 31.5 % | 10.0 % | 27.4 % | 13.2 % | 28.8 % |

Source: SORS

The main potential of the food industry lies in the production of safe, high quality food, which is highly sought after on foreign markets. This requires the implementation of new standards (ISO 9000 and ISO 14000), as well as implementing the HACCP quality system, ISO 22000; GLOBALG.A.P, Halal, Kosher, etc.).

Therefore, the food industry must remain in the focus of Serbia’s development policy as well as the foreign and domestic investors. The development policy must fit into global trends such as capacity concentration and highly sophisticated technology with the goal of improving productivity, production efficiency and competitiveness.

In the area of renewable energy and energy efficiency (EE), the government introduced a legal framework that included by-laws on feed-in tariffs for electricity produced from renewable energy sources. In 2013, the Government adopted the Second Energy Efficiency Action Plan for the period 2013-2015.

Most of Serbia’s potential in the area of renewable energy lies in biomass (49%), while the rest is in large Hydro-electric power plants (HPPs, 27%), solar (13%), wind (4%), geothermal (4%) and small HPPs (3%). Biomass energy resources are distributed across an area of 24,000 km² (25% of territory) covered with forests and 45,000 km² (55% of territory) used for agriculture. Biomass energy potential comes mainly from agricultural wastes and wood biomass. Usable energy potential of animal waste is estimated at 0.45 toe, while industrial and municipal waste is estimated at 1.4 billion toe.

While the Government has succeeded in resolving some of the most critical energy security issues over the last decade, Serbia still faces the risk of electric power shortages. Serbia is ranked poorly in the 2013 Doing Business report with respect to the reliability of electricity.

2.2.2. Milk and dairy sector

Total annual milk production is showing a slow decline over the past decade. The annual, farm-gate value currently stands at approximately EUR 300 million. This

means that milk production is the largest single sub-sector of Serbian agriculture, considering that it contributes 7.92% of the value of agriculture production (average 8.12% for 2008-2013).

Producers

According to the 2012 Agriculture Census, 431,290 suckler cows were recorded across 155,829 farms. The overall average herd size is 2.8 dairy cows. Herds of 1-2 cows, which would be considered in many countries as too small to be viable, still make up the backbone of the Serbian dairy industry, accounting for 70% of farms and 36% of the national herd. In the next herd-size group (3-9 dairy cows, with average herd size of 4.2 cows) there are 97% of dairy farmers, 78% of cows, approximately 68% of milk production and 59% of all milk delivered to dairies. Every fourth farm in Serbia is producing cow milk.

Table 5: Dairy cows – number of farms and heads by size of dairy herd 2012

| No. of heads (range) | Total (all farms) | | | | Average herd size | Family farms | | | |
|----------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|
| | Number of heads | Number of farms | Structure (%) | | | Number of heads | Number of farms | Structure (%) | |
| 1-2 | 153,901 | 108,795 | 35.7 | 69.8 | 1.4 | 153,870 | 108,774 | 37.6 | 69.8 |
| 3-9 | 182,344 | 42,715 | 42.3 | 27.4 | 4.3 | 182,139 | 42,675 | 44.4 | 27.4 |
| 10-19 | 41,706 | 3,320 | 9.7 | 2.1 | 12.6 | 41,616 | 3,312 | 10.2 | 2.1 |
| 20-29 | 14,139 | 613 | 3.3 | 0.4 | 23.1 | 13,983 | 606 | 3.4 | 0.4 |
| 30-49 | 8,373 | 236 | 1.9 | 0.1 | 35.5 | 8,218 | 232 | 2.0 | 0.1 |
| 50-99 | 7,825 | 120 | 1.8 | 0.1 | 65.2 | 7,023 | 109 | 1.7 | 0.1 |
| ≥ 100 | 23,002 | 60 | 5.3 | 0.1 | 383.4 | 2,904 | 24 | 0.7 | 0.1 |
| Total | 431,290 | 155,859 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 2.8 | 409,753 | 155,732 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Source: SORS

Herds of more than 50 cows are often regarded as those of minimum size for a viable full-time dairy farm, accounting for just 0.05% of herds, 7.15% of cows, 11% of milk production and 14% of milk delivered to dairies. Most of the production in this group comes from corporate farms with over 200 cows. The group of “emerging family farms” – those with 20-50 cows and potential for growth is still very small, numbering just under 849 farms. Nearly half of the production is located in central Serbia. Other production areas are the region of Sabac, Sombor and Zrenjanin. Additionally, the south-western area, characterised by difficult working conditions in agriculture, with its relatively high population density, is important cattle breeding areas.

Average milk production per cow has increased by 7.7% compared to 2008, amounting to about 3,200 l in 2013. With this average milk yield per cow, Serbia is placed in front of the other EU candidate countries, but compared to the EU member states, it has

significantly lower productivity. It is expected that serious reforms in the sector will resolve the institutional problems. Reference laboratories for testing of raw milk, will not only enhance competitiveness, but will also enable the comprehensive development of the sector. The overall average yield of 3,200 litres per cow reflects a range from 2,050 litres on 1 cow herds not delivering to dairies, to 8,200 litres on the few farms with more than 1,000 cows. Yield on the 3-5 cow farms that form the core of the dairies' supply base averages 2,900 litres.

Milk yields are more than 40% higher in Vojvodina: 3,890 liters/cow compared to 2,730 liters/cow in Central Serbia. Much of this difference is due to the breed structure: 52% of cows in Vojvodina are Friesian-Holstein compared with less than 8% in Central Serbia, where Simmental and Simmental-cross cattle predominate. The use of more intensive dairy breeds in Vojvodina is possible due to its better conditions for producing and conserving forage crops such as maize, together with the typically better management of founds on larger farms.

During recent years (2008-2012), the number of cattle decreased by 13%, and cows and heifers by 17%. Overall milk production didn't change significantly due to increases in average yield, brought about by improvements to breeding, nutrition and housing conditions, the enlargement of the herd, incentives for the amount of milk that is delivered to the dairies, as well as the growth of the number of intensively managed, highly productive animals. The latter number approximately 164,000 (30% of the total number of animals) and there is a trend for further growth. Compared to developed countries with milk production (the Netherlands, Germany etc.), where up to 95% of the animals are intensively managed, Serbia is still at a lower level of development.

Processors

Of the total 1,505 million litres of produced milk, 0.027 million litres are fed to livestock or lost on farm, resulting in 1,478 million litres for human consumption. 90% of all milk is processed by 187 dairy processing companies in Serbia. The rest of the milk is processed by additional 40 seasonal operating dairies. The 24 largest dairies account for 85% of dairy processing.

The situation amongst the smaller dairies is more variable, but even some of these are convincingly implementing plans to ensure their survival well into the future, and so it seems that Serbia will enter the EU with a significant number of viable small and medium sized dairies.

Table 6: Distribution of dairies according to milk processed

| Size range | No. of dairies | Share of dairies (%) | Share of processed milk (%) |
|-------------------|----------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| < 3 tons/day | 103 | 55 | 5 |
| 3 - 10 tons/day | 54 | 29 | 10 |
| 10 - 50 tons/day | 22 | 12 | 20 |
| 50 - 100 tons/day | 3 | 1 | 7 |

| Size range | No. of dairies | Share of dairies (%) | Share of processed milk (%) |
|---------------------|----------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| > 100 tons/day | 5 | 3 | 58 |
| Total number | 187 | 100 | 100 |

Source: Dairy Sector Study, Serbia 2013

According to the Serbian milk quality regulation of 16th December 2009, “Extra” class milk complies with the EU limit for Total Bacteria Count (TBC) of 100,000, but the regulation does not specify the level of Somatic Cell Count (SCC). Grade 1 falls outside the EU standards, with a TBC of 100-400,000. Grade 2 falls below the minimum Serbian standard of 400,000 TBC, for acceptance of milk by dairy processors, and trade represents 10% of the production.

Based on a survey in the 20 biggest dairies, made in the frame of the latest sector studies, UHT milk is the biggest individual product at 35% of total output, and adding pasteurized milk shows “market milk” to account for 54% of total product weight. Yoghurt is the next biggest product at 33% of total output while the largest contribution among the other seven products is sour cream at 6%. All varieties of cheese account for 4% of total output.

The milk market consists of two branches: the first branch where dairy plants process milk and sell their products through shops and supermarkets, and the second branch where milk is sold directly to local consumers or processed on farm into products such as white cheese and *Kajmak*, and the products sold at green markets or directly; consumption of milk and dairy products by farm households can be considered as part of the second branch. Data from the 2013 Annual Livestock Survey show that 52.2% of milk for human consumption is delivered to dairies and passes through the first market branch, whilst the rest is consumed on farm or sold directly.

Better advice and training of farmers is needed in order to strengthen the whole dairy sector and improve its general performance. Therefore, it will be necessary to invest significant financial means in education and upgrading of farmers level of knowledge. Previous experience shows that it could increase production up to 20%, without financial investments, depending on the structure of the farm and its location. Different results were obtained in the past years depending on the provider of the training and capability of adoption and implementation of knowledge gained by farmers.

Organic production is an area that is gradually evolving. It has recorded an increase in the number of animals holding organic status, as well as in the number of heads in a conversion period. The share of organic production in total livestock production is still very low, but certainly there are great opportunities for its development, particularly in mountainous regions. Organic milk production in Serbia is slowly taking its place in the market. Current and precise data on organic production and marketing are unavailable.

Another critical factor is also the size the dairies. Currently, milk supplies depend on a very large number of small farms. This raises serious concerns as to how the necessary investments can be supported or economically justified from their small turnover. In the long term, the problem should ease, through a reduction in the number of farms and an increase in their average size, but experiences across Europe show that such restructure

takes many years. Even if the average herd size doubled to 5.6, it would remain small compared to the EU average, so Serbia requires a strategic approach to restructure its dairy sector and meet the regulatory and competitive challenges of accession.

To become more competitive with EU dairy producers and achieve EU standards for animal welfare, hygiene and the environment, the dairy sector will require wide-ranging modification of buildings, equipment and management practices, implying highly significant investment requirement.

Compliance with EU standards is considered at a legislative level. By-laws and implementation regulations are still not in place. Data on farms that apply EU standards on animal welfare, hygiene and manure management are not available, although the number of farms meeting EU standards is considered to be extremely small. Currently, 56 dairy facilities are registered for export, out of which six milk plants have approval for export to the EU. The remaining 50 hold export licences for CEFTA and other countries. Consequently, there is a significant requirement to target interventions of the IPARD II Programme on recipients that are able to reach full application of EU standards, in respect of the whole farm, during the realization of the investment project. Therefore investments in this sector should be focused on appropriate accommodation of animals, manure management and equipment for milk production.

IPARD support should target the weaker links and inefficiencies of the production and marketing chain. The main objective is to strengthen the overall performance and the sustainable development of the sector in an EU accession context and to meet necessary market standards.

Farms generally need to update and improve their machinery in order to operate efficiently.

Dairies need to introduce regular sampling and laboratory testing of raw milk, to establish or upgrade their laboratories, to include automated milk testing equipment. Small dairies need access to commercial laboratory services, to install effluent storage and treatment plants and arrange for its safe disposal.

IPARD should be concentrated on farms with a minimum of 20 dairy cows and a maximum of 300 at the date of submission of application. Investments should upgrade buildings and equipment in order to meet EU hygiene, animal welfare and environmental standards, and to upgrade machinery in order to increase competitiveness, as detailed in a business plan. For large farms, with more than 300 cows at the date of the submission of application, aid should be targeted to upgrade their buildings and equipment for manure handling, storage and distribution, in order to meet EU environmental standards.

For dairy processing, aid should assist small and medium-sized dairies (SMEs) that have processing capacity of 10 tons/day by the end of the investment, to establish milk testing laboratories and effluent processing facilities, as well as to upgrade their plants, equipment, collection of milk and waste management.

2.2.3. Meat sector

Background and key figures

According to the 2012 Agriculture Census, about 77.5% of total agricultural holdings (489,364) are involved in livestock production. Cattle are held on about 177,000 holdings, pigs on 355,000, sheep on 155,000 and poultry on 414,000.

The livestock sector (including dairy) contributed 32.6% of agriculture production value 2013. However, it is more significant when considering on the farm production of goods that are consumed or sold directly.

Production at farm level

Number and size

The livestock sector is dominated by large numbers of farms, traditionally managed in low-intensity farming systems. They are characterized as self-sustainable, using native, locally adapted breeds. According to data from June 2014, the total numbers of facilities for fattening are: for cattle 1,532, for pigs 1,170, for sheep and goats 255 and for poultry 1,142 respectively (Table 7).

Table 7: Number of facilities for livestock breeding (for fattening)

| Number of registered facilities for livestock breeding (for fattening) | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|
| Cattle | | Pigs | | Sheep and goats | | Poultry | |
| number of heads | number of registered facilities | number of heads | number of registered facilities | number of heads | number of registered facilities | number of heads | number of registered facilities |
| - | - | - | - | - | - | 0-5,000 | 238 |
| - | - | - | - | - | - | 5,000-7,000 | 86 |
| 0-10 | 41 | 0-50 | 7 | 0-50 | 1 | 7,000-10,000 | 100 |
| 10-20 | 67 | 50-100 | 16 | 50-150 | 6 | 10,000-20,000 | 151 |
| Total | 108 | Total | 23 | Total | 7 | Total | 575 |
| 20-50 | 195 | 100-500 | 509 | 150-200 | 34 | 20,000-25,000 | 17 |
| 50-100 | 391 | 500-1,000 | 53 | 200-300 | 39 | 25,000-30,000 | 10 |
| 100-200 | 125 | 1,000-3,000 | 50 | 300-500 | 27 | 30,000-40,000 | 20 |
| 200-300 | 41 | 3,000-5,000 | 16 | 500-600 | 9 | 40,000-50,000 | 13 |
| 300-500 | 35 | 5,000-7,000 | 7 | 600-800 | 8 | 50,000-70,000 | 14 |
| 500-1,000 | 44 | 7,000-10,000 | 10 | 800-1,000 | 7 | 70,000-100,000 | 18 |
| Total | 831 | Total | 645 | Total | 124 | Total | 92 |
| 1,000-2,000 | 34 | 10,000-15,000 | 12 | 1,000-2,000 | 5 | 100,000-120,000 | 5 |
| 2,000-5,000 | 10 | 15,000-20,000 | 10 | 2,000-4,000 | 8 | 120,000-150,000 | 6 |
| 5,000-10,000 | 1 | 20,000-50,000 | 14 | > 4,000 | 3 | 150,000-200,000 | 8 |
| > 10,000 | 0 | > 50,000 | 2 | - | - | > 200,000 | 13 |
| Total | 45 | Total | 38 | Total | 16 | Total | 32 |
| Subtotal number of registered facilities for fattening | | | | | | | |
| Cattle | 984 | Pigs | 706 | Sheep and goats | 147 | Poultry | 699 |
| Number of unregistered facilities for fattening | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|------|-------|-----------------|-----|---------|-------|
| Cattle | 548 | Pigs | 464 | Sheep and goats | 108 | Poultry | 443 |
| Total number of facilities for fattening | | | | | | | |
| Cattle | 1,532 | Pigs | 1,170 | Sheep and goats | 255 | Poultry | 1,142 |

Source: Veterinary Directorate, MAEP (June 2014)

The main production indicators concerning the number of animals per farm holding are shown in the Table 8.

Table 8: Agricultural holdings according to farm size and number of livestock, 2012

| No. | Total | Cattle | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------|-----------|-------|-----------|------|-----------|------|------------|-------|
| | | 1-29 | % | 30-49 | % | 50-99 | % | ≥ 100 | % |
| heads | 908.102 | 691.032 | 76,10 | 62.757 | 6,91 | 52.848 | 5,82 | 101.465 | 11,17 |
| AH | 177.252 | 174.469 | 98,43 | 1.701 | 0,96 | 810 | 0,46 | 272 | 0,15 |
| Pigs | | | | | | | | | |
| No. | Total | 1-99 | % | 100-199 | % | 200-399 | % | ≥ 400 | % |
| heads | 3.407.318 | 2.409.390 | 70,71 | 142.447 | 4,18 | 89.407 | 2,62 | 766.044 | 22,48 |
| AH | 355.052 | 353.395 | 99,53 | 1.092 | 0,31 | 336 | 0,10 | 229 | 0,06 |
| Sheep | | | | | | | | | |
| No. | Total | 1-99 | % | 100-199 | % | 200-499 | % | ≥ 500 | % |
| heads | 1.736.440 | 1.553.148 | 89,44 | 93.556 | 5,39 | 61.211 | 3,53 | 28.525 | 1,64 |
| AH | 154.972 | 153.980 | 99,36 | 729 | 0,47 | 230 | 0,15 | 33 | 0,02 |
| Poultry | | | | | | | | | |
| No. | Total | 1-99 | % | 100-999 | % | 1000-4999 | % | ≥ 5.000 | % |
| heads | 26.708.220 | 8.875.188 | 33,24 | 1.215.168 | 4,55 | 1.714.953 | 6,42 | 14.902.911 | 55,79 |
| AH | 413.792 | 405.415 | 97,98 | 7.037 | 1,70 | 801 | 0,19 | 539 | 0,13 |

Source: 2012 Agriculture Census, SORS

Level of production quality

There is a need to increase production and to improve quality of livestock products and manure management techniques. Areas with a higher density of small farms could have a bigger impact on quality of ground water due to diffuse pollution caused by inadequate manure management systems. New support policy includes the encouragement of

specialised farms for production of meat for both domestic market needs and export, pursuance of good agriculture practices and minimum national standards in the field of environment protection.

Livestock production in Serbia is mainly based on small and medium sized family farms, which control a greater share of agricultural land and have bigger impact on total livestock production. The future of livestock farming, which is relatively labour intensive and employ most of agricultural workforce in rural areas, is not simply a question of agriculture development, but relates to the whole process of rural development. Small and medium sized farms are still the main suppliers of livestock products on the national market, except poultry, and they are facing a decrease in total livestock production. Therefore, in the future, policy measures for small sized farms are planned under the National Programme for Rural Development (NPRD) and for medium farms under the IPARD, keeping in focus income support for small farms and support to prospective middle sized farms to develop faster and become prepared for the future market situation.

Recent data show that over 86% of farmers intend to expand or improve cattle production in the short term. Several issues are important for the future development of the sector:

- reductions in the average age of the farm manager,
- establishing a system for the stabilization of prices for cattle feed as well as for meat (as final animal products) and risk management,
- better cooperation and assistance of Advisory Services,
- willingness for applying new technological solutions,
- availability of support through NPRD and IPARD II,
- availability of bank credits or other financial sources.

Compliance with EU standards is considered at a legislative level. By-laws and implementation regulations are still missing. Data on farms that apply standards on EU animal welfare, hygiene and manure management requirements are not available. The number of farms meeting these EU requirements is considered to be extremely small. As a consequence, there is a requirement to target interventions of the IPARD II Programme towards recipients that are able to reach full application of EU standards for the whole farm during the realization of the investment project. Therefore investments in this sector should be focused on appropriate livestock housing, feed storage and manure management.

Processing industry

Number and size

Total number of slaughter facilities (982 operating officially in March 2010) currently employs between 20,000 and 25,000 people. The estimated number of registered meat processing in establishments in 2002-2012 is presented in Table 9.

Table 9: Evolution of meat processing in registered establishments in

2002-2012, (000) t

| | 2002 | 2006 | 2010 | 2012 |
|------------------------|------|------|------|------|
| Beef & veal | 190 | 185 | 167 | 161 |
| Pig meat | 473 | 417 | 399 | 368 |
| Sheep meat | 36 | 45 | 44 | 54 |
| Poultry | 88 | 100 | 120 | 140 |

Source: SORS

The total number of 1,197 facilities for slaughtering and processing shows that Serbia has excessive slaughtering and meat processing capacities, indicating that the level of actual utilization is below projected capacities. Only about 0.5% of them hold an EU export licence, implying that the vast majority are not in compliance with standards mandatory for export to the EU.

Table 10: Number of facilities for slaughtering, cutting and processing of meat

| Type of the facility | Facilities (domestic market) | Facilities - export (EU) | Facilities - export (third countries) |
|--|------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Slaughterhouse (red meat) – ungulates | 277 | 2 | 9 |
| Slaughterhouse (poultry) | 31 | - | - |
| Combined facilities (slaughtering, cutting, processing – red meat) | 415 | 3 | 32 |
| Combined facilities (slaughtering, cutting, processing – poultry) | 19 | 1 | 9 |
| Processing of meat and manufacturing of meat products | 455 | - | - |
| TOTAL | 1,197 | 6 | 50 |

Source: MAEP

The current overall slaughterhouse capacity certainly exceeds the demand of the local market and in future with more consistent implementation of domestic standards and adoption of the EU standards the number of these facilities will significantly reduce. It is estimated that 44% of beef, over 14% of officially slaughtered sheep meat and almost 78% of pig meat (45% pork and 33% bacon) is consumed as a processed product; therefore the secondary processing sector is extremely important.

Level of production quality

Carcass classification of cattle, sheep and pigs does not exist in Serbian slaughterhouses. Therefore, in most cases, the payment is based on the use of live weight animal and/or on the basis of age during the sale. One of the most urgent tasks is the registration on classification of carcasses on the slaughter line.

Market and trade

Market situation (Products, consumption pattern, trade)

The foreign trade exchange of meat and meat products for 2013, records a negative trade balance of EUR 13.3 mill. Imports of meat and meat products was EUR 66.9 mill (in 2012, it was EUR 57.8 mill), while exports of these products in the 2013 was EUR 51.8 mill (in 2012, it was EUR 46.4 mill), source: *Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia, Report No. 24, 31.01.2014*.

The market supply of beef in Serbia is not a sufficient to satisfy the domestic market needs as well as the export. The quota for beef exports at preferential conditions for the European Union market amounts to 8,700 tons per year, but only 5% of this was used.

In 2012, the import of frozen beef was about 154 tons and export was only about 29 tons. The total fresh beef export is 1,500 tons, out of which about 630 tons was exported to the EU. The same goods exported in 2007 were about 9,100 tons, out of which about 2,300 tons were exported to the EU.

In 2013, the Serbian meat industry recorded production of fresh beef and veal meat at the level of the previous year (161 thousand tons). However, in comparison with the five-year average (2008-2012), it represents a reduction of 6%. Fresh pig meat production of 2013 showed 4% growth (to 381 tons), but this remains lower than in the five-year average (2008-2012) for 2%. Fresh poultry meat production stayed at more or less the same level through the past four years. Throughout the same period, production of processed meat products has remained stable but production of canned meat has increased by almost 100%.

For the Serbian meat processing sector the most important meat production sub sector is pig meat (Table 11). Generally production decreases annually together with the number of pigs and sows.

In the last decade, the number of cattle dropped by 20%. This has a large impact on the processing industry which is more and more looking for import of meat to satisfy processing demands. Serbia is trying to recover its traditional export markets for live and processed young beef.

The production of poultry meat in Serbia is dominated by a relatively small number of producers and processors. Nevertheless, it plays a key role in the meat sector and has increased its share in consumption.

Table 11: Meat production in Republic of Serbia (gross indigenous meat production in (000) t carcass weight)

| | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | Structure 2010-12 (%) |
|--------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------------------|
| Beef meat | 93 | 90 | 83 | 95 | 99 | 100 | 96 | 81 | 82 | 18.5 |
| Pig meat | 242 | 253 | 255 | 289 | 266 | 252 | 269 | 271 | 252 | 56.5 |
| Poultry meat | 65 | 67 | 75 | 70 | 76 | 80 | 84 | 103 | 94 | 20.1 |
| Sheep meat | 20 | 21 | 20 | 20 | 23 | 24 | 23 | 24 | 22 | 4.9 |
| TOTAL | 420 | 431 | 433 | 474 | 464 | 456 | 472 | 479 | 450 | 100.0 |

Source: SORS

Market and export regulations of Serbia

The Stabilisation and Association Agreement with the EU and the CEFTA agreement have created new opportunities to increase agricultural exports to Europe. However, for now Belarus, Russia and CEFTA members along with Italy and Greece are likely to remain the primary markets for beef, in view of existing meat supply and quality.

Serbian agriculture will require further development to capitalize, first on the markets which are available through the EU Interim Trade Agreement, and later to the enlarged market through full membership of the EU.

Level of attainment of EU standards especially in the areas of health, hygiene, food safety at farm and processing level

Currently there are six EU licensed slaughterhouses and four registered for CEFTA trade. The stated capacity of the six licensed facilities for export to EU markets is 875 cattle per day, slaughtering and cutting.

Comparing to EU food safety requirements and related standards, Serbia lacks quality assurance systems and therefore concrete data on deficits is missing. This is the main factor hampering development of the food industry. The disparity in the use and application of the EU standards in production and food processing is shown in Table 10, where it is shown that only a share of 0.5 % of the total of facilities is licensed for export to the EU i.e. fully in compliance with the standards.

Identification of training needs for the sector

Farmers – producer groups:

Training should relate to the following topics:

- book-keeping and management, undertaking a new, market-oriented approach,
- application of new livestock production technologies,
- improvement of production quality and hygiene and food safety,
- environmental protection and animal welfare,
- dissemination of principles of good agricultural practice.

Slaughterhouse industry:

The main focus and orientation should be on training for implementation of GHP, GMP and HACCP principles, as well as ISO 9001 management. Furthermore, it is very important to conduct training on meat cutting and grading according to the EU regulation “Grading of Cattle under EC/1215/2003”.

Identification at sector - level

Changes on farms:

Serbian farms are not sufficiently equipped with machinery. Farm buildings and the associated infrastructure needs to be improved. This can be achieved through investments for upgrading and equipping of existing facilities and construction of new ones.

Investment support for improvement of nutrition, quality of the breeding material and facilities for housing of animals have to be established, along with support for manure handling, storage and distribution according to the EU standards.

Changes in processing industry:

Modernization in respect of veterinary, health and environment protection standards is vital. Currently, required standards have only been introduced by a small number of meat processing plants that have licenses to export to EU. Apart from that, Serbian meat production shows a low degree of utilization of established production capacities and low level of specialization in specific products. Technological infrastructure of slaughterhouses and meat processing plants is also low.

Where should investments take place?

On agricultural holdings:

Priorities include the replacement of poor technical equipment and old buildings and introduction of new technologies and modes of livestock production processes in compliance with food safety, environmental protection and animal welfare. These are requirements for farms of all sizes. Furthermore, there is a need to improve mechanisation.

In the processing industry:

Investments to meet EU food safety and environmental protection standards are the first priority. Additionally, investments should be aimed at market orientation of production, utilization of existing market niches, creating new sales outlets, introducing new technologies, etc.

2.2.4. Fruit & Vegetable sector

Background and Key Figures

The fruit and vegetable sub-sector makes up about 20% of overall agriculture production value.

Production/Farmers

Number and Size

The structure of the fruit and vegetable sub-sector can be described as heterogeneous. Primary production is only partly based on the operation of socially owned collective farms, whilst the largest share of total production is derived from the family-owned farms.

Orchards account 5.7% of utilized agricultural area, whereas plum orchards account for about half of this. More than one half (54%) of fruit production holdings operate on less than 5 ha of UAA.

Table 12: Utilized agricultural area in fruit production, ha

| Agricultural holdings (AH) | Utilized agricultural area, ha | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|
| | < 1 | 1.1 - 2 | 2.1 - 5 | 5.01 – 10 | 10.01 – 50 | 50 < | Total |
| No. of AH (fruit and berries) | 60,079 | 57,219 | 101,608 | 53,771 | 21,412 | 1,114 | 295,203 |
| No. of AH (strawberry) | 1,292 | 1,301 | 3,016 | 1,698 | 656 | 19 | 7,982 |
| No. of AH (vineyards) | 81,436 | 1,590 | 716 | 131 | 88 | 16 | 83,977 |
| No. of AH (hops) | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 11 |
| Total | 142,807 | 60,112 | 105,344 | 55,601 | 22,159 | 1,150 | 387,173 |

Source: 2012 Agriculture Census, SORS

40% of the land in vegetable production is attributed to small holdings below 5 ha. Most of these grow tomatoes, peppers, beans, cabbage, watermelon, melon, onions and garlic, peas etc. This production is for direct consumption, internal use and industrial processing. On large farms, the most commonly grown vegetables are peas (30%), peppers (9%) and string beans (7%) and production is primarily organized for the processing industry.

Table 13: Utilized agricultural area in vegetable production, ha

| Agricultural holdings (AH) | Utilized agricultural area, ha | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|------------|----------------|
| | < 1 | 1.1-2 | 2.1-5 | 5.01–10 | 10.01–50 | 50 < | Total |
| No. of AH (tomato) | 11,947 | 10,169 | 17,097 | 8,372 | 3,160 | 115 | 50,860 |
| No. of AH (peppers) | 15,040 | 14,300 | 23,065 | 10,033 | 3,903 | 210 | 66,551 |
| No. of AH (potato) | 19,972 | 23,261 | 42,820 | 22,397 | 8,663 | 252 | 117,365 |
| No. of AH (crops in greenhouses) | 3,768 | 2,787 | 5,253 | 2,486 | 1,248 | 83 | 15, 625 |
| Total | 50,727 | 50,517 | 88,235 | 43,288 | 16,974 | 660 | 250,401 |

Source: 2012 Agriculture Census, SORS

Fruit production

Areas under orchards were 239,846 ha in 2012, representing 4.4% of UAA. Within this area, traditionally, plum orchards predominate (41%), followed by apple (20%) and sour cherry orchards (10%). The distribution of fruit-production is shown in Table 14.

Table 14: Production of fruit in Republic of Serbia

| Production (000) t | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | Structure Ø 2010-12 (%) |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|-------------------------|
| Total | 1,218 | 1,381 | 1,299 | 1,452 | 1,077 | 1,337 | 925 | 100.0 |
| Total-woody fruit species | 1,073 | 1,242 | 1,145 | 1,295 | 927 | 1,178 | 802 | 86.7 |
| Apples | 240 | 245 | 236 | 282 | 240 | 266 | 179 | 19.4 |
| Pears | 58 | 61 | 62 | 68 | 48 | 65 | 39 | 4.2 |
| Cherries | 23 | 29 | 30 | 29 | 22 | 29 | 22 | 2.4 |
| Sour cherries | 81 | 100 | 90 | 105 | 66 | 91 | 75 | 8.1 |
| Apricots | 22 | 23 | 22 | 31 | 23 | 33 | 17 | 1.8 |
| Quince | 10 | 13 | 12 | 15 | 11 | 14 | 11 | 1.2 |
| Plums | 556 | 681 | 607 | 663 | 427 | 582 | 391 | 42.3 |
| Peach | 59 | 66 | 63 | 77 | 69 | 75 | 54 | 5.8 |
| Walnuts | 24 | 25 | 24 | 25 | 21 | 24 | 15 | 1.6 |
| Total-berries (soft fruit) | 145 | 139 | 154 | 157 | 150 | 159 | 123 | 13.3 |
| Blackberries | 31 | 29 | 32 | 34 | 33 | 34 | 26 | 2.8 |
| Raspberries | 80 | 77 | 84 | 87 | 84 | 90 | 70 | 7.6 |
| Strawberries | 34 | 33 | 38 | 36 | 33 | 36 | 27 | 2.9 |

Source: SORS

Vegetable production

In the period 2009-2012 significant vegetable yield is recorded, although production was lower due to drought in the 2012 growing season. Vegetables are produced in a quantity of around 1 million tons annually (according to the 2012 Agriculture Census), which is not sufficient to meet domestic demand.

Within this production (Ø2010-12), potatoes hold the largest share (36%), followed by cabbage and kale (16%), melons and watermelons (12%), tomato (10%), pepper (8%) and onion (7%). Most of the area under vegetables is owned by small farms, which produce mainly for fresh consumption in the household and less for industrial processing. Around 10,000 ha are in the possession of large producers, growing vegetables for industrial use, such as peas (30%), pepper (9%) and beans (7%).

Level of production quality

Quality of production is characterized by a low technological level, including old and traditional orchards and vineyards, old varieties, inexistence of irrigation systems, inadequate plant protection, inadequate protection from hail, old

machinery and equipment for plant protection and harvesting. Only 13,444 ha of orchards and 19,868 ha of vegetables are irrigated.

Table 15: Production of vegetable (including potatoes)

| Production (000) t | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | Structure Ø 2010-12 (%) |
|-------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--|
| Total | 2,279 | 1,871 | 2,120 | 2,207 | 2,201 | 2,166 | 1,618 | 100.0 |
| Potatoes | 930 | 743 | 844 | 898 | 887 | 891 | 578 | 35.7 |
| Carrots | 68 | 57 | 66 | 68 | 101 | 60 | 47 | 2.9 |
| Onion | 140 | 116 | 141 | 131 | 144 | 140 | 107 | 6.6 |
| Garlic | 26 | 21 | 24 | 23 | 22 | 21 | 17 | 1.0 |
| Beans | 55 | 39 | 42 | 46 | 43 | 39 | 27 | 1.7 |
| Kidney beans | 14 | 13 | 15 | 17 | 18 | 17 | 12 | 0.7 |
| Green peas | 36 | 35 | 42 | 39 | 37 | 41 | 33 | 2.0 |
| Cucumbers | 67 | 60 | 62 | 67 | 70 | 72 | 55 | 3.4 |
| Cabbages and kale | 325 | 280 | 301 | 326 | 337 | 315 | 266 | 16.5 |
| Tomatoes | 189 | 152 | 176 | 189 | 189 | 199 | 156 | 9.6 |
| Peppers | 177 | 150 | 151 | 171 | 155 | 145 | 130 | 8.0 |
| Melons and watermelons | 251 | 205 | 256 | 230 | 197 | 225 | 190 | 11.8 |

Source: SORS

Processing Industry

Number and Size

Serbia has a long tradition and experience in production of fruit, including grapes and vegetables and their processing represents great potential.

Industrial processing of fruit and vegetables is in transition. Serbia has large processing facilities, but they are badly deployed, commonly found in areas with a small number of manufacturers. Some facilities have been privatized and others are in the process of privatization. A significant number of processors are no longer operational and others have obsolete equipment, mainly due to a lack of investment. Most facilities have equipment that is below the required standards for export, especially for the EU market. Only a small number of companies have high processing technology.

Serbia has a significant source of raw materials for processing and export. The ten-year average production is about 2.1 million tons of fresh vegetables and about 1.2 million tons of fresh fruit. However, this was not sufficiently used, since only 15% of vegetables and 20% of fruit produced in Serbia, is processed and sold.

Heat processing and drying of fruit and vegetables, as well as the production of juices, is performed by 85 firms with a total installed capacity of about 565,000 tons.

A significant part of the processing capacity relates to the production of fruit and vegetables.

There are 181 registered cooling facilities in Serbia for the preservation of fruit and vegetables, which account for a total capacity of 608,000 tons.

The majority of existing cold store facilities is obsolete and without air-conditioning, resulting in large losses. The extension of the fresh fruit season is limited by these poor storage capabilities. Only about 12 cold storages have ULO (ultra low oxygen) technology or quality systems in operation (e.g. HACCP and ISO standards).

Besides large units there are about 363 small cold stores with capacity ranging from 50 to 350 tons. Several of these facilities have been recently established by farmers in order to increase their competitiveness on the market. Only around 50% of facilities for hot fruit processing and mixed fruit and vegetables are fully operational.

The number companies in the fruit and vegetable sector, regarding the processing capacities, are shown in the Table 16.

Table 16: Number of bigger companies in fruit and vegetable sector

| | >2 Mill. kg | 1-2 Mill. kg | 0. 5-1 Mill. kg | 0.1- 0.5 Mill. kg |
|------------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| No. of companies | 18 | 29 | 27 | 109 |

Source: Chamber of Commerce

Market and Trade

Assessment of market situation (products, consumption pattern, trade)

There is great potential for export, especially for canned, frozen and dried vegetables. Fruit export is increasing significantly due to access to new markets. Frozen fruit account for 80% of exports and fresh fruit 16.6%. The export of fruit contributed significantly to agricultural development in the last twenty years. One of the most profitable products is raspberries, which is mainly exported as a frozen product to the EU market. Fresh fruit (mainly apples) are exported in to the Russian Federation, Germany, Austria and Scandinavian countries.

Level of attainment of EU standards

Regarding the fulfilment of food safety standards in the fruit and vegetable sector, the main legal acts are in place but without corresponding by-laws, implementing regulations and control measures. Therefore no statistics on these issues is available.

The Law on Food Safety that entered into force in 2009 (*“Official Gazette of RS”*41/2009)* is harmonized with the EC Regulation 178/2002 and EC Regulation 882/2008. It defines the competencies of Ministry of Agriculture and Environmental Protection (MAEP) and Ministry of Health (MoH). This law establishes the Directorate for National Reference Laboratories (DNRLs), the law on Ministries and rules on organization which defines the structure and management lines between relevant

directorates and their sub-units. Official controls in internal control are randomly performed by agricultural inspection.

Laws on pesticides, plant health and breeders' rights are partially harmonized with the EU directives and regulations. Important gaps remain, especially when it comes to the enforcement and control. The laws on seeds and planting material for fruit and grapes are partially harmonized with EU laws.

Identification of training needs for the sector

Training activities shall primarily assist producers to improve competences to increase their productivity and competitiveness in order to comply with the *acquis communautaire*. Inspectors of the MAEP should receive trainings to be able to conduct controls for the fulfilment of the national and the EU standards (Good Agricultural Practices or environmental measures).

Identification at Sector-level

Needs for the development of the sector

The major recommendations for actions to improve competitiveness in the fruit and vegetable sector are as follows:

- Development of agricultural infrastructure on the land,
- Establishment of modern wholesale markets, distribution/packing centres,
- Training and education has to be strengthened,
- Diversification of fruit and vegetable varieties,
- Competitiveness of Serbian products should be improved,
- Priority should be given to the development of producer groups,
- SMEs should be supported by assistance in development of business plans, standardization, certification, food safety and networking with European partners.

Where should the investments take place?

Investments in agricultural holdings:

- Investments in machinery for post-harvest management,
- Investments in establishing of modern storage facilities,
- Investments to support the establishment of modern distribution/packaging centres and wholesale markets,
- Investments in new technology,
- Investments to improve quality and standards.

Investments in the processing industry:

- Investments to upgrade existing facilities for processing in SMEs,
- Support to certify production facilities and final products.

2.2.5. Other crops (cereals, oil crops, sugar beet)

Background and key figures

The largest area of agricultural land in Serbia is used for cereal production and it occupies around 60% of the total harvested area. Production of cereals in Serbia is one of the biggest components of agricultural output, with a share of around 32% of the total (2004-2012). Maize is the most represented crop with over 1.2 million hectares sown, followed by wheat with around half million hectares. This represents a share of 25% of the agriculture production value for maize and wheat with share of 6.6%. Due to the large sown areas under cereals, they are among sectors with the highest value of the primary production, which additionally increases by further processing. Serbia is the biggest regional producer of cereals and, according to FAO data, it is the world's 19th largest maize producer and the 35th largest wheat producer. The production of cereals satisfies the needs of the domestic processing industry, and provides some quantity for export. For example, in recent years, in total export value of goods from Serbia, in the first place is maize. The market chain of cereals is short and informal channels of sale are prevalent.

Around 400,000 hectares of arable land is under industrial plants (12% of total harvested area). The largest share of areas under oleaginous plant is in the territory of Vojvodina, where processing capacities are also located. Sunflower and soya beans are among the most important agricultural crops in Serbia (growth in rapeseed production has been noticed in the last decade).

Serbia falls into the group of the biggest sugar beet producers in Europe, and in the world, according to the FAO data; it takes the 14th place in soya bean production and the 15th in the sunflower production. Thanks to a long tradition and favourable climatic and land conditions for production, Serbia achieves satisfying average yields for oleaginous plants. Domestic needs are satisfied with oleaginous plant production, while significant export products are sunflower and soya oil.

Regarding average yields of cereals, Serbia is on the lower level compared to EU member states, and they are especially low for wheat. Although, one explanation is that harmonization of data about yields is not yet finalized and it can be expected that the eventual figures will be higher. There are few innovations in production and post-harvest technology and price have pronounced seasonal trends, depending on the balance of demand, price and quality competitiveness. Oil plants and sugar beet are exceptions with yields equalling European ones because most of their production is in the north Serbian plains, on large farms with modern equipment. Serbia is one of the Europe's important crop producers, particularly for maize (Serbia produces 11% of the total EU-27), soya (35%), sunflower (6%) and sugar beet (2.5%).

The reasons for low yields are multiple, such as technological regression, inadequate agricultural practices, lack of suitable crop rotation, inefficient systems for knowledge transfer, use of uncertified seeds, inadequate use of fertilizers and insufficient financial resources.

Producers

Cereals are the most universal crop group in Serbia, grown on farms of all types and sizes. A total of 458,196 holdings (72.6% of total holdings) is engaged in production of cereals and has about 1.7 million hectares, with average size of about 3.7 ha per farm. The highest number of holdings (37%) is in the group of up to 2 ha, with a total area of about 123,000 hectares, which makes only 7% of the total area under cereals, and the average area of the grains of 0.7 ha per holding. More detailed figures are shown in Table 17. The difficulty of generating the funds needed to increase productivity and profitability of this production on family holdings is caused by a large number of parcels, small average area under cereals, low average level of education of farmers, lack of information reaching producers, as well as with other production and marketing related problems.

Table 17: Number of farms and area under cereals* by the farm

| | Number of holdings | Number of holdings (%) | UAA (ha) | UAA (%) |
|-----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------------------|-------------|
| Total (all farms) | 631,552 | 100.0 | 3,437,423 | 100.0 |
| Up to 2 ha of UAA | 171,695 | 27.2 | 123,441 | 3.6 |
| Above 2 ha to 5 ha | 155,393 | 24.6 | 284,673 | 8.3 |
| Above 5 ha to 10 ha | 81,686 | 12.9 | 295,833 | 8.6 |
| Above 10 ha to 20 ha | 30,809 | 4.9 | 227,283 | 6.6 |
| Above 20 ha to 50 ha | 12,669 | 2.0 | 237,129 | 6.9 |
| Above 50 ha to 100 ha | 4,231 | 0.7 | 195,024 | 5.7 |
| Above 100 ha | 1,713 | 0.3 | 352,179 | 10.2 |
| Total | 458,196 | 72.6 | 1,715,562 | 49.9 |

Source: 2012 Agriculture Census, SORS

* Wheat, rye, barley, oats, grain maize and other cereals for grain

Looking at the regions (NUTS 1 and NUTS 2), North Serbia, with 28% of the total number of holdings involved in production of wheat, has 61% of the total area under cereals, with the average area of grains of 8.2 ha per farm. Out of these holdings in the region of Vojvodina, around 23% of the holdings possess 53% of the total area under cereals, with the average area of 9.3 ha per farm. In contrast, South Serbia has a large number of small farms producing grain (72%) with an average area of 2 ha per household. It is the same for the region *Šumadija* and Western Serbia and Eastern Serbia.

Crops are cultivated using 425,000 double-axle tractors, 261,000 single-axle tractors, 25,000 combines and more than 3 million machine tools. Rural transport infrastructure is underdeveloped, while agricultural machinery and equipment are generally in poor condition. The average age of tractors is 12 years, while average age of combine-harvesters is 15 years.

Processing industry

This sub-sector stands out as one with the highest number of manufacturers throughout the food sector. So Serbia currently has about 370 warehouses for grain (different capacity) that operate within enterprises and cooperatives, grain traders (exporters), as well as craft objects, grain silos and mills. It is estimated that the total storage capacity is approximately 3.8 million tons of grain, and the ratio between industrial and

institutional capacities is 75:25%. The main problem is inadequate storage capacity and outdated technology for drying and storage of goods.

In the production of animal feed there are a large number of craft objects and feed mixers, while industrial facilities are generally related to warehouses and mills. It is estimated that there is in total more than 750 industrial facilities, out of which 111 have the capacity to produce more than 10 tons of concentrate per hour.

The bread-making industry has processing capacity for 2.5 million tons of wheat, which in recent years, is used up to about 60%, with a relatively stable level of production in the last ten years. Bread and pastries production is organized into objects of industrial and artisan type. According to official statistics, there are 3,408 facilities, out of which 3,023 are smaller facilities and about 120 are large industrial plants. Pasta is produced industrially at six facilities, while the number of trade facilities is much higher, and is estimated to be in around 600 buildings. Annually production stands at about 35,000 tons of pasta, which is about 60 % of actual capacity. Capacity is evenly distributed, and it can be noted that in parts of southern Serbia a larger number of artisanal facilities are present. There are two factories for the production of starch with an annual processing capacity of 140,000 tons of maize and they are both operational.

Currently, there is one plant for the production of bio-ethanol in Serbia which was built in 2007 in Sid, with an annual capacity of 100,000 tons. The factory is able to produce bio-diesel meeting the EU quality standard EN 14214.

Market and trade

The total purchase of wheat and maize has increased in the past decade. For all other types of grain it can be noted that there is a reduction of purchasing power.

In the structure of exports, cereals occupy an important place with a share of 21% of the total value of exports. Wheat and maize are net export products and from year to year they are in the top ten agricultural products, both in the quantity and the value of exports.

Nevertheless, despite the positive development of the crop sector in recent years, the farms are insufficiently equipped with technical equipment and machinery.

Serbia is on the way to create a mechanism for the risk assessment of applications to import or grow biotech crops and products. There remains strong resistance to accepting biotech crops and products derived from GMO crops. In 2013, a number of Serbian mayors signed a so called “Declaration on GMO” calling for a ban on GE products in their municipalities. In January 2013, Serbia signed the “Danube Soya Association” Agreement promoting non-GE soya cultivation and processing in the Danube region of Europe. Also during the last few years, a number of new civil society groups have appeared sponsoring anti-GE crop campaigns.

2.2.6. Egg sector

Poultry production, with two main production lines - breeding broilers and production of eggs, is the most represented branch of livestock production on the agricultural holdings in the Republic of Serbia. Nearly seven, out of 10 holdings of all types, are breeding poultry (Popovic, 2014). At the same time, poultry is the most industrialized branch of agriculture, where as many as 37.3% of poultry are being kept in only 225

holdings in the status of legal entities and entrepreneurs. According to the value of production, the poultry occupies the third place in livestock breeding, with a share of 11.8 %. In the total value of agricultural production, according to data for 2011 year, the production of hen eggs and broilers participate with 4.9%. The importance of poultry is growing both in the world market and in the market of the Republic of Serbia (Popović et al, 2010). Eggs are one of the highest quality food for daily consumption and belong to a group of high-protein foods and high biological value and nutrition.

A large number of small farms are characterized by the traditional way of production of several categories and types of poultry and small production capacities, while products are used mainly for the needs of their own household. Even 96.6% of households have less than 50 laying hens, what represents 44.86% of the total number of hens in Serbia.

Table 17A: Number and structure of householdings where the laying hens are kept in the Republic of Serbia (2012, Census of agriculture, Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia)

| Number of laying hens | Number of householdings | Structure (%) | Number of hens | Structure (%) |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------|------------------|---------------|
| 1-49 | 267.261 | 96,62 | 3.780.280 | 44,86 |
| 50-99 | 7.399 | 2,67 | 410.455 | 4,87 |
| 100-299 | 1.113 | 0,40 | 149.843 | 1,78 |
| 300-499 | 198 | 0,07 | 66.525 | 0,79 |
| 500-999 | 133 | 0,05 | 85.447 | 1,01 |
| 1.000-2.999 | 255 | 0,09 | 411.789 | 4,89 |
| 3.000-4.999 | 84 | 0,03 | 304.824 | 3,62 |
| 5.000 and more | 160 | 0,06 | 3.217.510 | 38,18 |
| Total | 276.603 | 100,00 | 8.426.673 | 100,00 |

Table 17B : Total number and stucture of egg producers

| Number of laying hens | Number of householdings |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| 5.000 – 10.000 | 89 |
| 10.000 – 25.000 | 30 |
| 25.000 – 50.000 | 17 |
| 50.000 – 100.000 | 7 |
| 100.000 – 150.000 | 4 |
| 150.000 – 200.000 | 4 |
| 200.000 and more | 2 |
| Total | 153 |

Source: Veterinary Directorate, March 2019.

On the other hand, production takes place in the facilities of medium and bigger capacity, with the usage of a high level technology with partially or fully mechanized work operations and with feeding of complete mixtures of concentrated feed, which contributes to high bearing capacity and excellent production results. On the 160 farms,

where is kept more than 5000 hens, there are 3.217.510 hens, i.e. 38.18% of the total number in the country.

The Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia collects and publishes data on the number and capacity of laying hens and the total number of eggs carried in the Republic of Serbia systematically and continuously. The data are identical to those shown in the database of FAOSTAT Food and Agriculture Organization (<http://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data>).

According to the analysis of the Poultry Association, until 2012 the import of eggs and egg products was greater than export and trend in recent years has been changed. The difference between imports and exports has been significantly reduced. During 2016 the import was about 4,7 million consuming eggs and about 68,5 million eggs through products (predominantly melange (egg) powder and powdered yolks), while 41,5 million eggs and around 6,3 million eggs through products were exported. In 2017, it was imported about 7,56 million eggs and about 75 million eggs through products and it was exported about 42 million eggs and approximately 6 million eggs through the products.

From the Republic of Serbia eggs are exported exclusively in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Northern Macedonia, while egg products are imported in huge quantities from EU countries, despite the fact that in Serbia there are two approved facilities for egg processing.

Green markets in the Republic of Serbia occupy the most significant place in the direct marketing of agricultural products. Vegetables and fruits are traditionally being sold at the green markets, so this channel of direct marketing will probably remain important in the future (Zarić et al., 2016). A similar conclusion can be drawn for both broilers and eggs, according to the data of the Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia in the period 2009-2013. the share of turnover in the green market in the total turnover of poultry and eggs was 56.65%. Total value of turnover of agricultural products in the green markets in the Republic of Serbia in 2018. compared to 2017. is higher by 5.8%. The turnover of broilers and eggs occupies 13, 3% in the total share structure of value of agricultural products in the green markets in 2018. (Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia, 2019).

There are two approved egg processing facilities in Serbia: "Takovo" Indjija and "Melange"-Valjevo. One of the facilities is producing only for its own needs. During 2018, a total of 225,000 kg of dried and 15,000 kg of liquid products were produced, from which about 30,000 kg were exported. After the introduction of the new computer program of the Border Veterinary Inspection of the Veterinary Directorate from 1st July 2018. it is possible to follow the import of all different egg products. Until then, it was followed by the wide range of product groups.

Quantities of imported dried melange (egg powder) and dried egg yolks during the second half of 2018, are equivalent to 36 million eggs. Based on the analysis of the quantities of produced and imported egg products in the Republic of Serbia, it can be concluded that nearly 70% of the needs are fulfilled through the import.

Depending on the structure, the production of eggs in the Republic of Serbia is represented in three different types:

1. Extensive production in the rural households for self-consumption,
2. Semi-intensive or intensive production of smaller volume,
3. Intensive high-efficiency production.

Extensive production of eggs in the rural households is generally of a small volume for self-consumption. In certain periods of the year, these households have overages of eggs which are placed on the market in accordance with the National Rulebook on small quantities of primary products, "Official Gazette of the Republic Serbia "number 111/2017. The producers directly sell or deliver to the final consumer, or local retail establishments who are supplying directly final consumers, eggs in quantities up to 500 eggs per week, i.e. 10,000 eggs per year. The selling area is their own and neighboring municipalities, and the selling chains can be a household, a local green market, home-delivery ("door to door " sale), a local retail store and local events (short food supply chains).

Producers with semi-intensive or intensive production of small volume are breeding hens in facilities approved by the Veterinary Directorate with a capacity between 350 and 5,000 hens. The total number of these producers is about 800, and most of these holdings are operative and well organized family farms on a local level.

There are about 150 large organized holdings with intensive production in the Republic of Serbia, which sell 1.5 billion eggs on the market annually and supply distribution centers or direct retail chains and facilities. The biggest part of this production is located at 15-20 producers (Škorić, 2017).

Harmonization of national legislation with EU legislation brings to producers additional costs related to animal welfare, food safety and environmental protection. Economic researches have shown that the application of EU legislation increases the costs of egg production by an average of 16%.

The provisions of the Rulebook on the conditions for animal welfare (Official Gazette of RS", No. 57/14) must be applied till 31st December 2020.

For each hen from 1st January 2021 it should be provided a floor area of at least 750 cm² in enriched battery cages, which is a large increase in the surface which is now 550 cm² in unenriched battery cages.

2.2.7. Viticulture

Background and Key Factors

The grape production sector in Serbia is very specific, since it is distinguished by a large number of grape producers who have vineyards of small areas. Based on the 2012 Agricultural Census, 80,341 holdings own vineyards, which is almost 13% of the total number of listed holdings (621,445 listed holdings).


Based on the data of the Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia, in 2017, the share of wine production in the total value of agricultural production was 7.74%. Production at the level of agricultural holdings

Number and size

The structure of the viticulture and wine production is quite heterogeneous; however, minor family holdings have the major share in the production.

More than one third (around 34%) according to the inventory of agriculture covers the holdings that have extremely small vineyards or vineyards smaller than 0.1 ha. The largest group of grape growing holdings (about 62%) are grape producers that have vineyards of small areas, that is, vineyards from 0.1 to less than 0.5 ha. On the other hand, only 6 listed wineries in Serbia covered by the Agricultural Census had vineyards of 100 hectares or more.

Chart 1: Area under vineyards (ha) and number of inventory listed holdings with vineyards; 2012



Source: Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia

Compared to the total yield of fruits and grapes, grape production participates with about 10% in the total quantity of produced fruit that is followed by the Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia, pomes (apple, pear and quince), stone fruit (plum, cherry, peach, sour cherry and apricot), berry fruit (raspberries, blackberries and strawberries) and nuts (walnut).


Grape production

Based on data from the Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia from 2018, the area under vineyards is 22,150 ha, 21,328 ha of which are vineyards in fertility.

According to the data from the Vineyard Register, currently (as of the day of 1st March, 2019) 3,997 grape producers were registered with 19,265 vineyard parcels. Within the Vineyard Register there is the area of 6,501.63 hectares of vineyards for mainly commercial purpose.

The production of grapes, i.e. the yield has varied from year to year depending on climatic conditions, but on average, for the last 10 years, the average produced quantity of grapes has been 167,363.1 t.

Chart 2: Production of grapes (yield) by years (t); 2009-2018



Source: Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia

Production quality level

Although there are modern vineyard plantations, due to the high costs of growing and maintaining vineyards, the quality of production predominantly has a lower technological level. The fragmentation of vineyard plots, obsolete vineyards with some of the major producers, the absence of certified cloned plants from autochthonous, regional and domestic varieties, the unsuitability of mechanization and equipment to modern vineyard production (vineyards with a larger number of vine plants per hectare), as well as inadequate protection against diseases and pests, are some of the problems of viticulture production in Serbia.

Processing Industry

Number and size


Serbia has a very long tradition in wine production, which has been based in the previous period on large socialistic systems with vast capacities, while nowadays it is mainly based on family wineries of very small, small and medium capacities. Significant number of processing capacities, that is, former socialistic and cooperative wineries, but few of the exceptions, have not been privatized or have had an unsuccessful privatization process during the transformation process, so their decay has occurred consequently. Together with the collapse of the wine systems, the vineyards were abandoned by the co-operatives, that is, natural persons who used to produce grapes, hence it brought about a great reduction in the area under vineyards in all wine-growing areas of Serbia.

Based on the data from the Winery Register, currently (2019), there are 353 wineries in Serbia engaged in wine production. The total maximum grape processing capacities in market-oriented wineries analyzed in 2019 (310 wineries) within that Register amount to 195,073,521 kg of grapes. Moreover, 312 wineries from the Winery Register in 2019 currently have a maximum wine production capacity of 71,520,850 l.

The structure of wine producers in Serbia is similar to the structure of grape producers, where wineries with very low wine production capacity prevail by the number of producers. Namely, more than a half or 136 wineries have limited capacities for wine production, below 20,000 l. A significant number of wineries (93) have slightly higher capacities (from 20,000 l to less than 40,000 l) for wine production, but there are still insufficiently large capacities for competitive wine production.

The largest wine production capacities are at the 48 largest Serbian wineries, which have a maximum individual production capacity of 100,000 l and more. This group of wineries also includes 13 wineries that have the capacity for annual production of 1,000,000 liters of wine and more.

Chart 3: Number of wine producers registered in the Winery Register by maximum available capacities for annual wine production; 2019



Source: MAFWM, Winery Register

General problems in wine production are scarce presence of controlled fermentation systems and cold stabilization system of wine, as well as the lack of modern equipment, suitable inert winery vessels, good quality vessels for wine aging and other equipment, appliances and containers. In the case of low-capacity wine producers, there are certain problems in production facilities in terms of maintaining adequate temperature and hygiene of facilities and vessels.

Production quality level

Although there is legal compliance in the Republic of Serbia with regard to the categorization of wine products and systems of geographical indications with the provisions of the EU legislation, currently there is no satisfactory share of production of high quality wines with geographical indications (the so-called PDO/PGI wines). Inadequate conditions and capacities for the production of high quality wines, i.e. obsolete equipment and vessels in certain wineries, in addition to other technical and administrative obstacles and the absence of a certification bodies system, largely affect the limited production of wines with geographical indications.

Chart 4: The ratio of production of wine without geographical indications and wine with geographical indications; 2016-2018

| Quality wine category | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 |
|--|------|------|------|
| Wine without geographical indications | 92% | 85% | 85% |
| PGI | 3% | 7% | 8% |
| PDO | 5% | 8% | 7% |

Source: MAFWM, Winery Register

Market and trade

The supply of the Serbian market with domestic wine is not sufficient for own needs, and general speaking, the import of wine is at least twice as large as export, both in terms of quantity and value of wine.

The Stabilization and Association Agreement with the countries of the European Union and the CEFTA agreement allowed the export of wine to these markets, but due to the decay of wineries and the clear cut of numerous vineyards in the previous period, Serbia is unable to respond to the demands of these markets in a quantitative manner. On the other hand, the Free Trade Agreement with the Russian Federation resulted in a certain increase of wine export to this market.

According to data by the Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia, in the ten-year period 2009-2018, at the annual average level, Serbia exported 12,622,000 l of wine (without aromatized wine) with an average annual value of exported wine of 13,397,000 EUR. The total average annual import of wine in the same period was twice as high i.e. 25,482,000 l of wine, and the total average value of imported wine was 25,721,000 EUR. The total average negative balance in the observed ten-year period was 12,860,000 l in terms of quantity, and EUR 12,325,000 in terms of value.

During the previous ten-year period (2009-2018), Serbia had the largest volume of wine trade within the CEFTA market, from which most of the imported wine originated. From this market, more wine was exported than imported, the average quantity of 18,102,265 l, while the average negative balance with this market in terms of value was 12,443,700 EUR. The average annual export to the CEFTA market was 5,365,500 l in the observed period (with an average annual value of 6,734,100 EUR), and the import was four times higher, i.e. 23,467,800 l (with an average annual value of 20,313,500 EUR).

According to the data by the Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia for the ten-year period from 2009 to 2018, a positive foreign trade balance was achieved with the EU countries in terms of wine quantities (798,100 l), but a negative average annual balance in terms of wine value (EUR 3,384,700). The average export to the EU market in the observed period was 2,733,000 l (with an average annual value of EUR 1,935,560), and the average annual import was 1,935,000 l (with an average annual value of EUR 5,167,260).

An important part of wine trade is carried out with other countries (primarily with the Russian Federation), the only place where Serbia achieves an average annual positive

balance, both in terms of quantity (4,444,300 l) for the period 2009-2018 and in terms of value (4,486,500 EUR) for the same period of years. In the observed period, the average annual export to third-country markets amounted to 4,523,500 l (with an average annual value of 4,727,300 EUR), while the average annual import amounted to 79,200 l (with an average annual value of 240,950 EUR).

In addition to wine, according to the data of the Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia for the ten-year period (2009-2018), Serbia recorded a positive average annual balance in the import and export of aromatized wines by the quantity, where the average balance for the quantity of aromatized wine was 23.840 l. Negative balance is achieved in terms of value of aromatized wine, in average annual value of 72.330 EUR.

What should be invested in?

Investing in agricultural holdings:

The primary objective of the IPARD II Programme is to strengthen the viticulture and wine production sector in order to achieve the EU market standards. Agricultural holdings have the need to grow vineyards with quality seedling material of appropriate varieties, clones and rootstocks adapted to specific local ecological conditions. Certain vineyards with varieties whose wine is not competitive or does not reflect the ecological and anthropogenic factors of wine-growing areas of Serbia and the vineyards infected with incurable diseases should be replaced with the vineyards with appropriate varieties, preferably autochthonous, regional and domestic created varieties. Additionally, certain vineyards need to be reconstructed aimed at modernization and acquiring competitive products.

Agricultural holdings engaged in grape production need to be modernized and improve their mechanization in order to be more effective in carrying out agro-technical and ampelotechnical measures in modern viticulture, as well as to introduce new production technologies.

It is necessary that producers of table grapes are provided with suitable conditions for storing of table grapes in order to achieve better competitiveness.

In terms of grapevine nursery, IPARD II Programme would, through investments in facilities, equipment, mechanization, as well as mother planting, enable the production of quality vine planting material of proper higher phytosanitary categories.

Investing in the manufacturing industry:

The IPARD II Programme should enable the application of EU requirements and strengthening of the competitiveness of wine/wine products and aromatized wine products through the construction and equipping of modern production facilities, but also through the modernization of equipment for the production of wine/wine products and aromatized wine products, installation of modern internal laboratories and other needs aimed at improving product quality. Producers of wine/wine products and aromatized wine products also have the need to be supported in terms of production of value-added products.

2.3. Environment and land management

Serbia intends to introduce agro-environmental measures in the later stage of the programme in line with preparedness of the institutions and potential recipients. Nevertheless also the investment measures are also destined to create a considerable impact to improve the environmental situation. Serbia has not yet defined GAEC-standards at the national level.

2.3.1. Biodiversity

Serbia is characterized by high genetic, species and ecosystem diversity. Mountainous and hilly areas of Serbia, as part of the Balkan Peninsula, are one of six centres of European biodiversity. In addition, Serbia is potentially one of the global centres of plant diversity, in terms of wealth of flora.

The Biodiversity Strategy of the Republic of Serbia and Action Plan for the period 2011 -2018 (Official Gazette of RS No. 13/2011)* includes an overview of the status of biological diversity in Serbia, the most important factors threatening biodiversity, as well as an overview of human activities which trigger these factors. It emphasizes the richness of Serbia in autochthonic cultivated plant and in agro-biodiversity which includes species and habitats of cultivated plants and animals.

Genetic resources of Serbia's agriculture are very rich; it is considered that between 700 and 800 varieties and species of different genetic resources exist in Serbia.

The biggest impact of agricultural activities on biodiversity comes from intensification of agricultural production through the conversion of large areas into monocultures and the use of chemicals.

There is no centralized database or coordinated system of biodiversity monitoring at national level. Biodiversity monitoring is incomplete and fragmented. The quality and quantity of data are very different, not standardized and often not comparable with data in other European countries.

Genetic resources in Serbia are very rich and include a large number of indigenous varieties and breeds of cultivated plants and animals:

1) Plant genetic resources

Serbia is characterized by a huge geographic and biological diversity reflected in the richness of indigenous flora. According to the most recent estimates, the flora of Serbia contains around 4,000 species out of total of 11,000 plant species in Europe.

It is estimated that the domestic agricultural organizations hold around 15,000 samples of cultivated plants in the form of seeds and about 3,500 samples of fruit trees and vines, mainly originating from Serbia and other Western Balkan countries. The national *exsitu* collections of plant genetic resources, managed by the plant gene bank, comprise a total of 4,238 samples. In nature, there are approximately 1,000 wild relatives of cultivated plants *in situ*. In addition, there are over 400 known species of medicinal plants officially registered. 150 species are legally protected from use and transport and there is a great potential of plant species (about 1,800 honeybee species) and ecosystems, and habitats for pollinators (honeybees, bumblebees) for use in agriculture.

2) Animal genetic resources

According to the latest data, the indigenous, locally adapted breeds of Serbia were suppressed and ignored. Fifteen species of domestic animals and 30 endangered species were registered. The application of conservation and rational utilization of animal genetic resources directly contribute to the conservation of biodiversity, favouring sustainable production systems, promotion of local products, as well as the development of the region as a whole. The trend of the population of indigenous breeds is stable, with a slight increase. A bank of animal genetic resources has not yet been established.

3) Forest genetic resources

The general condition of forests is classified as "unsatisfactory". The negative impact of forestry on biodiversity includes the establishment of monoculture plantations with poplar (currently about 39,000 ha) and pine plantations (100,000 ha of Scots pine). Forest stands of monocultures reduce biodiversity and degrade the overall quality of habitat for many species. Forest genetic resources and forest ecosystems consist of 282 tree species, of which about 250 are indigenous. Of particular importance is the presence of 88 wild fruit tree species in 18 genera. The most common are two types of beech and oak. As a form of in situ protection of genetic diversity of forest tree species, as well as for the purpose of their control use, 212 seed stands are recognized (58 coniferous and 154 deciduous species) in the total area of 1,865ha. Animal biodiversity of forest ecosystems is characterized by the presence of 46 species of amphibians and reptiles, 350 species of birds and 94 species of terrestrial mammals.

2.3.2. Water quality

The Law on Water (*Official Gazette of RS, No. 30/10*)* – regulates the legal status of waters, integrated water management, management of water structures and wetlands, sources and means of funding water management, monitoring and implementation of law, as well as other relevant issues regarding water management. The Law on Water applies to all surface and groundwater, including drinking water, thermal and mineral water. It is in line with the recommendations of the Water Framework Directive of the European Union (Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and Council, WFD), but the transposition of the WFD and other relevant laws and by-laws is still only partial.

In line with Law on Water, adoption of following national planning and strategic documents is foreseen: the Water Management Strategy for the Territory of the Republic of Serbia (planned for 2015), the Water Management Plan for the Danube River Basin (and RBMPs for water districts, planned for 2015-2021) and programmes of Measures, and Regulation on the Adoption of the Water Pollution Protection Plan (planned for 2015) which is in a final stage of drafting. Monitoring data are available only for 102 water bodies of a total of 496 surface water bodies. The water quality monitoring system recently has been extended to include all the parameters needed to determine the ecological status of water bodies. For groundwater bodies, only shallow groundwater is monitored. The key sources of water pollution are mostly untreated industrial and municipal waste water, drainage water from agriculture, landfill leachate and pollution related to navigation in rivers and operation of power plants.

In the draft Water Pollution Protection Plan, water nutrient load is being analysed for certain categories of pollution sources, such as point sources (settlements and industry) and non-point sources (land use, horticulture, livestock, etc.) and the related maps are produced. According to the available data, average values for nitrogen are about 120 kg/ha per year taking into account the total load on the whole territory. In the case of phosphorus, the average load is about 2 kg/ha per year, and about 3 kg/ha per year in areas of intensive agriculture.

Sensitive and vulnerable zones as per the UWWT Directive and the Nitrates Directive have not been delineated yet in Serbia. Currently a project is in place with the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency to delineate these zones. The project is expected to be completed in 2015.

Implementation of the EU Nitrates Directive (91/676/EEC) has not yet been initiated but will be important for Serbia's EU integration and will require considerable investment. Support will be needed to sustain long-term water and soil quality monitoring in intervention areas. The effective implementation of the Nitrates Directive can also have important benefits for public health through improvement in air quality and moderating the effects of climate change, since the poor management of animal manure is also linked to increased emissions of methane and nitrous oxide. According to World Bank data, agricultural emissions of GHG in the form of methane represented 44% in Serbia and agricultural nitrogenous emissions 64% of the total of all these emissions from all sources. In the EU, the respective data of agricultural emissions from these components are 41% and 56%.

2.3.3. Climate changes and GHG emissions and their relation to agriculture

Serbia is a member of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change since 10 June 2001 and the Kyoto Protocol, as of 17 January 2008, with the status of developing countries (non-Annex I countries). Serbia has no obligation to quantify the reduction in emissions of greenhouse gases in the first commitment period, but the obligations assumed by ratifying the Convention mean that it must establish and implement actions that contribute to achieving its goals.

Agro-climatic classification of Serbia was performed on the basis of meteorological data for the main climate station, for the period 1961 - 2004. Analyses show that the mean annual temperature has increased. The territory is characterised by a drier climate in lowland and valley areas, where most of the agricultural land is located. There was an increase of 0.2°C during recent decades. The average annual temperature for the areas at an altitude up to 300 m is 10.9°C, and for areas with an altitude of 300 m to 500 m around 10.0°C. In mountainous regions above 1,000 m the annual temperature is about 6.0°C and at the altitudes over 1,500 m it is around 3.0°C. Considering the atmospheric processes and characteristics of relief, rainfall on the territory of Serbia is unevenly distributed in time and space. Most of Serbia has continental rainfall patterns, including higher amounts in the warmer period of the year. The normal annual precipitation sum for the entire country is 896 mm. In lower regions, annual rainfall varies between 540 to 820 mm. Annual precipitation increases with altitude. The areas with an altitude of over

1,000 m have in average 700 to 1,000 mm of rainfall, while some mountain peaks in south-western Serbia have precipitation up to 1,500 mm.

Table 18: The average annual temperature

| Altitude (msl) | Average annual temperature (°C) |
|----------------|---------------------------------|
| < 300 | 10.9 |
| 300-500 | 10.0 |
| 500-1,000 | 9.0 |
| >1,000 | 6.0 |
| >1,500 | 3.0 |

Source: Republic Hidrometeorological Service of Serbia

More frequent and intense droughts in the past two decades have caused great damage to the agricultural sector in Serbia. Next to this, there is an increased number of storms and occurrences of hail and night frost. For Serbia, climate change leads to increased variations in both temperature and precipitation and increased numbers of extreme weather events. Climate change scenarios that were developed for Serbia show that in every scenario temperatures will increase. Regarding precipitation, until 2,030 an increase in precipitation is expected with unpredictable variations over different areas and over the seasons. Later this century, overall precipitation is expected to decrease.

The expected effects of climate change for agriculture, based on climate change scenarios, are the following:

- Overall, agriculture in Serbia will experience decreases in main crop harvests of maize, cereals, sunflower, legumes and potato. Strong effects are expected in the form of drought, floods, extreme weather events and alterations to the water table, leading to negative effects on agriculture due to increased water stress. In addition, studies in other countries indicate that invasive species of plants, insects and animals are already occurring or are expected to arrive, moving northwards. This brings the danger of introducing alien pests to agricultural areas;
- A threat to dairy farms lies in the fact that increased temperatures cause ‘heat stress’ in animals which can cause lowering of milk and meat production. Another threat to livestock and poultry is increased risk of occurrences of “traditional” diseases (E-coli, salmonella, Q-fever, mad cow disease, foot and mouth disease, blue tongue fever, etc.), but also an increased risk due to ‘new’ diseases (the African horse sickness virus, etc.). Climate change is expected to increase the conditions in which these diseases and pathogens can survive and spread.

Recent studies on climate change impact on forests show potential risks such as:

- shifting of some types of forests in relation to their latitude and altitude;
- changes of real distribution of different types of forests and their relation to each other and changes in the composition of particular plant communities;
- forest communities will be more exposed to various adverse impacts;

- all above mentioned will negatively affect the conservation of biodiversity and the prospect of a rational management of this natural resource.

2.3.4. Soil

The soil of Serbia is concerned by the following factors of land degradation: water erosion, wind erosion, siltation of land, loss of nutrients, chemical pollution from industrial sources, mechanical compaction of soil by heavy machinery, soil waterlogging, flooding, loss of fertility and others. In the central part, 80% of the land belongs to the classes that are well supplied with humus and 20% of soils are provided in the class of very humus. 88% of the total surface is affected by water-erosion and 25% by wind-erosion. The north is mostly affected by wind-erosion while in the south is more under the impact of water erosion.

Due to the comparatively low intensity of livestock breeding the problem of emissions and degradation caused by manure spreading is also low.

The entire territory of Serbia is affected by varying intensity of water erosion, but overall it experiences medium levels of water erosion. In Vojvodina aeolian erosion prevails.

Erosion activity of slopes is dominant in terrains with degraded rock massifs. Most intensive erosion with torrent activities is present in *Vranjska Banja*, *Pčinja* valley, *Grdelica* gorge, the watershed of *Vlasina*, valley of river *Lim*, the upper stretches of river *Ibar* and the mountain area of *Šumadija*.

Erosion and torrents occasionally cause big damage to settlements, industrial and energy facilities, transport infrastructure and agricultural land. Fluvial erosion with degradation of river beds and flooding of land are developed on river banks close to permanent water flows, caused by heavy rainfall, melting of snow and development of slope erosion and torrent activities of water flow in upper and middle parts of watersheds in hilly and mountain regions. Intensive cutting of river beds and degradation of river banks can cause landslide on unstable and semi stable slopes.

The collapse of river banks is dominant in areas with unregulated river beds, mostly in rural areas, where agricultural land is damaged, but some unregulated or low regulated banks also exist in urban areas. According to the data available, there was 6,996 km² of land eroded in 2013 (3,708 km² in 2011), while around 277 km² is stabilized (362 km² in 2011), which shows significant negative trend comparing to previous years.

Based on the available statistical data, it can be concluded that for the whole territory of Serbia there are accurate figures on land slides, rock falls and erosion which is presented in the chart below.

Sensitive and vulnerable zones as per the UWWT Directive and Nitrates Directive have not been delineated yet in Serbia. Currently a project is in place with Swedish EPA to delineate these zones and it is due to be completed in 2015.




Chart 1: Eroded and reclaimed land

Significant results in the protection against erosion and torrential floods were obtained in recent years, targeting environmental protection, protection of reservoirs, roads and settlements. Serbia has national and local specialised companies and scientific institutions with professional staff engaged in flood and erosion control and state policy is applied to this area with adopted laws and bylaws.

Drainage

The UAA covered by drainage system was 1,971,000 ha in 2010, while the UAA drained area was 1,673,000 ha, representing 33 per cent of total UAA. According to the Serbia country review (World Bank, 2007) problems with poor drainage have led to waterlogging, salinization and erosion. Drainage channels, associated structures and pumping station have deteriorated over time. Rehabilitation of structures is required. Estimations presented in the same study show a 20-30% crop yield increases as a result of the improvement of drainage systems. There are no recent data available to evaluate the current drainage system situation.

Floods

Directive 2007/60/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2007 on the assessment and management of flood risks has been partially transposed into national legislation through the Law on Water (*OG RS, 30/10*), and Regulation on the establishment of the methodology for preliminary flood risk assessment (*OG RS, 1/2012, 11.01.2011, 91–95*). According to the Law on Water, protection from harmful water effects the Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment encompasses preparation and implementation of the Flood Risk Management Plans on the basis of flood hazard and flood risk maps. Law on Water covers the preparation of the General Flood Defence Plan and the annual Flood Defence Action Plan, conducting measures of the regular and emergency flood protection as well as measures for protection from ice on watercourses, and measures for erosion and torrents control.

Based on the Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment, which was completed in 2012 for the territory of the Republic of Serbia, 99 Areas have been identified with Potential Significant Flood Risk (APSEFR) that is endangered by fluvial flooding. Preparation of flood hazard and flood risk maps is in progress. So far, 27 out of 99 APSEFRs have been mapped within different projects. Flood Risk Management Plans shall be prepared for the territory of Serbia, as well as for water districts. The overall objective and general content of the plans have been set by the Law on Water and initial activities have started at the international level, within the activities of the International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River (ICPDR). The highest flood risk is concentrated in the floodplains of the largest rivers, such as the Danube, *Tisa*, *Sava*, *Drina*, *Velika Morava*, *Južna Morava*, and *Zapadna Morava*, which host the largest cities and economic activities. Rough estimations show that an area of about 12,000 km² and approximately 1,500,000 people are potentially endangered by fluvial flooding.

Wetlands

As regards the wetlands a number of Ramsar sites exist in Serbia and these and other major wetlands are under appropriate protection in accordance with national Nature Protection Legislation. However, it should be noted that many of the wetlands have been drained in the past by river regulation works and drainage systems. Considering the predicted precipitation changes due to climate change, some of the wetlands may be under threat of degradation and even disappearance.

2.3.5. Usage of mineral fertilizers and pesticides

Average yields per unit of cultivated land have significantly risen in previous decades due to the increased usage of various chemical inputs in the process of crop production, most notably through usage of mineral fertilizers, various groups of pesticides, growth stimulators, etc. However all of these chemical inputs affect biological processes and their overuse can disrupt natural cycles and balance, primarily in the soil, as well as in agro ecosystems and overall environment. Ultimately, they can also directly or indirectly affect the health of animals and humans.

Mineral fertilizer consumption is, on average, 40 kilos per hectare. The use of agrochemicals is considered as fairly low and it is being regularly checked through a highly organized system of veterinary, phytosanitary and sanitary inspections.

Data on consumption of inputs (including fertilizers and pesticides) in Serbia have not been available for a long period of time. Namely, the Farm Survey has not been conducted for more than two decades. Based on the results of the Agriculture Census, the first data on consumption of inputs were published in 2013. The Statistical Office of Serbia will conduct the Farm Survey until 2016, which will allow regular reporting on the use of inputs. The process of harmonization of data and time series for production and yield of previous years, based on data from the Agricultural Census 2012, is currently in progress and should be completed by the end of 2017. According to data from 2012, use of mineral fertilizers was recorded on 491,157 holdings (77.8% of all holdings) covering an area of 2,298,574 ha, while organic fertilizers were recorded on 314,299 (49.8%) households, covering the area of 400,276 ha. Plant protection products were use on 455,103 holdings (72.1 %), which covered the area of 2,107,311 ha.

The basic goal is to improve the situation by setting up a monitoring/control system for agrochemical use, as well as to provide support for knowledge transfer through extension services.

2.3.6. Concept of high nature value farming in Serbia

Serbia has taken the first steps in identification of HNV farmlands. The indicative distribution of this land is initially elaborated using a limited amount of available data. It indicates that approximately 11,872 km² of agricultural land is of HNV. This is equivalent to approximately 19% of the UAA, and 13% of the total territory of Serbia. It should be stressed that the real area of HNV farmland is in fact significantly higher, as the approach followed only identified Type 1 HNV farmland (farmland with a high proportion of semi-natural vegetation) and did not fully capture Types 2 and 3 HNV farmland (farmland with a mosaic of low intensity agriculture and natural and structural elements).

Traditional farming systems and areas of extensively-managed agricultural land support a high diversity of wildlife species and habitats and/or the presence of endangered wildlife species of European or global significance. Examples of low-intensity farming systems, which have the potential to be HNV farming systems, can be found within each of the three broad types of farming - livestock production, annual crops and permanent crops. Ten types of HNV farming systems have been identified in Serbia:

- 1) Deciduous forests with a high proportion of grassland cover - Low intensity agro-forestry systems with semi-natural grasslands grazed by sheep and cattle in flooded forests on the banks of the Sava, Danube, Tisa, Tamis and other lowland rivers of Vojvodina. One of the oldest agro-forestry systems in lowland Serbia.
- 2) Winter nomadic pastures on rural lands and stubble - These pastures are mainly located in the Srem and Banat regions and in river valleys near high mountain ranges across the whole of Serbia – this system is called *popaša*, and has now disappeared.
- 3) Semi-natural meadows or meadows with sown mixtures used for hay production - This farming system led to the creation of the landscapes of the *Šumadija* mountains in Serbia. Their extensive management was characterised by late mowing and reseeded with native species. Both practices resulted in the maintenance of a high diversity of plant and animal communities.
- 4) Semi-intensive grazing of highland semi-natural grasslands in forest zones and natural grasslands above the forest zone - Semi-intensive livestock system based on grazing by sheep, cattle and horses of highland semi-natural grasslands in forest zones and natural grasslands above the forest zone, typically found in the more humid zones of Western Serbia.
- 5) Extensive nomadic grazing of highland grasslands - Extensive livestock system, with sheep, goats and cattle grazing highland grasslands in Southern, South Eastern and Eastern Serbia. Over 100,000 ha of pasture are under extensive grazing, mainly by indigenous sheep breeds, such as Pramenka–Zeckel.

- 6) Extensive grazing of closed village pastures - Extensive livestock system, with free-range pigs, sheep and poultry, grazing on semi-natural vegetation in managed orchards (mainly plums) and in forest patches, practised across all of central Serbia.
- 7) Combined use mountain grasslands - Livestock system based on grazing by sheep and cattle of valley meadows, mid-mountain combined-purpose meadows and highland pastures.
- 8) Deciduous forests lopped for winter forage - An extensive mountain sheep system, with winter forage collected from deciduous forest by lopping, practised in certain mountain areas with limited resources for the production of winter feed.
- 9) Marginal grazing on land with light, salinized or hard soils - Semi-intensive grazing systems with grazing by sheep, cattle and donkeys on sandy dunes, salinized or hard soils with high water table, typically found in the Banat region.
- 10) Grazing on wet areas in lowland villages - The centuries-old practice of exploiting communal pastures for grazing by non-ruminants (pigs and poultry, mostly ducks, geese and turkeys) continues in some parts of Serbia today.

2.3.7. Organic production

Organic production farming in Serbia is regulated by the new Law on Organic Production ("*Official Gazette*" No. 30/2010)*, which came into force on 1 January 2011. MAEP adopted the Rulebook on the Control and Certification of Organic Production and Organic Production Methods ("*Official Gazette*" No. 48/11)* in July 2011. Both documents have been prepared in accordance with Council Regulation No.834/07 as well as the Commission Regulation No.889/08 and Commission Regulation (EC) No 710/2009.

The law and by-law prescribe production of agricultural and other products obtained by organic production methods. After the entry into force of the new Law on Organic Production, the Competent Authority for organic production (Department of Organic Production) was established in the Directorate of National Reference Laboratories. The competent authority for organic production performs authorization of control bodies, supervises their work, leads a collective record of organic production, shortens the period of conversion and allows the use of reproductive material from non-organic production.

The MAEP Department for Agricultural Policy and International Cooperation performs tasks related to improving the system of organic production, prepares the professional basis for drafting regulations, proposes measures to support and produce information and analysis of the situation in organic production.

MAEP maintains a database on organic production, which is based on the annual reports of authorized control bodies. The Rulebook on the Control and Certification of Organic Production and Organic Production Methods ("*Official Gazette*" No. 48/11)* prescribes a new form and mode of keeping records. These regulations came into force in early July

2011. The latest data on the scale of organic production in Serbia is presented in the Table 19 and Table 20.

Table 19: Organic Plant Production, 2013

| Plant production | Area (ha) | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|----------------|--------------|
| | Period of conversion | Organic status | Total |
| Cereals | 1,608 | 665 | 2,273 |
| Fruit and grapes | 324 | 1,160 | 1,484 |
| Vegetables | 29 | 78 | 107 |
| Medicinal plants and herbs | 27 | 106 | 133 |
| Other* | 832 | 526 | 1,358 |
| Total arable land (ha) | 2,820 | 2,535 | 5,355 |
| Pastures/meadows (ha) | 2,221 | 652 | 2,873 |
| Total | 5,041 | 3,187 | 8,228 |

Source: MAEP

* Industrial crops, fodder crops, etc.

Table 20: Organic Animal Production, 2013

| Animal production | Number of animals | | |
|-------------------|----------------------|----------------|-------|
| | Period of conversion | Organic status | Total |
| Cattle | 323 | 1,853 | 2,176 |
| Sheep | 1,238 | 2,793 | 4,031 |
| Goats | 865 | 81 | 946 |
| Horses | 162 | 48 | 210 |
| Pigs | 118 | 57 | 175 |
| Poultry birds | 28 | 1,362 | 1,390 |
| bees (hives) | 1,337 | 603 | 1,940 |

Source: MAEP

The share of land in organic production is very low, 0.23% of UAA (*source: 2012 Agriculture Census, SORS and MAEP*). The area under organic production and the number of producers who deal with this type of production has increased from year to year.

Table 21: Area under organic production and the number of producers

| | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |
|---|-------|-------|--------|--------|
| Area under organic production | 5,855 | 6,335 | 6,340 | 8,228 |
| Number of producers of organic products | 137 | 323 | 1,061* | 1,281* |

Source: MAEP

*group certification included, covering up to hundred small farmers

During 2013, total export quantity increased (approx. 7,101 tons in 2013 and 1,562 tons in 2012). Similarly the total export value also increased (approx. 101 million EUR in 2013 and 3.74 mill EUR in 2012), *source: MF, Customs Directorate*.

Since 2004, MAEP has provided subsidies for organic production, but over the years it has changed the type of support, beneficiaries and the amount and conditions for subsidies. The volume of organic production is still not satisfactory, especially when taking into consideration the natural resources of Serbia. For this reason, MAEP has drafted the National Action Plan for development of organic production, which aims to identify the obstacles that prevent the intensive development of organic production in Serbia, as well as to define activities for overcoming them and to propose appropriate solutions for intensive development.

2.3.8. Bio energy sources and biomass

The technically exploitable power potential of renewable energy in Serbia is significant, estimated at over 4.3 million tons of oil equivalent (toe) per year - of which about 2.7 million toe is attributed to biomass, 0.6 million toe of unused hydro, 0.2 million toe from existing geothermal sources, 0.2 million toe of wind power and 0.6 million toe from solar radiation.

The National Action Plan for Renewable Energy in Serbia contains the following main specifications relating to biomass:

- The terms defined in detail: Biomass (of plant and animal origin), bio-liquids, bio-gas, facilities for bio-gas production, etc.;
- An overview of measures for achieving the projected increase of renewable energy share in the total consumption;
- Concrete measures for promotion of use of biomass energy;
- Biomass energy is classified into:
 - Forestry biomass (from cutting, remains from the industry, recycled),
 - Agricultural and fishery (primary products, remains from the primary production),
 - Waste biomass (biodegradable waste, paper waste, etc.);
- Yearly predictions are given, up to 2020, of the increase of the renewable energy share in total consumption, as well as share of individual renewable energy.

The future, prospects for biomass utilization in Serbia are indisputable, because biomass has the greatest renewable energy potential in the country. The potential of biomass utilization in the province of *Vojvodina* has to be directed primarily to utilization of the agricultural residues and wastes, whilst in central Serbia to forestry biomass.

In order to encourage the use of biomass for energy production, the Government of Serbia adopted the Biomass Action Plan (*Official Gazette of RS 56/2010*)* - which defined a strategy for the use of biomass as a renewable energy source, keeping in mind the potential, national strategy, legislation and European directives.

The Biomass Action Plan of the Republic was created in accordance with its obligations under the Energy Community Treaty and in the spirit of the new EU Directive on Renewable Energy (Directive 2009/28/EC), and in accordance with the recommendation

of the EU (COM/2005/628) in the preparation of action plans for biomass in order to increase its use in the EU. Until now the following types of plants exist:

- Heating: 20 units smaller 5 MWth, 5 units over 5MWth;
- Combined Heat and Power (CHP): smaller 3 MWel 2 units;
- Biogas from manure: smaller 1 MWel 3 units;
- Bio-diesel: 300.00 t/Y 2 units;
- Pellet producers: 2 big and many small units.

2.3.9. Forests

Serbia is considered as medium-forested land. Of the total surface area (without the territory of AP Kosovo and Metohia) 29.1% is forested. The total forests area (*Statistical Yearbook 2013, SORS*) amounts to 1,962,000 ha, of which 47.3% or 927,773 ha are in state ownership and 52.7% or 1,034,562 ha are private property. There are 49 species of trees, with the dominant broadleaf species (40) in respect of coniferous species (9).

Forest users - public enterprises make plans for the protection of forests, according to the Forest Law (published in the *Official Gazette No. 30/10*)*, which include operational maps of action in case of fire. These plans are subject to approved by the Ministry of Internal Affairs - The Protection and Rescue sector. Special vulnerability of forests from fire is defined in the planning documents. Although in Western Serbia conifers are more present, most of fires occur in Eastern Serbia, where broadleaf species predominate. The Forest Law covers the conservation, protection, planning, cultivation, forest use, management of forests and forest lands, monitoring the implementation of this law and other issues relevant to forests and forest land.

2.4. Rural economy and quality of life

2.4.1. Rural economy

The economic structure of rural areas in Serbia is very dependent on primary industries, particularly agriculture, and is based on the exploitation of natural resources. The high proportion of agriculture, food industry, mines and energy sector and the low significance of the tertiary sector are basic characteristics of the economic structure of rural areas in Serbia.

Although statistical sources record a high share of rural employment in agriculture (about 45%) and manufacturing industry (about 15%), it is necessary to highlight the tendency for changes in the economic structure of rural areas over the past six years (2008 to 2013). These changes are related to a decrease in the share of agriculture or primary sector (about 10%) and secondary industries (up to 1/4) and a significant increase in the service sector (over 60%) in total rural employment during this period. This represents a change of economic structures towards greater diversification of activities.

Differences in labour productivity and economic structure are equally evident between urban and rural areas and among certain regions or types of rural area.

The level of diversification experienced is similar to neighbouring countries and the limiting factors are almost identical: unfavourable position of the agricultural sector and

rural areas in development policies and commitments, adverse capital market and uncertain investment environment, limited markets to sell products and services, insufficiently educated human potential and the low level of private entrepreneurship.

The poor education structure, lack of professional experience, the low level of additional knowledge and skills and an insufficient coverage of active employment measures by the National Employment Service, all hinder labour market opportunities for the rural population and its competitiveness, in particular with regard to women and youth. Knowledge and new technology transfer in the area of food production takes place as part of the activities of the agricultural extension services, national Rural Development Support Network, private advisers, trade companies and agricultural suppliers. Other continuing educational programmes are rarely accessible to the rural population.

2.4.2. Rural infrastructure

Rural holdings in Serbia are generally characterized by poorer access to basic infrastructure amenities (population/roads, road density, water supply per capita, waste water from public sewage system, telephone grid) and poorer housing quality than holdings in the urban regions, in terms of electricity, water supply systems, sewage disposal systems, central heating, kitchens, toilets and bathroom facilities in the house. Serbia is slowing down the economic and social development process. Major indicators are lower in rural municipalities than urban ones as shown by a county of predominantly rural character.

The most significant differences concern connections to central heating systems, sewage systems, water pipelines and road networks. Also the energy supply in many rural areas is unstable and affected by numerous disruptions. As regards heating systems more than two thirds of rural holdings are not connected to central heating systems. Investments into heating plants, which use biomass as a source of energy, would improve this situation. NB, central heating is referred to in the sense of centralised community heating systems that are commonplace in Serbia, as opposed to central heating within a household.

Although in some municipalities, the holdings are connected to the sewage systems, in most of these cases the waste water is not treated. This creates environmental problems. In 21 municipalities, there are plants for cleaning sewage water, but most of them have various operational problems. Large quantities (85% of total) of unclean sewage water are released directly into rivers. Another barrier to the socio-economic development is the poorly developed network of local streets and unclassified roads. According to data of the World Economic Forum, Serbia is bottom of the list of 133 countries, according to the state of infrastructure.

Rural inhabitants themselves consider as a priority the improvement of the utility service infrastructure, and especially the water supply systems, sewage systems, electricity and road networks as priority issues, even when compared to their own economic problems.

2.4.3. Transfer of knowledge and information

Knowledge transfer in the field of agriculture is delivered through formal education at all levels (from secondary education to doctoral studies), through a variety of trainings organized by educational and research institutions, agricultural expert extension services, private companies, project units, media, etc. The public agricultural extension services include 34 agricultural extension and professional branches (*PSSS*) - 22 in the area of Central Serbia that are working under MAEP and 12 *PSSS* and the Ecological station whose work is monitored by the Provincial Secretariat for Agriculture, Water and Forestry.

The existing structures and systems of knowledge transfer are not efficient enough and fail to adequately fulfil the needs of dynamic technical and technological restructuring of the sector. There are no functional networks with specialized centres of knowledge. Additionally, knowledge is not systematically stored and it is difficult to access relevant information on local level. The quality of the equipment and the overall technical requirements for research lags behind the European average. However, the existing scientific and educational institutions have relatively good quality staff that has developed a number of results recognized and acknowledged internationally (new varieties, breeds and strains, scientific papers and technical solutions).

The work of extension services encompass about 41,500 holdings, the majority of which are selected farms, which are intensively monitored four times a year (4,000 in Central Serbia and 2,500 in Vojvodina), while other holdings are included in the extension system in other ways, mainly through participation in group classes and the occasional farm visits/consultations. This type of education covers 25,000 households in Central Serbia and 10,000 in Vojvodina. Organized knowledge transfer through the extension services reaches a relatively small number of recipients.

2.4.4. Small and medium sized enterprises

Serbia adopted the European Charter on Small Enterprises in 2003 and, therefore, committed to achieve its goals with economic policies measures. The Ministry of Economy (previously the Ministry of Economy and Regional Development), in cooperation with the European Commission and the OECD, assesses implementation of the Charter in the Western Balkans countries.

In 2009, a total of 88,586 SMEs were operating in Serbia, which represents 99.4% of the total number of enterprises. Broken down by sector, 63% of SMEs are in the services sector (wholesale and retail trade and repairing services for finished goods 34%, hotels and restaurants 6%, transport, storage and communication 10%, 13% of the real estate), 17% in the manufacturing industry and 8% in construction. SMEs and entrepreneurs employed 872,540 workers, representing more than 2/3 of the 1.3 million strong Serbian workforce.

The density of enterprises is significantly lower in rural areas than urban ones. However, SMEs in rural areas work predominantly for the local market and there are no sufficient efforts to improve the quality of products and services. Therefore,

investments in improving quality standards of local SMEs are necessary to increase competitiveness of these enterprises.

Serbia doesn't have sufficient programmes for support to small businesses in rural areas, while there were various forms of development assistance to underdeveloped municipalities. Currently the lack of start-up capital is a significant barrier for the development of viable businesses.

2.4.5. Rural tourism

Analysis of rural tourism in Serbia shows that it already contributes to the rural economy and has great potential for further development. Vojvodina, Western Serbia and Central Serbia have good examples and significant experience in rural tourism. It is estimated that there are more than 32,000 beds (registered and not registered) available for touristic use on rural holdings. It is estimated that a total of RSD 10 billion of income are derived from rural tourism (5 billion from accommodation services and 5 billion are direct revenues). This represents 16% of the RSD 62 billion of total direct tourism GDP, which was calculated for Serbia in 2010 by the World Tourist Organization.

The Serbian tourism strategy takes into consideration the potential to develop rural tourism in Serbia, but not as a priority product. Thus, rural tourism has been included in the product portfolio as being positioned on the bottom of the list of priorities in terms of its attractiveness and competitiveness. However, there are other products which highly correlate with rural tourism such as mountains and lakes, spas and wellness, touring, special interest and nautical attractions.

The 2007, the Tourism Development Strategy of the Republic of Serbia defined 4 tourist clusters "not based on administrative borders which presently exist in the country, but primarily on the rational strongholds and various kinds of economies of experience". These four tourist clusters that cover all the Serbian territory are: Vojvodina, Belgrade, South-Eastern Serbia and South-Western Serbia.

The promotion of rural tourism destinations does not leverage the synergies between the cultural, natural and village tourism products and the rural tourism product. Primarily, domestic tour operators are selling some rural tourism activities in Serbia, with limited interest shown in the international and regional market. The promotion of rural accommodation is not used and packaged as part of a holistic product which integrates rural activities with accommodation. Although the internet is used as a promotion tool, its use is not, in general, widespread for booking purposes yet.

Regarding the aforementioned points, the involvement of Serbia in two macro-regional strategies (i.e. the EU Strategy for the Danube Region (COM (2010) 715) and the EU Strategy for the Adriatic and Ionian Region (COM (2014) 357)) is particularly relevant for SMEs and rural tourism. Both macro-regional strategies identify specific strategic priorities in their Action Plans, which can be reached through projects implemented in the framework of this programme.

2.5. Preparation and implementation of local development strategies – Leader

From 2006, MAEP supported the initiative for establishing regional rural development centres across the country. They are mostly located in municipalities and are working jointly with local municipal staff to promote rural development in their respective regions.

In the last two years, each regional centre started to prepare and develop local rural strategies after initiating meetings with local stakeholders. As a result of this activity more than 200 local “village maps” have been completed according to PLA/PRA methodology.

In four regional centres, local rural development strategies were finalized and pilot LAGs were initially formed and supported.

IPARD II “Technical assistance” measure funds will be used to further improve the capacity of the Rural Development Network in the form of support for promotional and mapping capabilities, acquisition of skills and animating the inhabitants of rural territories and to assist in elaboration of rural development strategies throughout Serbia. Until October 2011, 100 local stakeholders interested in local facilitation of the process for introduction of LEADER approach in Serbia, received core training. Those who fulfil the requirements and activities from the “Technical assistance” measure assistance project will receive further training and on-the-spot assistance in the process of identification and establishment of local partnerships and the process of preparing Local Developments Strategies. These actions will be developed in parallel with elaboration of the required guidelines and adequate procedures at the national level, in line with EU requirements. Currently, there are 24 potential LAGs, encompassing 605 rural stakeholders. Each LAG has a local development strategy in place and they await positive action in the sense of achieving EU standards and improved quality of rural life.

Based on the outcomes of assistance and quality of responses from the local level, as well as with availability in the national budget resources, MAEP will explore the possibility to introduce support to potential local action groups in the National Programme for RD to facilitate the process of introducing the LEADER approach.

2.6. Table of context indicators

Table 22: Common context indicators

| Social-economic and rural situation | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|---|------|---|
| The name of contextual Indicator | Measurement Unit | The value of context indicator | Year | Comments + source of verification |
| 1. Population-national | Million inhabitants | 7.2 | 2012 | SORS /Eurostat |
| - rural | % | 40.6 | | |
| - intermediate | % | not available | | |
| - urban | % | 59.4 | | |
| 1a. Population national (OECD) | | | 2012 | SORS |
| - rural | % | 49.9 | | |
| - intermediate | % | 27.0 | | |
| - urban | % | 23.1 | | |
| 2. Structure - <15 years - 15-64 years - ≥ 65 years | Million inhabitants/ % national | 1.03 mill / 14.3% 4.91 mill / 68.4% 1.25 mill / 17.4% | 2012 | SORS |
| 3. Territory -national – total - without Kosovo and Metohia | km ² | 88,502 77,592 | 2012 | SORS |
| -rural | km ² | 70,113 | 2012 | SORS |
| | % | 90.4 | | |
| -rural (OECD) | km ² | 58,282 | 2012 | SORS |
| | % | 75.1 | | |
| 4. Population density | inhabitants / km ² | 92.8 | 2012 | SORS |
| 5. Employment rate for population aged 15-64 - National - Rural | % | 45.6 47.9 | 2012 | SORS |
| 6. Unpaid family workers - national | % | 6.7 | 2012 | LFS Unpaid family workers 15-64 /employed 15-64 |
| 7. Unemployment rate (15-64 years) - Total - Rural | % % | 24.6 21.3 | 2012 | LFS |
| 8. GDP -national | EUR PPP / capita PPS Index | 9,100 36.0 | 2012 | Eurostat |
| - rural | PPS Index | not available | 2012 | |

| Social-economic and rural situation | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------|--|
| The name of contextual Indicator | Measurement Unit | The value of context indicator | Year | Comments + source of verification |
| 9. Poverty rate - Total - Rural (sparsely | % % | 24.6 | 2012 | At-risk-of-poverty rate in 2012 |
| 10. Structure economy | Million Eur (current prices) | 25,539.4 | 2012 | SORS |
| GVA in the primary sector | % | 9.7 | 2012 | SORS |
| GVA in the secondary sector | % | 28.6 | 2012 | SORS |
| GVA in the tertiary sector | % | 61.7 | 2012 | SORS |
| 11. Structure employed population – national (15-64) | Thousand persons | 2,143 | 2012 | SORS |
| rural | % | 45.3 | 2012 | SORS |
| Structure of employed population by sectors - national | % | 47.9 | 2012 | SORS |
| - In the primary sector | | 21.0 | 2012 | SORS |
| - In the secondary sector | % | 26.5 | | |
| - In the tertiary sector | % | 52.6 | | |
| 12. Labour productivity by economic sectors - Total - In the primary sector | Euros/person | not available 3,531.51 | 2012 | SORS |

| Sectorial indicators | | | | |
|---|---|--|-------------|---|
| The name of sectorial Indicators | Measurement Unit | The value of sectorial Indicator | Year | Comment + source of verification |
| 1. Employment by economic activity - national Agriculture Forestry Food industry Tourism (Accommodation and food service activities) | Total (thousand persons) <hr/> Thousand persons /% of total | 1,341.114 27.120 / 2% 4.838 / 0.4% 60.555 / 4.5% 20.306 / 1.5% | 2012 | Statistical Yearbook 2013 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|------|----------------------------|
| | | | | |
| 2. Labour productivity in agriculture - national | EUR/AWU | 4,061 | 2012 | SORS |
| 3. Structure of agricultural production | Share of the following sectors: cereals, oil crops, sugar beet, fruit and vegetable, meat, milk, in the total agricultural output (quantitative terms) | 41.4% 4.2% 13.5% 17.6 % 2.0% 6.6% | 2013 | SORS |
| 4. Labour productivity in the food industry -national | EUR/person | 22,339 | 2011 | Statistical Yearbook 2013 |
| 5. Agricultural holdings - by size (in ha): number of holdings / share in total agricultural land -national | Total AH | 631,552 | 2012 | Census of Agriculture 2012 |
| 0ha | | | | |
| <2ha | | 10,107 / 1.6% | | |
| 2-4,9ha | | 298,286 / 47.2% | | |
| 5-9,9ha | | 182,489 / 28.9% | | |
| 10-19,9ha | | 89,083 / 14.1% | | |
| 20-29,9ha | Number / % | 32,313 / 5.1% | | |
| 30-49,9ha | | 7,677 / 1.2% | | |
| 50-99,9ha | | 5,352 / 0.9% | | |
| >100ha | | 4,394 / 0.7% | | |
| | | 1,851 / 0.3% | | |
| 6. Agricultural area - national | 1000 ha | Total: 5,052 | 2012 | Statistical Yearbook 2013 |
| | 1000 ha/% | | | |
| | Arable land | 3,282 / 65.0% | | |
| | Permanent grassland and meadow | 1,478 / 29.3% | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|------|---|
| | Permanent crops | 292 / 5.8% | | |
| 7. Agricultural area under organic farming - national | ha | 8,227.99 0.16% | 2013 | MAEP |
| 8. Irrigated land - national | ha | 53,086 1.05% | 2013 | Survey on Irrigation http://webrzs.stat.gov.rs/WebSite/repository/documents/00/01/36/85/saopstenje_VOD4_2013_cirS.pdf |
| 9. Animal husbandry | LSU | 2,019,889 | 2012 | Agriculture Census |
| 10. Farm labor force – national | Number of persons AWU | 1,442,628 611,814 | 2012 | Agriculture Census |
| 11. Age structure of farm managers - national <35: 35-54: >55: | Managers, number 1.000 persons/% | 30 / 4.8% 203 / 32.1% 399 / 63.1% | 2012 | Agriculture Census |
| 12. Agricultural training of farm managers - national Only practical agricultural experience Basic agricultural training Full agricultural training | Number of managers | 602,170 20,390 8,992 | 2012 | Agriculture Census |
| 13. Gross fixed capital formation in agriculture – national | Mill. EUR % of GVA in agriculture | 226 8.6% | 2012 | National Accounts |
| 14. Forest and other wooded land (FOWL) - national | Total area of forests 1.000 ha % of total land-national without Kosovo and Metohia | 1,962 22.2% 25.3% | 2011 | Statistical Yearbook 2013 |

| | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|---------|------|---------------------------|
| 15. Tourism infrastructure, including agritourism infrastructure - national | Total: number of bed places | 113,385 | 2012 | Statistical Yearbook 2013 |
|---|-----------------------------|---------|------|---------------------------|

| Environment indicators | | | | |
|--|---|--|----------------------|--|
| The name of environment indicators | Measurement Unit | The value of indicator | Year | Comment + source of verification |
| 1. Land cover - national | Total area, 000 ha - Agricultural area - Natural grassland - Total forest area, 000 ha | 8,850.2 5,052 837 1,962 | 2012 2011 | Statistical Yearbook 2013 |
| 2. Farmland birds index (FBI) – national (if available) | | not available | | |
| 3. Area of grassland (by protection status)- national (if available) | | not available | | |
| 4. Protected forest – national (if available) | | not available | | |
| 5. Water quality – national | -kg N/ha/year -kg P/ha/year | 120 kg N / ha of agricultural area 2.0 kg P / ha of agricultural area | | |
| 6. Soil erosion by water – national | km ² | 6,996 | 2013 | Survey on Protection against damaging water effects http://webrzs.stat.gov.rs/WebSite/repository/documents/00/01/44/83/ZS10_107_srb+cir.pdf |
| 7. Agricultural areas at risk of soil erosion by water | % | 80% | 2012 | SORS |
| 8. Production of renewable energy from agriculture and forestry | Forestry % of production | 13,997 TJ (Terajoules) 31% | 2011 | Statistical Yearbook 2013 |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| | from forestry in total production of renewable energy | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|

4. SWOT – SUMMARY OF THE ANALYSES ABOVE/ FINAL

4.1. SWOT - Agriculture, forestry and food industry, (incl. separate table for each sector selected for support)

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>STRENGTHS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Good agro-climatic conditions for increased agricultural productivity ➤ Sufficient area of high quality arable land for agricultural production ➤ Increased production capacities and productivity to supply domestic market sufficiently ➤ Increasing consumer demands for domestically produced products ➤ Long tradition in fruit, vegetable and grape production as well as livestock production (meat and milk products) ➤ Sufficient processing capacity for food production ➤ Improved policy formulation and government concerns for the development of the sector's competitiveness. ➤ Existing basic structures for extension and technology transfer for primary production ➤ Some of the existing food processing units (milk & meat) comply with EU food safety standards (category A) ➤ Existing support schemes (direct payments and investment support) for the main agro-food sectors ➤ The existence of large number of educational and scientific institutions | <p>WEAKNESSES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Small farm sizes and high share of non-market-oriented agricultural production (subsistence farms) ➤ Low degree of specialized agricultural production ➤ Poor farm management skills and lack of comprehensive advisory service and regular training ➤ Predominantly old population in rural areas ➤ Difficult access to credit ➤ Lack of financial support to fulfil the requirements of introduced legislation in the field of animal welfare, food safety, protection of environment, veterinary and phytosanitary requirements ➤ Lack of knowledge of the EU standards ➤ In sufficient level of education of farmers on medium and semi large farms about the production and economic activities ➤ Lack of agricultural mechanization, high manual labour force ➤ Outdated farm machinery, technical equipment and farm buildings ➤ Poor farm management skills and lack of comprehensive advisory service and regular training ➤ Poor integration of research & development and slow pace of innovation in agri-food sector ➤ Lack of knowledge on the use of renewable energy sources from agricultural production or food processing and resource efficiency technologies ➤ Lack of interest of producers for education ➤ Weak irrigation and drainage system |
| <p>OPPORTUNITIES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Favourable conditions for organic production ➤ Planned support from the EU – IPARD II for the period 2014-2020 ➤ Possible increase of income by reduction of production costs ➤ Alignment and enforcement of the national legislation with EU <i>acquis</i> ➤ Export opportunities due to improved level of compliance with standards (neighbouring/EU) | <p>THREATS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Time needed for the process of education and awareness change of producers; ➤ High cost burdens for operations to adjust to quality, food safety and environmental/animal welfare standards ➤ Climatic changes and unforeseeable natural disasters ➤ Unpredictable price fluctuations for agricultural products ➤ Emigration of people, especially of the young population, from rural areas ➤ Long time for obtaining of construction permits |

➤ Increasing support from the national budget for agriculture and the food industry to increase productivity

➤ Not completed process of building legalization in some villages and cities

➤ National standards are similar to EU standards

4.1.1. SWOT analysis of the milk and meat sector

STRENGTHS

- Large areas under meadows and pastures as basis for quality and quantity of food for animals
- Traditional milk products, which are in connection with Serbian cultural heritage

WEAKNESSES

- Lack of proper storage capacities to secure animal feed
- Insufficient knowledge on production methods
- Big share of milk not distributed through direct market chains
- Lack of quality raw milk for the needs of processing sector
- Lack of manure storage facilities and manure management

OPPORTUNITIES

- Reduction of production cost by introduction of adequate feed and fodder
- Linking of systems - Subjects in food chain
- Utilization of the available EU funds for precise definition and positioning of products of Serbian origin
- Utilization of available EU funds for the fact that it is all about real potential of Serbia
- Measures of agricultural policy should be directed forwards raising the protection of consumers and accommodation to EU regulations, promotion of quality and food safety of raw milk

THREATS

- National rules in the area of animal feed
- There are no legal provisions for protection of origin and quality for milk products
- Time for education process and changes of producers awareness is needed
- Time for education process on good hygiene practice and change of producer's awareness is needed
- Lack of independent accredited national laboratories
- Long time for obtaining of construction permits
- Incompleted process of building legalization in some villages and cities
- National standards are similar to EU standards

4.1.2. SWOT analysis of fruit and vegetables and other crops sector

STRENGTHS

- Good soil and climate conditions for crops, fruit and vegetables
- Long traditions in producing crops, fruit and vegetables
- GMO free production
- Sufficient sources of water for irrigation
- Available workforce
- Developed seed production
- Biodiversity - existence of varieties of cultivated plants
- High competitiveness of crops and vegetables on regional markets

WEAKNESSES

- Weak vertical and horizontal links of domestic market; decreasing competitiveness at international markets
- Lack of producer organisation
- Small number of market oriented producers with intensive production and modern technology
- Small export share of processed products
- Low level of state support
- Fragmentation of the land use
- Low level of technical and technological equipment (drying and storing of crops, packing facilities, cooling of fruit and vegetables, etc.)

OPPORTUNITIES

- Promotion and organization of domestic production
- Readiness of consumers to use domestic products
- Access to foreign markets
- Establishment of producer organizations

THREATS

- Limitations in respect to the price
- Long time for obtaining of construction permits
- Incompleted process of building legalization in some villages and cities

4.1.3. SWOT analysis of the egg sector

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>STRENGTHS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Quality and quantity of food for animals ➤ Tradition and well-known production technology ➤ Existence of larger organized companies with a modern intensive process of highly efficient production ➤ The existence of favorable areas for the establishment of organic production | <p>WEAKNESSES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Insufficient level of compliance with animal welfare requirements, hygiene and environmental standards ➤ Old population in rural areas ➤ Low competitiveness of small producers ➤ Insufficient level of manure storage capacity and inadequate biosecurity measures for small producers |
| <p>OPPORTUNITIES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Potential for sustainability of production of medium and large producers in accordance with EU standards ➤ Potential for increasing competitiveness and improving the quality of eggs ➤ Use of national and IPARD funds ➤ Improvement of the quality and health safety of egg production and consumer protection through the measures of agrarian and rural development policy | <p>THREATS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ High value investments in the welfare of animals (closing production) ➤ Insufficient capacities to meet ecological standards of production and animal welfare for small producers ➤ Reduction of the price of eggs on the regional, European and world markets ➤ The existence of diseases that can affect domestic consumption and exports |

4.1.4. SWOT analysis of the viticulture and wine sector

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>STRENGTHS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Favorable ecological conditions for the production of high quality grapes and wine production ➤ A long tradition in viticulture and winery ➤ Positive interest in wine production with family holding ➤ The existence of domestic created varieties, especially those suitable for integral and organic production | <p>WEAKNESSES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Poor price competitiveness with imported grapes and wine ➤ Inadequate organization of producers in a professional context ➤ Poor structure of grape and wine producers (dominant small producers) ➤ The fragmentation of parcels in wine-growing areas favorable for cultivation of vines ➤ The absence of certified plants from autochthonous, regional and domestic produced varieties ➤ Low level of technical and technological equipment in wineries ➤ Poor export of grapes and wine ➤ Insufficient organized promotion of domestic wines and denominations of geographical indications ➤ Demanding administrative procedures and conditions for registration of wineries, protection of geographical indications and conditions not required by the EU legislation |
| <p>OPPORTUNITIES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Improvement and organization of the domestic market ➤ Willingness of consumers to consume domestic wines in a greater extent ➤ More active promotion and access to foreign markets ➤ Establishing / transforming professional producer organizations and proper funds | <p>THREATS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Limitations in achieving better price competitiveness ➤ Poor implementation of regulations and controls regarding the use of unauthorized oenological practices and oenological resources ➤ Failure to adopt new legislation for eliminating the conditions for the registration of wine producers and other conditions that make it difficult for the |

- Strengthening the certification systems and clonal selection of autochthonous, regional and domestic created varieties of grapevine
- Improving the efficiency of the implementation of the procedures required by the EU legislation through authorization to do activities for professional institutions and organizations
- Removal of all administrative and other requirements for producers of grapes and wines not required by the EU legislation, which reduce the competitiveness of domestic producers
- Establishing measures to support the wine sector following the model of the EU requirements
- Use of the EU funds

grape and wine producers, which are not mandatory under the EU legislation

4.2. SWOT environment and land management

STRENGTHS:

- Rich bio-diversity and existence of genetic recourses
- Preserved diverse natural landscapes
- Good climatic conditions for agriculture
- Grasslands with high biodiversity value (rich species composition)
- Low use of chemical inputs
- Laws (environmental, natural protection, biodiversity, etc.) harmonized with EU requirements
- Genetic basis and environment enabling the breeding of local breeds
- High quality of soil including fertility, physical, chemical and biological characteristics and water management

WEAKNESSES

- Uncontrolled use of chemicals and pesticides
- Mismanagement of rivers and destruction of riverbeds
- Soil erosion and degradation
- Lack of management of rivers and channels
- Lack of manure storage facilities and manure management
- Lack of collection systems for garbage in rural areas
- Insufficient extended sewage system and water treatment plants
- Weak implementation of strategic policies to protect agricultural land from degradation and from losing the biodiversity of pastures (grazing without any criteria)
- Lack of interest in and knowledge of farmers on environmental issues
- Lack of training and specialized advisory service for environmental issues
- Lack of sustainable forest management
- Insufficient investment in forests and forestry activities
- Large area under low quality forests
- Abandonment of agricultural land
- Lack of GIS data

OPPORTUNITIES

- Design and implementation of agri-environmental and organic farming measures
- Successful implementation of the planned agri-environmental measure under IPARD II
- Maintenance of high natural value grasslands
- Increasing areas under organic farming certification
- Protection of genetic recourses in agriculture
- Groundwater and surface water protection due to appropriate manure storage facilities
- Development of eco and rural tourism and a green economy
- Promotion of good practices in agro-environmental protection by farmers

THREATS

- Weak enforcement of environmental laws
- Insufficient training for farmers and experts dealing with environment protection, lack of interest among farmers on environmental issues
- Loss of soil quality from intensive production
- Water pollution
- Further erosion of soil
- Climatic change, droughts, floods
- Grassland underutilization
- National standards are similar to EU standards

- Increase in awareness of and sensitivity for environmental protection among the rural population
- Export of certified organic products
- Strengthening the advisory services and training on agro-environmental issues
- Optimal use of all forest functions achieving the goals of sustainable forest management (SFM)
- Growing bioenergy crops
- Possibility of using EU funds for proper waste management

4.3. SWOT rural economy and quality of life

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>STRENGTHS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Availability of natural resources with specific microclimate conditions (land, water, good soil etc.) ➤ Significant share of small holdings in agriculture with potential for diversification ➤ Rich cultural heritage ➤ Attractive landscape for rural tourism ➤ Availability of human resources ➤ Existence of good practices in rural tourism and accompanying activities | <p>WEAKNESSES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Unfavourable demographic trends and social structure ➤ Inactive labour market ➤ Low economic development in rural areas ➤ Lack of financial resources ➤ Weak rural infrastructure (water supply, lack of waste management, sewage system); insufficient quality of rural roads; poor public services ➤ Lack of adequate advisory services and access to vocational and business training |
| <p>OPPORTUNITIES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Potential demand for traditional agricultural products ➤ Potential demand for leisure and tourism services offered in rural areas ➤ Effective use of the EU IPARD II funds | <p>THREATS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Continuing migration keeps weakening the already limited human resource base ➤ Growing rural poverty ➤ Growing disparity between rural and urban areas ➤ Climatic changes and unforeseeable natural disasters ➤ Long time for obtaining of construction permits ➤ Incompleted process of building legalization in some villages and cities |

4.4. SWOT preparation and implementation of local development strategies - Leader

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>STRENGTHS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Existing LAG-like groups ➤ Existing Local (Rural) Development Strategies on municipal level ➤ Existing Rural Development Network ➤ Basic planning capacity and founding experience gained, mainly from EU and other donor funded projects ➤ General awareness of local community opportunities under LEADER ➤ Existing national support schemes to develop LEADER | <p>WEAKNESSES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Limited capacities of LAGs (lack of human resources, project preparation/management skills, etc.) ➤ Lack of financial resources ➤ Limited awareness of the local development strategies ➤ No implementation so far of the existing local development strategies ➤ Limited skills for project design, project implementation etc. |
| <p>OPPORTUNITIES</p> | <p>THREATS</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ National rural network strengthens it to support of the LEADER initiative ➤ Cooperation between LAGs and relevant central institutions ➤ Increased opportunities to apply for funds ➤ Development of capacities of LAG representatives through skill acquisition under EU IPARD II Programme | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Lack of coordination among the central institutions and the local level ➤ Poor understanding of the role of and poor cooperation with LAGs by the local population |
|---|---|

5. MAIN RESULTS OF PREVIOUS INTERVENTION

5.1. Main results of previous national intervention; amounts deployed, summary of evaluations or lessons learnt

In 2013, 27.5 billion RSD was spent financing incentives in agriculture and rural development, which were foreseen by the Regulations and Laws. Out of this, 25.9 billion RSD was spent on direct payments, or 94.4% of the funds.

Investments in primary plant production and animal breeding, which were implemented in the past 8 years, contributed to promotion of competitiveness of domestic producers. Payments were made after the whole investment was completed by the recipient. Implementation of this measure was followed by administrative problems related to the long time needed for the issuance of construction licenses, as well as other licenses, as well as determination of conditions for project approval. Also, the investments had to be realised during the period of one year, due to the requirement of the national measure and state budget.

In 2013, rural development subsidies were allocated to the tune of 1.1 billion, or 4.0% of the total funds for subsidies to agriculture and rural development. Including support to rural infrastructure (in the amount of 616.3 million), total amount contributed in the 2013 was 1.72 billion RSD, or 6.25% of the total budget.

In the structure of subsidies for rural development in 2013, the most common were subsidies for improving the competitiveness of agriculture through investments on farms. For this purpose, 1.080 billion RSD was spent or 98.6% of the total support for rural development. Investments on farms were given as grants (to a certain percentage of the total value of investments) for the renovation and construction of buildings, purchase of livestock, equipment and machinery, improving standards, as well as the restoration and expansion of plantations of perennial plants. In the structure of funds disbursed for this purpose, a significant share of funds is paid on the basis of commitments from previous year, 2012 (over 90% of the total funds for investment on the farm).

In the period from 2010 to 2012, 527 beneficiaries received 80,942,036.63 RSD overall for investment support to procure machinery for the production of arable crops, industrial plants and vegetables. For the establishment of new plantations of fruit from 2002 to 2012, 3,789 beneficiaries received 1,377,114,326 RSD overall. For the construction of ULO and regular cooling storages and storages for drying of fruit in the period of 2006 to 2013, 33 beneficiaries received in total 469,651,270, 9RSD. From 2002 to 2012, 1804 beneficiaries received 1,917,072,751 RSD for

establishing new grape vines. Investment support had significant impact for gradual change of various structures, i.e. introduction of new varieties and clones whose fruit were demanded on the world market, increase of export, introduction of new assortment and improvement of quality of domestic vines, growth of vine producers with Geographic Indication, establishment of a start-up base for satisfaction of domestic needs for quality and certified seedlings of fruit and wine.

Investment in processing and marketing of agriculture and fishery products was realized in 2010 and in 2011 the milk, meat, fruit and vegetable sectors were targeted. Absorption of the measure was only 22% because of lack of information about available support, application requirements, lack of beneficiary funds to cofinance investments, unfavourable interest rates, low understanding of required conditions and absence of professional support for preparation of application forms and submission of required documentation. The most difficult step in the preparation of applications was the economic and financial criteria and lack of understanding of the importance of completeness of documentation. In 2011, around 280 million RSD were allocated for promotion of processing capacities for investments in production and processing of milk, meat, fruit and vegetables, grapes and for support of activities inclined towards establishment of products with added value. The measure was opened for competition too late and applicants had an insufficient period of time to prepare and submit applications, which caused the low absorption capacity (close to 6%).

Incentives for improvement of environment and rural areas referred to the measures to support organic production and genetic resources. Support for the improvement of the environment is traditionally less present in the structure of spent funds for support to rural development. In 2013, only 14,693,000 RSD were spent on these measures or 1.3% of the total funds intended to support rural development. Considering the complexity of environmental problems in Serbia, the importance of this type of support for certain areas and objective possibilities for better utilization of pre-accession funds for these purposes, it is clear that this segment of the policy will have much more attention in the coming period.

Support to on-farm diversification of activities was financed through the measure "Economic activities to add value to agricultural products, as well as the introduction and certification of the system of food safety and quality, organic products and products with label of geographical origin". Measures to support the development of rural tourism, traditional crafts and other, were not financed even though they were foreseen by the Regulation since budgetary funds were not available at that time. Total funds spent on support of the diversification of activities (rural tourism) in 2013 were 712,112 RSD, which represents only 0.07% of total rural development support.

In 2011, the Serbian Development Fund had a special budget line exclusively for the financing of certified traditional arts and handicrafts and it continued into 2012.

Investment support to rural infrastructure was much stronger in the past, especially in 2006, after which the available funds became more modest. In 2013,

support to rural infrastructure amounted 616.3 million RSD or 2.24% of the budget funds for subsidies.

Support to advisory services and professional activities in agriculture and food safety control was included in the special incentives in 2013 with 442.05 million RSD, or 1.65% of the budget funds for subsidies, which was slightly more compared to the previous year.

5.2. Main results of EU assistance, amounts deployed, summary of evaluations or lessons learnt

The main sources of EU finance of agricultural projects in Serbia were the CARDS Programme and IPA funds. Serbia has received assistance under IPA from the first two out of the five IPA components since 2007 and the first contract were signed in 2010.

Several IPA projects focused on strengthening capacity and institutional preparedness for IPARD:

IPA 2007 project *“Capacity building to implement rural development policies to EU standards“* (EUR 4.5 million) aimed to strengthen the capacity and competency in the Directorate of Agrarian Payments and the Managing Authority. Project had two components. Component 1- Twinning project *“Strengthening the capacities of the Serbia for the absorption of EU Rural Development funds in pre-accession period”* and Component two Technical assistance *“Capacity Building for the establishment and implementation of a LEADER initiative in Serbia (LIS)”*.

In the FWC evaluation report it was stated that results for the Component 1 are partly achieved. Result 1 - The IPARD Agency (PA) established in line with EU requirements, was not achieved. Result 2 - The MA is now established within the department of Rural Development and hence it is achieved, although further recruitment of additional staff is needed. The training plan for the PA and MA (result 3) has been elaborated and is under implementation.

The Component 2 - LIS project achieved mixed results, which according the FWC evaluation report, are the following; 1) Capacities and awareness within local communities to participate in the LEADER approach (result 1) have increased; 2) Based on this strong bottom-up work with local community groups, a pilot simulation exercise for selecting potential LAGS was evaluated from over 25 submissions in November 2012. It is anticipated that at least 15-20 potential LAGs are expected to meet the criteria of selection satisfying the requirement of result 2. 3) Less satisfactory has been the progress in achieving result 3 (the *“human, technical, organisational and financial procedures and/or resources for the overall support to LEADER approach within the MAEP are strengthened”*). No institutional mandate has been built (the latest plans for a *“Leader Advisory Board”* have failed due to the lack of commitment and decision by the Ministry for a national inter-agency forum on rural development, as it was done earlier through plans for a *‘National Leader Group’*). No mechanisms have been developed within

DAP for the development of procedures for the implementation of LEADER measures.⁶

IPA 2009 FWC Europe Aid/127054/C/SER/multi - LOT N° 1: Rural Development “*Assistance to the Directorate of Agrarian Payments*” (April 2013- February 2014). The objective of the project was to provide TA to the Directorate of Agrarian Payments (UAP) in order to strengthen the national and regional capabilities that are required to tackle the priorities for EU alignment and development in the sector, focusing in particular on meeting accreditation requirements for IPA Component V. One of the results of the project was a self-assessment process that highlighted main deficiencies (blocking factors) that may significantly affect the process of UAP accreditation. The result of the self-assessment process was a final report of Internal Audit (submitted on 26 July 2013).

IPA 2010 project “*The Farm Accountancy Data Network (FADN)*”, with the budget of EUR 2 million had the objective to improve economic, financial and performance data on Serbian agricultural holdings. FWC evaluation report stated that early indications of achieving the results were the following: 1) The five-year National Plan for FADN has been developed; 2) the institutional framework for FADN has been established and capacity strengthening is underway; 3) the FADN software is under development (although here again IT tasks are delegated to DAP placing yet more demands on its resources); and all the training, data gathering and methodological issues for the first pilot farms were successfully implemented.

IPA 2010 FWC “*Technical Assistance for the National Fund within the Ministry of Finance in Serbia for the preparation for IPA Component V*”. Objective: Finalisation of National Fund IPARD procedures, development of accounting standards, finalisation of accreditation package for IPARD. *Status*: Project ended in June 2013.

IPA 2011-EU Twinning Light Project, SR/2013/IB/AG/01TWL “*Assistance to Managing Authority of the Serbian Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Management (MAFWM) in elaboration of IPARD 2014-2020 Programme, support to accreditation and training*”. The project assisted in the elaboration of the core elements of the IPARD 2014-2020 Programme (identifying adequate support measures, indicators, legislative gaps related to implementation of measures, drafting the measure sheets, drafting the monitoring and evaluation reports with necessary accompanying documents) and provided further training to the MA on the process. Additionally new measures were included and a list of National Minimum Standards was revised. Beyond preparation for the new Programme 2014-2020, the project supported on-the-job training of currently employed staff and assisted in the revision of document in line with obtained comments and recommendations from DG AGRI and ex-ante evaluation. The submission of the first draft IPARD II Programme to the European Commission was the most valuable result achieved under this project. Numerous on the job trainings were conducted for the Managing Authority to get acquainted with their future tasks as a part of the operating structure under IPARD II Programme.

⁶“Technical Assistance for Evaluation of Agriculture and Rural Development Sector Implemented and Financed by IPA Programme and Others Donors in the Republic of Serbia”, Evaluation Report, January 2013.

One important stakeholder consultation meeting was organised to present the draft IPARD II Programme. Representatives of the processing industry and agriculture producers, associations, cooperatives and NGO's involved in rural development were invited to contribute with their written comments and discussion during the meeting to further improve the quality of the IPARD II Programme.

The IPA 2012 project *"Technical Assistance to the Serbian Authorities for the Management of the Pre-accession Assistance"* based in the Ministry of Finance has commenced in March 2014 and will run for two years. Whilst it will largely target staff and procedures of the NAO / NF and NAO support office, it has a dedicated IPARD component with the following activities: mapping of state of play of IPARD preparation, review of current legal basis and operational procedures for IPA V and their updating in line with new financial regulation, design and delivery of tailor-made trainings for NF and IPARD OS staff, providing coaching and on-the-job training through case studies under IPARD specifically designed for NF and IPARD OS and providing guidance and tools to NF in its operational activities for effective functioning of management control system.

IPA 2012 TWL Project 12SER01/11/71 "Assistance to the Managing Authority of the Serbian MAEP in negotiation and accreditation of the IPARD 2014-2020 Programme" - should start with implementation until the end of 2014. This project will assist the MA in the negotiation process for IPARD and preparation for National Accreditation. Additionally, this project will assist in the elaboration of national and EU standards for IPARD and establishment of a Standing Working Group (SWG), consisted of representatives of the MA, PA and technical bodies of IPARD Programme, which will work on definition of standards and preparation of relevant Guidebook for beneficiaries of IPARD II Programme, related to National and EU standards and IPARD promotional activities.

IPA Project Preparation Facility 5 (PPF5) (Contract Number: 2012/302-220) contributed to the preparation of the IPARD II Programme 2014-2020 to MAEP. Through the project quantitative, qualitative and up to date information for the preparation of the IPARD II Programme was provided by:

- a) Updating the tables included in chapter 3 of the draft of IPARD I programming document describing socio-economic situation and agricultural sectors using newest data sources including official census 2012;
- b) Updating the sector studies prepared in 2010 for milk production and milk processing, for meat production and meat processing, for fruit and vegetable production and processing;
- c) Supervising and peer reviewing the statistical data and analyses, provided in the updated sector studies, and other reports for the updating of the socioeconomic analysis to be included in the IPARD II Programme;
- d) Elaborating a draft of the chapter 3 of the IPARD II Programme in line with the DG AGRI Programming guidelines for the content of the chapter 3. The text of the chapter should not override 50 pages. It should contain a quantified description of the current situation showing disparities, shortcomings and potential for development;
- e) Reviewing and providing information about the existing National Minimum Standards (NMS) and the technical services, responsible for the controls in the following fields:

environmental protection, food quality and safety, animal health and welfare, plant health;

f) Preparing assessment of needs for agricultural machinery/mechanization in the crop sectors;

g) Ex-ante evaluation of the Rural Development Programme under IPARD 2014-2020 in Republic of Serbia.

The IPA projects focused on safety & standards area are as follows:

IPA 2008 project "Harmonisation of national legislation with EU legislation for placing on the market and control of plant protection products and implementation of new legal provisions" had budget of EUR 1.2 million. The aim of the project was support to the Plant Protection Directorate (PPD) in establishing a comprehensive structure for the effective implementation of the whole system of authorisation and control of the plant protection products (PPP`s) in line with the EU standards, starting with the legislation and institutional building and going on to providing communication systems. The main results were the following:

1) The introduction of new ways of working to improve efficiency, preparations for the new types of applications that can be expected once the legislation is harmonised with that in the EU and the writing of Standard Operating Procedures for all key areas of work, and in addition, a new strategy for plant protection which included the way forward with PPP`s regulation was developed and adopted;

2) It introduced PPD staff and a large number of specialist staff from institutes and faculties to all areas of the EU risk assessment methodologies and standards;

3) The Draft Law on PPPs was prepared as well as all relevant by-laws for authorization of PPPs was prepared and published;

4) A range of performance management systems were introduced to the PPD staff, faculties and institutes which were assessed for their suitability to be involved in the future authorisation process and provided drafts of the tender and contract for these to be selected and authorised;

5) Future Good Experimental Practice organisations were inspected and minor amendments for their future work in conducting of efficacy trials of PPP`s were given.

Public bid for performing activities of evaluation of PPPs in the process of authorisation was published in the *Official Gazette RS, No. 41/14. The selection of applied external institutions (institutes and faculties) is in progress, as the first documentary check of compliance and second phase of public bid (English and computer skills testing) were done. A final decision, authorisation and contracting will be made, in accordance with the plan, by the end of 2014.**

IPA 2008 project "Capacity Building and technical Support for the Renewal of Viticulture Zoning and for the System of Designation for Wine with geographical Indications" (EUR 1.2 million) had the aim to improve the situation in the wine sector, especially by establishing new viticulture zoning (VZ) that will be helpful

for small wine producers in poor and less-developed rural areas, who produce specific and geographically typical wines.

IPA 2010 project *“Equipment supply for the Serbian National Reference Laboratories Directorate in the food chain”* (EUR 6,5 million), aimed at building the capacity of the newly established National Reference Laboratories Directorate and to commission the Batajnica laboratory complex and make it fully operational in order to be in line with the EU best practice and standards. The project design was based on the provisions of the national Food Safety Law adopted in 2009. However, the initiative to amend the legislation in force launched during the project inception phase (which was not yet realized) impacted on the implementation. In addition, the division of tasks between the NRL and the other sectors of the Ministry, especially the Veterinary Directorate (veterinary inspection), the General Inspectorate (phyto-sanitary inspection) and the Plant Protection Directorate has not been clearly delineated. According the FWC evaluation report the achievement of the expected results has been poor (overall only 26% of results had been achieved to the end of September 2012). It is reported that 35% of results have been achieved in Component II (building, a Laboratory Information Management System), and 33% in Component III (accreditation). The buildings in Batajnica which were allocated to house the network of laboratories remain fully refurbished, but without a sufficient number of specialist staff and they are expensive to maintain.

IPA 2011 project *“Building capacity in the area of Food Safety and Animal Welfare”* had the aim to develop the capacity of the veterinary sector to enable the examination of potential risks arising from within the animal evidence base for future action that complies with the acquis. It ended in September 2014. Final report of the result is not yet available. It is to recognise that the following results have already been achieved:

- updated food and feed management documentation system;
- Veterinary Directorate's staff including the inspectors trained on implementation of the EU food legislation.

The IPA projects focused on Animal health area are as follow:

The IPA 2008, 2009, 2011 project *“Support for the control/eradication of classical swine fever”*, (EUR 20.3 million EU contribution) has the objective to eradicate animal diseases in the Western Balkan countries, in particular those diseases that continue to be a threat to the EU Member States, rabies and classical swine fever (CSF). The project has to be implemented for a period of at least five continuous years on the whole territory of Western Balkans (e.g. 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2014), with vaccinations twice per year in spring and autumn (April-May and October-November). Results achieved are the following: 1) Action Plan for improvement of the current institutional framework for eradication, control and monitoring of the CSF and Rabies; 2) Strategic operational multi-annual action plan for eradication, control and monitoring of Rabies; 3) Strategic operational multi-annual action plan for eradication, control and monitoring of CSF including a plan for non-vaccination eradication of CSF; 4) Contingency plan and operational manual for CSF; 5) Training programme agreed with the beneficiary

has been implemented; 6) Procedure manuals or protocols for monitoring and surveillance of the number and spatial distribution of foxes and feral pig population adopted by the beneficiary; and, 7) GIS based surveillance system for rabies and CSF customized with the Veterinary Information Management System (VIMS). As a result of the vaccination programme, the number of identified cases of rabies in animals in Serbia dropped from almost 200 in 2009 to only 1 in 2014 with the view of Serbia achieving the rabies free status in the coming years.

Monitoring of the effectiveness of oral vaccination of foxes (ORV) has been carried out in continuation from 2011 and was based on a) post mortem laboratory examination of brain tissue of target animals (foxes, jackals and other carnivores) by fluorescence antibody test (FAT), b) detection of antibodies against rabies virus in blood samples by ELISA and c) detection of tetracycline biomarker in the mandibles for the evaluation of vaccine bait uptake. From September 2011 to May 2014, the total number of 4943 brain tissue samples, 4241 blood sera and 4984 mandibles were analysed. Confirmed rabies-positive brains decreased from 10 in 2011/2012 to 6 in 2012/2013 and eventually to 1 positive fox in 2013/2014. The seroconversion rate increased from 10.48% (133/1269) to 20.12% (362/1800) and 42.23% (495/1172) in 2011/2012, 2012/2013 and 2013/2014, respectively. Along with the seroconversion, the number of detected tetracycline positive mandibles demonstrated an increasing tendency in the same period, being: 49.67% (682/1373) in 2011/2012, 62.54% (1294/2067) in 2012/2013 and 90.33% (1383/1531) in the monitoring program carried out in 2013/2014. Presented results confirmed that ORV of wild animals in Serbia against rabies was successful and characterized by steady increase of vaccine baits uptake and immunization of animals.

IPA 2012 twinning project "*Capacity Building for Upgrading of Food establishments and animal by-product management*" (EUR 2,000,000) supports the development of strategies in two distinct areas: for upgrading of food processing establishments and for animal by-product management. It supports the development of appropriate standards in the different sectors (e.g. meat and milk), and delivers training programmes for inspectors and a broader public awareness campaign. This project is strongly linked with preparations for the implementation of the IPARD in investments in agricultural holdings and investments in processing industry in the sectors of meat, milk, fruit and vegetables. Applicants have to reach minimum national standards in the field of animal health, public health, occupational safety in order to be eligible for assistance within measure Investments in physical assets concerning processing and marketing of agricultural and fishery products an applicant, as well as potential beneficiaries has to reach EU standards at the end of investments. Second important issue is that standards has to be checked on-the-spot which means that veterinary inspection is considered as a technical requirement for implementation of the IPARD Programme. The end result would be an upgrade of standards of beneficiaries' food establishments which would help raising absorption of funds.

5.3. Main results of multilateral assistance conducted, amounts deployed, evaluations or lessons learnt

In relation to this kind of assistance, promotion of national growth by increasing the competitiveness of Serbian SMEs, supporting firms to attain international standards and certification, supporting sales and marketing (trade shows and market research), creating industry groups and associations, stimulating business clusters, establishing cooperative network of public and private actors, and encouraging e-government through website standardization have been supported by donors, such as Austria, Czech Republic, Germany, Japan, the Netherlands, Denmark, Norway, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United States, the United Nations, and the World Bank (list of the donors with budget and duration see in Annex 1) According to the effectiveness of ODA support can be best captured at the local level and with bilateral projects, often financed by smaller donors and assistance covered by other sector (PAR, Competitiveness, Civil Society, Media and Culture).⁷

Norwegian support to Serbia started from 2001. The latest project was *“Improvement of work organisation of farmer’s cooperatives in Serbia based on Norwegian model“* (EUR 1 million). The purpose of the project was to improve the work of new and existing cooperatives and farmer’s associations according to the Western European-Norwegian model. Key results were the following: 1) Achieved strengthening of agricultural production in Serbia through revitalization of eight agriculture cooperatives and creation of new modern organizations of agricultural producers according to the European principles; 2) Realized trainings on: establishment and operation of modern agricultural cooperatives; marketing and trade; knowledge transfer to advisory service and agriculture cooperatives and their strategy; 3) Hand books and manuals for establishment of cooperatives developed; 4) Baseline analysis on agriculture cooperatives in Serbia prepared; and 5) Strategy on agriculture cooperatives in Serbia prepared.

Project - Implementation of a Private Sector programme for Support to the Fruits and Berries Sector in Southern Serbia (Denmark donation) - has supported five fruit value chains for domestic and export markets. This has been a very relevant project as Serbia has particular competitive advantages in the fruit sector. The project started at the end 2010 and will end in 2014. It provides technical assistance (EUR 4 million) and grants (EUR 5.3 million) through two calls for applications per year.

Project - Partnership for revitalization of rural areas (donation of the Government of Romania) - was implemented by the UNDP. Budget EUR 0.2 million. The project started in July 2010 and was extended until the end of 2011; further expansion into three new municipalities of *Kučevo*, *Žagubica* and *Golubac* is being considered. This project aims to link the existing potentials of five individual rural municipalities in Vojvodina using the LEADER approach. The project activities are strengthening rural social capital and promoting rural development through innovative trainings, improved coordination between all actors important for rural development and increased diversity of rural development strategies. The projects

⁷ SIDA Report on the “Evaluation of the effectiveness and efficiency of development assistance to the Republic of Serbia per sector”

achievements are the following: 1) Supported development of rural areas in Vojvodina through support to existing and emerging five networks, 2) Mobilized rural social capital and community participatory efforts to strengthen rural development activities of targeted pilot communities, 3) Implemented capacity building of potential LAGs in the targeted sub-regions and municipalities and Rural Development Network, for more sustainable implementation of the local rural development initiatives through promotion and trainings on LEADER approach and methodology.

World Bank projects

Project *Serbian Transitional Agriculture Reform (STAR)* was launched in December 2008 and finished in May 2013, through a EUR 12.5 million Loan Agreement and a GEF Agreement of USD 4.5 million. The objective was to enhance the competitiveness of Serbian agriculture and amongst its interventions has supported: Strengthening the Paying Agency for delivering rural development investment grants and evaluating their impact; The capacity of agricultural producers and processors to make use of these funds; The training programme for advisory service providers was expanded from 250 to 1,800 farm advisors since November 2011; Critical investments in community infrastructure in remote rural areas supported by GEF under the project have been initiated and contributed to improved accessibility of rural tourism ventures. The Transitional Agriculture Reform (STAR) project of the World Bank disbursed only 6% of the IBRD loan arrangement and 7.6% of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) grant in the first three years. It is clear from interviews carried out for this evaluation that the MAEP has a particular challenge in understanding and coordinating ODA support interventions.⁸

Project *Danube River Enterprise Pollution Reduction – DREPR* (GEF, SIDA), World Bank started at the beginning of 2006, with a budget of EUR 9 million. The global environmental objective of the project was to reduce nutrient flows into water bodies connected to the Danube River from selected agricultural holdings and enterprises and to promote positive influence on public health, economic sustainability of agricultural production, preservation of natural heritage and environmental protection. The project successfully realized defined project goals and the main key results through four project components: Regulatory Reform and Capacity Building, Investment in Nutrient Reduction, Water and Soil Quality Monitoring, Public Awareness Raising and Replication Strategy and Project Management, Implementation and Monitoring. The main achieved results of the DREPR project were: 1) The Code of Good Agricultural Practice prepared; 2) Developed Study - “Preparation of a Nitrate Directive Implementation Plan and Legal Framework for Serbia”; 3) 120 nutrient management plans prepared; 4) Visiting and working with over 200 farms; 5) 105 farms - received the grant support; 6) Three slaughterhouses supported through procurement of equipment for risk waste management; 7) Established of Training and Information Centre (TIC) for transfer of knowledge on Good Agriculture Practices; 8) 650 participants

⁸ SIDA Report on the “Evaluation of the effectiveness and efficiency of development assistance to the Republic of Serbia per sector”

trained in TIC about EU legislation on ND and WFD, CGAP, proper manure and slaughterhouse animal waste management; 9) Provided equipment for laboratories and software for the Soil Science Institute (SSI), Hydro meteorological Institute (HMI) and 4 local laboratories; 10) 104 farms supported in construction of facilities for storing of manure and with equipment for spreading of manure.

Support for agri-environmental policies and programming in Serbia - IUCN (International Union for Conservation of Nature). The main results were: 1) Prepared two pilot agro-environment schemes for contrasting protected areas where the continuation of traditional agricultural practices is important for the conservation of biodiversity associated with HNV farming systems and farmland ; 2) Established Agri-environment Working Group, a typology of HNV farming systems, and draft map of HNV farmland and various technical documents; 3) Conducted trainings on Agri-environment policy design and implementation: The importance of High Nature Value (HNV) Farming; 4) Finished and printed manual for preparation of national agri- environmental programme with the goal to initiate and provide biodiversity conservation and sustainable nature resource management in Serbia.

UN Agencies project *“Sustainable tourism for rural development”*. Planned outcomes of this project were: Legal and policy framework for supporting diversification of rural economy through tourism is developed and it contributes to achievement of Millennium Development Goals; local rural tourism and support industries are better linked and organized; and local stakeholders’ capacity is improved for delivering services and products in line with national strategies. Project with planned outputs: 1) Development of Legal and policy framework for supporting diversification of rural economy through tourism; 2) Elaboration of National Rural Tourism Master Plan; 3) Elaboration of National Programme for Rural Development 2010-2013; 4) Better networking and organization of local tourism and support industries; 5) Improvement of capacities of local stakeholders for delivering services and products in line with the national strategies.

In order to achieve these outcomes, this Joint Programme utilized several strategic approaches in its implementation: 1) Capacity building to assist in preparation for LEADER programme of EU and 2) a portfolio of training and capacity development activities targeting a host of local actors in the public, private and civil society sectors.

Main achievements: 1) The project supported the development of the National Rural Tourism Master Plan that was approved by the Government. It comprises a diagnostic, strategy, action plan and implementation plan and contains the framework and principles for the development of child, youth and family tourism. The National Rural Development Council was also constituted; 2) To enhance the capacity for sustainable rural tourism, over 1,000 rural tourism stakeholders were trained through workshops, practical trainings and coaching in programmes mainly concentrating on energy efficiency and sustainable use of resources. The programme also facilitated critical networking for groups and individuals involved in rural tourism (providers, local tourism offices, municipalities and civil society); 3) Local development strategies were

elaborated in all municipalities in each of the four target regions. Capacity was enhanced in a number of precursor organizations for the establishment of Local Action Groups, including planning, strategy development and group formation. The programme also developed the capacity of individuals and groups involved in rural development to prepare local development strategies and manage the project cycle; 4) Partnerships between public, civil and private sectors were fostered through more than 60 projects and guidelines for public-private partnerships in rural tourism were prepared.

6. DESCRIPTION OF THE STRATEGY

6.1. Description of the existing national rural development strategy

The National Agriculture and Rural Development Strategy (NARDS) of Serbia for the period 2014-2024 was adopted on 31 July 2014 and published in O.G. 85/14. It is based on the following vision for the development of agriculture and rural areas:

An efficient and innovative agri food sector based on knowledge, modern technologies and standards, offering high quality products to domestic and foreign markets, and sustainable development of the natural resources, environment and cultural heritage of the rural areas, providing economic activities and employment opportunities and quality of life for young people and other rural inhabitants.

In accordance with this vision, the following strategic development goals are defined:

- Increase of production growth and stability of producers' incomes;
- Competitiveness improvement with adjustment to the requirements of domestic and international markets and with technological and technical improvement of the sector;
- Sustainable resources management and environmental protection;
- Improvement of the quality of life in rural areas and poverty reduction;
- Efficient public policy management and institutional framework improvement for agricultural and rural areas development.

To achieve these strategic development goals the following policy principles have been defined:

- Agricultural and rural development policy should be oriented towards the above mentioned goals;
- Adoption and full approximation of the *acquis communautaire* should be assured and
- Institutional reforms with regard to efficient policy management and building capacities for implementation of EU CAP – policies should be implemented.

As a result of the situation analysis and perceived internal and external challenges the sector is facing the following priorities for intervention have been selected:

- ✓ Stabilization of income in agriculture;
- ✓ Increased financing of agriculture and rural development and risk management;
- ✓ Efficient land management and improved accessibility of the land resources;
- ✓ Improved physical resources;
- ✓ Improvement of the knowledge transfer system and human resources development;
- ✓ Adaptation to and mitigation of the climate changes effects;
- ✓ Technology development and modernization of the agricultural production and processing;
- ✓ Market chains development and logistic support to the sector;
- ✓ Protection and improvement of environment and preserving of the natural resources;
- ✓ Preserving of agriculture, human and natural resources in the areas with difficult working conditions in agriculture;
- ✓ Diversification of the rural economy and preserving of the cultural and natural heritage;
- ✓ Improvement of social structure and strengthening of the social capital;
- ✓ Modernization and adjustment of institutions and legal framework;
- ✓ Improvement of the products quality and safety.

In order to achieve the strategic goals the following policy interventions have been defined:

- Direct payments and market and price support interventions, related to income support of the farmers;
- Rural development interventions, financed under the IPARD II Programme and under the national support schemes;
- Support to general services, including veterinary and plants protection;
- Institutional development and capacity building.

Additionally, Serbia is also aiming to support the aforementioned policy and the achievement of its goals through the two macro-regional strategies where it participates (ie. the EU Strategy for the Danube Region (COM (2010) 715) and the EU Strategy for the Adriatic and Ionian Region (COM (2014) 357)).

6.2. Identification of the needs and summary of overall strategy

6.2.1. Needs identified:

1. Improve competitiveness of the agricultural sector

Farmers in Serbia lack competitiveness for their products, due to the standard of their holdings, instability of production conditions and because of low efficiency of production and high production costs. As a result, incomes are unstable.

The IPARD measure “Investments in physical assets of agricultural holdings” is designed to encourage investments in facilities, mechanization, equipment and technologies, which would allow the development of productivity and efficiency and attainment of EU-production standards in particular in public health, environmental protection, animal welfare and occupational safety. Investments in raising the standards are urgent in animal breeding farms in order to improve raw milk hygiene (milking and cooling facilities), animal welfare conditions (housing, ventilation, etc.), manure handling and storage. Fruit and vegetable farms need investments in order to improve post-harvest infrastructure and to optimize the use of irrigation water. Holdings also need investments to reach an efficient scale of operation. NPRD is designed to help smaller agricultural holdings to increase their production and/or to keep their agriculture production either as growing business or additional source of income.

2. Upgrade of the processing sector to EU-Standards

A large proportion of the enterprises in the food industry need investments to modernise facilities and production lines. There are urgent requirements to establish safe collection and storage of raw materials to reduce waste and to ensure food safety. Support for this sector is planned exclusively through the IPARD measure “Investments in physical assets concerning processing and marketing of agriculture and fishery products”. It will be focused on increased productivity and food processing efficiency to withstand competitive pressure and market forces as well as to help the sector to progressively align with EU standards. The renewed agricultural industry capacities should meet improved standards on EU-level in particular concerning hygiene, animal welfare, environment and quality of products.

3. Diversify activities and sources of income in rural areas

The IPARD measure: “Farm diversification and business development” contributes to rural economy diversification and decreased dependence of rural areas on agricultural income and creates conditions for the small agricultural holdings. The IPARD measure: “Farm diversification and business development” will support rural tourism and thus give the possibility for farmers to apply and diversify their activities and income. An analysis of rural tourism in Serbia shows that it already contributes to the rural economy and has great potential for further development. Furthermore, rural areas are characterized by a diversity of landscapes, rich biodiversity, cultural heritage and natural resources.

In addition, the national support schemes will provide funding for the beekeeping sector and honey production as well as for the aqua-culture sector.

4. Develop non-agricultural sectors of rural economy

Diversification of economic activities in the rural areas widens the range of services available to rural population and encourages products and services based on traditional knowledge and technology, natural resources and cultural heritage and will be supported with national support measures, rural tourism projects within the IPARD measure: "Farm diversification and business development" will be focused on zones showing an appropriate development potential. Economic diversification should encourage growth, employment and sustainable development in rural areas, and thereby contribute to better territorial balance, both in economic and social terms, increasing directly the income in rural areas by developing non-agriculture activities.

5. Improve the quality of vocational training and information services to farmers and small scale local business

The advisory services will be trained to help farmers, forest holders and SMEs in rural areas to use the IPARD II Programme incentives and to improve the sustainable management and economic and environmental performance of agricultural holdings or related businesses and thus of the sector as a whole. Development of the advisory services is one of the main priorities of the MAEP. Support to development of the advisory services will be provided by the national budget and IPA institution building. Under the IPA TA measure the advisory services will be supported to actively organize publicity and informational campaigns for potential grant beneficiaries.

6. Improve management of natural resources and resource use efficiency

A strong contribution to decrease the present trend of degradation of nature and the environment due to unsustainable land management and farming practices that result in land degradation and soil erosion, water pollution and biodiversity loss could be made by IPARD measures "Investments in physical assets concerning processing and marketing of agriculture and fishery products", and "Investments in physical assets of agricultural holdings". They have a strong link to this need as they are largely destined to improve environmental standards in primary production and processing of agricultural products and so contribute to the decrease of contamination of air and soil, in particular through investments to improved management of waste, introduction of water saving technologies and renewable energy. Support of physical assets for primary production and processing of milk, meat, fruit and vegetables and crops will provide necessary equipment and tools to recipients for proper management of natural resources and improvement of soil and water quality and, at the same time, it will assist in implementation of environmentally friendly practices in primary agricultural production and processing. At the end of each supported project the entire enterprise must comply with the main relevant national minimum standards in force regarding environmental protection, public health, animal welfare, and

occupational safety. Investments in irrigation systems will contribute to proper use of water resources. As there are valuable opportunities related to increased demand for organic products as well as eco-and agri tourism, which both depend on preservation of the environment and contribute to nature conservation “Agri-environmental-climate and organic farming measure” as well as” Farm diversification and business development” are the core measures directly designed to contribute to solve the problems. Development of the capacity of the advisory services and improved provision of information and advice to farmers on the sustainable management of natural resources will promote this need.

7. Maintenance of biodiversity and environment value of agricultural areas and agricultural systems and maintenance of water resource quality

The IPARD “Agri-environmental-climate and organic farming” measure raises awareness of the producers to protect and improve the natural resources at their disposal. It involves protection and preservation of the land, air quality, water, places of living of animals and plants, traditional rural areas and agricultural areas of high natural value. Synergy effects of investment measures ”Investments in physical assets concerning processing and marketing of agriculture and fishery products”, and “Investments in physical assets of agricultural holdings” such as: setting the special criteria for investments support, special subsidized programme in the energy supply area, technological improvement of production processes and special subsidies for introduction of environmentally friendly technology could also lead to improvements and protective effects. The support policy is going to gradually obtain the shape of the policy harmonized with EU standards, which requires administrative strengthening in the area of agri-environmental schemes monitoring and implementation. NPRD will continue to provide support in the field of agri environment through preservation of animal and plant genetic resources as well as preservation and conservation of soil. New measures in the NPRD will provide support to sustainable forest management and forestry activities. If available resources allow in the future, particular attention will be paid to preservation of biodiversity and autochthonous breeds.

8. Promotion of sustainable forest management (SFM), improving forest accessibility and access to environment-friendly technologies in the forestry sector

Support for sustainable and climate friendly land use should encompass forest area development and sustainable management of forests. Forests play a key role in moving towards a low carbon economy, maintaining biodiversity, sequestering carbon, offering ecosystem services, facilitating recreation as well as providing jobs and income possibilities in rural areas. The activities and support for establishment and protection of forests, promotion of investments in the development of forests area and in forest protection, will be financed from the National budget and possibly by donor's support.

9. Maintenance of a low level of greenhouse gas emissions (GES) from the agricultural sector and rural space and support for passing to an economy with low carbon emissions

Agriculture development will be increasingly facing climate change effects in the future. Higher concentrations of carbon-dioxide and other greenhouse gases, increase in temperature, change in the regime of the annual and seasonal precipitation and increased frequency of extreme temperatures will inevitably influence the scope of production and quality of food, stability of yield and the environment. Besides, the consequences such as decreased accessibility of water, more frequent appearance of diseases and pests and deterioration of land quality can be also expected. All the selected measures under the IPARD II Programme are designed in order to contribute to reduction of CO₂ emissions and assist in mitigation of the climate change impact on the sector of agriculture. Since NPRD is focusing only on smaller agricultural holdings, it doesn't predict support for this type of investments.

10. Reduction of poverty degree and risk of social exclusion

There are over 750,000 unemployed people in Serbia and they are mainly located in the country side. The economic crisis has strongly affected the Serbian economy, which is confirmed by the poverty growth rate figures of recent years. Rural areas are especially affected by poverty and differences are deepening between rural and urban areas. In that sense, more attention should be paid to this problem and measures selected for IPARD could provide support for reducing poverty and social exclusion by maintenance and creation of employment positions in the country side. In particular, investment measures such as "Investments in physical assets of agricultural holdings" and "Investments in physical assets concerning processing and marketing of agriculture and fishery products", "Farm diversification and business development" but also e.g. "Organic farming" measure could contribute to reduce this problem. The main support is expected through NPRD since it covers smaller agricultural holdings and thus keeps requirements for utilization of support measures easier for recipients.

11. Improve the basic infrastructure and services in rural areas

It is hard to realise provision of services, economic development in rural areas the growth potential and promotion of sustainability without sufficient coverage of basic infrastructures. In the period 2014-2020 the basic infrastructure and services in rural areas will be supported with national budget and donor's support.

12. Creation of jobs in rural environment

Without the creation of new jobs, no sustainable development in the countryside and the therefore necessary structural changes will be achieved. So the selection of measures for IPARD II is concentrated to a large extent on those which can directly contribute to creation of jobs such as "Investments in physical assets of agricultural holdings, and Investments in physical assets concerning processing and marketing of agriculture and fishery products, Farm diversification and business

development". Due to the limits in size of beneficiaries NPRD will not be so focused on creation of new jobs but rather to keeping of existing and preparations for further growth of holdings.

13. Improve the capacity of the local stakeholders to implement LEADER approach

As at local and regional level up to 24 potential LAGs have been established, supported by 605 thematic action groups. Strong progress has been made to develop civil society and social dialogue within rural population in Serbia and to facilitate good governance through local partnerships and to foster employment and to develop human capital. With this approach of an integrated territorial development tool on "local" level a balanced territorial development of rural areas, which is one of the overall objectives of the rural development policy could be better guaranteed. To reach a more comprehensive coverage of the territory by LAGs and to finance first projects, prioritised in the LDS, the IPARD measure "Implementation of Local development strategies - LEADER approach" is planned to be implemented in second phase of implementation of IPARD II. The TA and NPRD measure will be used to facilitate creation of partnerships and for developing skills of the potential local action groups for elaboration and implementation of LDS.

6.2.2. Summary showing main rural development needs and measures operating

Summary of the strategy under IPARD II Programme

In accordance with the strategic objectives of the NARDS for the period 2014-2024 based on overall SWOT and needs identified and in line with the IPA II priorities, the IPARD II Programme interventions in Serbia will focus on the following objectives:

- support the competitiveness of the agri-food sector, alignment with EU veterinary, phytosanitary, food safety and environmental standards, as well as its restructuring and modernization;
- contribute to the development of sustainable land management practices by supporting organic farming and other agro-environmental practices;
- contribute to sustainable rural development by supporting diversification of economic activities and strengthening the LEADER approach;
- support the efficient Programme implementation, monitoring, evaluation and publicity under the Technical Assistance measure.

Under the EU IPARD II, 11 measures are available, which provide for different intervention tools and diverse target groups. Six measures have been selected to be included in the IPARD II Programme for the period 2014-2020.

The selection of measures to be included in the IPARD II Programme for the period 2014-2020 was based on sectoral analysis of the priority sectors in agriculture and

food processing industry, on an assessment of the needs and potential for diversification of the rural economy and analysis of the environmental situation.

The agri-food sector faces a significant challenge to successfully restructure, introduce EU standards and increase productivity and competitiveness. The process of harmonization of national legislation with the acquis communautaire and the gradual alignment to EU standards in the area of food safety, hygiene, the environment and animal welfare, requires significant investments in the modernization of facilities and an emphasis on improving labour force knowledge and skills.

The most important challenges are the improvement of the situation for farmers in the primary sector and for enterprises in processing and marketing. Therefore from the overall budget for the period 2014 – 2020 about 44% are planned for the measure “Investments in physical assets of agricultural holdings“ and about 35% for the measure “Investments in physical assets concerning processing and marketing of agriculture and fishery products”. In this context for the sector there will be improvements especially in the fields of competitiveness, quality standards, and environmental improvement, modernization of production and processing and stabilization of income in agriculture. The successful development of competitive agri-food sector is important for the sustainable development of the rural areas. The improved environmental performance of the agri-food sector is also important for the environment and bio-diversity preservation. Thus, support for the agri-food sector will also contribute to the development of the rural economy and an improvement in the environment and mitigation of the climate changes, which is one of the strategic objectives of IPA.

With a budget of about 10% for the measure ”Farm diversification and business development” there will be an improvement to stabilization of income in rural areas both for farmers’ families and other people in rural areas by supporting investments in rural tourism. The Leader approach (“Implementation of Local development strategies-LEADER approach”) will start later in the period with all together about 3% of the budget. At the beginning of the period the LEADER approach in Serbia will be supported under the technical assistance measure for skill acquisition of the potential local action group and preparation of the local development strategy.

The overall objective of agri-environmental-climate and organic farming measure is associated with the introduction of pilot projects for the development of agricultural methods consistent with the protection and preservation of the environment. Considering the complexity involved in the preparation of such measures and the required mechanisms for implementation, the “Agri-environmental-climate and organic farming” measure is planned to be introduced in a later stage. Until then the measure will be further elaborated with the support under IPA 2012 Technical assistance project, expected to start till the end of 2014. Therefore, the budget planned for the measure is about 5%.

About 3% of the overall budget is allocated for “Technical assistance” measure. This measure will support the management of the IPARD II Programme by helping Managing Authorities (MA) to establish a monitoring and evaluation system, communication and publicity activities, work relating to the IPARD II Monitoring Committee. This measure

will also support acquisition of skills of the potential LAGs and further enhance the national rural network, as well as train the MA and assist the preparation of rural development policy.

Part of the identified needs of agri-food sector and the rural population (needs for vocational training, improvement of rural roads etc.) will be addressed outside the IPARD II Programme by other IPA policy areas and by national programmes and donor projects, as shown in the summary table below.

Table 23: Summary table showing main rural development needs and measures operating

| Needs identified | IPARD measures | IPA | Other donor | National |
|--|---|-----|-------------|----------|
| Need 1: Improve competitiveness of agricultural sector | Investments in physical assets of agricultural holdings' | ✓ | | ✓ |
| Need 2: Upgrade the processing sector to EU-Standards | "Investments in physical assets concerning processing and marketing of agriculture and fishery products", | ✓ | | ✓ |
| Need 3: Diversify activities and sources of incomes of farmers | "Farm diversification and business development" | | ✓ | |
| Need 4: Develop non-agricultural sectors of rural economy | Farm diversification and business development" | | ✓ | ✓ |
| Need 5: Improve the quality vocational training and information services to farmers and small scale local business | | | ✓ | ✓ |
| Need 6: Improve management of natural resources and resource use efficiency | Contribution by measures "Investments in physical assets concerning processing and marketing of agriculture and fishery products", 'Investments in physical assets of agricultural holdings' ;" Agri-environmental-climate and organic farming measure" ," Farm diversification and business development" , " | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Need 7: Maintenance of biodiversity and environment value of agricultural surfaces and agricultural systems and maintenance of water resource quality | " Agri-environmental-climate and organic farming measure" , Contribution by measures "Investments in physical assets concerning processing and marketing of agriculture and fishery products", and "Investments in physical assets of agricultural holdings" | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Need 8: Promotion of sustainable forest management (SFM), improving forest accessibility and access to environment-friendly technologies in the forestry sector | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| Need 9: Maintenance of a low level of greenhouse gas emissions (GES) from agricultural sector and rural space and support for passing to an economy with low carbon emissions | Contribution by measures “Investments in physical assets of agricultural holdings”, “Investments in physical assets concerning processing and marketing of agriculture and fishery products”, - “Agri-environmental-climate and organic farming measure” | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Need 10: Reduction of poverty degree and risk of social exclusion | Contribution by measures “Investments in physical assets of agricultural holdings”, and “Investments in physical assets concerning processing and marketing of agriculture and fishery products”, “agri-environment measure”, “Implementation of Local development strategies- LEADER approach” | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Need 11: Improve the basic infrastructure and services in rural areas. | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Need 12: Creation of jobs in rural environment | Contribution by measures ” Investments in physical assets of agricultural holdings”, and “Investments in physical assets concerning processing and marketing of agriculture and fishery products”, “agri-environment measure” “Farm diversification and business development” “Implementation of Local development strategies- LEADER approach” | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Need 13: Improve the capacity of the local stakeholders to implement LEADER approach | “Implementation of Local development strategies- LEADER approach” “Technical assistance measure” | | ✓ | |

6.3. Consistency between proposed IPARD intervention and country strategy paper (CSP)

The Country Strategy Paper (CSP) sets out the priorities for EU financial assistance for the period 2014-2020 to support Serbia on its path to accession. It translates the political priorities as defined in the enlargement strategy and the most recent annual Progress Reports into key areas where financial assistance is most useful to meet the accession criteria.

Agriculture and rural development is one of the priority policy areas to be supported under IPA II in the period 2014-2020.

The objective of EU assistance is to support alignment of the Serbian agricultural policy with the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), to contribute to a competitive, sustainable and efficient agriculture sector while maintaining vibrant rural communities, and to

improve food safety, veterinary and phytosanitary policies as well as plant and animal health. The expected results are as follows:

- Serbian agricultural policy is gradually aligned with the EU *acquis*, including the establishment of the structures and systems necessary for implementation of the CAP;
- Competitiveness of the Serbian agricultural sector is improved through modernisation of agri-food establishments to meet the EU environmental, food safety and other relevant standards;
- Territorial development is balanced in rural areas, including diversification of economic activities and investments in rural infrastructure;
- Food safety is improved in line with EU standards;
- Veterinary and phytosanitary services and controls are implemented in line with EU requirements and
- Animal health is improved through eradication of diseases and/or better control of brucellosis, bovine leucosis and tuberculosis, rabies and classical swine fever.

Support will be provided for implementation of the new agriculture sector strategy, legislative reforms and structural adjustments necessary for Serbia to assume the obligations of the EU membership. Support will be provided to measures enabling growth and development in agricultural production and processing and aimed at ensuring a competitive, sustainable and efficient agricultural sector. Capacity building activities will contribute to adaptation of the policy support to farmers in line with the CAP principles. Support will be provided for establishment of the structures and systems necessary for the implementation of the CAP.

IPA assistance will be provided under two strands: institutional and capacity-building and a seven-year rural development programme (IPARD).

The IPARD II Programme, with its selected measures, will provide primarily investment support to boost the competitiveness of agri-food sector and it will assist with its gradual adjustment to EU hygiene, food safety, veterinary and environmental standards, and to diversify rural economy. Moreover, support for agri-environmental schemes, and support to local initiatives will be supported through the IPARD II programme. The IPARD II Programme will also reinforce capacities of relevant EU fund management structures to be able to efficiently manage and implement the programme in line with EU requirements. Institutional capacities of MAEP and supporting organisations such as extension and advisory services will be strengthened in order to prepare for access to EU support.

The IPARD II Programme priorities are in full compliance with the IPA Country Strategy Paper for Serbia, as reflected by the financial weight given to the measures and selection of priority areas for intervention. The preparation of both documents was organised in close inter-ministerial coordination and in consultation with the most relevant stakeholders and, at the same time, using the elaborated sector analysis.

In addition, as stated in its Country Strategic Paper, Serbia also participates in the *EU strategy for the Danube region* and the *EU Strategy for the Adriatic and Ionian Region (EUSAIR)*, which are macro-regional strategies to enhance cooperation, socioeconomic development and territorial cohesion among the Member States and non-EU countries in the respective regions. These strategies offer solutions to common challenges in the concerned macro-regions. They are focusing *inter alia* on better environmental protection, sustainable tourism actions, and socio-economic development measures in the geographically specific context. Macro-regional strategies support the alignment of policies and therefore, they also facilitate IPARD interventions.

6.4. A summary table of the intervention logic showing the measures selected, the quantified targets should be expressed in terms of common indicators

| Measure | Quantified target | | Programme targets (total as combination of indicators at measure level) |
|---|---|---|--|
| Investments in physical assets of agricultural holdings | Number of projects supported Number of holdings performing modernization projects Number of holdings progressively upgrading towards EU standards Number of holdings investing in renewable energy production Number of holdings investing in livestock management in view of reducing N20 and methane emissions (manure storage) Total investment in physical capital by holdings supported (EUR) | 720 600 380 60 120 168,977,778 | Number of projects having received IPA support in agri-food sector and rural development: 1,439 Total investment generated via IPA in agri-food sector and rural development (EUR): 370,768,547 |
| Investments in physical assets concerning processing and marketing of agricultural and fishery products | Number of projects supported Number of enterprises performing modernisation projects Number of enterprises progressively upgrading towards EU standards Number of enterprises investing in renewable energy production Total investment in physical capital by enterprises supported (EUR) Number of jobs created (gross) | 463 463 463 46 165,893,333 160 | Number of economic entities performing modernisation projects in agri-food sector: 1,063 |
| Agri-environment- climate and organic farming measure | Number of contracts Agricultural land (ha) under environmental contracts Number of operation types supported Total area per type of type of operation (organic farming) Number of holdings supported under organic farming type of operation | 1,029 10,294 1 10,294 1,029 | Number of economic entities progressive upgrading towards EU standards: 843 |
| Farm diversification and business development | Number of projects supported Number of agricultural holdings/enterprises developing additional or diversified sources of income in rural areas Number of recipients investing in renewable energy Total investment in physical capital by recipients supported (EUR) | 256 167 50 35,897,436 | Number of jobs created (gross): 260 |

| | | | |
|--|--|-----------|---|
| | Number of jobs created (gross) | 100 | Number of beneficiaries investing in promoting resource efficiency and supporting the shift towards a low carbon and climate resilient economy in agriculture, food and forestry sectors: 276 |
| Implementation of local development strategies - LEADER approach | Number of LAGs operating in rural areas | 30 | |
| | Population covered by LAGs | 2,550,000 | |
| | Number of jobs created (gross) | 60 | |
| | Number of projects recommended | 50 | |
| | Number of small projects | 700 | |
| Technical assistance | Number of promotion materials for general information of all interested parties (leaflets, brochures etc.) | 11,118 | |
| | Number of publicity campaigns | 167 | |
| | Number of workshops, conferences, seminars | 334 | |
| | Number of experts assignments supported | 44 | |
| | Number of meetings of the Monitoring Committee | 14 | |
| | Number of studies on elaboration and implementation of Programme measures | 83 | |
| | Number of rural networking actions supported | 49 | |
| Number of potential LAGs supported | 72 | | |

6.5. OBJECTIVES OF THE IPARD PROGRAMME

The IPA II assistance under rural development programmes in the policy area agriculture and rural development shall be provided on the basis of relevant priorities set out in the country strategy papers, through a pre-defined set of measures further specified in the Sectoral Agreement. The implementation shall take the form of multi-annual rural development programmes with split commitments in accordance with Article 189(3) of the Financial Regulation, drawn up at national level and covering the entire period of the IPA II implementation.

Assistance under the IPARD programme shall contribute to achieving the following objectives:

In view of Union priorities for rural development, by means of developing human and physical capital, to increase the food-safety of the IPA II beneficiary and the ability of the agri-food sector to cope with competitive pressure as well as to progressively align the sector with Union standards, in particular those concerning hygiene and environment, while pursuing balanced territorial development of rural areas.

Channelling investment support through management and control systems which are compliant with good governance standards of a modern public administration and where the relevant country structures apply standards equivalent to those in similar organisations in the Member States of the European Union.

7. AN OVERALL FINANCIAL TABLE

7.1. Maximum indicative EU contribution for IPARD funds in EUR⁹, 2014-2020

| Year | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2014-2020 |
|--------------------|------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| Total (EUR) | - | 15,000,000 | 20,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 30,000,000 | 40,000,000 | 45,000,000 | 175,000,000 |

7.2. Financial Plan per measure in EUR, 2014-2020

| Measures | Total public aid (EUR) | EU contribution (EUR) | EU contribution rate (%) | National contribution (EUR) | National Contribution rate (%) |
|---|------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Investments in physical assets of agricultural holdings | 101,386,667 | 76,040,000 | 75 | 25,346,667 | 25 |
| Investments in physical assets concerning processing and marketing of agricultural and fishery products | 87,346,667 | 65,510,000 | 75 | 21,836,667 | 25 |
| Agri-environment-climate and organic farming measure | 10,294,118 | 8,750,000 | 85 | 1,544,118 | 15 |
| Implementation of local development strategies – leader approach | 5,833,333 | 5,250,000 | 90 | 583,333 | 10 |
| Farm diversification and business development | 20,000,000 | 15,000,000 | 75 | 5,000,000 | 25 |
| Technical assistance | 5,235,295 | 4,450,000 | 85 | 785,295 | 15 |
| Total | 230,096,080 | 175,000,000 | | 55,096,080 | |

⁹ The annual contributions are merely indicative as the actual amounts will be decided annually in the framework of EU budget.

7.3. Budget breakdown by measure 2014-2020

| Measures | Total public aid (EUR) | Private contribution (EUR) | Total expenditures (EUR) |
|---|------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Investments in physical assets of agricultural holdings | 101,386,667 | 67,591,111 | 168,977,778 |
| Investments in physical assets concerning processing and marketing of agricultural and fishery products | 87,346,667 | 87,346,667 | 174,693,334 |
| Agri-environment-climate and organic farming measure | 10,294,118 | - | 10,294,118 |
| Implementation of local development strategies – leader approach | 5,833,333 | - | 5,833,333 |
| Farm diversification and business development | 20,000,000 | 10,769,231 | 30,769,231 |
| Technical assistance | 5,235,295 | - | 5,235,295 |
| Total | 230,096,080 | 165,707,009 | 395,803,089 |

7.4. Budget breakdown by measure 2014-2020

| Measures | EU Contribution (EUR) | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2014-2020 EUR |
| Investments in physical assets of agricultural holdings | - | 7,535,248 | 9,900,325 | 10,622,224 | 11,199,743 | 17,002,434 | 19,780,025 | 76,040,000 |
| Investments in physical assets concerning processing and marketing of agricultural and fishery products | - | 7,464,752 | 10,099,675 | 8,690,276 | 9,162,757 | 13,910,066 | 16,182,475 | 65,510,000 |
| Agri-environment-climate and organic farming measure | - | - | - | 2,187,500 | 2,187,500 | 2,187,500 | 2,187,500 | 8,750,000 |
| Implementation of local development strategies – leader approach | - | - | - | 500,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,900,000 | 1,850,000 | 5,250,000 |
| Farm diversification and business development | - | - | - | 2,000,000 | 5,000,000 | 4,000,000 | 4,000,000 | 15,000,000 |
| Technical assistance | - | - | - | 1,000,000 | 1,450,000 | 1,000,000 | 1,000,000 | 4,450,000 |
| Total | - | 15,000,000 | 20,000,000 | 25,000,000 | 30,000,000 | 40,000,000 | 45,000,000 | 175,000,000 |

7.5. Per centage allocation of EU contribution by measure 2014-2020

| Measures | EU Contribution (%) | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
| Investments in physical assets of agricultural holdings | - | 50.23 | 49.50 | 42.49 | 37.33 | 42.51 | 43.96 |
| Investments in physical assets concerning processing and marketing of agricultural and fishery products | - | 49.77 | 50.50 | 34.76 | 30.54 | 34.78 | 35.96 |
| Agri-environment-climate and organic farming measure | - | - | - | 8.75 | 7.29 | 5.47 | 4.86 |
| Implementation of local development strategies – leader approach | - | - | - | 2.00 | 3.33 | 4.75 | 4.11 |
| Farm diversification and business development | - | - | - | 8.00 | 16.67 | 10.00 | 8.89 |
| Technical assistance | - | - | - | 4.00 | 4.83 | 2.50 | 2.22 |
| Total (%) | - | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |

8. DESCRIPTION OF EACH OF THE MEASURES SELECTED

8.1. Requirements concerning all measures

General requirements include: national minimum standards, national legislation relevant to the programme and evidence of targeting, confirmation of verifiability and controllability of measures.

8.1.1. National minimum standards and national legislation relevant to the programme

The applicable national standards and legislation are listed in Annex 3: National minimum standards. Recipients supported under IPARD II should meet the relevant national standards as regards registration of the farm, animal welfare and environmental protection, food and feed hygiene as well as identification and registration of animals.

Farmers should know the list of requirements which they shall respect on the entire holding, firstly, at the date of application and secondly, before the final payment of the investment is granted.

8.1.2. Common eligibility criteria applicable to all or several measures

8.1.2.1. Eligible expenditures

In line with Article 29 and 31 of the FWA and Article 33 (5) of the SA eligible expenditure shall be limited to:

- (a) the construction or improvement of immovable property up to market value of the assets;
- (b) the purchase of new machinery and equipment, including computer software, up to the market value of the asset shall be considered as eligible;
- (c) general costs linked to expenditure referred to in points (a) and (b) of this paragraph such as architects, engineers and other consultation fees, feasibility studies shall be eligible up to a ceiling of 12% of the costs referred to in the said points (a) and (b) according to the following conditions:
 - the eligible amount of the general costs shall not exceed the reasonable cost established in line with Article 11 (2) (f) and Article 11 (3) (d) of this Agreement;
 - for projects with eligible expenditure of the investments referred to in subparagraphs (a) and (b) greater than EUR 3 million, the business plan preparation costs cannot be greater than 3% of the eligible expenditure of these investments;
 - for projects with eligible expenditure of the investments referred to in points (a) and (b) of at least EUR 1 million and no more than EUR 3million, the business

plan preparation costs cannot be greater than 4% of the eligible expenditure of these investments;

- for projects with eligible expenditure of the investments referred to in points (a) and (b) less than EUR 1 million, the business plan preparation costs cannot be greater than 5% of the eligible expenditure of these investments.

Further detailed provisions concerning the maximum eligible amount in this paragraph by measure and sector are provided in the relevant measure text in the following chapters.

In accordance with Article 31 (1) (b) of the FWA and Article 33 (6) of the SA, investment projects shall remain eligible for European Union financing provided they do not, within five years from the final payment by the IPARD Agency, undergo a substantial modification. Substantial modifications to a project are those which result in:

- a cessation or relocation of a productive activity outside the programme area;
- a change in ownership of an item of infrastructure which gives to a firm or a public body an undue advantage; or
- a substantial change affecting its nature, objectives or implementation conditions which would result in undermining its original objectives.

8.1.2.2. Rules on origin of eligible expenditures

In line with Article 19 of the FWA, all supplies purchased under a procurement contract, or in accordance with a grant agreement, financed under this programme shall originate from one of the following eligible countries mentioned in Article 19 (1) of the FWA:

(a) Member States, IPA II recipients, contracting parties to the Agreement on the European Economic Area and partner countries covered by the European Neighbourhood Instrument, and

(b) Countries for which reciprocal access to external assistance is established by the Commission. Reciprocal access may be granted, for a limited period of at least one year, whenever a country grants eligibility on equal terms to entities from the Union and from countries eligible under IPA II. Before the Commission decides on the reciprocal access and on its duration, it will consult the IPA II beneficiary.

However, they may originate from any country when the amount of the supplies to be purchased is below the threshold for the use of the competitive negotiated procedure. For the purposes of this, the term "origin" is defined in 27 Article 8 (4) of Regulation (EU) 236/2014 (CIR) and Article 20(3) of Annex IV to the Cotonou Agreement.

8.1.2.3. Ineligible expenditures

In line with Article 33 (3) of the Sectoral Agreement, the following expenditures shall not be eligible under the IPARD II Programme:

- Taxes, including value added taxes;

- Customs and import duties, or any other charges;
- Purchase, rent or leasing of land and existing buildings, irrespective of whether the lease results in ownership being transferred to the lessee unless the provisions of the IPARD II Programme provide for it;
- Fines, financial penalties and expenses of litigation;
- Operating costs, except where duly justified by the nature of the measure in the IPARD II Programme;
- Second hand machinery and equipment;
- Bank charges, costs of guarantees and similar charges;
- Conversion costs, charges and exchange losses associated with the IPARD euro account, as well as other purely financial expenses;
- Contributions in kind;
- The purchase of agricultural production rights, animals, annual plants and their planting;
- Any maintenance, depreciation and rental costs, except where duly justified by the nature of the measure in the IPARD II Programme.
- Any cost incurred and any payments made by public administration in managing and implementing assistance, namely those of the management and operating structure and, in particular, overheads, rentals and salaries of staff employed on activities of management, implementation, monitoring and control, except where duly justified by the nature of the measure in the IPARD II Programme.

In accordance with Article 33 (4), unless the Commission expressly and explicitly decides otherwise, the following expenditure is also not eligible:

- Expenditure on projects which, before completion, have charged fees to users or participants unless the fees received have been deducted from the costs claimed;
- Promotional costs, other than in the collective interest;
- Expenditure incurred by a recipient where more than 25% of whose capital is held by a public body or bodies unless the Commission has so decided in a specific case on the basis of a complete reasoned request from Serbian Authorities. The Commission shall take its decision within three months of receiving the request. This exclusion shall not apply to expenditure on infrastructure, LEADER approach or human capital.

8.1.3. Controllability and verifiability of the measures

In line with Article 8 and Article 9 of the SA, the Managing Authority based on an opinion of the IPARD Agency confirms that verifiability and controllability of measures has been ensured.

The controllability and verifiability of the measures will be ensured by the following:

- Definition and application of clear, transparent and non-discriminatory eligibility and selection criteria will be applied;
- Selection criteria shall aim to ensure equal treatment of applicants, better use of financial resources and targeting of measures in accordance with the set up priorities of the Programme. In defining selection criteria the principle of proportionality shall be taken into account in relation to small grants. Selection process based on the pre-defined and publicised criteria with transparent and well-documented procedures (audit trails) and administrative capacity, ensuring compliance with the principles of sound financial management, including selection of applications, administrative and on-the-spot control of eligibility of expenditure, verification of compliance with the principle of value for money and public procurement legislation and adequate IT systems. A suitable application assessment system is established, based on (a reference price data base/use of 'standard costs'). Proper documentation management and verification of documents – recipients shall be required to keep records of operations, invoices and accounting records. Ex-post checks carried out on investment operations to verify the respect of commitments laid down in the IPARD II Programme. The ex-post checks shall be carried out within 5 years of the date of final payment to the recipient. All investments shall be checked based on an analysis of the risks and financial impact of different operations/ or measures.

The risk of errors will be decreased by the following measures:

- A well established internal control system, guaranteeing that controls described in procedure manuals are actually applied in the way that they're accredited and supervisory personnel reviews the functioning of controls;
- Publication and wide-scale dissemination of guidance documents to potential applicants, describing clearly the eligibility criteria and requirements for application, criteria for selection, rules for implementation of projects and preparation of payment claims;
- Training and issuing of guidelines to recipients on eligibility, implementation and preparation of payment claims;
- Regular training of IPARD Agency staff and technical bodies on procedures for verification of eligibility of applicants, applications, and payments claims, irregularities prevention and detection.

8.1.4. Targeting of measures

Targeting of measures is achieved through:

- Eligibility criteria limiting support to priority sectors and target groups; Groups are targeted based on: necessity to upgrade to EU standards, production level, sustainability of production and size of recipients;
- Selection criteria targeting support to the priorities of IPARD II Programme and measures objectives.

8.1.5. Packages of measures

Implementation of measures will start after the entrustment of budget implementation tasks and will be conducted in two phases. Taking into account the requirements for implementing the IPARD II Programme and the needs for capacity building of structures responsible for its implementation, it was decided to start with investment support measures, for which some experience has been gathered under the implementation of national support schemes.

Therefore, the IPARD II Programme in Serbia will start with two measures, namely:

- Investments in physical assets of agricultural holdings;
- Investments in physical assets concerning processing and marketing of agricultural and fishery products.

The second package of IPARD II Programme measures in Serbia shall include the following measures, namely;

- Farm diversification and business development;
- Technical assistance.

While progressively preparing for the implementation of the other selected measures, planned to start in the third phase, namely:

- Implementation of local development strategies – LEADER approach;
- Agri-environment – climate and organic farming.

8.2. INVESTMENTS IN PHYSICAL ASSETS OF AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS

8.2.1. Legal basis

- *Article 2 (1) of IPA Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 March 2014 laying down common rules and procedures for the implementation of the Union's instruments for financing external action.*
- *Article 27 1 (1) of the Sectoral Agreement*
- *Annex 4 of the Sectoral Agreement*

8.2.2. Rationale

According to the analysis under Chapter 3, the present state of technical equipment in the agri-food sector requires significant investments to strengthen the production chain. In accordance with the Strategy for Agriculture and Rural

Development, support should be allocated to recipients to increase productivity and competitiveness of agriculture production.

Investments in physical assets of agricultural holdings will increase productivity and competitiveness by technological improvement. Additionally, holdings will, as a prerequisite, comply with a set of national standards and will ultimately comply with EU standards of environmental protection and animal welfare.

Through supporting new mechanisation and new technology, the measure will also contribute to the mitigation of the climate change impact of the agriculture sector.

Investments in renewable energy on agriculture holdings could significantly contribute to poverty alleviation through the reduced cost for electricity. Reduced energy bills provide increased disposable income for households, individuals and enterprises. In addition, investments in energy efficiency are an important part of government's green growth strategies that contributes to reduction of GHG emissions and climate change mitigation.

Overview by sectors

Sector 1: Milk

The sector faces the following specific problems concerning production and marketing processes (see also sector analysis in Chapter 3):

- The main problem is the low quality of milk produced and low yield per cow which leads to non-profitable, small scale operations;
- Larger farms have poor feeding technology, lack of an advanced genetic breeding pool and poor livestock husbandry conditions;
- A further significant problem is proper manure storage and appropriate distribution of liquid and solid manure. High investment costs are not so feasible for medium-sized farms but they are extremely important for animal health and environmental pollution;
- Further improvements in milk storage, cooling and value added products development is needed to enhance competitiveness and product quality.

This sector is dominated by smaller production units. Subsistent and semi subsistent farms are highly represented. Investments in improving milk quality, quantity as well as restructuring the size of the farms will improve quality, competitiveness and sustainability of operations at farm level.

Sector 2: Meat

According to the sector analysis, the meat sector faces significant structural problems. In general, the livestock sector is dominated by a large number of farms

operating low intensity systems, which need to upgrade production to a higher level and to improve quality of livestock products.

In the production of red meat (cattle, sheep and goats), the observed trends indicate a decline in cattle production, which results in an overall decrease in production. Meat producing farms are not specialised and are not utilizing pastures properly (low pasture quality) and in general, the quality of the used feed and fodder is not at the appropriate level. Other key problems are the poor conditions of animal feed and livestock keeping facilities.

The fall of red meat production was followed by the significant increase of poultry meat production and consumption. This partially compensates for the fall of red meat production. The cattle sector is characterized by a limited number of large fattening farms (mainly in Vojvodina) and a large number of relatively small mixed farms, producing milk and meat.

-Specialisation of meat production farms is needed with a focus on pig, cattle and sheep breeding.

-Small farms need to improve productivity and consistency of piglet production in order to improve results in fattening as well as in meat quality.

-Large farms, and chicken farms need to improve manure storing facilities and mechanisation for handling of manure.

With the perspective of future accession of Serbia to the EU, it is important to support the specialised, viable sector to prepare for future compliance to EU standards and competition on the market. IPARD interventions under this measure should be aimed at helping the beef, sheep and goat as well as the pork production sector to achieve relevant EU standards, in particular regarding animal welfare and environmental conditions.

Sector 3: Fruits and vegetables:

There are several problems in the production of fruit and vegetables related to the small size of the farms, even though these farms may have a more specialised fruit and/or vegetable production. Small scale producers do not create enough profit due to high production costs and the very limited possibilities to influence pricing in the food chain. As a consequence, they cannot invest adequately and increase their competitiveness, which results in a decrease of the quality of products and creates processing problems. Furthermore, young farmers in the sector want to exit and obtain other, more profitable employment, in the nearby towns.

Also it is obvious that there is a need to improve the sorting, packing and storage facilities. A rather low level of education and vocational training creates difficulties in terms of the proper use of modern equipment for production and harvesting purposes and for ensuring the proper use of inputs. It is necessary to prevent losses caused by early frost, and increase productivity by improving irrigation methods.

The problem in the fruit and vegetable processing chain is that factories do not receive sufficient quantities of high quality products.

Sector 4: Other crops (cereals, oil crops, sugar beet)

According to the sector analysis (see chapter 3), crop yields in Serbia are much lower than in most EU countries as a result of the limited use of mineral fertilizers and certified planted seeds. Serbian farmers use less than half of the amount of chemical fertilizers comparing with farmers in developed countries, mostly due to the lack of financing, technological backwardness and an inefficient system of technology transfer. Moreover, farm technical equipment/ mechanisation used in crop production is over-aged, in particular with regard to care of environment.

Bearing in mind the above indicated issues, there is a need for increased yields and an improvement of the agro-technology as well as modernization of storing capacities on crop farms through IPARD support.

Sector 5: Eggs

According to the sectoral analysis, the egg production sector is facing with the specific problem related to insufficient level of compliance with EU animal welfare requirements and environmental standards. This particularly refers to the necessity of:

- replacing unenriched cages with the enriched cages and/or alternative way of keeping laying hens,
- investments in improving biosafety measures, as well as
- improvement of the classification, labelling, packaging and storage of the eggs.

Harmonization of law regulations with EU legislation brings producers additional costs related to animal welfare, food safety and environmental protection. Economic researches have shown that the application of EU legislation increases the cost of egg production by an average of 16%, which negatively affects on their competitiveness.

The application of EU animal welfare standards after the replacement of unenriched cages consequently reduces the number of laying hens in the existing facilities by 30-40%, which would lead to the huge deficit of at least 500,000,000 eggs on the market of the Republic of Serbia.

Sector 6: Viticulture

Based on the sector analysis, the viticulture and winemaking sector is facing significant problems and difficulties in the production and trade of grapes and wines. The main problem affecting the poor competitiveness of grape producers in Serbia is the fragmentation of vineyards (especially in Central Serbia), which

induces high production costs and thus reduces the competitiveness of grape and wine producers. In addition, the average area under vineyards per individual holding is small, i.e. unsatisfactory for making the profit which would further be put in new investments in the viticulture and wine production sector.

Grape producers are not highly specialized for this type of production, and they also encounter the following problems:

- small possibility of growing new vineyards with certified cloning planting material from autochthonous, regional and domestic created varieties of grapevine, as well as the existence of vineyards that need to be restructured and replaced with new vineyards in order to achieve greater competitiveness;**
- insufficient diversity of vine rootstocks in commercial vineyards adapted to specific soil characteristics and general ecological conditions;**
- presence of incurable diseases in vineyards, where it is necessary to eradicate the vineyards, i.e. do the conversion with new vineyards;**
- a small share of the modern supports in vineyards, that is, metal pillars which reduce the costs of depreciation and increase the price competitiveness of the produced grapes;**
- poor capacities in terms of viticulture machinery and connecting machines that would be suitable for use in modern, newly developed plantations with dense planting (higher number of plants per hectare);**
- presence of "non-competitive" vineyards in the vineyards of large (former socialist) systems.**

Producers of grapevine planting material are facing the problems of lack of proper modern facilities, mechanization, and mother plants necessary for the production of quality clonal planting material of higher phytosanitary categories.

8.2.3. General objectives

- To support Serbian agricultural primary producers in progressive alignment to EU rules, standards, policies and practices with a view to EU membership;**
- To support economic, social and territorial development, with a view to a smart, sustainable and inclusive growth, through the development of physical capital;**
- To address the challenges of climate change by promoting resource efficiency**
- To improve productivity, products quality and to reduce production costs**
- To improve competitiveness of local producers and to adjust to the demands of domestic and foreign markets.**

8.2.3.1. Specific objectives

The measure consists of the following sectors:

Sector 1: Milk

Specific sector objectives under this measure for the milk sector are as follows:

- to help, as a priority, small and medium sized dairy farms but also larger, viable ones (20 to 300 cows) to upgrade to milk production quality standards as well as animal welfare conditions and environmental standards as well to improve production infrastructure and farm equipment to achieve better sustainability and competitiveness in the future;
- larger, specialised dairy farms (more than 300 cows) are only eligible for manure management and thus benefit from investment support related to manure storing and handling standards.

Sector 2: Meat

Specific sector objectives under this measure for the meat sector are as follows:

- to help, as a priority, small and medium sized viable farms (20-1,000 cattle; 150 to 1,000 sheep and goat; 100 to 10,000 pigs; 4,000 to 50,000 broiler chickens, to upgrade to animal welfare conditions and environmental standards as well to improve production infrastructure and farm equipment to achieve better sustainability and competitiveness in the future EU market;
- larger specialised farms above the maximum limits (more than 1,000 cattle, 1,000 sheep, 10,000 pigs and 50,000 broiler chickens) only will be able to benefit from the support related to EU standards on animal welfare and manure storing and handling.

Sector 3: Fruit and vegetables

Specific sector objectives under this measure for fruit and vegetable sector are the following ones:

- Establishing new production lines and renewing existing production, set up green houses;
- improve machinery and equipment to reduce postharvest losses and to improve production process through the entire production chain;
- improve storage facilities of fruits, vegetables and seedlings.

Sector 4: Other Crops: cereals, oil crops, and sugar beet

Specific sector objectives under this measure for the crop sector are the following:

- Purchase of tractors (up to 100 kw), machinery and mechanization, (except combine harvesters) and construction of storing facilities and equipment;

- Construction, extension, renovation, modernization and equipping of storing capacities.

Sector 5: Eggs

Specific sector objectives under this measure for the egg sector are the following:

- Improving the competitiveness and productivity of agricultural holdings, which are engaged in the production of eggs (from 5,000 to 200,000 laying hens), through the investments in the construction of facilities and purchase of equipment;
- The achievement of EU standards regarding the safety and quality of eggs, animal welfare and environmental protection, through investments related to the construction of facilities and the purchase of equipment for keeping (breeding) laying hens, the storage and distribution of manure, as well as the production of energy from renewable sources in the agricultural holding.

Sector 6: Viticulture

Specific sector objectives under this measure for the wine sector are the following:

- Improving the competitiveness of grape producers through planting new vineyards, restructuring and conversion of the existing "non-competitive" vineyards and increasing the total area under vineyards per holding;
- Improving the phytosanitary condition of vineyards through eradication, i.e. conversion of vineyards;
- Improving the mechanization and connection machines, and introducing these to the adapted modern viticulture production with a large number of grapevine plants per hectare;
- Improving storage capacities for table grapes;
- Increasing the area of irrigated vineyards and those that have anti-hail protection systems;
- Increasing the area with the vineyards of high quality grapes intended for the production of wines with geographical indications;

8.2.4. Linkage to other IPARD measures in the programme and to national measures

This measure is linked to the measure "Investments in physical assets concerning processing and marketing of agricultural and fishery products".

Upgraded processing and marketing conditions improve primary production which should lead to improving quality and food safety of raw materials needed for the processing industry and aligning of the food chain. Hence, it will be followed by rational and efficient processing, which results in a synergistic effect on both sides.

Distinction is assured by limiting types of recipients, in this measure to agricultural holdings designated to primary production, while in the other measure recipients are commercial enterprises dealing with marketing and processing.

National measures under the NPRD (2018-2020) support small holdings and farm either to up-grade to a more competitive agriculture production and to diversify to non-agriculture activities (demarcation see Chapter 10). Additionally, some of them should be encouraged to cross above the viability level.

8.2.5. Recipients

Recipients under this measure are farmers or groups of farmers, whether natural or legal persons and other agricultural legal entities (e.g. private agricultural enterprises, etc.) responsible for conducting and financing investments on the agricultural holding (as defined by the national law and included in the national farm register).

Recipients have to have less than 25% of their capital or voting rights held by public bodies, and registered in the national Register of Agriculture Holdings in accordance with the Law on Agriculture and Rural Development.

For users who are legal entities: only micro, small and medium sized enterprises as defined in Article 6 of the Accounting Law of the Republic of Serbia (OG of RS 62/2013 and its subsequent modifications) are eligible. National definition of the micro small and medium sized enterprises is presented in Annex 6.

8.2.6. Common eligibility criteria

8.2.6.1. Type of eligible holdings

Eligible holdings have to:

- Prove that it has no outstanding tax or social security payments against the state, at time of submission of application/claim for payments;
- Submit the signed statement that there is no application of the same investment in another public grant or subsidy scheme;
- In case of application for investment, the recipient must fulfil all contractual obligations under previously approved investments financed by the MAEP;
- In cases where the recipient is not the owner of the holding or the land where the investment is carried out, a lease or rent contract should be presented. The contract between concerned parties should cover the period of at least 5 years from the date of the final payment.

8.2.6.2. National standards to be respected

No later than before the final payment of the investment, the entire holding must comply with the appropriate national minimum standards in force regarding

environmental protection and animal welfare. If the national standards are similar to the Union standards, in duly justified cases, derogation from this rule may be approved by the Commission.

The fulfilment of appropriate national minimum standards for agricultural holdings with up to 15 ha in the Fruit and Vegetable Sector will be checked only within the sector for which the user submits the request, and not on the entire agricultural holding.

For this purpose, the applicant shall provide as an obligatory part of the final payment claim a certificate from the national veterinary and environmental authorities confirming that all applicable national minimum standards are respected on the holding of the applicant. A full list of these standards is included in Annex 3 of the programme and will be made available to the applicants with the documents of the call for proposals.

8.2.6.3. Economic viability of the holding

The applicant has to prove the economic viability of the farm through a business plan at the end of investment period. The business plan should be in line with the template provided by the IPARD Agency. For investments exceeding EUR 50,000 as defined in IPARD implementing regulation, a complete business plan is needed, and for smaller investments, below EUR 50,000, it has to be in the simplified form as defined in the application form.

Economic viability is defined as full utilization of the agricultural holding resources on an optimal scale. The agricultural holding should demonstrate that it will be able to service its debt obligations regularly, without putting the normal operation of the agricultural holding at risk.

The criteria to be used by the IPARD Agency to assess the future economic viability of the holding are presented in Annex 2. A template of the business plan will be prepared by the IPARD Agency and will be available to all potential recipients.

8.2.6.4. EU standards

Up on the finalization of the investment, the relevant EU standards, as regards environmental protection and animal welfare, have to be respected.

Before the final payment claim is submitted to the IPARD Agency, the competent national authorities have to assess whether the relevant EU standards are met. In this case, the authorities issue a certificate of confirmation. Such a certificate forms an obligatory part of the final payment claim submitted by the applicant to the IPARD Agency.

8.2.6.5. Other common eligibility criteria

- The investment must concern the production of agricultural products included in the Annex I to the Treaty, and / or the development of new products, processes and technologies linked to products covered by Annex I to the Treaty.
- At the moment of submission of application for support applicants should prove sufficient agriculture experience and competences in one of the following categories:
 - agricultural secondary school education or
 - at least three years of agricultural experience (proved by a professional service record from the employer or registered for that time in the Register of Agricultural Holdings) or
 - university degree or
 - secondary school education and commitment in writing that they will follow a training course with a minimum duration of at least 50 teaching hours in the relevant sector before applying for the final payment;
 - In the case of legal entities, the above requirements apply to managers.
- All supplies purchased under this measure shall originate from an eligible country. However, they may originate from any country when the amount of the supplies to be purchased is below the threshold for the use of the competitive negotiated procedure (currently EUR 100,000). For the purposes of this measure, the term ‘origin’ should be used as defined in Chapter 8.1.2.2;
- Only investments made after the signature of the contract can be considered eligible for reimbursement by the IPARD Agency, except for feasibility studies and other consultancy costs related to the preparation of the application;
- Recipients within the IPARD framework can obtain support for only one tractor, with a maximum power (not exceeding 100 KW) based on scale and nature of activity. Out of the total amount of allocated EU funds, for measure investments in physical assets of agriculture holdings, a maximum of 20% can be spent on purchase of tractors;
- For a period of five years after the final payment by the IPARD Agency, the recipient is obliged to use the investment for the purpose it was intended without substantial modifications affecting its nature or its implementation conditions, or give undue advantage to a firm or public body, and/or result either from a change in the nature of ownership of an item of infrastructure, or cessation or relocation of a productive activity co-financed.

8.2.6.6. Investments in renewable energy plants

This measure will only support investments in renewable energy (on-farm) for self-consumption. As for electricity, the selling of electricity into the national grid is

allowed as far as the self-consumption limit is respected (i.e. electricity sold into the grid equals on average the electricity taken out of it over one year).

8.2.7. Specific eligibility criteria (per sector)

Sector 1: Milk

Agricultural holdings having, at the end of the investment, minimum 20 and up to maximum 300 cows, are eligible for the following:

- Investment in the construction and/or in reconstruction and/or in equipment of facilities or stables for milk cows, including equipment facilities for milk production like milking machines, on-farm milk cooling and storage facilities on farm premises; in facilities and equipment for waste management, waste water treatment, air pollution prevention measures, in construction and/or in reconstruction of manure storage capacities including specific equipment of facilities for handling and usage of animal feed and manure, such as manure reservoirs, specialized manure transportation equipment;
- Investment in farm mechanisation (including tractors up to 100 KW) and equipment;
- Investments in on-farm energy production from renewable sources.

Agricultural holdings with more than 300 cows at the beginning of investment are eligible for investment in:

- Construction and/or reconstruction of manure storage capacities and/or in specific equipment and mechanisation of facilities for handling and usage of manure;
- Investments on-farm in energy production from renewable sources.

Sector 2: Meat

Agricultural holdings, having at the end of the investment a total capacity of minimum 20 and up to maximum 1,000 cattle, and/or minimum 150 and up to maximum 1,000 sheep and/or goats, and/or minimum 30 up to 400 sows, and/or minimum 100 and up to maximum 10,000 fattening pigs and/or minimum 4,000 and up to maximum of 50,000 broiler chickens per tour, and/or having at the end of the investment a registered facility for keeping/breeding of heavy lines parent flocks, are eligible for the following:

- Investment in construction and/or in reconstruction and/or in equipment of facilities or stables, in facilities and equipment for waste management, waste water treatment, air pollution prevention measures, in construction and/or in reconstruction of manure storage capacities including specific equipment of facilities for handling and usage of animal feed, fodder and manure, like manure reservoirs, specialized manure transportation equipment;

- Investment in farm mechanisation (including tractors up to 100 KW) and equipment;
- Investments on-farm in energy production from renewable sources.

Agricultural holdings with capacity more than 1,000 cattle and/or more than 1,000 sheep and/or goats and/or more than 400 sows, and/or more than 10,000 pigs and/or more than 50,000 broiler chickens per tour, at the beginning of investment are eligible for:

- Construction and/or in reconstruction of manure storage capacities and/or in specific equipment and mechanisation of facilities for handling and usage of manure;
- Investments on-farm in energy production from renewable sources.

Sector 3: Fruits and vegetables

Agricultural holdings having at the end of the investment a minimum 2 and up to maximum 20 ha of soft fruit and/or minimum 5 and up to maximum 100 ha of other fruit are eligible for the following investment. For storage facilities, however, criteria have to be met at the beginning of investment.

- Purchase of tractors (up to 100 kW), machinery and equipment;
- Construction/extension/renovation/modernization of greenhouses (covered with glass and/ or plastic) as well as the purchase of equipment and/or materials for fruit production, and horticulture and nursery production;
- Investment in on-farm systems for protection against hail (including computer equipment) for orchards;
- Investment in on-farm irrigation systems using groundwater (extraction from springs, wells) and surface water (withdrawn from rivers, lakes and reservoirs) and construction of irrigation system, including pumps, pipes, valves and sprinklers which will replace old inefficient systems and contribute to savings in quantity of used water;
- Investment in establishing and restructuring of fruit plantations (purchase of perennial seedlings material - except annual plants), including soil preparation;
- Investment in construction and/or in reconstruction and/or in equipment of facilities for storage facilities for fruit, including ULO capacities.

Agricultural holdings, having at the end of the investment, capacity of at least 0,5ha up to 5ha of greenhouses and/or minimum 3 ha and up to maximum 100 ha open space production of vegetables, are eligible for the following investments. For storage facilities, however, capacities have to be met at the beginning of investment.

- Purchase of tractors (up to 100 kW), machinery and equipment;

- Construction/extension/renovation/modernization of greenhouses (covered with glass and/ or plastic) as well as the purchase of equipment and/or materials for vegetable production and harvesting, and horticulture and nursery production;
- Investment in on-farm irrigation systems (open field) for vegetables using groundwater (extraction from springs, wells) and surface water (extraction from rivers, lakes and reservoirs) and construction of system, including pumps, pipes, valves and sprinklers;
- Investment in construction and/or in reconstruction and/or in equipment of facilities for storage facilities for vegetables, including ULO capacities;
- Investments on-farm in energy production from renewable sources.

Agricultural holdings, registered in the Register of producers of fruit, grapevine and hop planting material in accordance with the Law on Planting Material (“Official Gazette of RS” No. 18/05 and 30/10) with minimum of 0.5 ha and up to maximum of 50 ha of fruit mother plantation, at the end of the investment, are eligible for:

- Investing in on-farm irrigation systems using groundwater (extraction from springs, wells) and surface water (withdrawn from rivers, lakes and reservoirs) and construction of irrigation systems including pumps, pipes, valves and sprinklers to savings in quantity of consumed water;
- Planting new mother plantations of higher phytosanitary categories of planting material;
- Construction of facilities for conservation and multiplication of planting (nursery) material and purchase of equipment/devices/materials (including plant material) for nursery production, as well as storage facilities for preserving planting material.

Sector 4: Other crops (cereals, oil crops, sugar beet)

Agriculture holding which have minimum 2 and up to maximum 50 ha of land under crop sector are eligible for investments in:

- Purchase of tractors (up to 100 kW), machinery and mechanization, except combine harvesters and construction of storing facilities and equipment.

Agriculture holdings which have minimum 50 and up to maximum 100 ha of land under crops are eligible for investments in:

- Purchase of mechanization and machinery (except combine harvesters) for agriculture production and construction of storing facilities and equipment.

Agriculture holdings which have more than 100 ha of land under crops are eligible for investments in:

- Construction, extension, renovation, modernization and equipping of storing facilities.

Sector 5: Eggs

Agricultural holdings with a total capacity of the facility with the minimum of 5,000 and the maximum of 200,000 laying hens in exploitation, i.e. agricultural holdings that have a registered facility for the production of the parent flocks of light breeding stock lines, i.e. laying hens breeding, at the end of the investment, are eligible for following:

- investments in construction and/or equipment of facilities for laying hens, production and storage of eggs, as well as animal feed; waste management facilities, wastewater treatment, air pollution prevention measures, construction of manure storage capacities;
- investment in farm mechanization (including tractors up to 100 kW) and equipment;
- investments on-farm in energy production from renewable sources

Agricultural holdings with a total capacity of facility with more than 200,000 laying hens, at the beginning of the investment, are eligible for the following:

- investment in re-construction related only to replacement of old unenriched cages and or equipment for meeting EU standards regarding animal welfare, facilities and equipment for waste management, wastewater treatment, air pollution prevention measures, construction of manure storage capacities;
- investments on-farm in energy production from renewable sources.

Sector 6: Viticulture

Agricultural holdings registered in the Vineyard Register in accordance with the Law on Wine ("Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia", No. 41/09 and 93/12) with a minimum of 2 ha and a maximum of 100 ha of vineyards, at the end of the investment, registered in the Vineyard Register are eligible for:

- Setting up new, restructuring and conversion of the existing vineyards;
- Purchase of tractors for orchards and vineyards (up to 100 kW), plant protection, cutting, tarping and harvesting machines and machines for other agro-technical and amphelotechnical measures and equipment;
- Investing in on-farm systems for protection against hail (including computer equipment);
- Investing in on-farm irrigation systems using groundwater (extraction from springs, wells) and surface water (withdrawn from rivers, lakes and reservoirs) and construction

of irrigation systems including pumps, pipes, valves and sprinklers to replace old inefficient systems and contribute to savings in quantity of consumed water;

- Investing in the construction and/or reconstruction and/or equipping of storage facilities for table grapes, including ULO capacities.

Agricultural holdings registered in the Register of producers of fruit, grapevine and hop planting material in accordance with the Law on Planting Material (“Official Gazette of RS” No. 18/05 and 30/10) with minimum of 0.5 ha and up to maximum of 50 ha of grapevine mother plantation, at the end of the investment, are eligible for:

- Investing in on-farm protection systems against hail for mother plantations, nursery plantations, vineyards and other (including computer equipment);

- Investing in on-farm irrigation systems using groundwater (extraction from springs, wells) and surface water (withdrawn from rivers, lakes and reservoirs) and construction of irrigation systems including pumps, pipes, valves and sprinklers to savings in quantity of consumed water;

- Planting new mother plantations of higher phytosanitary categories of planting material;

- Construction / extension / adaptation of facilities for conservation and multiplication of planting (nursery) material and purchase of equipment/devices/materials (including plant material) for nursery production, as well as storage facilities for preserving planting material.

8.2.8. Eligible expenditure

In line with Article 29 and 31 of the FWA and Article 33 (5) of the SA eligible expenditure shall be limited to:

- (a) the construction or improvement of immovable property up to market value of the assets;
- (b) the purchase of new machinery and equipment, including computer software, up to the market value of the asset shall be considered as eligible;
- (c) general costs linked to expenditure referred to in points (a) and (b) of this paragraph such as architects’, engineers’ and other consultation fees, feasibility studies shall be eligible up to a ceiling of 12% of the costs referred to in the said points (a) and (b) according to the following conditions:
 - the eligible amount of the general costs shall not exceed the reasonable cost established in line with Article 11 (2) (f) and Article 11 (3) (d) of this Agreement;
 - for projects with eligible expenditure of the investments referred to in subparagraphs (a) and (b) greater than EUR 3 million, the business plan preparation costs cannot be greater than 3% of the eligible expenditure of these investments;

- for projects with eligible expenditure of the investments referred to in points (a) and (b) of at least EUR 1 million and no more than EUR 3million, the business plan preparation costs cannot be greater than 4% of the eligible expenditure of these investments;
- for projects with eligible expenditure of the investments referred to in points (a) and (b) less than EUR 1 million, the business plan preparation costs cannot be greater than 5% of the eligible expenditure of these investments.

Further detailed provisions concerning the maximum eligible amount in this paragraph by measure and sector are provided in the relevant measure text in the following chapters.

In accordance with Article 31 (1) (b) of the FWA and Article 33 (6) of the SA, investment projects shall remain eligible for EU financing provided they do not, within five years from the final payment by the IPARD Agency, undergo a substantial modification. Substantial modifications to a project are those which result in:

- a cessation or relocation of a productive activity outside the programme area;
- a change in ownership of an item of infrastructure which gives to a firm or a public body an undue advantage; or
- a substantial change affecting its nature, objectives or implementation conditions which would result in undermining its original objectives.

(d) Renewable energy production facilities shall be eligible for support only if their production capacity is no more than equivalent to the combined average annual energy consumption of thermal energy and electricity in the agriculture enterprise/ holding. The average energy consumption will be calculated on the bases of the three previous years before submission of application.

8.2.9. Selection criteria

| Type of selection criteria | | Points |
|---|--------|--------|
| The investment is located in the areas with difficult working conditions in agriculture ¹⁰ | yes/no | 25/0 |
| Recipient is certified for organic production | yes/no | 20/0 |

¹⁰ The areas with difficult working conditions in agriculture includes the list of settlements in mountain areas as presented in Annex 4 and the list of other settlements as presented in Annex 5.

| Type of selection criteria | | Points |
|---|--------|--------|
| Investment project is in the sector of milk production for holdings with up to 50 cows; or investment is in the sector of meat production for holdings with up to 100 of cattle, or sheep and goats up to 500, or pigs up to 1000 | yes/no | 15/0 |
| Applicant is a person younger than 40 years at the time when the decision to grant support is taken | yes/no | 15/0 |
| Applicant is a woman | yes/no | 15/0 |
| Recipient is a cooperative or a member of cooperative | yes/no | 10/0 |

8.2.10. Aid intensity and EU contribution rate

Aid intensity, expressed as the share of public support in the eligible expenditure of an investment, amounts up to:

- 60% of total eligible expenditures, or
- 65% in case where investments are done by young farmers (younger than 40 years at the time when the decision to grant support is taken),
- 70% - in mountainous areas (see list of settlements in mountain areas Annex 4),
- An additional 10% can be given for investments in effluent storage of benefit for the environment.

EU co-financing rate is 75% of the public aid.

A recipient can claim the support, irrespective of the total value of the investment, for eligible expenditure within the following ceilings:

For fruit, vegetables, other crops and viticulture:

- Minimum EUR 5,000;
- Maximum EUR 700,000.

For milk, meat and egg sector:

- Minimum EUR 5,000;
- Maximum EUR 1,000,000.

Recipient can receive a total support of maximum EUR 1.5 million of public support from the IPARD II Programme.

The payments for investments can be received in two instalments, subject to the details fixed in the contract signed between a recipient and the IPARD Agency.

8.2.11. Budget 2014-2020 for the measure investments in physical assets of agricultural holdings

| Year | Total eligible cost | Public expenditure | | | | | | Private contribution | |
|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------|-------------------|-------|-----------------------|-------|----------------------|--------|
| | | Total | | EU contribution | | National contribution | | | |
| | EUR | EUR | % | EUR | % | EUR | % | EUR | % |
| | 2=3+9 | 3=5+7 | 4=3/2 | 5 | 6=5/3 | 7 | 8=7/3 | 9 | 10=9/2 |
| 2014 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2015 | 16,744,995 | 10,046,997 | 60 | 7,535,248 | 75 | 2,511,749 | 25 | 6,697,998 | 40 |
| 2016 | 22,000,723 | 13,200,434 | 60 | 9,900,325 | 75 | 3,300,108 | 25 | 8,800,289 | 40 |
| 2017 | 23,604,943 | 14,162,966 | 60 | 10,622,224 | 75 | 3,540,741 | 25 | 9,441,977 | 40 |
| 2018 | 24,888,318 | 14,932,991 | 60 | 11,199,743 | 75 | 3,733,248 | 25 | 9,955,327 | 40 |
| 2019 | 37,783,187 | 22,669,912 | 60 | 17,002,434 | 75 | 5,667,478 | 25 | 15,113,275 | 40 |
| 2020 | 43,955,612 | 26,373,367 | 60 | 19,780,025 | 75 | 6,593,342 | 25 | 17,582,245 | 40 |
| TOTAL | 168,977,778 | 101,386,667 | | 76,040,000 | | 25,346,667 | | 67,591,111 | |

8.2.12. Indicators and targets

| Name of indicator | Target value |
|--|--------------------|
| Number of projects supported | 720 |
| Number of holdings performing modernization projects | 600 |
| Number of holdings progressively upgrading towards EU standards | 380 |
| Number of holdings investing in renewable energy production | 60 |
| Number of holdings investing in livestock management in view of reducing N ₂ O and methane emissions (manure storage) | 120 |
| Total investment in physical capital by holdings supported (EUR) | 168,977,778 |

8.2.13. Administrative procedure

The measure will be implemented by the IPARD Agency. Projects under the measure will be selected through open calls for applications. The decision on the financial allocation per measure, per call, will be made in agreement with the IPARD Agency. The Managing Authority shall each year draw up an annual programme for call for applications, indicating number of calls, time for launching and deadlines for applications and the indicative budget of each measure and call for applications.

The IPARD Agency shall launch the calls for proposals and implement wide information campaign in co-operation with the MA.

The submitted applications shall be checked administratively and on-the-spot for completeness, administrative compliance, eligibility and viability of the business plan by the IPARD Agency. The compliant and eligible applications shall be ranked and funded up to the limit of the budget of the call for applications.

Applications are filed by recipients using the template provided in the call for applications. Detailed administrative checks are carried out prior to approving an application to identify whether it was complete, if it was filed on time and whether the requirements for approving the applications were met. The checks are documented on detailed check list templates.

Applications that arrive complete, timely and in line with the requirements of the rulebook and public tender will be reviewed in the order of their delivery. Upon the processing of the application forms by the IPARD Agency, a ranking list will be formed according to the ranking criteria. The ranking list will be created and projects selected following each Call for Applications. In case when there are more projects with the same amount of points according to the ranking criteria, those selected will be the ones with an earlier date of the submission of the complete application. In cases when there are less compliant and eligible applications than available funds for support, the ranking list will not be prepared.

After administrative control eligible applications will be checked on the spot by the IPARD Agency. After administrative control and control on the spot, selected projects will be contracted for financing.

All the provisions stated above are subjected to accreditation and may be subject to modification. The final provisions will be laid down in Directorate for Agrarian Payments procedures.

Applicants for aid under measures within the IPARD II Programme are obliged to submit their applications and business plans together with other requested documentation to the IPARD Agency.

8.2.14. Geographical scope of the measure

This measure applies in areas as defined in the programme chapter 2.1.

8.3. INVESTMENT IN PHYSICAL ASSETS CONCERNING PROCESSING AND MARKETING OF AGRICULTURAL AND FISHERY PRODUCTS

8.3.1. Legal basis

- *Article 2 (1) of IPA Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 March 2014 laying down common rules and procedures for the implementation of the Union's instruments for financing external action.*
- *Article 27 (1) (3) of the Sectoral Agreement*
- *Annex 4 of the Sectoral Agreement*

8.3.2. Rationale

According to the analysis under Chapter 3, the food processing industry and associated marketing in Serbia require significant support in modernization of technology, enrichment of assortment of products, strengthening of market chains and improvement of production efficiency and product quality.

Investments in the modernization of processing facilities in milk and dairy, meat, fruits, and vegetables sectors, will increase productivity, competitiveness and overall performance of this sector, and contribute to reaching the required EU standards. Furthermore, these investments will facilitate better positioning of products on the market and increase the export of products.

Benefits for industrial firms from improvements in energy efficiency improvements include reductions in resource use and pollution, improved production and capacity utilisation, and less operation and maintenance, which leads to improved productivity and competitiveness. In addition, investments in energy efficiency are an important part of government's green growth strategies that contributes to reduction of GHG emissions and climate change mitigation.

Overview by sectors

Sector 1: Milk processing industry

According to the sector analysis, the market for dairy products is showing increased demand. Meanwhile, it is envisaged that there will be decline in the number of dairies in years to come, since many will not have the capacity to invest in introduction of EU standards and consequently survive on the market.

It is necessary to upgrade the technological standards in micro, small and medium-sized dairies in order to comply with EU standards in the field of food hygiene and environmental protection. It is necessary to raise the level of competitiveness, both on domestic and foreign markets, by creating a high quality product.

Serbia can strengthen its role on domestic and international market of dairy products with sufficient investments in modernization of dairy-processing industry and increase of quality of milk adjusted and improved to EU standards.

Also, the quality of raw milk can be improved by better organization of milk collection and better equipped facilities for collection and storage of milk, by using specialised transport vehicles for milk and relevant processing equipment.

To be able to compete on the domestic and export markets, processing plants should invest in marketing and modern processing equipment in order to increase competitiveness and profitability of final products.

Sector 2: Meat processing industry

According to the sector analysis, there is expected to be a decline in the number of slaughtering facilities during years to come. A large number of existing facilities will not be able to invest in the adjustment to EU standards and therefore they will not survive on the market and, on the other hand, there is a large percentage of unused existing capacities. To be able to compete with other suppliers, the meat-processing industry must be modernized and technologically upgraded, it has to improve marketing and the quality of meat and meat products and to adjust to EU standards.

General objective is harmonization/compliance to veterinary and sanitary regulations according to the related EU standards and increase the competitiveness of agriculture products.

It is important to increase exports and overall performance in the entire chain of meat production and processing—slaughtering and processing. Small slaughterhouses and plants for meat cutting and processing need modernization of facilities and equipment in order to be in compliance with regulations related to hygiene and food safety, as well as with regulations related to human health and environment protection.

Sector 3: Fruit and vegetables processing industry

According to the sector analysis, the fruit and vegetable sector needs investments in reconstruction of buildings and new equipment for the purpose of fulfilling EU standards. These investments will increase the competitiveness of the processing industry on domestic and especially foreign markets.

To be able to compete with other suppliers, fruit and vegetable processors need to grow their businesses through the introduction of new technologies, new and modernized products and the improvement of marketing for better placement on the domestic and foreign markets of their products.

Also, it is necessary to provide support to micro, small and medium-sized enterprises in order to adapt their production processes to the requirements in terms of quality, food safety, hygiene and environmental protection as defined in national and EU standards.

Sector 4: Egg processing industry

According to the sectoral analysis, in the Republic of Serbia, 2/3 of egg products, which are needed in the industry and which are placed on the market come from the import, not from the national production.

It is necessary to improve the technological standards and EU standards in the field of the food safety and the environmental protection, as well as to raise the level of competitiveness and productivity of egg processing facilities.

The expected investments have a goal to orientate better their production to the market, to use existing market positions, to create new production sites and to introduce new technologies.

Sector 5 : Grape processing industry

The grape processing sector, i.e. production of wine/wine products and aromatized wine products is an area that requires a lot of investment, knowledge and training of the producers, but also an additional effort to set a number of EU standards in this field. Given that consumers are increasingly demanding in terms of quality with acceptable wine prices, wine and aromatized wine product producers need to improve wine quality and achieve appropriate competitiveness. Increasing competitiveness on the domestic and foreign markets and achieving EU standards requires investment in the reconstruction of production facilities and related facilities as well as purchase of new equipment, devices and vessels.

The aim of this measure is to improve businesses of grape processors that produce wine/wine products and aromatized wine product producers through the introduction of the state-of-the-art technologies and the production of innovative grape and wine products according to EU standards. Additionally, to improve competition and ensure the recognition of Serbian wines, it is necessary to provide better product recognition with geographical indications for wines.

8.3.3. General objectives

- To increase the ability of the agri-food sector to cope with competitive pressure by supporting its modernisation and thus the production efficiency;
- To progressively align with EU rules and standards, regarding environmental protection, food safety and quality products, animal welfare and traceability of the food chain and waste management;
- To increase the competitiveness of the food processing industry from the selected sectors by adjusting to demands of domestic and foreign market, and technical and technological improvement of sector;
- To address the challenge of climate changes, by promoting renewable energy.

8.3.3.1. Specific objectives

Sector 1: Milk and dairy sector

The specific objectives for the milk processing sector are:

- To support viable enterprises for milk processing with capacity between 3,000 l - 100,000 l of collected milk per day on average for:
 - improvement of technology for milk processing and marketing;
 - introduction of new technologies, processes and products in order to achieve better position of dairy products on the domestic and international market;
- To increase quality and microbiological safety of milk of the targeted enterprises.
- To support enterprises to reach EU standards relating to safety and quality of milk products.

Sector 2: Meat processing sector

The specific objectives for the meat processing sector are:

- To encourage investments in slaughtering facilities with a minimum capacity per day for: 10 cattle or 50 pigs or 50 sheep and goats or 5,000 poultry, which would comply with the EU standards;
- To enable the introduction of new technologies, refining processes and products in order to achieve better position in the domestic and international market;
- To support the introduction of food safety and quality systems (GHP, GMP, HACCP and ISO);
- To improve the treatment and handling of waste.

Sector 3: Fruit and vegetables processing sector

The specific objectives for the fruit and vegetable processing sector are:

- To support the micro, small and medium size enterprises for processing of fruit and vegetables in order to:
 - Upgrade the fruit and vegetables processing sector to the EU standards;
 - Improve production techniques and technologies;
 - Support introduction of food safety and quality systems;
 - Improve the marketing of fruit and vegetables products;
 - Achieve better a position on the domestic and international markets by introducing new technologies and equipment.

Sector 4: Egg processing sector

The specific objectives of the sector for egg processing are:

- support to investments in the new and existing processing capacities, in order to comply with EU standards and increase their competitiveness and productivity;
- introduction of the new technologies, improvement of the processes and products in order to achieve better position on the domestic and international market;
- introduction of a safety and quality food system (GHP, GMP, HACCP and ISO);
- improving treatment and waste management.

Sector 5: Grape processing sector

Specific objectives for the grape processing sector, i.e. production of wine/wine products and aromatized wine products include supporting of micro, small and medium-sized enterprises that produce wine/wine products and aromatized wine products, in order to:

- improve the sector and reach EU standards,
- improve production technology and techniques,
- support the introduction of quality schemes, i.e. production of value-added products,
- improve recognition of grape originate products with geographical indications on the domestic and foreign market.

8.3.4. Linkage to other IPARD measures in the programme and to national measures

The measure is particularly linked with the measure "Investments in physical assets of agricultural holdings", which ensures the provision of raw materials. Investments in processing and marketing of agricultural products will provide/ensure collection/buying of high quality products from primary producers, agricultural farms/holdings from the priority sectors.

8.3.5. Recipients

Recipients are entrepreneurs and legal entities/enterprises, with less than 25% of their capital or voting rights held by public bodies. An enterprise can consist of one or more establishments (local production units).

Recipients of support have to be registered in the Business Register of Serbia and hold an active status.

8.3.6. Common eligibility criteria

8.3.6.1. Types of enterprises supported

Only micro, small and medium sized enterprises as defined in Article 6 of the Accounting Law of the Republic of Serbia (*OG of RS 62/2013* and its subsequent modifications) are eligible. National definition of the micro small and medium sized enterprises is presented in Annex 6.

The recipients:

- Must, in the case that the recipient is not owner, provide a contract on lease of the land or facility with minimum duration of the lease of ten years from the date of submission of application;
- Should prove that it has no outstanding tax or social security payments at the time of submission of an application/claim for payments. The applicant submits the signed statement that there is no application of the same investment in another public grant or subsidy scheme;
- Must, in the case that the recipient is the legal entity, prove that its accounts are not blocked¹¹ at the moment of submission of application, and that they were not blocked for more than 30 days, within 12 months period prior to submission of application;
- The establishments listed in the web site of EU (DG SANTE) as an EU approved third country establishment for the specific category of food and animal origin, are not eligible for support.

8.3.6.2. Economic viability of the enterprise

The applicant has to prove the economic viability of the enterprise through a business plan running to the end of investment period. The business plan should be in line with the template provided by the IPARD Agency. For investments exceeding EUR 50,000 as defined in IPARD implementing regulation, a complete business plan is needed, and for smaller investments, below EUR 50,000, it has to be in the simplified version as defined in the application form.

¹¹ It refers to the case of insolvent business performance of the legal entity when the account might be blocked. In case when the legal entity has used the bank account as a means of payment, and it was not able to pay off, the bill in due time, the bank account is blocked/ suspended for withdrawals and all capital inflow is going to be transferred to the account of the client whom the legal entity is owing

The criteria to be used by the IPARD Agency to assess the future economic viability of the holding are presented in the Annex 2.

8.3.6.3. National standards/EU standards

- Not later than the final payment, the entire enterprise must comply with the main relevant national minimum standards in force regarding environmental protection, public health (food safety aspects), animal welfare, and occupational safety (Annex 3);
- The investment supported must comply with the relevant EU standards by the end of the realization of the investment;
- Upon project completion, the recipient shall provide as an obligatory part of the final payment claim, a certificate from the national food safety, veterinary/phytosanitary and environmental authorities confirming that all applicable national minimum standards are respected on the enterprise and that the investment project is in compliance with the EU standards.

8.3.6.4. Other eligibility criteria

- Investments supported must concern the processing and / or marketing of products covered by Annex I to the Treaty, including fishery products, and / or the development of new products, processes and technologies linked to products covered by Annex I to the Treaty, including fishery products.
- All supplies purchased under this measure shall originate from an eligible country. However, they may originate from any country when the amount of the supplies to be purchased is below the threshold for the use of the competitive negotiated procedure (currently EUR 100,000). For the purposes of this measure, the term ‘origin’ should be used as defined in Chapter 8.1.2.2
- Investments at retail level are not eligible under this measure;
- Only investments made after the signature of the contract can be considered eligible for reimbursement by the IPARD Agency, except for feasibility studies and other consultancy costs related to the preparation of the application;
- For a period of five years after the final payment by the IPARD Agency, the recipient is obliged to use the investment for the purpose it was intended without substantial modifications affecting its nature or its implementation conditions, or give undue advantage to a firm or public body, and/or result either from a change in the nature of ownership of an item of infrastructure, or cessation or relocation of a productive activity co-financed.

8.3.7. Specific eligibility criteria (per sector)

Sector 1: Milk processing and marketing

- The recipient has to be registered in the List of Establishments (according to the Law on Veterinary Matters (*Official Gazette Republic of Serbia, No 91/2005, 30/2010* and its subsequent modifications)*);
- Must have capacity of 3.000 l -100.000 l of collected milk per day on average in the last accounting year prior to the submission of the application.

Sector 2: Meat processing and marketing

- Recipients have to be registered in the List of Establishments (according to the Law on Veterinary Matters (*Official Gazette Republic of Serbia, No 91/2005, 30/2010* and its subsequent modifications)*);
- In case of slaughterhouses eligible are recipients with a minimum capacity for: 10 cattle or 50 pigs or 50 sheep and goats or 5,000 poultry per day;

Sector 3: Fruit and vegetables processing and marketing

Only micro, small and medium sized enterprises as defined in Article 6 of the Accounting Law of the Republic of Serbia (*OG of RS 62/2013* and its subsequent modifications) are eligible. National definition of the micro small and medium sized enterprises is presented in Annex 6.

Sector 4: Egg processing and marketing

Only micro, small and medium sized enterprises, as defined in the Article 6 of the Accounting Law of the Republic of Serbia (*OG of RS 62/2013* and its subsequent modifications) are eligible. National definition of micro, small and medium sized enterprises is presented in Annex 5.

Sector 5: Grape processing

The recipient have to be registered in the Vineyard Register in accordance with the Law on Wine ("Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia", No. 41/09 and 93/12) with the maximum available capacities of annual wine production from 20.000 up to 1.000.000 liters at the end of the investment registered in the Winery Register in accordance with the Law on Wine ("Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia", No. 41/09 and 93/12).

8.3.8. Eligible expenditure

In line with Article 29 and 31 of the FWA and Article 33 (5) of the SA eligible expenditure shall be limited to:

- (a) the construction or improvement of immovable property up to market value of the assets;

- (b) the purchase of new machinery and equipment, including computer software, up to the market value of the asset shall be considered as eligible;
- (c) general costs linked to expenditure referred to in points (a) and (b) of this paragraph such as architects, engineers and other consultation fees, feasibility studies shall be eligible up to a ceiling of 12% of the costs referred to in the said points (a) and (b) according to the following conditions:
 - the eligible amount of the general costs shall not exceed the reasonable cost established in line with Article 11 (2) (f) and Article 11 (3) (d) of this Agreement;
 - for projects with eligible expenditure of the investments referred to in subparagraphs (a) and (b) greater than EUR 3 million, the business plan preparation costs cannot be greater than 3% of the eligible expenditure of these investments;
 - for projects with eligible expenditure of the investments referred to in points (a) and (b) of at least EUR 1 million and no more than EUR 3million, the business plan preparation costs cannot be greater than 4% of the eligible expenditure of these investments;
 - for projects with eligible expenditure of the investments referred to in points (a) and (b) less than EUR 1 million, the business plan preparation costs cannot be greater than 5% of the eligible expenditure of these investments.

Further detailed provisions concerning the maximum eligible amount in this paragraph by measure and sector are provided in the relevant measure text in the following chapters.

In accordance with Article 31 (1) (b) of the FWA and Article 33 (6) of the SA, investment projects shall remain eligible for European Union financing provided they do not, within five years from the final payment by the IPARD Agency, undergo a substantial modification. Substantial modifications to a project are those which result in:

- a cessation or relocation of a productive activity outside the programme area;
- a change in ownership of an item of infrastructure which gives to a firm or a public body an undue advantage; or
- a substantial change affecting its nature, objectives or implementation conditions which would result in undermining its original objectives.

d) Renewable energy production facilities shall be eligible for support only if their production capacity is no more than equivalent to the combined average annual energy consumption of thermal energy and electricity in the agriculture enterprise/ holding. The average energy consumption will be calculated on the bases of the 3 previous years before submission of application.

Examples of eligible investments per sector

Sector 1: Milk and dairy sector

Eligible investment for milk and dairy sector:

- Construction/extension/modernisation of milk collection centres and milk processing enterprises, milk storage and cooling equipment, specialised milk transportation equipment, equipment and technology for improvement and control of quality and hygiene, including simple test equipment to distinguish between poor and good quality milk, physical investments for establishment of food safety systems (GHP, GMP, HACCP), IT hardware and software for milk registry and monitoring, control and management, investment in energy saving technologies, environmental protection, equipment and facilities for processing of intermediate products and wastes; treatment and elimination of wastes, specialised milk transport vehicles.

Sector 2: Meat sector

Eligible investments for slaughterhouses and meat processing plants:

- Construction / renovation of slaughterhouses/ facilities for meat processing and cooling storage rooms, equipment for slaughterhouses, technology and equipment for treatment of waste and by-products, physical investments in establishment of food safety systems (GHP, GMP, HACCP), IT hardware and software for monitoring, control and management, investment in renewable energy (construction of installation and equipment) primarily focused on own needs.

Sector 3: Fruit and vegetables sector

Eligible investments for fruit and vegetable processing sector:

- Construction/extension/modernisation of premises used for the food processing activity, to comply with the relevant EU standards, facilities and equipment for processing of fruit and vegetables (preserving pasteurizing, drying, freezing, etc.), packaging and labelling equipment, including filling lines, wrappers, labellers and other specialised equipment, investment in renewable energy (construction of installation and equipment) primarily focused on own needs, physical investments in establishment of food safety and quality management systems (GHP, GMP, HACCP, ISO).

Sector 4: Egg processing sector

The eligible investments for egg processing sector:

- Construction facilities for egg processing, packaging and storage facilities, equipment for egg processing, equipment for treatment of waste and by-products, physical investment in establishment of the food safety system (GHP, GMP, HACCP), IT hardware and software for monitoring, control and management, investment in renewable energy (construction of the installations and equipment) primarily focused on self consumption.

Sector 5: Grape processing sector

The eligible investments for grape processing sector:

- Investment in construction and/or equipment of facilities for the processing of grapes or production and storage of wine/wine products and aromatized wine products;
- Investment in construction and /or equipment of tasting facilities, facilities for evaluation of characteristics and wine presentations;
- Equipment, devices and vessels for the production, bottling / packaging and storing of wine/wine products and aromatized wine products and other specialized and laboratory equipment, instruments and devices;
- Equipment for disinfection of workers;
- Investing in renewable energy sources (construction of installations and equipment) primarily focused on own needs;

8.3.9. Selection criteria

| Type of selection criteria | | Points |
|--|--------|--------|
| Recipients investment is located in areas with difficult working conditions in agriculture | yes/no | 20/0 |
| The investment is oriented towards environmental protection or waste management | yes/no | 20/0 |
| Recipient is certified for production of PDO and PGI products | yes/no | 20/0 |
| Investments in upgrading the whole enterprise to EU-Standards | yes/no | 20/0 |
| Investments to improve energy efficiency, including the use of renewable energy sources | yes/no | 20/0 |

If there are applicants who have the same number of points, priority will be given to the applicant who submitted the application first.

8.3.10. Aid intensity and EU contribution rate

Aid intensity, expressed as the share of public support in the eligible expenditure of an investment, amounts up to:

- 50% of total eligible expenditures, or
- For investments relating to the treatment of effluents the maximum aid intensity could be increased by 10% (maximum 60%).

EU co-financing rate is 75% of the public aid.

A recipient can claim the support, irrespective of the total value of the investment, for eligible expenditure within the following ceilings:

Milk processing and marketing

- Minimum EUR 10,000;
- Maximum EUR 2,000,000.

Meat processing and marketing

- Minimum EUR 10,000;
- Maximum EUR 1,000,000.

Fruit and vegetables processing and marketing

- Minimum EUR 10,000;
- Maximum EUR 1,000,000.

Egg processing and marketing:

- Minimum EUR 10,000;
- Maximum EUR 1,000,000.

Grape processing and marketing:

- Minimum EUR 10,000;
- Maximum EUR 1,000,000.

The recipient cannot receive more than EUR 2.0 million of public support from the IPARD II Programme.

The application for the next investment can be brought in only after finalisation (final payment) of the previous investment.

8.3.11. Budget 2014-2020 for the measure “Investments in physical assets concerning processing and marketing of agricultural and fishery products”

| Year | Total eligible cost | Public expenditure | | | | | | Private contribution | |
|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------|-------------------|-------|-----------------------|-------|----------------------|--------|
| | | Total | | EU contribution | | National contribution | | | |
| | EUR | EUR | % | EUR | % | EUR | % | EUR | % |
| | 2=3+9 | 3=5+7 | 4=3/2 | 5 | 6=5/3 | 7 | 8=7/3 | 9 | 10=9/2 |
| 2014 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2015 | 19,906,004 | 9,953,002 | 50 | 7,464,752 | 75 | 2,488,250 | 25 | 9,953,002 | 50 |
| 2016 | 26,932,466 | 13,466,233 | 50 | 10,099,675 | 75 | 3,366,558 | 25 | 13,466,233 | 50 |
| 2017 | 23,174,069 | 11,587,034 | 50 | 8,690,276 | 75 | 2,896,759 | 25 | 11,587,034 | 50 |
| 2018 | 24,434,018 | 12,217,009 | 50 | 9,162,757 | 75 | 3,054,252 | 25 | 12,217,009 | 50 |
| 2019 | 37,093,509 | 18,546,755 | 50 | 13,910,066 | 75 | 4,636,689 | 25 | 18,546,755 | 50 |
| 2020 | 43,153,266 | 21,576,633 | 50 | 16,182,475 | 75 | 5,394,158 | 25 | 21,576,633 | 50 |
| TOTAL | 174,693,334 | 87,346,667 | | 65,510,000 | | 21,836,667 | | 87,346,667 | |

8.3.12. Indicators and targets

| Name of indicator | Target value |
|---|--------------|
| Number of projects supported | 463 |
| Number of enterprises performing modernisation projects | 463 |
| Number of enterprises progressively upgrading towards EU standards | 463 |
| Number of enterprises investing in renewable energy production | 46 |
| Total investment in physical capital by enterprises supported (EUR) | 165,893,333 |
| Number of jobs created (gross) | 160 |

8.3.13. Administrative procedure

The measure will be implemented by the IPARD Agency. Projects under the measure will be selected through open calls for applications. The decision on the financial allocation per measure, per call will be made in agreement with the IPARD Agency. The Managing Authority shall each year draw up an annual programme for call for applications, indicating number of calls, time for launching and deadlines for applications and the indicative budget of each measure and call for applications.

IPARD Agency shall launch the calls for proposals and implement wide information campaign in co-operation with the MA.

The submitted applications shall be checked administratively and on-the-spot for completeness, administrative compliance, eligibility and viability of the business plan by the IPARD Agency. The compliant and eligible applications shall be ranked and funded up to the limit of the budget of the call for applications.

Applications are filed by recipients using the forms in line with the requirements and public tenders. Detailed administrative checks are carried out prior to approving an application to identify whether it was complete, if it was filed on time and whether the requirements for approving the applications were met. The checks are documented on detailed check list templates.

Applications that arrive complete, timely and in line with the requirements of the rulebook and public tender will be reviewed in the order of their acceptance. Upon the processing of the application forms by the IPARD Agency, a ranking list will be formed according to the ranking criteria. Ranking list will be created and projects selected following each Call for Applications. In case when there are more projects with the same amount of points according to the ranking criteria, those selected will be the ones with an earlier date of the submission of the complete application. In cases when there are less compliant and eligible applications than available funds for support, the ranking list will not be prepared.

After administrative control eligible applications will be checked on the spot by the IPARD Agency. After administrative control and control on the spot, selected projects will be contracted for financing.

All the provisions stated above are subjected to accreditation. The final provisions will be laid down in Directorate for Agrarian Payments procedures.

Applicants for aid under measures within the IPARD II Programme are obliged to submit their applications and business plans together with other requested documentation to the IPARD Agency.

8.3.14. Geographical scope of the measure

This measure applies in areas as defined in the programme chapter 2.1.

8.4. AGRI-ENVIRONMENT – CLIMATE AND ORGANIC FARMING MEASURE

This section will be elaborated in a later stage before the measure on organic farming (OF) is implemented.

8.4.1. Legal basis

- *Article 2 (1) of IPA Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 March 2014 laying down common rules and procedures for the implementation of the Union's instruments for financing external action.*
- *Article 27 (1) (4) of the Sectoral Agreement*
- *Annex 4 of the Sectoral Agreement*

8.4.2. Rationale

So far, the development of organic agriculture in Serbia has been relatively slow, but it certainly has the potential to rapidly increase with adequate support and incentives. Investments in organic production could contribute to increase of areas under the organic production for 25% in respect to current situation. Serbia has favourable soil and climatic conditions for organic agriculture and there are good opportunities for the development of both domestic and export markets for organic products.

Payments for conversion to organic production are particularly significant in terms of assistance to agricultural producers to enter the market of organic products. Compensatory payments are required for lost income and additional costs associated with the transition to organic production methods and maintenance of organic farming practices and methods.

The advantage of organic production is reflected in the fact that it enhances income generation on smaller farms, which is particularly important for the agricultural sector in Serbian. A large proportion of agricultural production takes place in a traditional way on small holdings, without the use of modern machinery or large

amounts of pesticides and fertilizers. Such farms are very easily convertible to the organic system of production.

Organic farming helps to reduce environmental pollution and protect biodiversity, it contributes to the improvement of water management and land. What is more, it does not burden the land with chemical pesticides, fertilizers, genetically modified organisms and products consisting of or derived from genetically modified organisms. It reduces emission of greenhouse gases and ammonia, which contributes to the improvement of air quality and mitigation of climate change. The positive impact of organic agriculture on environment and the growing need and interest in the market for organic products are good reasons for ensuring financial support for these activities. In the future, pilot projects might be extended to cover larger agriculture territory.

8.4.3. General objectives

To contribute to sustainable resource management and climate change adaptation and mitigation by application of agricultural production methods compatible with the protection and improvement of the environment, going beyond relevant mandatory EU standards;

To contribute to the preparation of Serbia for the future implementation of the agri-environment-climate measure under the RDP after the accession.

8.4.4. Specific (s) objectives of the measure

Support for the introduction and maintenance of organic agricultural production methods;

Mitigation and adaptation relating to climate change;

Increasing agricultural land and number of farms managed in accordance to the Law on Organic Production and corresponding regulations;

Increasing the competitiveness of organic agricultural production;

Increase in exports of organic products to foreign markets.

8.4.5. Dissemination of results

Regular training and awareness activities of the National Advisory Service will be used to disseminate the best practices, results and experience gained during the implementation of the measure.

8.4.6. Linkage to other IPARD measures in the programme and to national measures

This measure is linked to the measure "Investments in physical assets concerning agricultural holdings" and "Investments in physical assets concerning processing and marketing of agricultural and fishery products".

In its selection criteria, the measure "Investments in physical assets, concerning agricultural holdings" provides priority to investment projects of certified organic producers and thus contributes to implementation of the agri-environmental measure.

Upgraded processing and marketing conditions could act as a driver to improve primary production of specific products with added value. This should lead to the improved quality and food safety of raw materials needed for the processing industry and which should increase potentials for export. Hence, it will be followed by rational and efficient processing, which results in a synergistic effect on both sides.

Distinction is assured by the fact that organic production is a certified process followed by appropriate proofing documentation.

National measures under the NPRD (2015-2020) will support small holdings and farms either to up-grade to a more competitive agriculture production or to diversify to non-agriculture activities (demarcation see Chapter 10). Additionally, some of them should be encouraged to cross above the viability level. IPARD measure will support only organic producers involved in crop production (cereals, oil crops, vegetable, fruit or grape production and production of aromatic/medicinal plants), while animal organic production as well as animal and plant genetic resources will be subject of support in NPRD.

8.4.7. Recipients

Recipients are:

- active registered agricultural holdings - natural persons (including entrepreneurs)
- legal entities, with less than 25% of their capital or voting rights held by public bodies, and registered in the national Register of Agriculture Holdings in accordance with the Law on Agriculture and Rural Development.

8.4.8. Type of operation

The proposed agri-environmental measure will focus implementation on organic production.

The main aim of the selected scheme is to gain implementation experience and introduce EU methodologies and practice in this sector. At the same time, they are selected in a way that will positively contribute to the key agri-environmental issues identified in Serbia. An organic farming measure has been implemented in Serbia for the last ten years and there is already a good knowledge base and support structure for further development under the EU support scheme.

Examples of type of operations

Type of operations will focus only on support to organic farming conversion and/or maintenance.

8.4.9. Common eligibility criteria for all type of operations

8.4.9.1. Baseline

The recipient shall respect the minimum mandatory standards as established by national legislation that refer to the specific AE scheme. The mandatory standards are national rules which are notably addressing relevant GAEC standards (good agricultural and environmental conditions) related to soil, water, landscape management, relevant minimum requirements for fertiliser and plant protection products.

8.4.9.2. Relevant knowledge

All of the recipients are required to pass training for the respective commitment they are undertaking. The recipient is obliged to undertake at least 10 days of certified training in organic farming topics.

8.4.9.3. Eligible size of agricultural land/herd

The minimum area for crop and vegetable production is at least 0.2 hectares, and for fruit and grape production at least 0.3 hectares. There are no restrictions for organic production in protected areas (such as greenhouses).

8.4.10. Commitments

Scheme 1: Organic farming scheme

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Rationale | <p>Organic farming improves the natural balance of plant nutrients by using crop rotation and the integration of crop and livestock production. Due to the limited use of fertilizers and pesticides, organic farming improves soil and water quality, plays a positive role in biodiversity conservation and contributes to the sustainable management of soil, fruit and vegetables and vineyards.</p> <p>The pilot implementation of the OF scheme will contribute to the development of organic farming in Serbia, which is currently very low.</p> |
| Environmental objectives | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• To reduce the use of fertilizers and pesticides on agricultural land;• To contribute to the sustainable management of soils;• To increase the area of agricultural land and the number of farms managed according to organic farming standards; |

| | |
|--|--|
| Pilot scope | Support will only be provided to vegetable, fruit or grape production and crops that are certified as organic or are in conversion. |
| Specific eligibility requirements | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Recipients must have a minimum area for crop and vegetable production of at least 0.2 hectares, and for fruit and grape production at least 0.3 hectares, and for organic production in the protected area (greenhouses) there are no restrictions; |
| Minimum mandatory standards | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Law on Organic Production, (OG RS No 30/10) (details on requirements for organic farmers in line with Organic Law will be elaborated later) – Rulebook on Control and Certification and Methods of Organic Production, (OG RS, No 48/11 and 40/12) |
| Management requirements | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – To undertake 10 days of training in organic farming topics; – To manage the land in accordance with the national regulations governing organic production; – To have a contract relating to the control and certification of organic production with the authorized control body in accordance with the Law on organic farming for the area they are working within. |
| Payment rates | Estimated payment rates will be calculated before measure accreditation |
| Indicators: | <p><i>Baseline (2013)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 1,014 ha included in support under this measure – 109 Number of producers who have used an incentive for organic crop production <p><i>Output</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 7,500 ha included in support under this measure – 500 Number of producers who have used an incentive for organic crop production |

8.4.11. Eligible costs

Support will only be provided for cereals, oil crops, vegetables, fruit or grape production, aromatic/medicinal and fodder plants that are certified as organic or are in the conversion stage.

Payment rates will be elaborated in the process of measure accreditation.

The IPARD Agency will make cross-checks to ensure that aid ceilings have been respected in the case of combinations of agri-environmental commitments and activities on the same land.

8.4.12. Aid intensity and EU contribution rate

Aid intensity (public aid) will be at the level of 100% of the total eligible costs. The EU contribution rate shall be 85% of public expenditure the remaining 15% will be covered by the national budget.

8.4.13. Budget 2014-2020 for the measure “Agri-environment – climate and organic farming measure”

| Year | Total eligible cost | Public expenditure | | | | | | Private contribution | |
|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------|------------------|-------|-----------------------|-------|----------------------|--------|
| | | Total | | EU contribution | | National contribution | | | |
| | EUR | EUR | % | EUR | % | EUR | % | EUR | % |
| | 2=3+9 | 3=5+7 | 4=3/2 | 5 | 6=5/3 | 7 | 8=7/3 | 9 | 10=9/2 |
| 2014 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2015 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2016 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2017 | 2,573,529 | 2,573,529 | 100 | 2,187,500 | 85 | 386,029 | 15 | - | - |
| 2018 | 2,573,529 | 2,573,529 | 100 | 2,187,500 | 85 | 386,029 | 15 | - | - |
| 2019 | 2,573,529 | 2,573,529 | 100 | 2,187,500 | 85 | 386,029 | 15 | - | - |
| 2020 | 2,573,529 | 2,573,529 | 100 | 2,187,500 | 85 | 386,029 | 15 | - | - |
| TOTAL | 10,294,118 | 10,294,118 | | 8,750,000 | | 1,544,118 | | - | - |

8.4.14. Indicators and targets

| Name of indicator | Target value |
|--|--------------|
| Number of contracts | 1,029 |
| Agricultural land (ha) under environmental contracts | 10,294 |
| Number of operation types supported | 1 |
| Total area per type of type of operation (organic farming) | 10,294 |
| Number of holdings supported under organic farming type of operation | 1.029 |

8.4.15. Geographical scope

This measure applies in areas as defined in the programme chapter 2.1.

8.5. IMPLEMENTATION OF LOCAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES – LEADER APPROACH

8.5.1. Legal basis

- *Article 2 (1) of IPA Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 March 2014 laying down common rules and procedures for the implementation of the Union's instruments for financing external action.*
- *Article 27 (1) (5) of the Sectoral Agreement*
- *Annex 4 of the Sectoral Agreement*

8.5.2. Rationale

Rural areas in Serbia are characterized by a diversity of landscapes and biological features, rich cultural heritage and natural resources. On the other hand, these areas suffer consequences of depopulation. This is the reason for their low development and the existence of all forms of deprivation of basic amenities and growing poverty. Increased attractiveness of rural areas as places to live is closely related to the improvement of physical infrastructure, better access to social services, and improvement of social structures and support for the development of entrepreneurship.

Serious threatd of further escalation of the development gap versus urban areas is imposed by a lack of respect for the specific needs of the village and its inhabitants, the absence of systematic and insufficiently coordinated activities of different stakeholders.

The LEADER concept involves simultaneous use of the territorial approach, "bottom-up" public - private partnerships, integrated multi-sector approach, innovation, cooperation and networking. It was designed and developed by the EU as an instrument of rural development that has significantly contributed to the strengthening of social capital, creating additional employment and diversification of economic activities in rural areas, as well as improving and maintaining

competitiveness and encouraging innovative responses to old and new rural problems.

The introduction of the measure for implementation of local rural development strategies by LEADER principles and associated preparatory activities are a method of mobilizing and implementing of rural development in local rural communities. It directly contributes to strengthening of the social capital, promoting better local governance, improving infrastructure, diversification of rural activities, development of the service sector in local communities as well as the level of nurturing of cultural heritage.

In recent years, pilot initiatives were implemented, at the local level, such as partnerships similar to local action groups (LAG) and partnerships which ensure effective implementation of rural development measures. LAG type partnerships were established in Serbia through various project initiatives aimed to support strengthening of the rural social capital and defining local partnerships priorities and boosting capacity through training for the preparation of project proposals, financial planning and project cycle management.

During 2011-2013, 605 groups were registered by memorandums of understanding which were defined as Partnerships for territorial rural development. During the process of creating and strengthening partnerships, the project supported the establishment of 24 of them. Simulating IPARD evaluation process, from the 24 strategies, 21 LRDS met the criteria of the LEADER measure under the IPARD, which covers 8% of the population and about 15% of the territory of Serbia. These results are achieved through a gradual "step-by-step" approach, through guidance, tailored training, mentoring, case studies, field trips and other necessary support, based on the best practices in the EU, where possible and appropriate, tailored to the specifics of Serbia. At the same time, the project established principles and coordination at the national level for the implementation of the LEADER in Serbia.

This successful process will be continued in IPARD II. First of all, LAGs will be selected and in the second step actions/projects of these groups will be supported.

8.5.3. General objectives

General objectives are the development of civil society and fostering social dialogue within the rural population, support of good governance, promotion of employment and development of human capital, which, all together, by implementing the measure through the local partnerships, contributes to the sustainable development of rural areas.

8.5.3.1. Specific objectives

This measure has to contribute to the promotion of rural development through local initiatives and partnerships, strengthening the capacity of rural inhabitants and members of established partnerships through training and education, to develop, organize and lead the partnership, to prepare and implement LDS

through local projects and to activate the rural areas for networking and inter-territorial cooperation.

The LEADER approach in Serbia will be supported through the following measures:

- Measure Technical Assistance – for potential LAGs. Technical Assistance activity "Acquisition through of skills and animating the inhabitants of rural territories" will be used for capacity building of potential LAGs.
- Measure "Implementation of local development strategies – LEADER approach" – for selected LAGs.

This measure includes following activities:

Activity 1: "Acquisition of skills, animating the inhabitants of LAG territories" for capacity building and animation among already selected LAGs, their members and rural inhabitants.

Activity 2: "Running costs and small projects" for running the selected LAGs and small scale projects that will be implemented by LAGs.

Activity 3: "Cooperation projects" for inter territorial projects; this activity should be implemented in the latest phase of implementation. The relevant procedure for applying for this activity will be later developed by the Managing Authority and described in the programme.

- Measures in IPARD II programming document for realization projects prioritized in LDSs.

8.5.4. Linkage to other IPARD measures in the programme and to national measures

The IPARD LEADER measure will not be implemented in parallel with NPRD. The latter will be implemented until the beginning of the implementation of LEADER measure in IPARD in order to avoid double financing.

8.5.5. Recipients

Recipients for all activities are the selected LAGs.

8.5.6. Common eligibility criteria

Eligibility criteria for selection of the LAGs

Based on the submitted applications, LAGs selected by the Managing Authority will be checked for eligibility criteria by the IPARD Agency as follows:

- The LAG is an association officially registered in Serbian Business Registers Agency;

- The selected LAG covers a coherent, well-defined, geographically continuous rural territory, with more than 10,000 and less than 150,000 inhabitants, including settlements with a population of less than 25,000;
- At the decision-making level, the economic and social partners as well as other representatives of the civil society, such as farmers, rural women, young people and their associations must make up more than 50% of the partnership. Moreover, a minimum 20% of shall be representatives of the local authorities. However, public authorities as defined in accordance with the national rules, or any single interest group, shall represent less than 50% of the voting rights;
- Members of the managing structure of a LAG must be residents and / or be registered and / or a registered branch in the LAG territory as well as chairman;
- The LAG must propose an integrated Local Development Strategy based on the LEADER Ordinance developed by the Managing Authority. Provisions on minimum elements to be included in LDS will be explained in the later stage in IPARD II Programme.

8.5.7. Eligible activities and eligible expenditure

**Measure "Implementation of local development strategies – LEADER approach"
– for selected LAGs will cover eligible expenditures for the following activities:**

8.5.7.1. Eligible activities for activity 1 - "Acquisition of skills, animating the inhabitants of lag territories" for capacity building and animation of the selected LAGs:

- a) Animation, awareness raising and promotional activities, events (e.g. seminars, workshops, meetings, etc.),
- b) Training and education of the LAG staff and members (e.g. preparation of business plans, preparation of project applications, accounting, etc.); Rural studies, analysis of the territory and other analysis and data gathering necessary for implementation of the local development strategy,
- c) Publicity to support the local development strategy preparation process and the production of promotional materials for the rural stakeholders in the proposed LAG territory,
- d) Training for the LAG staff and members involved with the setting up of the local action group and the implementation of the local development strategy and / or in preparation of business plans, project applications etc.,
- e) Participation of the LAG members in seminars, workshops, meetings, study visits, including events of the national and the European RD network,

- f) Planning, monitoring and follow-up and revision of the local development strategy (LDS) for the territory of the contracted LAG,
- g) Studies of the contracted LAG area that support the implementation of the LDS,
- h) Information and publicity activities to support the implementation of the LDS, to stimulate cooperation and networking among rural stakeholders within the contracted LAG territory, and to enhance the involvement of vulnerable social groups (women, youth, the elderly, minorities, the disabled and other) in the implementation of the LDS.

Examples of Eligible expenditure:

- Expert services;
- Translation and interpretation;
- Travel expenses, including accommodation and daily allowances;
- Animation activities (e.g. trainings, participation in seminars, workshops and fairs, subscription and acquisition of publications, other animation activities, etc.);
- Rental of facilities and equipment for events and catering.

8.5.7.2. Eligible activities for activity 2 - "running costs and small projects" for running the selected lags and implementation of small projects:

- a) Maintaining an office (office rent and overheads) for the contracted LAG within its territory and the salaries of LAG employees;
- b) Training and capacity building for the contracted LAG staff to improve capacities for LDS implementation;
- c) Small scale projects implemented by the LAGs (EUR 1,000-5,000 value for supporting of cultural events, promotion of local products, renovation or construction of cultural and natural heritage, investment in cultural goods, small touristic infrastructure, etc.).

Examples of Eligible expenditures:

- Salaries (co-financing) for the LAG manager and/or other LAG employees;
- Office rent and overheads;
- Office materials (stationery etc.);
- Purchase of equipment, including IT equipment, furnishing;
- Costs linked to communication;

- Training costs;
- Services (IT specialists, accountants, etc.);
- Small projects implemented by the LAGs. Selection and management of small projects shall be explained in LDSs and proposed actions shall be in line with LDS. Operations of the small value: EUR 1,000 – 5,000 should support, e.g. cultural events, promotion of local products, renovation or construction of cultural and natural heritage, investment in cultural goods, etc.

8.5.7.3. Eligible activities for activity 3 – “Cooperation projects for inter territorial or transnational projects”

- a) Training and capacity building for the contracted LAG staff to set up, animate and evaluate cooperation projects;
- b) Common actions and joint activities managed with national cooperation partners.

Examples of eligible expenditure:

- Salaries supported by the LAG and/or its local partners;
- Travel expenditures for LAG’s staff and their local partners;
- Costs linked to communication;
- Training costs;
- Services (IT specialists, accountants, etc.);
- Small projects linked to the common action implemented by the LAG: operations of small value (EUR 1,000 – 5,000) for common cultural events, common promotion of local products, investments in cultural or touristic goods.

8.5.7.4. Non eligible expenditure

- taxes, public fees/charges/dues;
- costs of proceedings (law);
- financing costs;
- insurance costs (investments);
- licence fees;
- costs of fiscal advice and solicitors;
- costs of (financial) lease;
- costs of investments, that are not state of the art;
- costs, arising from the time before signing of the contract with the IPARD Agency (application).

8.5.8. Selection criteria

8.5.8.1. Selection criteria will be used to evaluate local development strategies of LAGs and will be based on following:

- Area based approach and coherence of the LDS with the covered territory;
- LDS quality based on the analysis of developmental needs and potentials on the LAG territory, the content and its alignment with the objectives set up in the IPARD II Programme;
- Capacity of the LAG for implementation of the LDS;
- Quality of the partnership;
- Management body of the LAG must ensure age diversity and gender equality;
- The managing body of the LAG must be representative by ensuring age diversity and gender equality in terms of at least 30% are women;
- Projects supported by other sources (not the IPARD Programme) should be considered as added value, however double funding must be avoided through written statement of the LAG.

8.5.8.2. Minimum content of LDS

- The definition of the area and population covered by the strategy;
- Description of the current situation: an analysis of the development needs and potential of the area, including a SWOT analysis;
- Description of the LDS strategy and its objectives. The strategy shall be coherent with the IPARD Programme;
- Description of the process of community involvement in the development of the strategy;
- Decryption of LAG's partnership and internal decision making rules;
- Description of actions demonstrating how objectives are translated into expected activities and type of projects supported (the process of defining LDS measures or actions);
- Description of cooperation projects the LAG intend to follow (subjects of cooperation, regions/countries targeted) and how these cooperation will have positive effects on the local development strategy and on the local actors;
- Financial plan of the strategy, including expenditure on acquisition of skills and animation, running costs and small projects;
- Description of the procedure related to the recommendation of the local projects.

The evaluation criteria will be given in more details in the Implementing Regulation developed by MA.

After the selection and the ranking of the LAGs is done by the Evaluation Committee, IPARD Agency will conclude contracts with the LAGs reaching the minimum ranking score suggested in the MA implementing regulation.

8.5.9. Aid intensity and EU contribution rate

The aid intensity is provided from the EU and national budget and it is expressed as the share of public support in the eligible expenditures amounts up to 100%, where the EU contribution rate is 90% and the share of Serbia is 10%.

The highest possible annual amount of public support for the specific activities and types of expenditure shall be defined in the implementing regulation. Eligible expenditures and related costs /expenses will be further elaborated in the implementing regulation and calls.

8.5.10. Indicators and targets

| Name of Indicator | Target Value |
|---|---------------------|
| Number of LAGs operating in rural areas | 30 |
| Population covered by LAGs | 2,550,000 |
| Number of jobs created (gross) | 60 |
| Number of projects recommended | 50 |
| Number of small projects | 700 |

8.5.11. Administrative procedure

Procedure for selecting LAGs and approval of strategies

The procedure outlined below describes the selection procedure of LAGs and will be carried out by the Managing Authority.

- The LAGs will be selected on the basis of an open tender procedure for all rural areas. This will be announced by the IPARD Agency.
- Special criteria will be used to ensure a) area based approach, b) the quality and the conformity with the objectives of the IPARD Programme of the proposed local development strategies and c) the capability of the LAG to manage the implementation of the proposal.
- The selection procedure applied will be based on a ranking system of the selection criteria and not the one based on of the “first come, first served” approach. The ranking criteria system will be developed later (introduced in the implementing regulation) on by the Managing Authority as a part of the guidelines for the LEADER approach.
- Based on submitted applications and evaluation of the set selection criteria, LAGs will be pre-selected by an Evaluation Committee consisting of representatives from MAEP/Managing Authority and other relevant rural actors and non-profit

organizations dealing with rural development. The Evaluation Committee shall submit the list of pre-selected LAGs to the IPARD Agency for selection/approval. The role of the IPARD agency is limited to the eligibility checks in the approval procedures.

- The final selection will be ensured by a Selection Committee which members are appointed by the minister of MAEP. The Selection Committee follows the Rules of Procedure defined in Implementing Regulation in its decision-making process linked to applications that have been submitted to it by the IPARD Agency. If the decision made is in opposition to the evaluation report of Evaluation Committee then it has to be justified by incompliance with the eligibility criteria. The Minister of MAEP sends the written official notification to applicants on the approval or rejection of their application for LAG status.
- Rejection of applications and requests for amendment / explanation / correction of submitted application issued by the IPARD Agency are possible in the case if it is submitted after a deadline, if a LAG application does not fulfil the basic eligibility criteria or it is not submitted according to the provisions of the MA Implementing regulation or if it is incomplete and needs amendment or correction, etc.

Contracting procedure

- The IPARD Agency will sign contract agreements covering further projects in line with Activities 1 and 2 and the implementation of specific cooperation projects with the selected LAGs and will establish a registration system of selected/approved LAGs.
- Contracting of LAGs establishes the basis for reimbursement of eligible expenditures.

Contracting procedure will be carried out by the IPARD Agency and includes administrative control, field control, and concluding the contract on awarding the IPARD funds for the co-financing of the LAG (hereinafter the Contract) based on the Annual Action Plan submitted and approved by the IPARD Agency.

- The contract for funding a LAG's running costs, capacity building costs and small projects - The IPARD Agency finalizes the contract with the selected LAGs that submitted an Annual Action Plan which has been approved by the IPARD Agency for the period of one year, by which mutual rights and obligations shall be regulated.
- The request for payment - Funds from the IPARD are being paid to the contracted LAG based on the request for payment that LAG shall submit quarterly for payment to the IPARD Agency. All expenditures incurred by the contracted LAG and declared on the invoices or the statements of expenditure submitted as part of the request for payment must be paid in full by the contracted LAG before being submitted as part of the request for payment. A contracted LAG cannot be paid grants in the amount exceeding the amount stated in the IPARD contract, or the Annex to the IPARD contract. After the administrative and the field control of the request for

payment, the IPARD Agency director for payments makes a decision on payment, or a decision on rejecting, or letter of rejection of payment.

- Administrative and on-the-spot checks for payment are performed by the IPARD Agency. Also the responsible Ministry, the National Court of Auditors, authorized and legitimated national supervisory bodies and legitimated authorities of the EU are allowed to check the compliance with the regulations (compliance audit).
- Reporting by the contracted LAGs - The contracted LAG is required to submit two reports on the work of the contracted LAG (hereinafter Report) to the Managing Authority in every year of its operation. Based on the submitted reports by the contracted LAGs, the Managing Authority prepares an annual review of contracts of the contracted LAGs, which is published on the official website of the Managing Authority.
- In the case of the priority projects recommended by LAGs correspond to eligible operations of some measures in the IPARD Programme, the same conditions that apply to that measure in the IPARD Programme will apply. As regards the local projects under the IPARD measures, a LAG issues a letter of recommendation confirming that the project is in line with its LDS.

8.5.12. Geographical scope of the measure

The LEADER approach will be implemented in rural areas as defined in the programme chapter 3.1.

8.5.13. Other information specific to the measure

N/A

8.5.14. Budget 2014-2020 for the measure “Implementation of local development strategies – LEADER approach”

| Year | Total eligible cost | Public expenditure | | | | | | Private contribution | |
|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------|------------------|-------|-----------------------|-------|----------------------|--------|
| | | Total | | EU contribution | | National contribution | | | |
| | EUR | EUR | % | EUR | % | EUR | % | EUR | % |
| | 2=3+9 | 3=5+7 | 4=3/2 | 5 | 6=5/3 | 7 | 8=7/3 | 9 | 10=9/2 |
| 2014 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2015 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2016 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2017 | 555,556 | 555,556 | 100 | 500,000 | 90 | 55,556 | 10 | - | - |
| 2018 | 1,111,111 | 1,111,111 | 100 | 1,000,000 | 90 | 111,111 | 10 | - | - |
| 2019 | 2,111,111 | 2,111,111 | 100 | 1,900,000 | 90 | 211,111 | 10 | - | - |
| 2020 | 2,055,556 | 2,055,556 | 100 | 1,850,000 | 90 | 205,556 | 10 | - | - |
| TOTAL | 5,833,333 | 5,833,333 | | 5,250,000 | | 583,333 | | - | |

8.6. FARM DIVERSIFICATION AND BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

8.6.1. Legal basis

- *Article 2 (1) of IPA Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 March 2014 laying down common rules and procedures for the implementation of the Union's instruments for financing external action.*
- *Article 27 (1) (7) of the Sectoral Agreement*
- *Annex 4 of the Sectoral Agreement*

8.6.2. Rationale

The dominant part of the rural labour force in Serbia, which is around 45% of the employed rural population, works in agriculture. Such a high proportion of the rural population engaged in agriculture, ranks Serbia among "the predominantly agrarian" European countries. Aside from agriculture, the rural labour force is engaged in the processing industry (over 16%), wholesale and retail trade (10.2%), construction (5.8%) and transport (4%). Industries with the share of rural employment over 3% are also public administration, education, health and social work. The main reason for the small number of jobs in these industries and their low representation in the total employment figures is insufficient development of rural public services. The current structure of employment is the result of insufficiently diversified economic structure. It is highly dependent on the primary sector and the exploitation of natural resources.

The interventions under this measure aim at improving job opportunities in rural areas. They address the major problems of rural areas, as identified in the above analysis, which are summarised as follows:

- Lack of job opportunities;
- High dependency on agriculture;
- Declining quality and accessibility of basic services and infrastructure.

These problems result in decreasing the attractiveness of rural areas as a place to work and live and they increase the disparities between urban and rural areas. Due to the decline in life quality and job opportunities, rural areas have witnessed demographic decline, and a related deterioration of employability.

The availability of the IPARD funds, strengthening of social capital and market linkages, would strengthen rural communities and contribute to their sustainable development in the future.

Analysis of rural tourism shows that it already contributes to the rural economy and has great potential for further development (see chapter 3.4). The focus of diversification in the IPARD II will be put on rural tourism because of already long tradition of support through national support schemes in the past and because of great potential and need for further development of that sector. Furthermore, rural areas in Serbia are characterized

by diversity of landscapes and biological features, rich cultural heritage and natural resources. Diversification of the rural economy through higher level of services and activities related to rural tourism will reduce dependence on agricultural income and provide the conditions for stable additional income for those households which survival can not only be linked to agriculture. This type of support will contribute to less economically developed and socially vulnerable rural areas. On the other hand, activities in rural tourism expand the range of additional services available to the rural population, as well as services and products which are based on traditional knowledge, technology, natural resources and cultural heritage.

8.6.3. General objectives

- Increasing the level of diversification and the development of economic activities in rural areas through development of business activities, with the possibility of creating new jobs and directly increasing farm and household income;
- Improving the quality of life in rural areas and thus reducing the depopulation of rural areas.

8.6.3.1. Specific objectives

- Investment support to the development of tourist facilities and services to the agricultural producers and other economic operators in the rural areas, and thus the expansion of economic activities in the country in the field of rural tourism;
- Support the development of tourist recreational activities, especially for family and children's tourism.

8.6.4. Linkage with the other IPARD measures in the programme and national measures

This measure is well suited for implementation in close connection with the LEADER approach. In this case, the local population and their organisational structures must be involved early in the drafting of the local development strategy, identifying the activities which should become eligible for their specific region under this measure.

The measure is linked to the measure of the LEADER approach, namely the measure "Implementation of the Local Development Strategy".

The measure will complement the support provided under the national programme for protection of the local heritage (e.g. crafts and traditional products) and sale points for traditional products.

8.6.5. Recipients

Recipients of this measure are:

- Natural persons registered as agricultural producers in rural areas or members of the farm household diversifying on or off farm activities;

- Legal entities established or operating in rural areas in the range of micro and small sized enterprises as defined in the Law on Accounting (*OG of the RS No. 62/2013* and its subsequent modifications). The national definition of micro and small enterprises is presented in Annex 6. Legal entities, in the same range, established outside rural areas are also eligible if supported investments/activities are located in rural areas.

8.6.6. Common eligibility criteria

1. Investment must comply with the relevant national standards and requirements at the end of the realization of the investment as provided in Annex 3;
2. Recipient must be registered as accommodation establishments according to the provisions of Law on Tourism (*Official Gazette RS No 36/2009, 88/2010, 99/2011* and its subsequent modifications;)* and Law on Catering (“Official Gazette RS”, No 17/19 and its subsequent modifications at the end of the realization of the investment and before the final payment;
3. Applicant has to prove the economic viability of the enterprise through a business plan at the end of investment period. The business plan should be in line with the template provided by the IPARD Agency. For investments exceeding EUR 50,000 as defined in the IPARD implementing regulation, a complete business plan is needed, and for smaller investments, below EUR 50,000, it has to be in the simplified format as defined in the application form.

The criteria to be used by the IPARD Agency to assess the future economic viability of the holding are presented in the Annex 2.

4. The applicant should prove that it has no outstanding tax or social security payments against the state at the time of submission of an application/claim for payments. The applicant submits the signed statement that there is no application of the same investment in another public grant or subsidy scheme;
5. For a period of five years after the final payment by the IPARD Agency, the recipient is obliged to use the investment for the purpose it was intended, without substantial modifications affecting its nature or its implementation conditions or give undue advantage to a firm or public body, and/or result either from a change in the nature of ownership of an item of infrastructure, or cessation or relocation of a productive activity co-financed.

8.6.7. Specific eligibility criteria

- Maximum capacity in the number of beds in registered accommodation establishments is limited to up to 30 single beds for recipient.

8.6.8. Eligible expenditure

The following expenditure will be eligible:

1. Construction and improvement of immovable property;

2. Purchase of new equipment and furniture, including special equipment and furniture for disabled people and for children;
3. Purchase of new machinery, mechanization and equipment for maintenance of the touristic place and landscape and for touristic and gastronomic purposes, including IT hardware and software up to the market value of the asset;
4. Investment in facilities for outdoor and indoor recreational areas such as play-yards and related equipment;
5. General costs such as architects', engineers' and other consultation fees, feasibility studies, the acquisition of patent rights and licences up to a ceiling of 12% of total eligible expenditure, of which business plans costs are eligible up to 5% but not more than EUR 2000;

Investment in renewable energy (construction of installation and equipment) must be a part of a tourism project.

8.6.9. Eligible activities

Investment in construction and/or reconstruction and/or equipping of the facilities for the provision of tourism and hospitality services, such as rooms, restaurants and other facilities, including facilities for storage, sales, recreation, playing, keeping of animals, tourist camps, improving outdoors facilities (for riding, fishing in inland waters, cycling, themed trails, a riding trails) and other facilities/mechanization, machinery and equipment in the service of tourism/catering. .

8.6.10. Selection criteria

| Criteria | Answer | Points |
|--|-----------------|-----------|
| Applicant is a person an younger than 40 years at the time when the decision to grant support is taken | yes / no | 20 |
| Applicant is a woman or a company that employs the structure of at least 30% of women | yes / no | 20 |
| Applicant is located in the mountainous area as specified in Annex 4 | yes / no | 20 |
| Diploma of specialised vocational school in hospitality/tourism; Diploma of High school in hospitality/tourism; University diploma | yes / no | 3/6/10 |
| The project involves creation of new jobs based on the business plan | yes / no | 20 |
| The project involves infrastructural and equipment investment for disabled people | yes / no | 10 |

8.6.11. Aid intensity and EU contribution rate

Aid intensity, expressed as the share of public support in the eligible expenditures of the investment amounts up to 65%.

EU co-financing rate is 75% of the public aid.

Recipients can apply with more than one project during the IPARD Programme. The application for the next investment project can be submitted after finalisation (final payment) of the previous investment project.

A recipient can claim the support, irrespective of the total value of the investment, for eligible expenditure within the following ceilings:

- Minimum EUR 5,000;
- Maximum EUR 300,000.

Recipient can apply for up to three projects and receive a total support of maximum EUR 400,000 of public support from the IPARD II Programme.

8.6.12. Budget 2014-2020 for the measure “Farm diversification and business development”

| Year | Total eligible cost | Public expenditure | | | | | | Private contribution | |
|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------|-------------------|-------|-----------------------|-------|----------------------|--------|
| | | Total | | EU contribution | | National contribution | | | |
| | EUR | EUR | % | EUR | % | EUR | % | EUR | % |
| | 2=3+9 | 3=5+7 | 4=3/2 | 5 | 6=5/3 | 7 | 8=7/3 | 9 | 10=9/2 |
| 2014 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2015 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2016 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2017 | 4,102,564 | 2,666,667 | 65 | 2,000,000 | 75 | 666,667 | 25 | 1,435,897 | 35 |
| 2018 | 10,256,410 | 6,666,667 | 65 | 5,000,000 | 75 | 1,666,667 | 25 | 3,589,744 | 35 |
| 2019 | 8,205,128 | 5,333,333 | 65 | 4,000,000 | 75 | 1,333,333 | 25 | 2,871,795 | 35 |
| 2020 | 8,205,128 | 5,333,333 | 65 | 4,000,000 | 75 | 1,333,333 | 25 | 2,871,795 | 35 |
| TOTAL | 30,769,231 | 20,000,000 | | 15,000,000 | | 5,000,000 | | 10,769,231 | |

8.6.13. Indicators and targets

| Name of indicator | Target value |
|---|--------------|
| Number of projects supported | 219 |
| Number of agricultural holdings/enterprises developing additional or diversified sources of income in rural areas | 143 |
| Number of recipients investing in renewable energy | 43 |
| Total investment in physical capital by recipients supported (EUR) | 30,767,692 |
| Number of jobs created (gross) | 85 |

8.6.14. Administrative procedure

The measure will be implemented by IPARD Agency. Projects under the measure will be selected through open calls for applications. The decision on the financial allocation per measure, per call will be made in agreement with the IPARD Agency. The Managing Authority shall each year draw up an annual programme for call for applications, indicating number of calls, time for launching and deadlines for applications and the indicative budget of each measure and call for applications.

IPARD Agency shall launch the calls for proposals and implement wide information campaign in co-operation with the MA.

The submitted applications shall be checked administratively and on-the-spot for completeness, administrative compliance, eligibility and viability of the business plan by the IPARD Agency. The compliant and eligible applications shall be ranked and funded up to the limit of the budget of the call for applications.

Applications are filed by recipients using the forms in line with the requirements and public tenders. Detailed administrative checks are carried out prior to approving an application to identify whether it was complete, if it was filed on time and whether the requirements for approving the applications were met. The checks are documented on detailed check list templates.

Applications that arrive complete, timely and in line with the requirements of a rulebook and public tender will be reviewed in the order of their delivery. Upon the processing of the application forms, by the IPARD Agency, a ranking list will be formed according to the ranking criteria. The ranking list will be created and projects selected following each call for applications. In case when there are more projects with the same amount of points according to ranking criteria those selected will be the ones with an earlier date of the submission of the complete application. In case when there are less compliant and eligible applications than available funds for support, the ranking list will not be prepared.

After administrative control eligible applications will be checked on the spot by IPARD Agency. After administrative control and control on the spot, selected projects will be contracted for financing.

All the provisions stated above are subjected to accreditation and may be subject to modification. The final provisions will be laid down in the Directorate for Agrarian Payments procedures.

Applicants for aid under measures within the IPARD Programme are obliged to submit their applications and business plans together with other requested documentation to the IPARD Agency.

8.6.15. Geographical scope of the measure

This measure applies in rural areas as defined in the programme chapter 3.1.

8.7. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

8.7.1. Legal basis

- *Article 2 (1) of IPA Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 March 2014 laying down common rules and procedures for the implementation of the Union's instruments for financing external action.*
- *Article 27 (1) (9) of the Sectoral Agreement*
- *Annex 4 of the Sectoral Agreement*

8.7.2. Rationale

The measure covers the provision of technical assistance and supports costs associated with implementation of the IPARD Programme.

8.7.3. General objectives

The objectives of this measure are to assist implementation and monitoring of the program and its possible subsequent modification.

8.7.3.1. Specific objectives

In support of implementation and monitoring of the programme, the specific objectives include:

- Support for monitoring of the programme;
- Support to adequate flow of information and publicity;
- Support to studies, visits and seminars;
- Support for external expertise;
- Support for evaluation of the programme;
- Support to potential Local Action Groups and preparation for the LEADER measure of the IPARD Programme;

8.7.4. Support for the national rural development network Linkage to other IPARD measures in the programme and to national measures

This measure will provide coverage of technical assistance needs for all the measures of the programme.

8.7.5. Recipients

The recipient of activities under the measure of Technical Assistance is the Managing Authority of the IPARD Programme.

8.7.6. Common eligibility criteria

Eligible expenditure is based on real costs which are linked to the implementation of the financed operation and must relate to payments effected by the final recipient, supported by receipted invoices or accounting documents of equivalent probative value¹².

All projects must be procured in accordance with the rules for external aid of the Commission contained in the Financial Regulation. For this purpose the application of PRAG could be adapted to the specificities of the beneficiary country. However, public procurement may be conducted on behalf of the final beneficiary by a centralized competent public authority.

For this measure, actions financed or foreseen to be financed within twinning covenants or other projects supported under other IPA components will not be eligible.

Technical assistance to support the establishment up of management and control systems is eligible prior to the initial conferral of management "entrustment of budget implementation tasks", for expenditure incurred after 1 January 2014.

Eligible expenditure shall be reported on in the context of the annual report.

8.7.7. Specific eligibility criteria (per sector)

N/A.

8.7.8. Eligible expenditure

- a) Expenditures on meetings of the Monitoring Committee, including costs of all experts and other participants, where their presence is considered to be necessary to ensure the effective work of the Committee;
- b) Other expenditures necessary to discharge responsibilities of the Monitoring Committee which falls under the following categories:
 - expert assistance to consider and review programme baselines and indicators
 - experts to assist or advise the Monitoring Committee concerning implementation and functioning of the monitoring arrangements;

¹² 'accounting document of equivalent probative value' means any document submitted to prove that the book entry gives a true and fair view of the actual transaction in accordance with current accountancy law

- c) Expenditure associated with meetings and ancillary tasks of working groups;
- d) Expenditure on information and publicity campaigns, including costs of printing and distribution);
- e) Expenditure on translation and interpretation at the request of the Commission, not including those required pursuant to the application of the framework, sectoral and financing agreements;
- f) Expenditure associated with visits and seminars. Each visit and seminar shall require the submission of a timely written report to the Monitoring Committee;
- g) Expenditure associated with the preparation or streamlining of implementation of measures in the programme to ensure their effectiveness, including those measures which application is foreseen at a later stage;
- h) Expenditure associated with “Acquisition of skills” to prepare potential LAGs for the implementation of the measure “Implementation of local development strategies – “LEADER approach””;
- i) Expenditure for evaluations of the programme;
- j) Expenditure associated with the establishment and operation of a national network supporting the coordination of activities preparing and implementing local rural development strategies. This can also cover expenditure associated with the future establishment of national rural development network in line with the EU rules for member states as well as the expenditure linked to participation in the European Network for Rural Development;
- k) Expenditure on the level of salary support for MA and IA employees which takes into account remuneration levels on the labour market in order to retain staff and build/keep know-how in the administration. Introduction of this expenditure can only be done after prior approval of the Commission and may be limited in time;
- l) Expenditure for supply of the necessary software, hardware, specialized and office equipment, and materials in order to increase the quality and effectiveness of the performance of the Monitoring Committee;
- m) Expenditure associated with the streamlining of specific parts of the management and control system, with the objective to increase effectiveness and efficiency through short term specific activities.

8.7.9. Selection criteria

N/A.

8.7.10. Aid intensity and EU contribution rate

Aid intensity, expressed as the share of public support in the eligible expenditures amounts up to 100%, where the EU contribution rate is 85%. Pre-financing may be provided from the national contribution, but is in no case considered as costs incurred to be reimbursed by the Commission.

8.7.11. Budget 2014-2020 for the measure “Technical assistance”

| Year | Total | | EU | | National | |
|--------------|------------------|-----|------------------|----|----------------|----|
| | EUR | % | EUR | % | EUR | % |
| 2014 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2015 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2016 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2017 | 1,176,471 | 100 | 1,000,000 | 85 | 176,471 | 15 |
| 2018 | 1,705,882 | 100 | 1,450,000 | 85 | 255,882 | 15 |
| 2019 | 1,176,471 | 100 | 1,000,000 | 85 | 176,471 | 15 |
| 2020 | 1,176,471 | 100 | 1,000,000 | 85 | 176,471 | 15 |
| Total | 5,235,295 | | 4,450,000 | | 785,295 | |

8.7.12. Indicators and targets

| Indicator | Target value |
|--|--------------|
| Number of promotion materials for general information of all interested parties (leaflets, brochures etc.) | 9,424 |
| Number of publicity campaigns | 142 |
| Number of workshops, conferences, seminars | 283 |
| Number of experts assignments supported | 37 |
| Number of meetings of the Monitoring Committee | 12 |
| Number of studies on elaboration and implementation of Programme measures | 70 |
| Number of rural networking actions supported | 42 |
| Number of potential LAGs supported | 61 |

8.7.13. Administrative procedure

The Managing Authority shall each year draw up a provisional action plan for the operations envisaged under the Technical Assistance measure which shall be submitted to the IPARD Monitoring Committee for agreement. The contracts should be granted after following the appropriate external aid public procurement procedures and should in that way respect the main Treaty principle such as: transparency, proportionality, equal treatment, non-discrimination and should ensure sound financial management (value for money).

8.7.14. Geographical scope of the measure

N/A.

8.7.15. Transitional arrangements

Technical assistance actions supported under the programming period 2014-2020 may concern also subsequent programming periods. Therefore, the technical assistance allocated for the programming period 2014-2020 may be used to facilitate e.g. the preparation for the programming period post 2020.

9. NATIONAL RURAL DEVELOPMENT NETWORK

The process of stimulating the interest of all stakeholders involved in rural development for the preparation of the National Rural Network in Serbia started with the establishment of the Association “Network for Rural Development of Serbia”. The association is a voluntary, non-governmental and non-profit organization, based on the free association of natural persons or legal entities, established to improve the quality of life and balance regional development in rural areas of Serbia.

The Association’s area of activity is the territory of the Republic of Serbia and members of the Rural Development Network of Serbia are 15 regional NGO Associations covering the whole territory of Serbia.

The vision of the Network: Evenly developed Serbia where rural areas are a desirable place to live, where people contribute, with their work and activities, to the conservation, development and improvement of all potentials, values and advantages that rural communities have.

The mission of the Network: The Network has a purpose to provide support to stakeholders in rural development, through identification, initiation, promotion and networking of participants, potentials and advantages, which contribute to strengthening of regional development and improvement of the quality of life in rural communities.

Values of the Network: The Network will base its work on the principles of voluntariness, democracy, openness, equal opportunity, gender equality, transparency, implementation of best practices and compliance with all local features that are present in rural communities in Serbia.

The key areas for achieving the vision

1. Strengthening the capacity and sustainability of the organization;
2. Improving visibility and identity of the organization;
3. Improving information-service provisions for target groups;
4. Active involvement in planning and implementation of the rural development measures;
5. Strengthening partnerships with international organizations.

The basic concept of operation of the Network:

- Improvement of overall capacities to work on the activities carried out in the field of rural development and agricultural support, including information which are important for rural areas and concern the development policies of agriculture and villages, as well as other state and European level policies which are relevant to the population;

- Establishment of functional cooperation with institutions at international, national, regional and local levels with emphasis on the MAEP and the existing rural networks abroad;
- Organizing and conducting training, informing events, seminars for rural people and other stakeholders in rural development;
- Strengthening and formalizing links with institutions at the local level and development joint actions related to rural development, with objective to ensuring full equality between all rural areas concerning the use of state budget funds;
- Promotion of the LEADER approach and starting the initiative to form local action groups, with the involvement of all stakeholders from the public, civil and commercial sectors;
- Starting the initiatives in cooperation with local governments, associations and all other interested parties for the preparation of local and regional rural development strategies;
- Identifying and promoting good practices and successful initiatives throughout Serbia and Europe, in order to acquire knowledge and encourage creativity and new ideas for using and developing existing rural development potentials on the local level.

Key target groups and potential members: Registered agricultural holdings in Serbia, local communities, civil society organizations, Local governments, Local action group initiatives and companies active in rural areas.

Key partners: The founders and members of the NRDS, Ministry of Agriculture and Environmental Protection, Provincial Secretariat for Agriculture, Regional Chambers of Commerce, Regional Development Agencies and Agricultural advisory services, other ministries.

Cooperation with the Ministry of Agriculture and Environmental protection:

- a) Development framework for joint action in RD policy development and implementation;
- b) Cooperation in providing opportunities for identification and further capacity building of other local stakeholders on RD related topics;
- c) Data collection from the field and assistance in promotional activities of the Ministry on the local and regional level;
- d) Supporting civil society participation in planning and implementation of the National RD policy and EU accession processes and supporting informing and consultation of local stakeholders about the National RD policy and EU accession issues.

International cooperation: The association “Network for Rural Development of Serbia” became a full member in EU PREPARE network in 2011 and it is the founder of the Balkan Rural Development Network from 2013.

The National Rural Network in Serbia will be further developed under the IPARD II Programme 2014-2020. The development of NRN will be financed under the Technical Assistance measure and the following types of expenditure will be covered:

- Operative functioning of the NRN management unit and setting up and running of operational forums of the network;
- Preparation of the action plan for the network and its implementation including organization of exchange of experience and know-how, preparation of training programmes for Leader local action groups including technical assistance for in-country and international cooperation activities by the LAGs;
- Setting up of an integrated data base and Internet portal for the network to underpin the exchange of experience and know-how and best practices;
- The rules, functions and obligations of the network should be further specified in the written statute.

10. INFORMATION ON COMPLEMENTARITY OF IPARD WITH THE MEASURES FINANCED BY OTHER (NATIONAL OR INTERNATIONAL) SOURCES

10.1. Demarcation criteria of IPARD with support under other IPA policy areas

Demarcation between IPARD and other IPA programmes is mainly achieved through eligible recipients, since the IPARD II Programme will mainly support private recipients (farmers, SMEs from agro- food sectors, etc.) while other IPA components are mainly targeted at public institutions. Coordination and programming of the assistance at country level for all IPA components is the responsibility of the Department for Planning, Programming, Monitoring and Reporting on EU Funds and Development Assistance within the Serbian European Integration Office (SEIO). SEIO coordinates planning and use of the European funds, donations and other forms of foreign development aid. The Deputy Prime Minister for European Integration fulfils the role of the aid coordinator. Other donor coordination capacities at central level include high-level Commission for Programming and Management of EU Funds and Development Assistance and Sector Working Groups, where the IPARD MA has its representatives.

Sector Working Groups (SWGs) are the main mechanism for coordination of development assistance at national level. SWGs were established in 2010 with the objective to ensure aid effectiveness in the following areas: rule of law; public administration; civil society, media and culture; competitiveness; human resource development; transport; environment and energy; and agriculture and rural development. The governing principle for each of the SWGs is to assure and assist implementation of national strategic objectives and programmes in line with defined sector needs and priorities.

Regarding the demarcation criteria for the LEADER measure with cross border cooperation (CBC), the details of control will be defined in the preparation for accreditation of the measure and will be linked to strengthening of control mechanism within the CBC Steering Committee and submission of written statements of recipients.

10.2. Complementarity of IPARD with other financial instruments

Another institutional mechanism for coordination is the Aid Coordination Group for Agriculture. It is established based on the Donor Coordination Rules of Procedures document. These rules of procedures are based on the document “Setting up a more effective aid coordination mechanism in Serbia”.

Tasks of the Aid Coordination Group are as follows:

1. Coordination and alignment of donor support and strategies;
2. Analysis of sector situation and recommendations for sector development;
3. Discussion of support strategies;
4. Definition/setting of expected results of the group (annual, semi-annual or quarter);
5. Identification of weaknesses and problems during process of programming and implementation of donor assistance and proposal of measures for their elimination;
6. Preparation of inputs for the Sector Working Groups;
7. Cooperation with the macro-regional strategies coordinators.

Activities of Secretariat of the Aid Coordination Group are performed by the lead national institution - MAEP which guarantees to avoid double funding.

Another instrument that prevents additional co-financing of IPARD measures is provided through the Law on Agriculture and Rural Development, *Official Gazette No. 41/09**, Article 14. According to this article, all municipalities which plan to have support for agriculture and rural development, must obtain approval of the MAEP prior to its introduction. These approvals are issued by the MA, securing the insight in to other means of support to RD and to prevent overlapping to IPARD measures.

10.2.1. Complementarity with the Area Based Development approach

In the context of the SEE2020 Strategy, the EU should help countries in the Western Balkans to better respond to market signals, integrate the agriculture in expanding regional and international markets, improve efficiency and provide alternative jobs outside agriculture. Regional cooperation and exchanging best practices are an efficient way of promoting rural development, in particular in border areas which need to be better interconnected with the neighbouring regions. These challenges would be best tackled following a comprehensive approach based for instance on the concept of Area Based Development (ABD).

There is a particular need to foster sustainable local development and increasing the prosperity of people and communities in remote and rural border areas which are often lagging behind economically. Over the years, border regions have turned into marginalised peripheries, where access to markets is limited, knowledge and technology transfer from the core difficult, and demographic indicators deteriorating. However, in many of those areas a considerable potential exists, which, if unleashed, would reverse the trend and lead to an increase in rural prosperity. Sustainable development of targeted border areas would foster employment and contribute to furthering regional cooperation and good neighbourly relations.

The ABD signifies an all-inclusive approach to the socio-economic development of the territories covering the less favoured local communities in border areas. Over recent years, preparatory work for implementation of the approach was supported by the European Commission and carried out by the Regional Rural Development Standing Working Group (SWG). So far, stakeholders were mobilized and priorities were set in four regions in the Western Balkans and preparatory work in the two is ongoing. Several municipalities in Serbia are part of Drina - Tara, Drina - Sava areas where ABD approach is being facilitated.

Needs and priorities identified under the ABD to a large extent, in a form of projects, will be submitted for funding by the relevant Cross-Border Cooperation programmes. However, in order to achieve a meaningful change in the selected areas, compilation of all sources of funding, in many cases complemented by regulatory action by the country and local authorities, is necessary. In this respect, implementation of IPARD in those areas will also play a significant role. Therefore, an effort should be made to ensure that IPARD contributes towards ABD and that there are synergies between different instruments contributing towards ABD objectives.

10.3. Demarcation criteria and complementarity of IPARD measures with national policy

There is a need for demarcation criteria between the New National Programme for Rural Development 2015- 2020 and IPARD II measures.

Serbia assures that all measures are designed in line with the IPARD II rules. During the examination of the eligibility and the selection of the individual projects of the IPARD II agency, the given demarcation criteria will be checked and double financing will be excluded.

In the light of the reform of the CAP at EU-level and the recently conducted Serbian Agriculture Census, the MAEP developed a new Strategy for Agriculture and Rural Development 2014 to 2024. The Strategy gives an up-dated overview of the main objectives for the most relevant agricultural sectors and rural development. Additionally, main measures were identified that will support further development of the sectors concerned in the coming period. In line with this Strategy the New National Programme for Rural Development 2015- 2020 was prepared. The New National Programme (awaiting adoption by the Government) will provide tools and concrete support measures to achieve quality standards in food production and processing as well as improvements in conservation and protection of environment and animal welfare.

In 2011, MAEP established the National Council for RD in order to secure good coordination and communication with other relevant ministries, institutions and stakeholders. One of the main goals is to prevent double financing and over lapping in funding of the RD project and programmes.

Demarcation, between IPARD and NPRD will be provided through different criteria for recipients of support. IPARD programme will mainly support viable agricultural holding and private recipients (farmers, SMEs from agro-food sectors etc.), while other national measures are mainly addressed to help smaller agricultural holdings to increase their

production and has focus on diversification of agricultural and non-agricultural economy, excluding the support to tourism which is foreseen under the IPARD II Programme. Households above the IPARD II limits, in measure 8.2. will be eligible only for investment in manure management or for on-farm investment in energy production from renewable sources. Large companies are not considered for support neither from the national budget nor from the IPARD II Programme.

The IPARD II and NPRD programmes are complementary. The implementation of NPRD will start together with implementation of IPARD II Programme. In the table below, the demarcation criteria between IPARD II and NPRD measures are presented. The demarcation criteria for the milk sector in the measure "Investments in physical assets of agricultural holdings" is minimum and/or maximum number of milk cows at the end of the investment. Similarly, the demarcation criteria for the meat sector in the same measure is minimum and /or maximum number of cattle, sheep, goats, pigs or chicken at end of the investment. The demarcation criteria for the fruit and vegetable sector are minimum and /or maximum of the land surface or the capacity of greenhouses. Investments in grape production are foreseen only in the NPRD. In the context of agri-environmental-climate and organic farming measures, IPARD Programme will support only organic producers involved in crop production (cereals, oil crops, vegetable, fruit or grape production and production of aromatic/medicinal plants), while organic livestock production will be subject of support in NPRD.

Investments in physical assets concerning processing and marketing of agricultural and fishery products as well as rural tourism and LEADER measure will be provided exclusively through the IPARD II Programme.

Table 24: Demarcation and complementarity of IPARD Programme with NPRD

| Measure | | IPARD | NPRD |
|---|-------------|--|--|
| Investments in physical assets of agricultural holdings | Milk sector | <p>RECIPIENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agricultural holdings with minimum 20 up to maximum 300 cows at the end of the investment <p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Investment in construction and/or in reconstruction and/or in equipment of facilities of stables for milk cows, including equipment facilities for milk production like milking machines, on-farm milk cooling and storage facilities on farm premises; in facilities and equipment for waste management, waste water treatment, air pollution prevention measures, in construction and/or in reconstruction of manure storage capacities including specific equipment of facilities for handling and usage of animal feed and manure, like manure reservoirs, specialized manure transportation equipment; - Investment in farm mechanisation (including tractors up to 100 kW) and equipment - larger specialized dairy farms (more than 300 cows) are only eligible for manure management and benefit so from the support investments related to manure storing and handling standards - Investments on-farm in energy production from renewable sources | <p>RECIPIENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agricultural holdings with less than 1-19 cows at the end of the investment. No specific criteria for investments in the milk sector for goats and sheep. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agricultural holdings with 0 - 100 heads of breeding cattle, with the precondition of having minimum of 3 heads of breeding cattle at the end of the investment (for purchase of breeding animals). No specific criteria for investments in the milk sector for purchase of goats and sheep. <p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Purchase of animals (dairy cows, sheep and goats); - Investments in construction/extension /adaptation /modernization and/or in equipment of facilities of stables for milk cows including equipment facilities for milk production (for milking in outdoor or indoor system, cooling and storage facilities); - Investments in construction/ extension/ adaptation/modernization of facilities for animal feed storing and/or in equipment/ mechanization for preparation, handling, distribution and storage of feed and fodder on the farm; - Investments in construction/extension /adaptation /modernization of facilities for handling, storage and processing of manure and/or in machinery/ equipment for handling, storage and application of manure; |
| | Milk sector | <p>RECIPIENT</p> <p>Agricultural holdings with more than 300 cows at beginning of investment</p> <p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Construction and/or in reconstruction of manure storage capacities and/or in specific equipment and mechanisation of facilities for handling and usage of manure - Investments on-farm in energy production from renewable sources | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Construction/expansion/adaptation of milking facilities; - Purchase of equipment for milking or closed system of milking in a free range and tied up housing; - Purchase of portable milking equipment; - Purchase of equipment for milk cooling and storage |

| | | |
|-------------|--|--|
| Meat sector | <p>RECIPIENT</p> <p>- Agricultural holdings with a total capacity of minimum 20 and up to maximum 1,000 cattle and/or minimum 150 and up to maximum 1,000 sheep and/orand goats, or minimum 30 up to 400 sows, and/or minimum 100 and up to maximum 10,000 fattening pigs and/or minimum 4,000 and up to maximum of 50,000 broiler chickens per tour, at the end of investment are eligible for the following:</p> <p>SUPPORT</p> <p>- Investment in construction and/or in reconstruction and/or in equipment of facilities of stables, in facilities and equipment for waste management, waste water treatment, air pollution prevention measures, in construction and/or in reconstruction of manure storage capacities including specific equipment of facilities for handling and usage of animal feed and manure, like manure reservoirs, specialized manure transportation equipment;</p> <p>- Investment in farm mechanisation (including tractors up to 100 KW) and equipment</p> <p>- -Investments on-farm in energy production from renewable sources</p> | <p>RECIPIENT</p> <p>- Agricultural holdings with 1-19 heads of breeding cattle and/or 1-149 heads of breeding sheep and goats and/or 1-29 heads of breeding sows and 1,000-3,999 broiler chickens at the end of investment</p> <p>- Agricultural holdings with 0 - 100 heads of breeding cattle, or 0 - 500 heads of breeding sheep and goats, or 0- 150 heads of breeding sows, with the precondition of having minimum of 3 heads of breeding cattle, or 10 heads of breeding sheep and goats, or 5 heads of breeding sows at the end of investment (for purchase of breeding animals)</p> <p>SUPPORT</p> <p>- Purchase of breeding animals for meat production (cattle, sheep, goats and pigs);</p> <p>-Construction/extension/adaptation/modernization of facilities/premises for the storage of feed and fodder (hay, silage, haylage);</p> <p>- Purchase of equipment and machinery for the preparation, handling and distribution of feed and fodder (hay, silage, haylage) on the farm, electrical enclosures and thermal - drinkers;</p> <p>- Construction/extension/renovation/modernization of facilities for the handling, storage and application of manure in the case of a closed posture on the farm and the purchase of equipment/machinery for this purpose,</p> <p>- Construction/extension/renovation/modernization boxes for sow, farrow rearing of piglets</p> |
| Meat sector | <p>RECIPIENT</p> <p>Agricultural holdings with more than 1,000 cattle or more than 1,000 sheep and goats or more than 10,000 pigs or more than 50,000 broiler chickens per tour, at beginning of investment</p> <p>SUPPORT</p> <p>- Construction and/or in reconstruction of manure storage capacities and/or in specific equipment and mechanisation of facilities for handling and usage of manure.</p> <p>- Investments on-farm in energy production from renewable sources</p> | <p>- Construction/extension/renovation/modernization of facilities for the handling, storage and application of manure in the case of a closed posture on the farm and the purchase of equipment/machinery for this purpose,</p> <p>- Construction/extension/renovation/modernization boxes for sow, farrow rearing of piglets</p> |
| Fruit | <p>RECIPIENT</p> <p>- Agricultural holdings with minimum 2 and up to maximum 20 ha of soft fruit and minimum 5 and up to maximum 100 ha of other fruit;</p> <p>SUPPORT</p> | <p>RECIPIENT</p> <p>- Agricultural holdings with less than 2 ha of soft fruit or less than 5 ha of other fruit / grape production</p> <p>SUPPORT</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Purchase of tractors (up to 100 kw), machinery and equipment - Construction/extension/renovation/modernization of greenhouses (covered with glass and/ or plastic) as well as the purchase of equipment and/or materials for fruit production, and horticulture and nursery production; - Investment in on-farm systems for protection against hail (including computer equipment) for orchards - Investment in on-farm irrigation systems using groundwater (extraction from springs, wells) and surface water (withdrawn from rivers, lakes and reservoirs) and construction of system, including pumps, pipes, valves and sprinklers; - Investment in establishing and restructuring of fruit plantations (purchase of perennial seedlings material - except annual plants), including soil preparation; - Investment in construction and/or in reconstruction and/or in equipment of facilities for storage facilities for fruit; including ULO capacities <p>RECIPIENT</p> <p>Agricultural holdings, registered in the Register of producers of fruit, grapevine and hop planting</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Investments in new or renovation of existing plantations (field clearing and planting with supporting equipment) and into propagating plantations of fruit trees and vines, as well as installing the nets, facilities for conservation and multiplication of planting material; - Investments in zoning in the fruit sector: designation of regions and conditions for producing of high-quality and competitive fruits; - Purchase of fruit - vineyard machinery for deep tilling, rippers and machines for pruning, clearing and harvesting; - Purchase of machinery and equipment for sowing, planting, crop protection and irrigation for fruit and vine production, production of planting material (including nursery and floriculture) in the open field (purchase of machinery for fruit - vine production; purchase of precision machines for seeding, transplanting seedlings machine, high-quality sprayers or atomizers for disease, pest and weed control; systems with micro sprinklers for protection of orchards, vineyards and nurseries from freezing, anti-hail nets and related equipment; purchase of drip irrigation systems, purchase of plastic sheeting, agro-textiles and sprinkler for irrigation); - Construction/expansion/renovation of greenhouses and provision of equipment and/or materials for production of berries, nursery production, certification and clonal selection and horticulture in greenhouses (purchase of greenhouse elements, high quality cover for polytunnels and greenhouses, systems for heating of polytunnels, systems for artificial light, irrigation and fertilization of water-soluble fertilizers and tables for the production of nursery plants); - Construction/expansion/renovation of capacities for storage of fruits, grapes and seedlings (construction of cold storage, storage facilities for storage, preparation and shipment of seedlings); construction and equipping of centers for collection and preparation of fruits and grapes for the market (packaging equipment and equipment for washing, polishing, cleaning, sorting, evaluating and packaging of products, and purchase of pallets for long-term product storage) <p>RECIPIENT</p> |
|--|---|---|

| | | |
|------------|---|---|
| | <p>material in accordance with the Law on Planting Material (“Official Gazette of RS” No. 18/05 and 30/10) with minimum of 0.5 ha and up to maximum of 50 ha of fruit mother plantation at the end of the investment are eligible for:</p> <p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Investing in on-farm irrigation systems using groundwater (extraction from springs, wells) and surface water (withdrawn from rivers, lakes and reservoirs) and construction of irrigation systems including pumps, pipes, valves and sprinklers to savings in quantity of consumed water; - Planting new mother plantations of higher phytosanitary categories of planting material; - Construction of facilities for conservation and multiplication of planting (nursery) material and purchase of equipment/devices/materials (including plant material) for nursery production, as well as storage facilities for preserving planting material. | <p>Agricultural holdings, registered in the Register of producers of fruit, grapevine and hop planting material in accordance with the Law on Planting Material (“Official Gazette of RS” No. 18/05 and 30/10) with maximum of 0.5 ha of fruit mother plantation at the end of the investment are eligible for:</p> <p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Investing in on-farm irrigation systems using groundwater (extraction from springs, wells) and surface water (withdrawn from rivers, lakes and reservoirs) and construction of irrigation systems including pumps, pipes, valves and sprinklers to savings in quantity of consumed water; - Planting new mother plantations of higher phytosanitary categories of planting material; - Construction of facilities for conservation and multiplication of planting (nursery) material and purchase of equipment/devices/materials (including plant material) for nursery production, as well as storage facilities for preserving planting material. |
| Vegetables | <p>RECIPIENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agricultural holdings with capacity of at least 0,5ha up to 5ha of greenhouses and minimum 3 ha and up to maximum 100 ha open space production of vegetables at the end of investment, except for storage facilities where capacities have to be met at the beginning of investment <p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Purchase of tractors (up to 100 kw), machinery and equipment - Construction/extension/renovation/modernization of greenhouses (covered with glass and/ or plastic) as well as the purchase of equipment and/or materials for vegetable production and harvesting, and horticulture and nursery production -Investment in on-farm irrigation systems (open field) for vegetables using groundwater (extraction from springs, wells) and surface water (withdrawn from rivers, lakes and reservoirs) and construction of system, including pumps, pipes, valves and sprinklers; | <p>RECIPIENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Agricultural holdings with capacity less than 0.5ha of greenhouses for vegetable/floriculture/nursery production or less than 3ha vegetable /floriculture production in the open field. <p>SUPPORT</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | <p>- Investment in construction and/or in reconstruction and/or in equipment of facilities for storage facilities for vegetables; including ULO capacities</p> | <p>- Purchase of machinery and equipment for sowing, planting, crop protection and irrigation for vegetable production (including nursery and floriculture) in the open field (purchase of precision machines for seeding, transplanting seedlings machine, high-quality sprayers or atomizers for disease, pest and weed control; anti-hail nets and related equipment; purchase of drip irrigation systems, purchase of plastic sheeting, agro-textiles and sprinkler for irrigation);</p> <p>- Construction/expansion/renovation of greenhouses and provision of equipment and/or materials for vegetable production nursery production, certification and clonal selection and horticulture in greenhouses (purchase of greenhouse elements, high quality cover for polytunnels and greenhouses, systems for heating of polytunnels, systems for artificial light, irrigation and fertilization of water-soluble fertilizers and tables for the production of nursery plants);</p> <p>- Construction/expansion/renovation of capacities for storage vegetables (construction of cold storage, storage facilities for storage, preparation and shipment of seedlings); construction and equipping of centers for collection and preparation vegetables for the market (packaging equipment and equipment for washing, polishing, cleaning, sorting, evaluating and packaging of products, and purchase of pallets for long-term product storage)</p> |
| Other crops (cereals, oil crops, sugar beet) | <p>RECIPIENT</p> <p>- Agriculture holdings which have minimum 2 and up to maximum 50 ha of land under other crops;</p> <p>SUPPORT</p> <p>- Purchase of tractors (up to 100 kw), machinery and mechanization (except combines) and construction of storing facilities and equipment;</p> <p>RECIPIENT</p> <p>- Agriculture holdings with 50-100 ha of land under other crops;</p> | <p>RECIPIENT</p> <p>- Agricultural holdings which have less than 2 ha of land under crop sector;</p> <p>SUPPORT</p> <p>- Purchase of machinery for soil cultivation;</p> <p>- Purchase of seeding machines;</p> <p>- Purchase of sprayers for fertilization and plant protection i.e. control of diseases, pests and weeds;</p> <p>- Construction/expansion/renovation of dryers for medicinal herbs and spices</p> <p>RECIPIENT</p> | |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|--|
| | | <p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Purchase of mechanization and machinery (except combines) for agriculture production and construction of storing facilities and equipment; <p>RECIPIENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agriculture holdings which have more than 100 ha of land under crops; <p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Construction/ extension/ renovation/ modernization and equipping of storing facilities; | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agricultural holdings which have minimum 2 and up to maximum 50 ha of land under other crops; <p>SUPPORT</p> <p>Purchase of machinery and mechanisation (not included in LEE of IPARD Program)</p> |
| Egg sector | <p>RECIPIENT</p> <p>Agricultural holdings with a total capacity of the facility with the minimum of 5,000 and the maximum of 200,000 laying hens in exploitation, i.e. agricultural holdings that have a registered facility for the production of the parent flocks of light breeding stock lines, i.e. laying hens breeding, at the end of the investment, are eligible for following:</p> <p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - construction and/or equipment of: <p>facilities for laying hens breeding, production and storage of eggs, as well as animal feed; waste management facilities, wastewater treatment, air pollution prevention measures, in construction of manure storage capacities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - investment in farm mechanization (including tractors up to 100 kW) and equipment: - investments on-farm in energy production from renewable sources <p>RECIPIENT</p> <p>Agricultural holdings with a total capacity of facility with more than 200,000 laying hens, at the beginning of the investment are eligible for the following:</p> <p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - investment in re-construction related only to replacement of old unenriched cages and or equipment for meeting EU standards regarding animal welfare, facilities and equipment for waste management, wastewater treatment, air pollution | <p>RECIPIENT</p> <p>Agricultural holdings with a total capacity of the facility with the maximum of 5,000 laying hens in exploitation, i.e. agricultural holdings that have a registered facility for the production of the parent flocks of light breeding stock lines, i.e. laying hens breeding, at the end of the investment, are eligible for following:</p> <p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - construction and/or equipment of: <p>facilities for laying hens breeding, production and storage of eggs, as well as animal feed; waste management facilities, wastewater treatment, air pollution prevention measures, in construction of manure storage capacities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - investment in farm mechanization and equipment: - investments on-farm in energy production from renewable sources | |

| | | | |
|--------------------|---|---|--|
| | | <p>prevention measures, construction of manure storage capacities;</p> <p>- investments on-farm in energy production from renewable sources</p> | |
| Viticulture sector | <p>RECIPIENT</p> <p>Agricultural holdings registered in the Vineyard Register in accordance with the Law on Wine ("Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia", No. 41/09 and 93/12) with a minimum of 2 ha and a maximum of 100 ha of vineyards at the end of the investment, registered in the Vineyard Register, are eligible for:</p> <p>SUPPORT</p> <p>- Setting up new, restructuring and conversion of the existing vineyards;</p> <p>- Purchase of tractors for orchards and vineyards (up to 100 kW), plant protection, cutting, tarping and harvesting machines and machines for other agro-technical and amphenotechnical measures and equipment;</p> <p>- Investing in on-farm systems for protection against hail (including computer equipment);</p> <p>- Investing in on-farm irrigation systems using groundwater (extraction from springs, wells) and surface water (withdrawn from rivers, lakes and reservoirs) and construction of irrigation systems including pumps, pipes, valves and sprinklers to replace old inefficient systems and contribute to savings in quantity of consumed water;</p> <p>- Investing in the construction and/or reconstruction and/or equipping of storage facilities for table grapes, including ULO capacities.</p> <p>RECIPIENT</p> <p>Agricultural holdings registered in the Register of producers of fruit, grapevine and hop planting material in accordance with the Law on Planting Material ("Official Gazette of RS" No. 18/05 and 30/10) with minimum of 0.5 ha and up to maximum of 50 ha of grapevine mother plantation are eligible for:</p> <p>SUPPORT</p> <p>- Investing in on-farm protection systems against hail for mother plantations, nursery plantations, vineyards and other (including computer equipment);</p> | <p>RECIPIENT</p> <p>Agricultural holdings registered in the Vineyard Register in accordance with the Law on Wine ("Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia", No. 41/09 and 93/12) with a maximum of 2 ha of vineyards at the end of the investment, registered in the Vineyard Register are eligible for:</p> <p>SUPPORT</p> <p>- Setting up new, restructuring and conversion of the existing vineyards;</p> <p>- Purchase of plant protection, cutting, tarping and harvesting machines and machines for other agro-technical and amphenotechnical measures and equipment;</p> <p>- Investing in on-farm systems for protection against hail (including computer equipment);</p> <p>- Investing in on-farm irrigation systems using groundwater (extraction from springs, wells) and surface water (withdrawn from rivers, lakes and reservoirs) and construction of irrigation systems including pumps, pipes, valves and sprinklers to replace old inefficient systems and contribute to savings in quantity of consumed water;</p> <p>- Investing in the construction and/or reconstruction and/or equipping of storage facilities for table grapes, including ULO capacities.</p> <p>RECIPIENT</p> <p>Agricultural holdings registered in the Register of producers of fruit, grapevine and hop planting material in accordance with the Law on Planting Material ("Official Gazette of RS" No. 18/05 and 30/10) with maximum of 0.5 ha of grapevine mother plantation are eligible for:</p> <p>SUPPORT</p> <p>- Investing in on-farm protection systems against hail for mother plantations, nursery plantations, vineyards and other (including computer equipment);</p> | |

| | | | |
|---|-------------|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Investing in on-farm irrigation systems using groundwater (extraction from springs, wells) and surface water (withdrawn from rivers, lakes and reservoirs) and construction of irrigation systems including pumps, pipes, valves and sprinklers to replace old inefficient systems and contribute to savings in quantity of consumed water; - Planting new mother plantations of higher phytosanitary categories of planting material; - Construction / extension / adaptation of facilities for conservation and multiplication of planting (nursery) material and purchase of equipment/devices/materials (including plant material) for nursery production, as well as storage facilities for preserving planting material. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Investing in on-farm irrigation systems using groundwater (extraction from springs, wells) and surface water (withdrawn from rivers, lakes and reservoirs) and construction of irrigation systems including pumps, pipes, valves and sprinklers to replace old inefficient systems and contribute to savings in quantity of consumed water; - Planting new mother plantations of higher phytosanitary categories of planting material; - Construction / extension / adaptation of facilities for conservation and multiplication of planting (nursery) material and purchase of equipment/devices/materials (including plant material) for nursery production, as well as storage facilities for preserving planting material. |
| Investments in physical assets concerning processing and marketing of agricultural and fishery products | Milk sector | <p>RECIPIENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Viable entrepreneurs and legal entities/enterprises for milk processing with capacity between 3,000 l -100,000 l of collected milk per day on average <p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Construction/extension/modernisation of milk collection centres and milk processing enterprises, milk storage and cooling equipment, specialised milk transportation equipment, equipment and technology for improvement and control of quality and hygiene, including simple test equipment to distinguish between poor and good quality milk, physical investments for establishment of food safety systems (GHP, GMP, HACCP), IT hardware and software for milk registry and monitoring, control and management, investment in energy saving technologies, environmental protection, equipment and facilities for processing of intermediate products and wastes; treatment and elimination of wastes, specialised milk transport vehicles, | <p>Support to Investments in physical assets concerning processing and marketing of agricultural and fishery products will be provided only through IPARD II Programme.</p> <p>NPRD measure for diversification of rural economy includes processing on agricultural holding.</p> |
| | Meat sector | <p>RECIPIENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Entrepreneurs and legal entities/enterprises - slaughtering facilities with a minimum capacity of 8 working hours of: 10 cattle or 50 pigs or 50 sheep and goats or 5,000 poultry per day <p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Construction / renovation of slaughterhouses/ facilities for meat processing and cooling storage | <p>Support to Investments in physical assets concerning processing and marketing of agricultural and fishery products will be provided through IPARD Programme</p> |

| | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|
| | rooms, equipment for slaughterhouses, technology and equipment for treatment of waste and by-products, physical investments in establishment of food safety systems (GHP, GMP, HACCP), IT hardware and software for monitoring, control and management, investment in renewable energy (construction of installation and equipment) primarily focused on own needs. | |
| Fruits and Vegetables | <p>RECIPIENT</p> <p>Only micro, small and medium size enterprises for processing of fruits and vegetables</p> <p>SUPPORT</p> <p>- Construction/extension/modernisation of premises used for the food processing activity, to comply with the relevant EU standards, facilities and equipment for processing of fruit and vegetables (preserving pasteurizing, drying, freezing, etc), packaging and labelling equipment, including filling lines, wrappers, labelers and other specialised equipment, investment in renewable energy (construction of installation and equipment) primarily focused on own needs, physical investments in establishment of food safety and quality management systems (GHP, GMP, HACCP, ISO)</p> | <p>Support to Investments in physical assets concerning processing and marketing of agricultural and fishery products will be provided only through IPARD Programme.</p> <p>NPRD measure for diversification of rural economy includes processing on agricultural holding.</p> |
| Egg processing and marketing | <p>RECIPIENT</p> <p>Only micro, small and medium legal entities are eligible, as defined in the Article 6 of the Law on Accounting. The definition of micro, small and medium legal entities is given in Annex 5.</p> <p>SUPPORT</p> <p>The eligible investments for egg processing:</p> <p>-Construction facilities for egg processing, facilities.</p> <p>-packaging and storage facilities,</p> <p>- equipment for egg processing,</p> <p>-equipment for treatment of waste and by-products,</p> <p>-physical investment in establishment of food safety system(GHP, GMP, HACCP),</p> <p>- IT hardware and software for monitoring, control and management,</p> <p>-investment in renewable energy (construction of installations and equipment) primarily focused for self-consumption</p> | <p>Support to Investments in physical assets concerning processing and marketing of agricultural and fishery products will be provided only through IPARD Programme.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|------------------|--|--|
| | Grape processing | <p>RECIPIENT</p> <p>The recipients have to be registered in the Vineyard Register in accordance with the Law on Wine ("Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia", No. 41/09 and 93/12) with the maximum available capacities of annual wine production from 20.000 to 1.000.000 liters at the end of the investment registered in the Winery Register in accordance with the Law on Wine ("Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia", No. 41/09 and 93/12).</p> <p>SUPPORT</p> <p>The eligible investments for grape processing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Investment in construction and/or equipment of facilities for the processing of grapes , and storage of wine/wine products and aromatized wine products; - Investment in construction and /or equipment of tasting facilities, facilities for evaluation of characteristics and wine presentations; - Equipment, devices and vessels for the production, bottling / packaging and storing of wine/wine products and aromatized wine products and other specialized and laboratory equipment, instruments and devices; - Equipment for disinfection of workers; - Investing in renewable energy sources (construction of installations and equipment) primarily focused on own needs; - Investment in the establishment and implementation of food safety systems, quality systems and geographical indication. | <p>RECIPIENT</p> <p>The recipients have to be an agricultural holding registered in the Vineyard Register in accordance with the Law on Wine ("Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia", No. 41/09 and 93/12) with the maximum available capacities of annual wine production up to 20.000 liters at the end of the investment registered in the Winery Register in accordance with the Law on Wine ("Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia", No. 41/09 and 93/12).</p> <p>SUPPORT</p> <p>The eligible investments for grape processing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Investment in construction and/or equipment of facilities for the processing of grapes , and storage of wine/wine products and aromatized wine products; - Investment in construction and /or equipment of tasting facilities, facilities for evaluation of characteristics and wine presentations; - Equipment, devices and vessels for the production, bottling / packaging and storing of wine/wine products and aromatized wine products and other specialized and laboratory equipment, instruments and devices; - Equipment for disinfection of workers; - Investment in the establishment and implementation of food safety systems, quality systems and geographical indication |
|--|------------------|--|--|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>Diversification of rural economy</p> | <p>RECIPIENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Natural persons registered as agricultural producers in rural areas or members of the farm household diversifying on or off farm activities, - Private legal entities established or operating in rural areas in the range of micro and small sized enterprises as defined in the Law on Accounting (OG of the RS No 62/2013 and its subsequent modifications) <p>SUPPORT</p> <p>Investment in construction and/or reconstruction and/or equipping of the facilities for the provision of tourism and hospitality services, such as rooms, restaurants and other facilities, including facilities for recreation, playing, tourist camps, improving outdoors facilities (for riding, fishing in inland waters, cycling, themed trails, a riding trails) marketing costs such as a printing promotional materials, creation/maintenance of web-site.</p> | <p>Rural tourism and Old and Artistic Crafts</p> <p>RECIPIENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Natural persons engaged in the provision of catering and hospitality services in home restaurants or rural tourist households - Legal entities and entrepreneurs registered for maintenance of old and artistic crafts and handicraft and registered as agricultural producers <p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Construction, reconstruction and renovation of facilities for rural tourism as well as the procurement of equipment for the provision of catering and hospitality services in home restaurants or rural tourist households - Purchase of equipment and tools for maintenance and improvement of old and artistic crafts and handicrafts; <p>Added value by on farm processing</p> <p>RECIPIENT</p> <p>Natural persons producing small quantities of plant and animal primary products registered as agricultural holdings (excluding entrepreneurs) for investments in the sector of milk, meat, meat, fruits, vegetables, medicinal and aromatic plants.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Legal entities and entrepreneurs in the sector of wine and spirit production <p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Construction/expansion/renovation of facilities for processing; - Equipment for sampling, intake, processing, filling and packaging of products; - Equipment for cleaning, washing and disinfection (sterilization) of processing facilities; - Laboratory equipment (excluding glassware) for internal use; - Support for promotion and on-farm sale of products <p>Wine and spirits sector</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Construction expansion/renovation and |
|---|---|--|

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | | <p>equipping of facilities for production, bottling and storage of wine and spirits, and tasting rooms for wine-tourism and other forms of rural tourism, as well as the arrangement of space in the winery and distillery;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Equipment for production of wines and spirits and raw materials (glass bottles, closure caps, corks and labels); - Laboratory equipment (excluding glassware) for internal use; <p>Support for the promotion of PDO PGI products and their sale;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Construction/expansion/renovation of plants for wastewater treatment and prevention of air pollution; - Construction of plants for energy generation from renewable resources for own consumption (solar power, hydroelectric power, wind turbines, biomass power plants, exchanger pumps) |
|--|--|--|---|

| | | | |
|------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| Agro-environment | Organic farming | <p>RECIPIENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Active registered agricultural holdings- natural persons (including entrepreneurs) -Legal entities <p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support will be provided only to plant production (cereals, oil crops, vegetable, fruit or grape production and production of aromatic/ medicinal plants) that are certified as organic or are in conversion stage | <p>RECIPIENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Natural persons registered as agricultural producers , entrepreneurs, legal entities, scientific-research institutions, educational institutions and gene banks <p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “ex situ” conservation of plant genes and collections at gene banks and institutions - “in situ” conservation of plant genes on farms: <p>RECIPIENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Natural persons registered as agricultural producers , entrepreneurs, legal entities, scientific-research institutions, educational institutions and gene banks, AI centers, monasteries <p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “ex situ” conservation of farm animal genes at gene banks and AI centers - “in situ” conservation of farm animal genes on farms: <p>RECIPIENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Natural persons and legal entities registered as agricultural producers <p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Compensatory subsidies paid annually in order to cover the additional costs and foregone incomes due to the implementation of agri-environmental measures and high nature value farming (HNVF) practices <p>RECIPIENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Natural persons and legal entities registered as agricultural producers <p>SUPPORT – shall be terminated as soon as IPARD organic measure starts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Compensatory subsidies paid annually in order to cover the additional costs and foregone incomes due to the implementation organic farming practices (both in animal and plant organic farming) <p>RECIPIENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Natural persons and legal entities registered as agricultural producers |
|------------------|-----------------|---|--|

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | | <p>SUPPORT</p> <p>Soil erosion control through the following activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Establishment of measures to protect soil as natural resource and management of soil erosion; - Early sowing of winter crops and creating of appropriate grass cover in areas where the risk of erosion is greater; - Achieving a minimum of 25% coverage area before the beginning of autumn and winter erosive impact is triggered by water, wind, floods, etc.; - Establishing of grass cover strips in sensitive areas, especially on the slopes and at the plot bottoms at steeper slopes; - Leaving of crop residues on the soil surface in order to maintain the organic matter; - Wind buffers reducing the wind speed to less than 20 km/h, i.e. construction of windbreaks with a permeability of 40 - 50% and regulation of the height of stratosphere layers; - Establishing of the ridges on the land surface at an elevation of 5 - 10 cm; - Soil cultivation in land contours or across the direction of the slope of an area; - Soil cultivation by creating of specific structures for the protection from water torrents (eg. construction of terraces). <p>RECIPIENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Registered agricultural holdings; - Associations of forest owners (local, regional and national level); - Users of state forests in forest areas and national parks; - Entrepreneurs in the field of forestry conducting business in rural areas; - Managers of protected natural areas. <p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of forest areas and improving of forest management profitability; - Investments in forestry technology, processing and mobilization and marketing of forest products on the market; - Supporting the building of forest infrastructure in order to increase the availability and efficiency of the use of forest resources; - Advisory Forest Service; - Establishment of groups and organizations of manufacturers; - Support the establishment of the NATURA 2000 network; |
|--|--|--|---|

| | | | |
|--------|--|---|---|
| | | | - Support cooperation and the creation of clusters and networks in forestry |
| LEADER | | <p>RECIPIENT</p> <p>Selected LAGs</p> <p>SUPPORT starts from 2018</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Acquisition of skills, animating the inhabitants of LAG territories" for capacity building and animation of selected LAGs, - Running costs and small projects" for running the selected LAGs and implementation of small projects, - "Cooperation projects for inter territorial or transnational projects" | <p>LEADER support will be provided only through IPARD Programme. Until 2017 NPRD will support establishment of partnerships and preparations of LDS which could be used for IPARD programme.</p> <p>RECIPIENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Partnerships for Territorial Rural Development i.e. registered citizens' associations and other non-profit organizations with the status of a legal entity, if they did not use the funds of international donors or autonomous province for the development of local rural development strategies - LDS for which they are asking support for; <p>SUPPORT</p> <p>Incentives used to fund the process of designing LDSs and establishment of the partnerships for territorial rural development such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Costs incurred in the course of preparations for the setting up of partnerships; - Costs related to the elaboration and amendments of the LDSs; - Costs related to the work of the partnership; - Costs of implementation of the LDSs |

11. DESCRIPTION OF THE OPERATING STRUCTURE, INCLUDING MONITORING AND EVALUATION

11.1. Description of the operating structure and their main functions

The Operating Structure of the IPARD II Programme has been established in line with the requirements of the Art.10 (1) (c) of the FWA:

(a) the Managing Authority, being a public body and acting at national level, to be in charge of preparing and implementing the programmes, including selection of measures and publicity, coordination, evaluation, monitoring and reporting of the programme concerned and managed by a senior official with exclusive responsibilities; and

(b) the IPARD Agency with functions of a similar nature as a paying agency in a Member State in charge of publicity, selection of projects as well as authorisation, control and accounting of commitments and payments and execution of payments.

With a Decision of the Government of the Republic of Serbia N 48-200/2014 from 10 January 2014 the MAEP has been designated as the Operating Structure (OS) for the implementation of

the IPA for rural development. Within the MAEP, the Department for Rural Development has been designated for IPARD MA, while the Directorate for Payments is designated as IPARD Agency.


11.1.1. Managing Authority

The role of the MA is performed by the Department for Rural Development within MAEP:

- In accordance with Article 10 (1) of the FWA and Article 8 of the SA the Managing Authority shall be responsible for managing the IPARD II Programme in an efficient, effective and correct way. It shall be allocated the functions and responsibilities in accordance with Annex 1 of the Sectoral Agreement (SA):
 - drafting of the IPARD II Programme and any amendments to it;
 - controllability and verifiability of the measures, to be defined in the IPARD II Programme in cooperation with the IPARD Agency;
 - selection of measures under each call for applications under the IPARD II Programme and the financial allocation per measure, per call, in agreement with IPARD Agency;
 - ensuring that the appropriate national legal basis for IPARD implementation is in place and updated as necessary;
 - assisting the work of the IPARD II Monitoring Committee as defined in Article 52 of the SA, notably by providing the documents necessary for monitoring the quality of implementation of the IPARD II Programme;
 - The Managing Authority shall set up a reporting and information system to gather financial and statistical information on progress of the IPARD II programme, also on the basis of information to be provided by the IPARD Agency, and shall forward this data to the IPARD II Monitoring Committee, in accordance with arrangements agreed between Serbia and the Commission, using where possible computerised systems permitting the exchange of data with the Commission and linked to the reporting and information system to be set up by NAO;
 - The reporting and information system will contribute to the annual and final implementation reports;
 - The Managing Authority shall propose amendments of the IPARD II Programme to the Commission, with copy to the NIPAC, after consultation with the IPARD Agency, and following agreement by the IPARD II Monitoring Committee. The Managing Authority is responsible for ensuring that the relevant authorities are informed of the need to make appropriate administrative changes when such changes are required following a decision by the Commission to amend the IPARD II Programme;

- The Managing Authority shall each year draw up an action plan for the operations envisaged under the Technical Assistance measure which shall be submitted to the IPARD II Monitoring Committee for agreement;
- The Managing Authority shall draw up an evaluation plan in accordance with Article 56 of the SA. It shall be submitted to the IPARD II Monitoring Committee not later than one year after the adoption of the IPARD II Programme by the Commission. It shall report to the IPARD II Monitoring Committee and to the Commission on the progress made in implementing this plan;
- The Managing Authority shall draw up a coherent plan of visibility and communication activities in accordance with Article 24 of the FWA, which is implemented by an annual list of actions, and shall consult and inform the Commission, having taken advice from the IPARD II Monitoring Committee. The plan shall in particular show the initiatives taken and those to be taken, with regard to informing the general public about the role played by the European Union in the IPARD II Programme and its results;
- When a part of its tasks is delegated to another body, the Managing Authority shall retain full responsibility for the management and implementation of those tasks in accordance with the principle of sound financial management.

Chart 2: Organisational chart of MA



11.1.2. IPARD Agency

The role of the IPARD-Agency (PA) is performed by the Directorate for Agrarian Payments, which was officially established on October 2009. The Directorate for Agrarian Payments is responsible for agricultural subsidies and payments. Rural development measures are processed in the Directorate for Agrarian Payments directly, including the claims for payments.


The IPARD Agency shall be allocated the functions and responsibilities in accordance with Annex 1 of the Sectoral Agreement (SA).

In accordance with Article 10(1) of the FWA and Article 9 of the SA it shall be responsible for:

- providing an opinion to the Managing Authority on the controllability and verifiability of the measures in the IPARD II Programme;
- making calls for applications and publicising terms and conditions for eligibility with prior notification to the Managing Authority;
- selecting the projects to be implemented;
- laying down contractual obligations in writing between the IPARD Agency and the recipients including information on possible sanctions in the event of non-compliance with those obligations and, where necessary, the issue of approval to commence work;
- follow-up action to ensure progress of projects being implemented;
- reporting of progress of measures being implemented against indicators;
- ensuring that the recipient is made aware of the European Union's contribution to the project;
- ensuring irregularity reporting at national level;
- ensuring that the NAO, the management structure and the Managing Authority receive all information necessary for them to perform their tasks;
- ensuring compliance with the obligations concerning publicity referred to in Article 23 of the FWA.
- In respect of investments in infrastructure projects of a type that would normally be expected to generate substantial net revenue, the IPARD Agency shall assess, prior to entering into contractual arrangements with a potential recipient, whether the project is of this type. Where it can be concluded that it is, the IPARD Agency shall ensure that the public aid from all sources does not exceed 50% of total costs related to the project and considered as eligible for European Union co-financing.

The IPARD Agency shall ensure that for any project under the IPARD II Programme the accumulation of public aid granted from all sources does not exceed the maximum ceilings for public expenditure set out in Article 32 of the SA.

Chart 3: Organisational chart of the Directorate for Agrarian Payments



11.2. Description of monitoring and evaluation systems, including the envisaged composition of the Monitoring Committee

11.2.1. Monitoring

Conforming to the EU programming provisions, the monitoring function has been institutionalized by the establishment of a monitoring system within IPARD Managing Authority and IPARD Monitoring Committee.

The Managing Authority and the IPARD II Monitoring Committee shall monitor the effectiveness, efficiency and the quality of the implementation of the IPARD II Programme and report to the IPA II Monitoring Committee and to the Commission on progress of the programme measures in pursuance of Article 53 (2) of the FWA and Article 52 of the SA.

Programme monitoring shall be carried out by reference to the indicators presented in the IPARD II programme.

Data collection

The IPARD Agency shall act as monitoring data provider to the Managing Authority, responsible to provide validated and accurate data, as defined in the monitoring tables prepared by the Managing Authority. The tables are set out according to indicators and

in line with EC recommended tables for monitoring. The entire procedure will be IT based and supported with necessary software, ensuring that every step is registered properly.

For each measure a monitoring form with common indicators will be prepared and attached as an obligatory part of the application form and final payment request form. It will be the responsibility of the IPARD Agency to enter data, provided by the recipients into the monitoring data base, and assuring data quality checks. The verified data will be transferred into an agreed compatible format to the MA monitoring system, where the data will be processed and monitoring tables produced. The detailed obligations and responsibilities of the MA and IPARD Agency in respect to the monitoring, evaluation and reporting will be laid down in the Memorandum of Understanding.

Contractual obligations with recipients will stipulate responsibilities for provision of data to the IPARD Agency/Managing Authority and/or evaluators or other bodies necessary to perform monitoring and evaluation of the Programme.

Monitoring Committee

In accordance with Article 19 of the Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 447/2014, Article 53 of the Framework Agreement, an IPARD II Monitoring Committee will be established not later than 6 months after the entry into force of the first financing agreement.

In line with Article 52 of the SA the IPARD II, the Monitoring Committee:

- shall examine the results of the IPARD II Programme in particular the achievement of the targets set for the different measures and the progress on utilisation of the financial allocations to those measures. In this regard, the Managing Authority shall ensure that all relevant information in relation to the progress of measures is made available to the Monitoring Committee and the NIPAC;**
- shall periodically review progress made towards achieving the objectives set out in the IPARD II programme;**
- shall consider and approve, where appropriate, any proposal drawn up by the Managing Authority to amend the IPARD II programme to be submitted by the Managing Authority to the Commission, in copy to NIPAC;**

Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 8 (3) of SA, the IPARD II Monitoring Committee may, following consultation with the Managing Authority and the IPARD Agency, propose to the MA for submission to the Commission, with copy to the NIPAC and NAO, amendments or reviews of the IPARD II Programme to ensure the achievements of the Programme's objectives and enhance the efficiency of the assistance provided;

- shall consider and approve the annual and final implementation reports before they are sent to the NIPAC for submission to the Commission and to the NAO, with a copy to the Audit Authority;**

- shall examine the evaluations of the IPARD II Programme;
- shall consider and approve the plan of visibility and communication activities as well as any subsequent updates of the plan;
- shall be consulted on the technical assistance activities under the IPARD II Programme. It shall consider and approve each year an indicative annual action plan for the implementation of technical assistance activities including indicative amounts for information purposes.

All final documents of IPARD II Monitoring Committee meetings are made public.

Composition of Monitoring Committee

The IPARD Monitoring Committee shall be composed of representatives from relevant public authorities and bodies, appropriate economic, social and environmental partners. The number of non-governmental organisations in the IPARD Monitoring Committee shall be at least equal to the number of the members from governmental bodies and authorities. The economic, social and environmental non-governmental organisations, invited to become members of the IPARD Monitoring Committee, will be selected among the organisations, consulted during the preparation of the Programme or other relevant organisations, which are the most representative of the respective sectors. Representatives of bilateral and multilateral donor organisations, banking sector, the academia and other organisations, relevant to the IPARD programme, will be invited as observers of the IPARD Monitoring Committee.

IPARD II MC working groups may be established to address specific problems.

The IPARD II Monitoring Committee shall be chaired by a senior representative of MAEP who shall have voting rights.

The Commission, the Operating Structure, the NAO and the NIPAC shall participate in the work of the IPARD II Monitoring Committee without voting right.

The IPARD II Monitoring Committee shall adopt its rules of procedure. The IPARD II Monitoring Committee shall meet at least twice a year. Ad-hoc meetings may also be convened.

The IPARD II Monitoring Committee shall report to the IPA Monitoring Committee and may make proposals on any corrective action to ensure the achievement of the objectives of the actions and enhance the efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the IPARD assistance.

The MA will act as the Secretariat to the IPARD Monitoring Committee and assist its work by providing information and analysis and providing follow-up on its decisions.

11.2.2. Evaluation

Evaluation looks at the effectiveness (extent to which objectives are achieved), the efficiency (best relationships between resources employed and results achieved), and at the relevance of

an intervention (extend to which an intervention's objectives are pertinent to needs, problems and issues).

The obligation to evaluate IPARD II Programme has been set by Articles 55 and 57 of the Framework Agreement and further detailed by Articles 54-58 of Sectoral Agreement.

The IPARD II Programme shall be subject to ex-ante and ex-post and, where considered as appropriate by the Commission, interim evaluations carried out by independent evaluators under the responsibility of the Managing Authority for organizing the evaluations. The evaluation activities will be financed under the technical assistance measure. The MA will be responsible for the proper reporting of the evaluation findings and recommendations submitted to the relevant national authorities and the Commission.

The evaluations shall examine the degree of utilisation of resources, the effectiveness and efficiency of the programming, its socio-economic impact and its impact on the defined objectives and priorities. They shall cover the goals of the IPARD II Programme and aim to draw lessons concerning rural development policy. They shall identify the factors which contributed to the success or failure of the implementation of the IPARD II Programme, including the sustainability of actions and identifications of best practices.

In line with Article 56 of the SA, the Managing Authority will be responsible to draw up an evaluation plan for the period 2014-2020 following the requirements of Article 57 of the FWA. The evaluation plan will be submitted to the IPARD II Monitoring Committee not later than one year after the adoption of the IPARD II Programme by the Commission. The Managing Authority shall report each year on the results achieved under the evaluation plan to the IPARD II Monitoring Committee with copies to the Audit Authority. A summary of the activities shall be included in the annual report.

Detailed recommendations of the evaluations will be taken into consideration and integrated into the implementation process of the IPARD Programme. The quality and implications of evaluations shall be assessed by the Managing Authority, the IPARD Monitoring Committee and the Commission.

In accordance with Article 58 of SA at latest in the first year after the programme implementation period, an ex-post evaluation shall be prepared for the IPARD II Programme. That report shall be completed and submitted to the Commission not later than the end of that year.

Ex-post evaluation shall cover the utilisation of resources and the effectiveness and efficiency of the IPARD II Programme, its impact and its consistency with the ex-ante evaluation. It shall cover factors contributing to the success or failure of implementation, the achievements of the IPARD Programme and results, including their sustainability. It shall draw conclusions relevant to the IPARD II Programme and to the enlargement process.

11.2.3. Reporting

The obligation for reporting the IPARD II Programme has been set by Articles 58, 59 and 60 of the Framework Agreement and further detailed by Article 59 of the Sectoral Agreement.

In accordance with Article 58 and 59 of the Framework Agreement concerning the general reporting requirements and the reporting requirements to the Commission under indirect management by the IPA II beneficiary, the NIPAC and the NAO shall provide the Commission with an annual report on the implementation of IPA II assistance and with an annual report on the implementation of the entrusted budget implementation tasks by 15 February of the following financial year.

In line with Article 60 of the FWA the operating structures shall deliver all the necessary information to the NIPAC and the NAO for the purposes of the reports.

The obligation to draw up an annual reports and final reports on the implementation of the IPARD II Programme by the Managing Authority has been set by Article 54 of the Sectoral Agreement. Managing Authority, following consultation with the IPARD Agency, shall draw up annual reports on the implementation of the IPARD II Programme in the previous calendar year by 30 June each subsequent year following a full calendar year of implementation of the IPARD Programme.

The annual implementation reports shall include data related to the previous calendar year and the cumulative financial and monitoring data for the whole period of implementation of the IPARD Programme as well as aggregated monitoring tables. The final reports on implementation of the IPARD Programme shall cover the whole period of implementation and may include the last annual report.

All annual and final implementation reports in particular shall contain information relating to: the progress in the implementation of priorities and measures in relation to the attainment of the objectives of the IPARD II Programme, the problems encountered in managing the programme and the measures taken, financial tables showing EU, national and total expenditure per measure and/or sector and financial execution, monitoring and evaluation activities carried out.

The annual and final implementation reports shall be sent, after examination and approval by the IPARD II Monitoring Committee, to the NIPAC for submission to the Commission with copies to the NAO and the Audit Authority.

The Commission shall examine the annual and final implementation report and inform (IPA II recipient) of its observations within four months of the date of receipt of the annual implementation report and within five months of the date of receipt of the final implementation report.

A final report shall be submitted at the latest six months after the final date of eligibility of expenditure under the IPARD II Programme.

The Commission shall issue guidelines concerning the content and presentation of the annual and final implementation reports.

12. SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL STRUCTURE

In line with Art.7 of the Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 447/2014, Serbia has designated all authorities provided in the IPA legislation.

Table 25: Structures and authorities with reference to the state of affairs in Serbia

| Body / Authority | Description acc. IPA II legislation | Situation in Serbia |
|------------------------------|---|--|
| National IPA Coordinator | <p>The NIPAC shall be established by the IPA II recipient. The NIPAC shall be a high-ranking representative of the government or the state administration of the IPA II recipient with the appropriate authority. In addition to the functions and responsibilities under Articles 6(2), 18(2), 62 and 78 of the FWA, where budget implementation tasks are entrusted to the IPA II recipient, the NIPAC shall:</p> <p>(a) take measures to ensure that the objectives set out in the actions or programmes for which budget implementation tasks have been entrusted are appropriately addressed during the implementation of IPA II assistance.</p> <p>(b) In accordance with Article 60 of this Agreement, coordinate the drawing up of an evaluation plan in consultation with the Commission presenting the evaluation activities to be carried out in the different phases of the implementation as per provisions of Article 58 of this Agreement.</p> | <p>The Government of Serbia, in the Conclusion No. 119-3909/2014 dated 22May 2014, appointed the Minister without a portfolio responsible for European Integration, Mrs. Jadranka Joksimovic, to be the National IPA Coordinator (NIPAC) and reconfirmed the role of Department for Planning, Programming, Monitoring and Reporting on EU Funds and Development assistance within the Serbian European Integration Office as NIPAC's Technical Secretariat.</p> <p>Roles and responsibilities of all bodies in IPA structure are written in new draft of the FWA which is still in process of final consultations and adoption. Adopted Framework Agreement will be endorsed in the form of Law and ratified by the Serbian Parliament (it is foreseen to be adopted till the end of the 2014.) Specificities related to IPARD are addressed in different chapters depending on the subject of each chapter of the agreement. This is also the case with the annex A were the information on functions and responsibilities of the structures authorities and bodies (including NIPAC) are provided and Article 18 of Section III Rules for programming, Paragraphs 2 and 5 of the Draft model of the FWA.</p> |
| National Authorizing Officer | <p>The NAO shall be established by the IPA II recipient. The NAO shall be a high-ranking representative of the government or the national administration of the IPA II recipient with the appropriate authority.</p> <p>The NAO shall bear the overall responsibility for the financial management of IPA II assistance in [IPA II recipient] and for ensuring the legality and regularity of expenditure. The NAO shall in particular be responsible for:</p> <p>(a) the management of IPA II accounts and financial operations;</p> <p>(b) the effective functioning of the internal control systems for the implementation of IPA II assistance in accordance with Annex B to this Agreement.</p> | <p>The Government of Serbia, in the Conclusion no. 119-8560/2013 dated 14th October 2013, appointed State Secretary in the Ministry of Finance, to be the National Authorizing Officer (NAO).</p> <p>A Memorandum of Understanding to be signed between the NAO and IPARD OS (IPARD Agency and MA) shall reflect the institutional, procedural, reporting and communication arrangements and will be signed in a due time.</p> |

| Body / Authority | Description acc. IPA II legislation | Situation in Serbia |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| | The management structure shall be composed of a National Fund and a support office for the NAO. The tasks and responsibilities of the National Fund and the support office shall be adequately segregated. | |
| National Fund NAO support office | The National Fund shall be located in a national level ministry of the IPA II recipient with central budgetary competence and shall act as central treasury entity. It shall support the NAO in fulfilling his/her tasks, in particular those of management of IPA II accounts and financial operations referred to under Clause 2(3) of Annex A of the FWA and shall be in charge of tasks of financial management of IPA II assistance, under the responsibility of the NAO. | The new systematization act of the Ministry of Finance took effect from 5 February 2009. It incorporates a National Fund (both as a Treasury function and as the NAO Services) which is established directly under the NAO as a new Department in Ministry of Finance. The National Fund Department for EU funds management at the Ministry of Finance assumes the role of the National Fund under the direct authority of the National Authorizing Officer. Currently, the number of fully employed staff at the National Fund is 14. NF manuals of procedures in the context of IPARD are developed and will be aligned with IPA II regulation. |
| IPARD Operating Structure | The operating structure to be established in accordance with Article 10 and Article 55 of the Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 447/2014 shall, for rural development programmes, consist of the following separate authorities operating in close cooperation: (a) the Managing Authority, being a public body acting at national level, to be in charge of preparing and implementing the programmes, including selection of measures and publicity, coordination, evaluation, monitoring and reporting of the programme concerned and managed by a senior official with exclusive responsibilities; and (b) the IPA Rural Development Agency with functions of a similar nature as a IPARD Agency in the Member States being in charge of publicity, selection of projects as well as authorisation, control and accounting of commitments and payments and execution of payments. | see Chapter 10.1 |
| Audit Authority | The IPA II recipient shall provide for an external audit authority which shall be independent from the NIPAC, the NAO, the management structure and the operating structure(s) and be ensured the necessary financial autonomy. It shall comply with internationally accepted auditing standards. A head of the audit authority shall be appointed by the IPA II recipient. S/he shall possess adequate competence, knowledge and experience | The Government Office for Audit of EU Funds Management System has been established by the Serbian Government's Decision no. 110-3278/2011-1 dated 02 June 2011 as the Audit Authority for IPA programmes under decentralized management. In December 2013, the Government of Serbia adopted the Decree on appointing the Audit Authority and its head for auditing the management system for EU pre-accession programmes under the Instrument for pre-accession assistance (IPA), which represents the legal basis for the work of the Audit Authority. |

| Body / Authority | Description acc. IPA II legislation | Situation in Serbia |
|-------------------------|--|----------------------------|
| | <p>in the field of audit to carry out the required tasks.</p> <p>The audit authority shall carry out audits on the management and control system(s), on actions, transactions and on the annual accounts in line with internationally accepted auditing standards and in accordance with an audit strategy. Further guidance and definitions from the Commission may complement those standards.</p> | |

Table 26: The designation of all relevant authorities and a summary description of the management and control structure (NIPAC, NAO, MA, IPARD Agency and Audit Authority)

| Authority Type | Name of the authority/body, and department or unit, where appropriate | Head of the authority/body (position or post) | Address | Telephone | Email |
|-----------------|---|---|--|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| NAO | n / a | State Secretary in Ministry of Finance Nikola Ćoršović | Kneza Milosa 20 11 000 Belgrade Serbia | +381 11 3642 602 | nikola.corsovic@mfin.gov.rs |
| NIPAC | n / a | Minister without portfolio responsible for European integration Jadranka Joksimović | Nemanjina 11 11 000 Belgrade Serbia | +381 11 3617 580 | kabinet@eu.rs |
| MA | Department for Rural Development | Head of Department Dragan Mirkovic | Nemanjina 22-26 11 000 Belgrade | +381 11 3348 053 | dragan.mirkovic@minpolj.gov.rs |
| IPARD Agency | Directorate for Agrarian Payments | Director Vladislav Krsmanovic | Hajduk Veljkova 4-6 15 000 Sabac | +381 15 367 500 | vladislav.krsmanovic@minpolj.gov.rs |
| Audit Authority | Audit Authority Office of EU Funds | Office Director Miloš Todorović | Nemanjina 4 (and Nemanjina 11) 11000 Belgrade Serbia | +381 11 3639- 951 | kancelarija@aa.gov.rs |

13. RESULTS OF CONSULTATIONS ON PROGRAMMING AND PROVISIONS TO INVOLVE RELEVANT AUTHORITIES AND BODIES AS WELL AS APPROPRIATE ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL PARTNERS

13.1. Provision adopted for associating the relevant authorities, bodies and partners

In line with the specific provisions on rural development programmes, laid down in Article 55 of the Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 447/2014 of 2 May 2014, the IPARD II Programme has been prepared in consultation with the appropriate interested stakeholders applying the partnership principle.

Serbia has accumulated significant experience in the application of the partnership principle in the national strategic policy formulation, involving government, civil society and private sector stakeholders at both national and local levels. The partnership was widely applied during the preparation of the National Agriculture and Rural Development Strategy for the period 2014-2024, as well as during the preparation of the IPARD I and IPARD II Programmes since 2009. Relevant stakeholders (competent regional and local and other public authorities, economic and social partners, NGOs) will be involved in all the stages of IPARD programme, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, following the EU legal requirements.

In order to establish strong intra and inter-ministerial coordination in the policy formulation and programming of rural development in Serbia with a Government Decision No 02-9603/2010 (amended with Government Decision No 02-6999/2011 a National Council for Rural Development (NCRD) has been established. Currently NCRD is chaired by the Minister of Agriculture and Environmental Protection, has 14 members, representing MAEP and other Ministries.

The Council will be reorganised in order to reflect the new organisational structure of the Government and the MAEP and re-established for the period 2014-2020 to coordinate the national rural development policy.

The following groups of policy stakeholders have been identified for inclusion in different stages of the IPARD Programme preparation and implementation:

1. Public authorities and bodies in order to establish strong intra and inter-ministerial coordination, consisting of:
 - Ministry of Agriculture and Environmental Protection (MAEP) its sectoral directorates, Veterinary, Phyto-sanitary and Food Safety Directorates, Advisory Services, Agency for Environmental Protection, Water Directorate.
 - Representatives of other Ministries of the Republic of Serbia – Ministry of Finance, Serbian European Integration Office, Ministry of Public Administration and Local Self-Government, Ministry of Construction, Transport and Infrastructure, Ministry of Trade, Tourism and Telecommunications, Ministry of Economy, Ministry of Communication, Science and Technological Development,

Ministry of Labour, Employment, Veteran and Social Affairs, Ministry of Youth and Sport, SORS.

2. Regional and Local authorities - Standing Conference of Towns and Municipalities, National Agency for Regional Development.
3. Branch associations and Non - Governmental Organisations in the fields of Agriculture and Rural Development in Serbia – Serbian Chamber of Commerce, Farmers' Association, National Farmers' and Cooperatives' Association, National and Regional Associations of Agricultural Co-operatives and Producers, National Association of Food Processors, Organizations for environmental issues, National associations promoting equality of women and men, and issues related to Handicapped Persons, Roma, etc.
4. Donor's organisations such as World Bank, UNDP, USAID, GIZ.
5. Other partners such as commercial banks and micro-finance institutions in Serbia, research institutes and academia.
6. Representatives from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Serbian European Integration Office as national coordinators for the EU Danube and Adriatic and Ionian macro-regional strategies.

The process of preparation of the National Strategy for Agriculture and Rural Development for the period 2014-2024 for the Republic of Serbia was carried out by the Managing Authority supported by eight thematic/sectoral Working Groups, established by an Order of the Minister of Agriculture and Environmental Protection in 2013. The members of the Working Groups represent the MAEP departments, researchers and the most relevant stakeholders. Since NRDS was prepared and designed in line with IPARD requirements all comments and suggestions related to the NRDS were used for elaboration of IPARD II Programme. The work of the Working Groups was organized via regular working meetings and workshops to present and consult the results.

The consultation process started in May 2013 – in the period from 13 to 17 May 2013, eight workshops for the members of the thematic working groups were organized to present and discuss the SWOT analysis and needs identified of the agri-food sector and rural areas in Serbia. In July 2013 one day meeting of the Working groups was held to present and discuss the first outline of the NARDS. In the following period, three workshops with the main representatives from the working groups were organized to finalise the Draft Strategy before the end of 2013.

A National Stakeholder Meeting to present and discuss the First Draft of the National Agriculture and Rural Development Strategy for the period 2014-2024 was organized on 29 January 2014 in Belgrade. All the designated stakeholders were invited to take part in the meeting.

In February and March 2014, the Draft NARDS was subject to public hearing in Novi Sad, Krusevac, Cacak and Leskovac and at the same time it was posted on the internet portal of the Ministry with e-mail address for comments and proposals. All the comments and opinions received are reflected in the NARDS text and respectively in the IPARD II Programme text.

In the period March-June 2014 the First Draft of the IPARD II Programme and potential measures for recipients were presented to different workshops and meetings of the working groups such as:

- Two parallel traveling workshops – Caravans held in the period 31 March – 1 April 2014 with rural stakeholders to discuss the LEADER approach in Serbia and opportunities offered under the IPARD II Programme for the period 2014-2020.
- Meetings with the stakeholders and representatives of companies and unions of farmers, during the seminars and conferences held on the International Agriculture Fair in Novi Sad, in May 2014.
- Meetings of the thematic working groups, dealing with market chain, fruit and vegetables and livestock sector to discuss the outline of the Measure for Investment in physical assets of the agricultural holdings, including specific eligibility criteria per sector, eligible investments, economic viability of the farms etc.
- Meeting with the representatives of the civil sector and the representatives of the stakeholders in the fields of environment protection, agriculture and rural development to discuss the rural development policy and the Draft IPARD II Programme was held on 16 June 2014 in organization of the Government office for cooperation with civil society.

Within the NRDS and IPARD II Programme preparation process, MA is organising meetings on three levels. First level was comprised the representatives of branch associations, agricultural cooperatives, local self-governance and municipalities, NGO's involved in rural development, environmental protection organizations, food processing and marketing industry associations, organizations for equal opportunities and gender equality and other stakeholders, representing potential recipients under the IPARD II measures and national support schemes, as well as representatives of the advisory services and the Network for Rural Development of Serbia.

The second level included representatives of all MAEP organizational units' members (such as Veterinary Directorate, Forestry Directorate, Plant Protection Directorate, Land Management Directorate, General Inspectorate, Sector for analytic and agricultural policies, Agency for Environmental Protection etc.), representatives of international organizations and universities.

The third level was comprised of the representatives of other ministries and public bodies.

A national partnership meeting was organized on 24 July 2014 and on that occasion the Draft IPARD II Programme, including SWOT, needs identified strategy and selected measures was presented. All the designated partners, as presented in the Table were invited to give contribution to elaboration of the IPARD Programme. The representatives of EU Delegation in Serbia took part in the stakeholder meeting discussions. The Draft IPARD II Programme was sent to the submitted list of stakeholders two weeks before the consultation meeting and participants were asked to submit the written comments and suggestions to the Managing Authority. Significant number of stakeholders gave their contributions in a written form and they were all taken into account by the MA when finalizing the IPARD II Programme text.

13.2. Designation of the partners consulted – summary

| University representatives | | |
|--|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Name of institution/body/person | Competence/Expertise | Name of the Contact Person |
| Faculty of Agriculture, University of Belgrade | Agro economist | Prof. dr Natalija Bogdanov |
| Faculty of Agriculture, University of Belgrade | Agro economist | Prof. dr Miladin Ševarlić |
| Faculty of Agriculture, University of Belgrade | Plant breeding | Prof. dr Slaven Prodanović |
| Faculty of Agriculture, University of Novi Sad | Fruit growing | Prof. dr Zoran Keserović |
| Faculty of Agriculture, University of Novi Sad | Cattle breeding | Prof.dr Snežana Trivunović |
| Faculty of Agriculture, University of Novi Sad | Fruit growing | prof. dr Nada Korać |
| Faculty of Agriculture, University of Novi Sad | Fruit and Grape | prof. dr Dragoslav Ivanišević |
| Faculty of Agriculture, University of Novi Sad | Cattle breeding | Miloš Beuković |
| Faculty of Agriculture, University of Belgrade | Cattle breeding | Vladan Bogdanović |
| Faculty of Agriculture, University of Belgrade | Food technology | Dr Viktor Nedović |
| Faculty of Agriculture, University of Belgrade | Cattle breeding | Cvijan Mekić |
| Faculty of Agriculture, University of Belgrade | Food technology | Prof dr Petar Puđa |
| Faculty of Agriculture, University of Novi Sad | Cattle breeding | Dragan Glamočić |
| Faculty of Agriculture, University of Belgrade | Agro economist | Saša Todorović |
| Faculty of Technical Sciences, University of Novi Sad | Biosystems engineering | Milan Martinov |
| Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, University of Belgrade | Veterinarian | Mila Savić |
| Representatives of public institutions | | |
| Advisory Service <i>Sombor</i> | Agricultural advisory service | Branislav Ogrizović |
| Guarantee Fund of the Autonomous Province of Vojvodina | Agro economist | Goran Vasić |
| Department of Agriculture | Rural development | Ivan Pavlović |

| | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| and Rural Development of the City of Niš | | |
| Regional Fund for Agricultural Development | Regional development | Jozsef Szabo |
| Advisory Service Vrbas | Agricultural advisory service | Katarina Radonić |
| Municipal Council for Environmental Protection of Vršac | Environmental protection | Miloš Vasić |
| Provincial Secretariat for Agriculture | Rural development | Slobodan Teofanov |
| Institute of Vegetable Crops, Smederevska Palanka | Agricultural advisory service | Milan Zdravković |
| Institut PKB | Agricultural advisory service | Petar Stojić |
| Advisory Service Kraljevo | Agricultural advisory service | Vekoslav Savić |
| Advisory Service Sremska Mitrovica | Agricultural advisory service | Željko Graovac |
| Advisory Service Čačak | Agricultural advisory service | Vesna Nišavić Veljković |
| Institute for Crop production and Vegetable growing, Novi Sad | Crop production and vegetable growing | Ana Marjanović Jeromela |
| Agency for Environmental Protection | Environmental protection | Maja Krunić-Lazić |
| Team for Social Inclusion and Poverty Reduction | Social inclusion | Jelena Milovanović |
| Institute for the Maize “Zemun Polje” | Maize production | Miodrag Tolimir |
| Institute of Agricultural Economics | Agro economist | Dr Drago Cvijanović |
| National Agency for Regional Development | Regional development | Slobodan Mišković |
| Centre for Development of Jablanički and Pčinjski district | Regional development | Goran Milenković |
| Institute for Applied Science in Agriculture | Agro economist | Snežana Janković |
| Jaroslav Černi Institute for the Development of Water Resources | Water protection | Milorad Milovanovic |
| Representatives of international institutions and organizations | | |
| GIZ | Farming | Emilija Stefanović |
| USAID | Agriculture | Đorđe Boljanović |
| Embassy of the Netherlands | Agriculture | Mila Mirković |
| Milk Industry | | |
| Mlekara Šabac | Production of milk and dairy products | Zoran Đerić |
| ”Niška mlekara” | Production of milk and dairy | Zvezdan Gavrilović |

| | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------|
| | products | |
| AD "Imlek" | Production of milk and dairy products | Dragica Bolić |
| "Mlekara Subotica" | Production of milk and dairy products | Valentina Minić |
| "Meggle" | Production of milk and dairy products | Tanja Soldatović |
| "Somboled" | Production of milk and dairy products | Dimitar Pavlevski |
| "Mlekoprodukt" | Production of milk and dairy products | Živanko Radovančev |
| "Kuč-kompani" | Production of milk and dairy products | Đukić Dejan |
| "Granice" | Production of milk and dairy products | Nemanja Gajević |
| "Lazar" | Production of milk and dairy products | Milan Vidojević |
| „DisTodorović” | Production of milk and dairy products | Slaviša Todorović |
| “Eko-Mlek” | Production of milk and dairy products | Saša Nedeljković |
| Meat Industry | | |
| "Carnex" | Meat production | Milorad Šekularac |
| AD "Neoplanta" | Meat production | Boris Mačak |
| "Juhor-eksport" | Meat production | Dragan Miladinović |
| "Imes" AD | Meat production | Rajko Latinović |
| IM „Bačka Topola“ | Meat production | Danilo Žunjić |
| „Union MZ“ | Meat production | Zvonko Milenković |
| „Kotlenik promet“ | Meat production | Milomir Tošović |
| „Nedeljković“ | Meat production | Dušan Branković |
| „Đurđević“ | Meat production | Nebojša Nikitović |
| „Koteks“ | Meat production | Verica Josipović |
| Representatives of associations | | |
| Serbia Organica | Organic production | Ivana Simić |
| Centre for training agricultural advisors and farmers | Agricultural advisory service | Aleksandar Davidov |
| Panonska Rakija | Alcoholic beverages | Ana Pandžić |
| Association of Farmers Gložan | Association of agricultural producers | Andrija Bartoš |
| Agrarian Union Municipality of Kanjiža | Association of agricultural producers | Bata Eržebet |
| Forecasting and reporting service NS | Forecasting and reporting service | Dragica Janković |
| Association of Fruit Producers Eco Fruit Arilje | Fruit Production | Božo Joković |

| | | |
|--|---|----------------------|
| Association Šumadia-Wuerttemberg | Cattle breeding | Branko Andrijašević |
| Banatski Forum | Regional development | Zoran Sefkerinac |
| The Union of Agricultural Producers | Association of agricultural producers | Zlatan Đurić |
| Alliance associations of farmers | Association of agricultural producers | Jožef Kovač |
| Farmers Association Senta | Association of agricultural producers | Ferenc Šoti |
| Alliance of Agricultural Association of Vojvodina | Association of agricultural producers | Mikloš Nađ |
| Association "Futoški kupus" | Production of cabbage | Miroljub Janković |
| Farmers Association Subotica | Association of agricultural producers | Miroslav Kiš |
| Association of Agricultural Producers "Banat Lenny" | Association of agricultural producers | Nikola Filipović |
| Šabac association of cattle breeders | Cattle breeders | Slobodan Ilić |
| Serbian dairy forum | Dairy production | Mira Čubrilo |
| Beekeeping Alliance org Serbia | President of the Serbian Federation of Beekeeping | Rodoljub Živadinović |
| Association of Serbian brewery | President of the Association | Miodrag Maksimović |
| Business Association of cold storage Serbia | Executive director of the Business Association | Evica Mihaljević |
| "Žita Srbije", Association for the promotion of production and export of grain | Director of the Association | Vukosav Saković |
| ZZ „Agronom“, Brewery | Agriculture, Authorized Representative | Stevan Beljanski |
| Farmers Association "Subotica" | Head of a Framers Association | Miroslav Ivković |
| Business Association of Poultry "Poultry Community" | Poultry products | Rade Škorić |
| SeCoNs Group for developmental initiative | Director of Research at SeCoNS | Slobodan Cvejić |
| Društvo srpskih domaćina | Farmer | Nikola Bajić |
| Partnership for Territorial Rural Development - LAG Partnership for Potamišje | Entrepreneur | Nenad Nikolić |
| pLAG Đerdap, Donji Milanovac | Prof dr Director | Vesna Vandić |
| RRC Dunav | RRC Danube Coordinator | Snežana Jovanović |
| ZZ Begečki povrtari | Agricultural Engineer, Director | Goran Zec |

| | | |
|--|--|---------------------|
| Cooperative Association of Serbia | President of Cooperative Association of Serbia | Mr Dragan Marković |
| Agricultural producer Vinča | Fruit growing, nursery producer | Verko Kačarević |
| NGO | Association of agriculture producers | Nenad NIKolic |
| NGO | Green Eco Circle | Milorad Cosic |
| NGO | Center for sustainable development | Natasa Gligorijevic |
| Representatives of chambers of commerce | | |
| Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Serbia | Secretary of the Agriculture, Food and Water association | Nenad Budimović |
| Chamber of Commerce of Vojvodina, Novi Sad | Secretary of Agriculture association | Đorđe Bugarin |
| Representatives of industry | | |
| "Bambi" ad | Director General of Bambi Concern | Miroslav Miletić |
| "Delhaize Srbija" | Category Manager | Biljana Kaličanin |
| "Rubin" AD | Deputy of Director at "Rubin" | Miroslav Jovanović |
| MK Group | Advisor to the President at MK Group | Jaroslav Stupavski |
| Others | | |
| GROW RASAD, Irig | Nursery producer | Anđelko Mišković |
| "Žitovojvodina", Novi Sad | Assistant Director | Zdravko Šajatović |
| Agrogrnja d.o.o | Head of the Cooperation Centre | Dejan Jovkić |
| SKGO | Advisor of local government | Marko Tomašević |
| SKGO | Advisor | Slađana Grujić |

13.3. Results of consultations- summary

The detailed table with results of consultations is in Annex 7.

14. THE RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EX-ANTE EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAMME

14.1. Description of the process

The ex-ante evaluation of the IPARD II Programme for 2014-2020 was carried out in the period June - July 2014 by an evaluation team of two international experts, Ms. Simona Cristiano and Mr. Roberto Cagliero (Contract signed the 24 June 2014).

The methodology used follows the procedures set out by the "Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance Rural Development 2014-2020 (IPARD II): Draft Guidelines for Ex ante Evaluation" (Directorate General for Agriculture and Rural Development, 2014) and in "Getting the most from your RDP: Guidelines for the ex-ante evaluation of 2014-2020 RDPs"

(EENRD 2012, draft). Also, a number of further relevant studies and other documentation were referred to in the process of this evaluation, relating to all the programming development.

The ex-ante evaluation was undertaken in close liaison with the Managing Authority (MA) and the process was open and frank. The MA and IPARD Agency were fully cooperative in terms of provision of data, consultation and revision of the Programme.

The ex-ante evaluation was produced using a number of different approaches including literature review, textual analysis of drafts of various documents directly or indirectly contributing to IPARD, and with several meetings between the evaluation team and the officials involved in the process of the programme development. The evaluation team activities were also discussed and coordinated with the services of the Commission and with the staff PPF5 - Project Preparation Facility, Serbia.

The ex-ante evaluation formally began with a kick off meeting on the 26 June 2014 in Belgrade. This meeting introduced the evaluators to the key MA and IPARD Agency officials and provided a review of the IPARD drafting process to date as well as copies of material produced to that point and other relevant documents: IPARD legal basis, national relevant regulations, strategic documents, previous programmes for rural development and sectorial analysis. The evaluators also required the Sectoral Agreement, CSP final version, Framework Agreement final version and implementing regulations.

An inception report (D0) setting out a revised evaluation work programme, was provided to the MA following the kick off meeting, to take account of changes in the timing of the IPARD drafting process.

A preliminary review of the context analysis and associated SWOT was conducted immediately post-inception with a feedback presentation provided on 1 July (based on a new IPARD Programme draft version). During the meeting, the evaluators also dealt with the assessment of the needs and the general structure of the internal and external intervention logic, providing initial recommendations. Furthermore, the evaluator provided a support for the activities for the estimation of the target (output) at the level of intervention (Measure). The above was supplemented by a number of informal feedback conversations and e-mails at various points in the process, in response to the provision of additional and amended documents and following questions put to the evaluators. The analysis and SWOT matrix were amended in line with the recommendations as well as the target indicators.


Written feedback (D1) was constructed based on a review of available documentation and proposed to the MA on 13 July. This document is an early draft about the description of the evaluation process and the main conclusions and recommendations (documentary table), in order to explain how the results of the assessment were considered in the development of the programme.

Feedback on the draft of the intervention logic, the complementarity with the measures financed by other sources, the description of the operating structure and the description of management and control structure were submitted to the MA on 14 July.

During July, the evaluator was commissioned to deliver two interim reports (D2 and D3), relating to stage 1 (SWOT analysis), 2 (intervention logic), 3 (Governance and management). The final Evaluation Report was delivered by the end of July.

The Evaluation Report is structured on the evaluation questions contained in the guidelines document and those specific discussed and agreed with the MA. Throughout the process special attention was given to the requirement that the IPARD shows robust intervention logic and a concrete implementation capacity.

The evaluators were satisfied that, as shown in the draft IPARD, these conditions are fulfilled.



14.2. Overview of the recommendations

R.1. The comprehensiveness of the context analysis

Date: 01/07/2014

Topic: Provide a more comprehensive description of the programming area

The context analysis, as well as the SWOT analysis and the needs assessment, doesn't provide a holistic picture of the programming area. Particularly, the analyses of the current situation is lacking of a more focused description of **crucial dimensions** of rural development in Serbia, such as the environment, the rural economy, the quality of life and LEADER. Thus, the analyses should be better enhanced through focusing on such dimensions.

Also, in some cases the context analysis doesn't provide a proper description of the **disparities**, trends, benchmarks or time series which could better explain the current situation of the different dimensions of rural development in the Republic of Serbia. This is particularly evident in the case of the quality of life.

On this regards, it is recommended to enhance the context analysis through underlining the identification of core driving forces which can be observed for the different dimensions of the rural development in Serbia.

Finally, in the cases of the **sectorial analyses**, it is recommended to provide a more comprehensive description of the different sectors and to explain the reason why the analysis

focuses only on some sectors. Besides, the sectorial analyses should be better summarized coherently with EU format.

R.2. The use of context indicators

Date: 01/07/2014

Topic: Provide a more appropriate use of context indicators

In line with the European Commission indications, the whole list of common context indicators (CCI) should be fully applied across the context analysis. On this regards, the evaluator recommended to quantify those CCI which are still missing in the analysis and to better explain some that estimated by a proxy approach. This was particularly the case of the environmental situation.

Also, as long as the CCI should serve the context analysis for better explain some key aspects of the current situation in the Republic of Serbia, the evaluator recommended to link such indicators to the different parts of the analysis.

Besides, the evaluator recommended the use of programme context indicators in view of better underlining specific situations of rural development in the Republic of Serbia, where needed.

R.3. The SWOT analysis

Date: 01/07/2014

Topic: Provide a more appropriate and comprehensive SWOT analysis

In line with the European Commission indications, the SWOT analysis should be justified by the context analysis, of which it should provide a diagnostic reading. On this regards, it is recommended to revise the SWOT analysis by proving all of its items a robust justification based on the context analysis, on common/programme specific indicators and qualitative information.

Too, the evaluator recommends to prepare a SWOT matrix of a general nature, which advances the information at sector and thematic level, as required by the proposed structure of the content of an IPARD Programme. Besides, the SWOT seems to be lacking of the analysis on the crops.

The revision of the SWOT should also go towards a rationalization of the items, by deleting the redundancies and re-classifying some items, and a better representation of the linkages between the ones to the others. On this regards, the use of a relational SWOT is recommended by the ex/ante evaluator in view of providing a dynamic reading of the context of the programme.

R.4. The needs assessment

Date: 01/07/2014

Topic: Provide a consistent needs assessment

The needs assessment can be considered as funded on the context and SWOT analyses, thus the 13 needs of IPARD look justified, even if not all the needs can find a consistent basis in the SWOT. Also, it is to underline, as a critical point, that in some cases the evidence of disparities

is not highlighted through the selection of a temporal or spatial benchmark. Under this point of view, the evaluator recommends to set appropriate benchmarks where needed.

In addition, it would be appropriate to indicate a ranking of importance of 13 needs to steer the strategy in a direct way, although it is possible indirectly to get this prioritization. The main recommendation, in view of the strategy design, is to clearly set up the IPARD objectives, instead of the IPARD priorities indicate in the draft programme.

R.5. The description of the intervention logic

Date: 13/07/2014

Topic: Provide a coherent strategy

The intervention logic and the programme design, including the selection of measures, are justified, and particularly assessed in connection with other national programmes and agricultural schemes, the NRDP principally.

The programme strategy as a whole should be articulated around the results of the earlier context and SWOT analysis and in view of addressing the needs assessment on the programme areas. The evaluator underlines the need for enhancing the coherence of the intervention logic in terms of linkages with the needs assessment and the other instruments which are complementary to IPARD.

Particularly, the evaluator recommends to rank the needs arisen, through the set up of IPARD objectives framework, and to explain clearly the motivations which drove the choices of the MA towards the use of the different IPARD measures and in the relation with the other instruments. The very critical point is the explication of why only some needs are object of interventions IPARD, while others are not.

In terms of internal coherence, the IPARD objectives (Draft 7 July) are consistent with the needs and the interventions selected and justified along the path of the intervention logic. The balance between the different measures is appropriate, and the provision of mutually reinforcing interactions is in place. There are no immediate possible conflicts and contradictions between the measures and the objectives.

In terms of external coherence, the programme linkages with other interventions (chapters 6 and 10), in particularly with the NRDP, demonstrate a good level of possibilities of complementary with these other interventions, but the demarcation item is not always very clear and it is not possible to detect some risks in verifiability and control. It is evident that a parallel implementation, avoiding overlaps and enabling synergies, between IPARD and NRDP, but also with all the other instruments, could be a strategic relevant key. In this regard, the most important recommendation is to set up a "demarcation and complementary table".

R.6. The description of each of the measures selected

Date: 13/07/2014

Topic: Provide a coherent measure description

The content of the measures as well as the selected target groups is appropriate.

The overviews by sectors are clear and in coherence with the context analysis (e.g. investment?), but it may be appropriate to summarize.

The framework of the objectives of the selected interventions is generally consistent with the objectives of IPARD and the specific objectives contribute to the general ones. However, in some cases in the description of the specific objectives are highlighted eligibility criteria, which are then repeated in the correct parts. It would be better to avoid such duplications.

The descriptions of the linkages with other instruments, as well as the economic viability and the standards, sounds complex and with some critical points in the verifiability. The evaluator on this regard recommends to explain these items more clearly.

Administrative procedure needs to be described more in depth, although the measure fiches require only a generic description of the administrative procedures for the implementation of this measure; but e.g. there are not indications in the field of controls. The evaluator on this regard recommends to explain these items more clearly.

The eligibility criteria are derived from a very bureaucratic approach and they may have a risk of verifiability; the formulation of Business Plan is not robust, it could be appropriate to compare to FADN methodology. The selection criteria are not always reflected in the analysis of the context and the SWOT analysis. The evaluator on this regard recommends to explain these items more clearly.

R.7. Establishment of targets

Date: 13/07/2014

Topic: Provide a robust quantification of targets

The identification of appropriate quantified targets for those indicators directly related to the achievements of the focus areas is vitally important for measuring the extent to which the original objectives of the programme are actually being met. The responsibility for establishing appropriate target values rests with the Managing Authority, while the evaluation team should verify the plausibility of these values. Under this point of view, the evaluator has supported in a direct way the MA during this process.

The sources of information used are reliable and the methods proposed for the calculation has been rigorous enough and based on a set of information coming from the IPARD Agency and shared with an expert group. So, the targets are based on a computation of unit costs from previous similar or equivalent interventions supported under national/regional schemes.

The assessment of target values has been conducted jointly with the analysis of the contribution of the expected outputs to results, while the actual draft programme does not indicate an overall estimation of the targets (chapter 6.4) nor any information about result indicators and impact indicators. On this regard, the evaluator suggests on one hand to check the realistic scope of potential recipients and, on the other hand, the definition of a set of appropriate and very focused, result and impact indicators framework.

R.8. Distribution of financial allocations

Date: 13/07/2014

Topic: Provide a coherent budgetary allocation

In the current context of limited resources, the need to prioritize and concentrate is of increased importance. The IPARD programme, under this point of view, demonstrates that the allocation of financial resources to the measures is balanced, focused and appropriate to meet the objectives that have been set. On the whole, the coherent allocation of available resources could enhance the added value of public support and promotes a more efficient use of resources towards achieving the objectives, but only in a very coherent implementation with all the support instruments available.

In respect of the consistency of the budgetary resources with the programme objectives, the expenditures are directed towards the needs and challenges identified in the SWOT analysis and the needs assessment. Thought, a larger portion of the budget is properly allocated on the objectives that are more influential. Actually, it is not possible to assess the degree of budgetary consistency across territories and economic sectors.

In addition, by now, the evaluator team cannot complement the budgetary analysis by assessing the level of risk involved in financial implementation, to identify those measures that, by their very nature, are associated with more complex development processes. But it is possible to underline that:

- IPARD measures are never been implemented,
- the administrative procedures description cannot give an exhaustive picture,
- there are any information about the level of the decommitment,
- some measures, e.g. LEADER; have a complex delivery mechanisms, involving numerous stakeholders,
- other measures, as well as AEC, could attract more demand than expected.

On this regard, the evaluator recommends an appropriate description of the implementation risk.

R.9. Description of the operating structures and their functions

Date: 13/07/2014

Topic: Provide a better description of the work-flow, roles and functions

The description of the operating bodies is quite comprehensive. It includes the information of the practical implementation of IPARD measures, the monitoring and evaluation system but it lacks of detailing the financial management and the controls mechanisms of the IPARD Programme. Particularly, it is recommended to better explain “what does who and when”, through the use of functional and work-flow chart. This could help a clear identification of the tasks and of the roles of each operating bodies and the reciprocal information flows. Though it could serve the assessment on the administrative capacities being involved into the implementation of the IPARD programme.

Besides, there’s a specific need for better explain the governance arrangements on LEADER approach, particularly by detailing the role and functions of the LAGs in managing, monitoring, control and evaluation activities.

R.10. Human resources and Administrative capacity for programme management

Date: 13/07/2014

Topic: Provide details on the human resources being involved in IPARD II

The draft Programme does not provide sufficient information on the human resources and the administrative capacities being involved into the implementation of IPARD II.

On this regards, the evaluator suggests to detail the number of human resources working in the IPARD MA offices and to describe the activities conducted to enhance their competencies, such as training activities. Also, the assistance of other on-the-job support activities, such as twinning and technical assistance should be detailed.

R.11. Delivery System

Date: 13/07/2014

Topic: Provide details on the delivery system

The description of the delivery system is unsatisfactory. Particularly, it should be improved by detailing the monitoring and evaluation arrangements for data and information collection and reporting, such as the identification of the sources of information and with a specific reference to the use of the FADN and IACS systems for IPARD implementation.

Also, there's a specific need for envisage specific arrangements for the implementation of the LEADER approach, especially for monitoring, control and financing purposes. This implies the provision supporting activities to the LAGs to be conducted at a very early stage.

With specific reference to the monitoring and evaluation matter, it is recommended to explain if the setting up of specific governance structures is envisaged and which offices will be in charge. Particularly, the setting-up of a Monitoring and evaluation unit and the support of an evaluation steering group is recommendable, in view of ensuring the engagement of adequate specific capacities into the activities.

R.12. Financial Management

Date: 13/07/2014

Topic: Provide a more comprehensive description of the financial arrangements and circuit

The description of the financial management is unsatisfactory. The draft programme provides only a description of the responsibilities. Particularly it is recommended to describe the financial circuit and arrangements envisaged, possibly through the use of a financial flow-chart, and by identifying the operating bodies and their tasks. Though, the description of the IPARD measures should explain the key steps for the payments process: advances, interim and final payments to recipients. Too, details on how the financial flows will feed the monitoring system should be provided.

Finally, there's a specific need for envisage specific arrangements for the implementation of the LEADER approach, especially by clarifying the role of the LAGs into the financial system.

R.13. Stakeholders Involvement

Date: 13/07/2014

Topic: Provide a more comprehensive description of the arrangements for effective and further involvement of the stakeholders

The draft Programme provides a detailed description of relevant stakeholders and the consultations conducted by the MA during the programming phase. However, the description lacks of referring about the criteria used for the identification of the relevant stakeholders and on how the results of the consultations have been taken into account for the programming purpose. Too, information on further involvement of the stakeholders during the programming period needs to be provided, with a specific reference to the communication of the IPARD implementation performances and results.

On the specific issue of LEADER, there's a need for clarifying if and how the LAGs are considered as relevant Programme stakeholders.

Indeed, as it is, the description of the stakeholder involvement does not provide the information needed to assess the effective involvement of the stakeholders into the Programme design and implementation.

Table 27: Overview of the recommendations

| Date | Topic | Recommendation | How recommendation has been taken into account |
|--|--|---|---|
| The SWOT analysis, needs assessment | | | |
| 01/07 | Provide a more comprehensive description of the programming area | <p>The analyses should be better enhanced through focusing on crucial dimensions Provide a proper description of the disparities</p> <p>Enhance the context analysis through the use of core driving forces</p> <p>The sectorial analyses should be summarized, coherently with UE format</p> | <p>Recommendation has been followed up and modifications in the final version of the programme are introduced</p> |
| 01/07 | Provide a more appropriate use of context indicators | <p>The whole list of CCI should be fully applied. Quantify those CCI which are still missing in the analysis and to better explain some that estimated by a proxy approach.</p> <p>Define a set of the most important specific indicators</p> | <p>Recommendation has been followed up and modifications in the final version of the programme are introduced</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| 01/07 | Provide a more appropriate and comprehensive SWOT analysis | <p>Check and provide that all of its items have a justification.</p> <p>Go towards a rationalization of the items: deleting the redundancies, re-classifying some items.</p> <p>Provide a representation of the linkages between items</p> | SWOT table is completely rearranged in line with recommendations. |
| 01/07 | Provide a consistent needs assessment | Estimate a ranking of 13 needs | Recommendation has been followed up and modifications in the final version of the programme are introduced |
| Construction of the intervention logic | | | |
| 01/07 | Provide a coherent strategy | <p>Set up of IPARD objectives framework, to explain clearly the choices of the MA towards the use of the different IPARD measures</p> <p>Set up a "demarcation and complementary table" in chapter. 10</p> | Recommendation has been followed up and modifications in the final version of the programme are introduced |
| 13/07 | Provide a coherent measure description | <p>Avoid duplications and redundancies</p> <p>Provide a more clear description of linkages and demarcation and criteria.</p> <p>Administrative procedure needs to be described more in depth</p> | Recommendation has been followed up and modifications in the final version of the programme are introduced |
| Establishment of targets, distribution of financial allocations | | | |
| 13/07 | Provide a robust quantification of targets | <p>Define a realistic Scope of potential recipients</p> <p>Provide a set of appropriate result and impact indicators</p> | Recommendation has been followed up and modifications in the final version of the programme are introduced |
| 13/07 | Provide a coherent budgetary allocation | Provide an appropriate description of the implementation risk | |
| Programme implementing, monitoring, evaluation and financial arrangements | | | |
| 13/07 | Provide a better description of the work-flow, roles and functions | <p>Explain in a better way “what does who and when”, through the use of functional and work-flow chart</p> <p>Explain in a better way the governance arrangements on LEADER approach</p> | This recommendation will be taken into account through the National ordinance for implementation for LEADER measure |

| | | | |
|--------------|--|--|--|
| 13/07 | Provide details on the human resources being involved | Detail the number of human resources working in the IPARD MA offices and the describe the activities conducted to enhance their competencies | Recommendation has been followed up and modifications in the final version of the programme are introduced |
| 13/07 | Provide details the delivery system | The delivery system must be described more clearly | This recommendation will be taken into account through the National ordinance for implementation as above |
| 13/07 | Provide a more comprehensive description of the financial arrangements and circuit | Describe the financial circuit and arrangements envisaged, possibly through the use of a financial flow-chart, and by identifying the operating bodies and their tasks | This recommendation will be taken into account through the National ordinance for implementation of this measure |
| Other | | | |
| 13/07 | Provide a more comprehensive description of the arrangements for effective and further involvement of the stakeholders | Provide information on further involvement of the stakeholders during the programming Clarify if and how the LAGs are considered as relevant Programme stakeholders Describe, where possible, the effective involvement of the stakeholders into the Programme design and implementation | Recommendation has been followed up and modifications in the final version of the programme are introduced |

15. PUBLICITY, VISIBILITY AND TRANSPARENCY IN ACCORDANCE WITH IPA LEGISLATION

In accordance with the rules, laid down in Article 23 and 24 of the FWA and further detailed in Article 24 and 25 of the Sectoral Agreement, MAEP will establish a coherent set of activities and adequate procedures to ensure transparent implementation and maximum available information, publicity and visibility of support under the IPARD Programme for the period 2014-2020. The IPARD II Operating structure shall fulfil the requirements on information, publicity and transparency, and ensure the appropriate EU visibility of the actions.

The communication and visibility actions will seek to:

- Ensure a sufficient number of good quality applications and transparency of implementation by effectively communicating information on funding opportunities under the IPARD II Programme;
- Make the results of the implemented projects visible and promote the positive contributions of the EU and national funds for rural development in Serbia;
- Ensure the transparency of public support by publishing the names of grant recipients.
- Increase awareness of the general public about the EU accession process and IPARD support to Serbia.

In line with the Article 25 of the SA, all information, publicity and visibility actions will be planned, implemented, monitored and evaluated within the framework of the IPARD II Visibility and Communication Plan for the period 2014-2020, implemented by an annual list of actions. The plan of visibility and communication activities shall be agreed between the Managing Authority and the Commission. This plan of visibility and communication activities shall be appraised by the IPARD II Monitoring Committee and shall set out:

- the aims and target groups;
- the content and strategy of the communication and information measures, stating the measures to be taken;
- its indicative budget;
- the administrative departments or bodies responsible for implementation.

The criteria to be used to evaluate the impact of the information and publicity measures in terms of transparency, awareness of the IPARD II programmes and the role played by the Union.

Programmes contributing to the macro-regional strategies can be invited to present their best practice achievements in the annual fora and other events related to the macro-regional strategies where a country is a member.

Activities from the Visibility and Communication Plan will be financed under the Technical assistance measure. At the meetings of the IPARD II Monitoring Committee the chairperson shall report on progress in implementing the information and publicity activities and provide the Committee members with examples of such activities.

15.1. Actions foreseen to inform potential RECIPIENTS, professional organisations, economic, social and environmental partners and bodies involved in promoting equality between men and women and NGOs about possibilities offered by the programME and rules of gaining access to funding

The MA, in close coordination with the IPARD Agency, will be responsible for informing potential recipients about funding opportunities under the IPARD II Programme. The MA will ensure the establishment of a single website providing information on, and access to, the IPARD II Programme of Serbia, including information about the timing of implementation of programming and any related public consultation processes.

The potential recipients will benefit from a wide range of support tools, such as printed informational materials, information sessions, seminars and training sessions. The MA will ensure that it reaches the intended audience and special attention will be paid to the wide circulation of printed materials and use of local mass media in the case of rural areas where access to the internet is still limited. Representatives of supporting organizations, advisory services, branch associations and NGO's will also be invited to the information events, seminars and training sessions.

In order to help the IPARD recipients to prepare good quality applications, experts from the advisory services and private consultants will be trained on the eligibility rules. The training sessions for the advisory services and private consultants will be organised prior to the start of the measures and will focus on the Guide for Applicants and more specifically on how to support potential recipients when filling in the application forms and preparing the business plans. The list of the advisory services offices and contacts of the trained private consultants will be made available to potential recipients on the IPARD Programme website.

15.2. Actions foreseen to inform the recipients of the EU contribution

The recipients who have been contracted under the IPARD Programme measures will be provided with detailed written guidelines on project implementation, including instructions for the preparation of payment claims and guidelines on visibility. The MA and IPARD Agency will ensure that the grant recipients strictly fulfil the visibility rules set out in the Guide for Applicants and in the standard contract.

The MA and the IPARD Agency will provide the necessary support in implementing these rules, including issuing clear technical descriptions and instructions and by organizing training sessions.

The administrative instructions and Guidelines for Applicants for the implementation of the measures will include clear guidelines, stipulating the responsibility of the recipients for publicity and visibility, and information that the list of final recipients with an amount of IPARD support will be published by the IPARD Agency.

15.3. Actions to inform the general public about the role of EU in the programmes and the results thereof

The MA will inform the public about IPARD Programme adoption, its amendments, main achievements in the implementation process and results, using all media at appropriate national and territorial level. Special emphasis will be placed on information about the contribution of the EU to the IPARD financed projects.

Following programme approval, the MA will widely publicize the content of the programme and make the programme and the administrative instructions for the implementation of the measures available to all interested parties through the IPARD II single website, the MAEP website and partner/relay websites and, where appropriate, will distribute hard copies. The MA will also organize an information campaign, including information sessions, press conferences, media publications, etc.

The MA will plan and implement publicity measures aimed at informing the general public on the results of the programme. To ensure transparency and the accountability of the implementation, the MA will regularly publish information on the programme, including financial, output and results indicators as well as the evaluation reports.

In order to ensure transparency concerning support under IPARD the IPARD Agency shall be responsible for the publication of the list of the operations and recipients of IPARD II assistance in accordance with the conditions established by Article 23(2) of the FWA. The list of operations shall be accessible through the IPARD II single website and shall be up-dated at least every six months.

16. EQUALITY BETWEEN MEN AND WOMEN AND NON DISCRIMINATION PROMOTED AT VARIOUS STAGES OF PROGRAMME (DESIGN, IMPLEMENTATION, MONITORING AND EVALUATION)

16.1. Description of how equality between men and women will be promoted at various stages of programme

Gender equality is guaranteed by the Constitution and Serbia is a signatory of several international conventions and documents that guarantee the equality of men and women and prohibits discrimination on the gender basis. The Strategy for Improving the Position of Women and Promotion of Gender Equality for 2009-2015 has identified six areas in which it is necessary to make progress: improving the economic status, improving health, greater involvement in decision-making processes, in the executive authority and public administration, equality in education, prevention of violence and eradication of gender stereotypes in the media.

Parallel by the development of gender equality legislation, respective institutional mechanisms have been built at all levels. The Gender Equality Directorate (GED), established in 2007 as the administrative body within the Ministry of Labour and Social

Policy, is in charge for proposing legal and policy measures aimed at improving position of women and promoting the policy of equal opportunities. The National Parliament has established the Committee for Human and Minority Rights and Gender Equality, while the Government of Serbia has the Gender Equality Council as an advisory body. The Office of the National Ombudsperson includes a Deputy for Gender Equality, Rights of Child and Rights of Persons with Disabilities. The establishment of the Commissioner for Protection of Equality as an independent state agency in 2010 is considered to be of a significant importance. At the level of the Autonomous Province of Vojvodina, the policy of gender equality is promoted by the Secretariat for Labour, Economy and Gender Equality, the Gender Equality Committee, the Deputy Ombudsperson for Gender Equality, and the Gender Equality Institute. More than a half of local self-governments (approx. 100) have established gender equality bodies.

The gender equality principles are taken into consideration in the process of the preparation of the IPARD Programme. To ensure adequate reflection of gender issues, public authorities and NGO's active in the area of equal opportunities are consulted during the National Rural Development Strategy and the IPARD Programme preparation.

The gender situation is taken into account in the process of the design of the individual measures for support by giving priority to entrepreneurial women in the selection criteria of the measures. Moreover, the programme ensures integration of rural women organisations in the partnership of Local Action Groups and gender equality in a managing body of the LAGs.

During the implementation of the IPARD Programme, the uptake of the support under the measures by female-managed agricultural holdings and enterprises will be specifically monitored. All monitoring and evaluation reports will include a section on equal opportunities, in which the effects of the IPARD Programme on gender equality will be examined. Representatives of the public and NGO's, promoting equal opportunities will be invited to take part in the IPARD MC.

The information and publicity actions will also target equal participation of women and men.

16.2. Describe how any discrimination based on GENDER, race, origin, religion, age, sexual orientation, is prevented during various stages of programme implementation

The legal anti-discrimination framework has been established in Serbia. Beside the Constitution, the general protection regime includes the Law on the Prohibition of Discrimination, the Ombudsman Law and the Statute of the Autonomous Province of Vojvodina. Anti-discriminatory clauses have been integrated in other legal acts, so that the policy of equal opportunities, guaranteed by the Constitution (Art. 15), has been further developed. The Constitution (Art. 60) provides "fair remuneration for work done", while the principle of the equal payment for equal work for men and women is guaranteed by the Gender Equality Law (Art. 17). The Labour Law, as well as the Law

on Employment and Insurance in Case of Unemployment, also includes provisions aimed at preventing discrimination against women at the labour market and during employment.

The Law on Prohibition of Discrimination (published in the Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia, No. 22/09 dated March 26, 2009)* introduces the equality principle in relation to the gender, race, color, ethnicity, language, gender identity, sexual orientation, political, religious or philosophical affiliation, economic, education and social situation, pregnancy, parental connection/responsibility, age, family or marital status, civil status, residence, health conditions, disability, relation to a special grouping and in relation to any other reason.

The preparation and implementation of the IPARD II Programme respects all of the provisions laid down in the above mentioned legal base and the principles of equal treatment. There shall be no direct or indirect discrimination against any person based on gender, age, marital status, language, mental or physical disability, sexual orientation, political affiliation or conviction, ethnic origin, nationality, religion, race, social origin or any other status. The Code of Conduct of the Managing Authority and IPARD Agency fully respects all anti-discrimination provisions stipulated by the relevant law, which will also be strengthened by the appropriate training for employees.

The programme measures include no discriminatory criteria. Implementation of the IPARD programme will not tolerate any discrimination towards potential recipients based on religion, ethnicity, gender or physical disability.

17. TECHNICAL AND ADVISORY SERVICES

According to the 2012 Agriculture Census, Serbia has 631,122 registered holdings with a large number of small-sized farms (the average farm size is 5.3 ha). This ownership structure, modest knowledge and lack of additional skills of the rural population (97% of the rural population did not attend additional training programmes, 54% have no special knowledge and skills) lead to low productivity and low income earned from agriculture. The existing advisory system structure is insufficient and fails to meet the dynamic needs of the technical and technological restructuring of the sector.

Knowledge transfer in the field of agriculture takes place through formal education at all levels (from the middle to doctoral studies) as well as through a variety of training organized by educational and research institutions, advisory services, private companies, project units and the media.

To bring closer farmers to the latest achievements of science and professional enterprises, and to help them to introduce new technologies and practices in the period from 2004 to 2007, and then in 2013 and in 2014 a national measure was implemented to support knowledge transfer in the field of agriculture through support for special education projects in agriculture. Also in 2010, a similar measure was conducted through the project Transitional Agriculture Reform (STAR) which has been implemented through loans from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development IBRD.

In the process of implementation of IPARD II Programme, the Advisory Service of Serbia will play an important role. In the Communication and Visibility Plan it is foreseen that this service will be the main partner to the MAEP in promotion of the programme and in providing the assistance to farmers to complete application forms. This will increase the need for additional staffing and increased scope of work, which is also foreseen in the Strategy for Agriculture and Rural Development and it is supported by a proposed budget increase. The Serbian Advisory Service consists of 35 agricultural advisory and expert services with 256 advisors employed. Out of that number, 13 services are on the territory of Vojvodina, with 88 advisers, 12 are public and one is private. The control and coordination of these services is conducted by the Provincial Secretariat with the assistance of Agriculture Advisory Service (AAS) of Novi Sad, which is an authorized organization for professional training of advisors. The Provincial Secretariat in accordance with the law adopts the annual programme and the funds these activities.

From a total of 22 services across the country, with the exception of Vojvodina, 168 advisors are employed, 19 are public and 3 are private. The control and coordination of these services is implemented by MAEP with the assistance of the Institute for Applied Science in Agriculture (IPN), which is the designated organization for professional training of advisors as well as the tasks of monitoring and evaluating the effects of the work of advisors (authorization obtained in accordance with the law for a period of five years).

Legal base for Advisory Service activities:

- **Law on Advisory and expert work in agriculture (2010);**
- **Mid-term programme for development of advisory services in agriculture for the period 2011-2015;**
- **Annual Programme for development of advisory services in agriculture.**

MAEP adopts an annual programme and the financially support these activities in accordance with the law. The annual programme defines the type and exact number of activities the advisor performs in the course of a year, deadlines or rather the dynamics of their realization, manner of monitoring and evaluating the effects of the work of advisors, territorial coverage of a certain service, number and expertise of the advisor as well as the source, schedule and manner of using the funds.

Their scope of work with agriculture holdings is based on following approach:

1. Work with individual agriculture holdings:

- **Work with the selected agriculture holdings for the period of three years, where advisor has to visit selected agriculture holding several times in a year and to calculate certain economic parameters;**
- **Work with other holdings in the office, telephone, fax, e-mails or in the field;**
- **Assistance for filling out forms and applications for preparing documents and business plans when applying for using funds.**

2. Work with groups:

- **Agricultural cooperatives and farmers associations;**
- **Organizations, associations, and informal groups of agricultural producers;**
- **Lectures;**
- **Workshops (trainings with practical demonstrations);**
- **Seminars / winter schools;**
- **Field Days- Demonstration on the spot/ field;**
- **Tribunes (for the promotion of agricultural and rural development policy).**

3. Work through mass media: TV shows, radio shows, articles on the website www.psss.rs, texts in the bulletin issued by the service and local newspapers.

4. Monitoring, collecting and dissemination of data:

- **For a Serbian Market information system in Agriculture – STIPS;**
- **For seasonal works in farming, fruit growing and viticulture;**
- **For the data bookkeeping system for agricultural holdings in RS - FADN (Farm Accountancy Data Network).**

In accordance with the law, IPN, the authorized organization in Serbia and AAS Novi Sad in AP Vojvodina, adopt the Annual Plan for training advisors. The Expert Advisory Council approves the plans and its realization is financed from the budget of RS or rather from the budget of AP Vojvodina.

Farm Advisory Service is supervised and monitored by two independent bodies authorized by MAEP:

1. The Expert Advisory Council for advisory services and applied research in agriculture works on:

- **Proposes Medium-term programme;**
- **Proposes the development of policy;**
- **Propose the financing of advisory services and applied research;**
- **Give an expert opinion on the nature and type of education and propose the types of trainings for advisory agents and farmers;**
- **Give an expert opinion on Annual plan for specialization of agricultural advisory agents.**

2. The Institute for Science Application in Agriculture (IPN) works on:

- **Training of advisory agents;**
- **Makes a draft of the Training programme for advisory agents;**
- **Develops extension modules;**

- Composes and prints material for advisory service;
- Organises educations – trainings of advisory agents;
- Monitoring and evaluating the effects of advisory work;
- Assessing agricultural extension agents and offices;
- Making the rank list of advisory agents according to their achieving of planned tasks;
- Creates a unique methodology for conducting and keeping records of advisory activities (forms, software, the portal);
- Prints publications and other materials for advisory service;
- Reports to the MAEP.

The Advisory Services organise the training programmes, seminars and educations for farmers through Annual Programmes which are agreed and financed by the MAEP. In 2010 support for the modernization and improvement of the advisory service of Serbia was set with the adoption of the new Law on Advisory and Extension Services in Agriculture. The rationale for the adoption of the new law, among other things, lies in the fact that the national advisory service had limitations in terms of number of professionals. These professionals have a difficult task to meet challenges faced by about 631,000 agricultural holdings of which over 466,000 registered expressing interest in obtaining advisory services. The total number of farmers that were under the scope of advisory services in 2013 was about 20,000.

One of the activities of Advisory Service of Serbia is establishment of FADN system, while in regards to IPARD implementation Advisory Service will work on the promotion of IPARD programme measures and will assist the potential recipients on preparation of application forms for IPARD and development of business plans. Taking into account that the functioning of the advisory service is funded from the national budget which limited in size is caused the need to introduce the system of licensing and thus increase the coverage of the professionals providing services to commercial farms, by including other providers of services under the strict rules and conditions.

Necessary actions to be taken in the coming period in order to build the capacity of Serbian Advisory Service to meet forthcoming tasks and to prepare for assistance for implementation of IPARD II Programme will refer to the elaboration of the training plan that will help them in planning of future work related to support of recipients. Special focus should be given in the fields of meeting the standards, elaboration of Guidebook for recipients and activities with potential recipients. This initial set of training activities should cover introduction to Rural Development policy, tasks and targets, where advisors should get sufficient knowledge on the topic and get initial information for future work in promotional activities related to IPARD.

Advisory Service will work with potential recipients on application form for IPARD, development of business plans as well on the promotion of IPARD programme measures.

For this purpose it will need assistance in transfer of knowledge and trainings through different kind of EU support (TW, TWL projects).

With respect to preparation of other technical services and bodies for implementing the IPARD II Programme another set of training materials will be linked with requirements related to meet national and EU standards, with special focus on what recipients have to know before they start planning to apply for IPARD funds. These tasks will be further elaborated, supported and monitored by the MAEP Standing Working Group which will be established in forthcoming period. The main tasks of MAEP SWG besides defining of national and EU standards is to predict possible problems by defining the criteria and conditions that recipients have to fulfil at the time of applying for IPARD funds and at the end of investment, to suggest a checklist to control the fulfilment of these criteria/conditions in terms of these standards, to identify or propose document that the IPARD technical bodies have to issue as a confirmation of fulfilment of certain standards, to support the preparation of manuals for the users, and instructions for issuing the documents for the implementation of IPARD, to define the relationship between PA and technical bodies (communication process and the responsibilities of the technical bodies) and to define the necessary training plan for capacity building of technical bodies and to participate in the implementation of this training plan.

In addition to providing information with regard the IPARD Programme to potential recipients, the Serbian Network for Rural Development and the professional organizations also have an important role in disseminating information about IPARD and providing technical support and advice to potential recipients in their areas of influence. Since the IPARD is a new experience for Serbia there is a great need to get the support to communicate Rural Development Policy, IPARD rules and conditions correctly and efficiently. In this context regarding a contribution to the successful implementation of IPARD Programme, the responsible institutions and authorities need to develop their capacities in order to ensure sufficiently supported, trained and prepared advisory services to provide assistance and information for potential recipients.

18. ANNEXES

ANNEX 1: PROJECT AND ASSISTANCE TO AGRICULTURE AND RD SECTOR

ANNEX 2: DESCRIPTION OF THE METHODOLOGY FOR ASSESSMENT OF THE

ECONOMIC VIABILITY OF RECIPIENTS

ANNEX 3: NATIONAL MINIMUM STANDARDS

ANNEX 4: AREAS WITH DIFFICULT WORKING CONDITIONS IN AGRICULTURE

ANNEX 4.1: LIST OF SETTLEMENTS IN AREAS WITH DIFFICULT WORKING CONDITIONS IN AGRICULTURE

ANNEX 4.2: LIST OF SETTLEMENTS IN MOUNTAIN AREAS

ANNEX 5: DEFINITION OF SMALL AND MEDIUM ENTERPRISES

ANNEX 6: RESULTS OF CONSULTATIONS-SUMMARY

ANNEX 7: LIST OF SETTLEMENTS OUTSIDE THE RURAL AREAS

ANNEX 1: PROJECT AND ASSISTANCE TO AGRICULTURE AND RD SECTOR

Table 28: Projects within IPA Programme 2007-12

| Project name | Value (EUR) | Budget year | Status | Development partner |
|---|-------------|-------------|------------------------------|--|
| Strengthening the capacities of the Republic of Serbia for the absorption of EU Rural Development funds in pre-accession period | 4,000,000 | IPA 2007 | Completed | Complete EU funding |
| Assistance to the Directorate of Agrarian Payments | | IPA 2009 | Completed | FWC |
| IPA Project Preparation Facility 5(PPF5) | N/A | IPA 2012 | Completed | PPF |
| Capacity building and technical support for the renewal of viticulture zoning and control of production of wine with Designation of Origin | 1,200,000 | IPA 2008 | Completed | Complete EU funding |
| Support for the control/eradication of classical swine fever and rabies in the Republic of Serbia | 8,300,000 | IPA 2008 | Completed | EU funding 6,300,000 National funding 2,000,000 |
| Harmonization of national legislation with EU legislation for placing on the market and control of Plant Protection Products (PPP) and implementation of new legal provisions | 1,300,000 | IPA 2008 | Completed | Complete EU funding |
| Support for the control/eradication of classical swine fever and rabies in the Republic of Serbia | 6,000,000 | IPA 2009 | Completed | Complete EU funding |
| Equipment supply for the Serbian National Referent Laboratories Directorate in the food chain | 6,500,000 | IPA 2010 | Twinning component completed | Complete EU funding |
| Establishment of the Serbian Farm Accountancy Data Network (FADN) | 3,545,400 | IPA 2010 | Ongoing | Complete EU funding |
| Support for Food Safety, Animal Welfare and Control/Eradiation Classical Swine Fever and Rabies | 6,000,000 | IPA 2011 | Ongoing | Complete EU funding |

| | | | | |
|---|-----------|----------|-----------|---|
| Implementation of Effective Land Management Measures and Administrative Procedures to Support the Improvement of the Agrarian Structure in Accordance with EU Requirements | 3,880,000 | IPA 2011 | Ongoing | EU funding 2,780,000EUR Donation form the Federal Republic of Germany 1,000,000 EUR National funding 100,000 EUR |
| Assistance to Managing Authority of the Serbian Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Management in elaboration of IPARD 2014-2020 Program, support to accreditation and training | 250,000 | IPA 2011 | Completed | Complete EU funding |
| Development of a Sustainable Services Information System for the Ministry of Agriculture and Water Management | 1,500,000 | IPA 2012 | Ongoing | Complete EU funding |
| Capacity building for upgrading of food establishments and for animal by-product management | 2,000,000 | IPA 2012 | Ongoing | Complete EU funding |
| Continuation of support for the control/eradication of classical swine fever and rabies in the Republic of Serbia | 7,100,000 | IPA 2012 | Ongoing | Complete EU funding |
| Institutional capacity building and support to agriculture and rural development in Serbia for IPARD management / SERVICE COMPONENT | 1,000,000 | IPA 2012 | Ongoing | Complete EU funding |
| Implementation of sustainable use of plant protection products and establishing systems for regular technical inspection of pesticide application equipment | 1,300,000 | IPA 2012 | Ongoing | Complete EU funding |
| “European Union assistance for flood relief in Serbia” | 8,000,000 | IPA 2012 | Ongoing | Complete EU funding |

| | | | | |
|---|-----------|---------|----------------|--|
| Further Support of the Control/Eradication of Classical Swine Fever and Rabies as well as support for the control of zoonoses and food borne diseases in the Republic of Serbia | 4,800,000 | IPA2013 | To be tendered | EU funding 3,230,000 EUR National funding 1,570,000 EUR |
|---|-----------|---------|----------------|--|

Source: ISDACON; FWC Evaluation report

Table 29: Bilateral Assistance to the Sector

| DONOR | PROGRAMME / PROJECT SUPPORT IN THE AGRICULTURE SECTOR |
|----------------|--|
| Austria | Project on the “ <i>Organic Food Production Support in South Serbia (OFPSSS)</i> ” in <i>Jablanica</i> and <i>Pcinja</i> Districts implemented in 2010-2011 with a budget of EUR 0.72 mill). |
| Denmark | Project on the ‘ <i>Implementation of a Private Sector programme for Support to the Fruit and Berries Sector in Southern Serbia</i> ’. Total budget EUR 8,650,000, donation from the Government of the Denmark is EUR 5,350,000, National budget EUR 3,300,000. Project started at the end 2012 and will be finished in November 2015. Provides technical assistance and grants through calls for applications per year. |
| Czech Republic | Project for “ <i>Support of Cheese Production in the Pester Region</i> ” as part of agri-business development in the <i>Pester (Raska region)</i> . Budget EUR 0.51 m., planned duration 2011-2014 |
| Germany | <i>Development of a Financial System in Rural Areas in Serbia</i> Part of an agreement in the amount of EUR 21 million as a loan to be implemented by commercial banks in Serbia. Also provides technical assistance is (EUR 0.5 mill). |
| | ACCESS (“ <i>Assistance to the Competitiveness and Compatibility for the EU of Serbian SME</i> ”) works with private sector market players, government, universities, organic agri-business value chains, civil society, as well as farmer groups in the organic agricultural and food processing sector. It aims to further Serbia’s economic development and facilitate the country’s future membership in the EU by supporting the Serbian National Strategy for the Development of SMEs and Entrepreneurship. Programme implemented in three phases (2011-2013, 2014-2016 and 2017-2019) allocated EUR 4.7 mill for the first phase. The project ‘ <i>Municipal Economic Development in the Danube Region</i> ’ (GIZ-KWD) supports national, regional and local policy makers in their efforts to facilitate regional development and enable private sector growth. In particular municipalities in Eastern Serbia are being supported in the area of municipal economic development. Currently, phase II covering 3 years (2010-2012) provides EUR 370,000 towards rural development to various municipalities, such as: · Enhancing Vegetable Production in Kladovo, Boljevac and Golubac (Project value EUR 29,930); |

| DONOR | PROGRAMME / PROJECT SUPPORT IN THE AGRICULTURE SECTOR |
|-------------|--|
| Netherlands | · Promoting Fruit Production in the Municipalities of Negotin, Kladovo and Golubac – “Danube Fruit” (Project value EUR 29,370). |
| | Forthcoming Programme for “ <i>Development of a Sustainable Bioenergy Market in Serbia</i> ”. Programme to be implemented by GIZ with TA of EUR 8 mill. and a total budget of EUR 110 mill. |
| | Project for ‘ <i>Capacity building for inspection services</i> ’ in the Veterinary Directorate – implemented by VWA; January 2011 - January 2013. Budget EUR 350,000. |
| | “ <i>Capacity assistance to the milk testing laboratory</i> ”- Worked with milk testing laboratory at the Faculty of Agriculture in Novi Sad, implemented by Dienst Regelingen; February 2010 - August 2011. Budget EUR 130,000 |
| | “ <i>Phytosanitary capacity building</i> ” – implemented by Netherlands Plant Protection Service; March 2009 - February 2010. Budget EUR 130,000. |
| | “ <i>Improvement of official controls of the veterinary inspection service in Serbia</i> ” – implemented by VWA; March 2010 - July 2011. Budget EUR 130,000. “ <i>The capacity building development in plant health regulation in Serbia under the EU legislative framework 2010</i> ” – implemented by NPPS; NAK and Naktuinbouw. 2010-11. Budget EUR 125,000. |
| Japan | “ <i>Support to the Agricultural Sector of Serbia through Vitalization of Domestic Fertilizer Production</i> “ Budget: RSD 202.74 mill. First phase started in 2007 and was completed in October 2008, second phase completed in December 2011 |
| Norway | “ <i>Improvement of work organisation of farmer's cooperatives in Serbia based on the Norwegian model</i> ” Budget EUR 1.0 mill. First phase was in 2010, second phase concluded in December 2011. <i>Development of cooperatives in Serbia, 2002-1,000,000 EUR, 2003. Development of private cooperatives 8 mill NOK, 2005-958,000 Euro, 2006-1,031,000 EUR</i> |
| Romania | <i>Partnership for revitalization of rural areas</i> implemented by UNDP. Budget EUR 0.2 mill. Project started in July 2010 and was extended until the end of 2011. |
| Spain | Project on ‘ <i>Sustainable tourism in rural development</i> ’ financed by Spain and implemented through FAO, UNDP, UNWTO, UNICEF, & UNEP. MAEP together with Ministry of Economy and Regional Development. Total budget US\$ 4 mill. Project was implemented from December 2009 to December 2012. |
| Switzerland | Project for “ <i>Assistance in the field of intellectual property rights</i> ” in MAEP with the Intellectual Property Office implemented by the Swiss Confederation - State Secretariat for Economic Affairs and Institute for Intellectual Property. Budget: CHF 778,300 Period: May 2009 – December 2012. |
| | Project for “ <i>Assistance to the know-how of GLOBALG.A.P standard</i> ” |

| DONOR | PROGRAMME / PROJECT SUPPORT IN THE AGRICULTURE SECTOR |
|--------|--|
| | <p>Budget: CHF 605,000. Duration: May 2009 – December 2012</p> <p>Further assistance is being identified in Integrated Pest Management (IPM) support to introduce EU standards. Interest also in Sanitary & Phyto-sanitary Measures (SPS) for meeting WTO accession requirements.</p> |
| Sweden | <p><i>Development of South East European Network for Plant Genetic Resources (SEED Net).</i> Budget EUR 0.25 mill. Project started in 2004 and ended in December 2011.</p> <p><i>Topola-Pilot Development of agriculture and rural development in municipality Topola, 2002</i></p> <p><i>Support to Milk production in Serbia - phase 1 (2003) project phase 2 (2006).</i></p> |
| USA | <p>USAID “<i>Support sustainable development of dairy sector in Šumadija</i>” Budget: RSD 6.65 mill. Aug 2010 – Aug 11.</p> <p>USAID’s ‘<i>Agribusiness Project</i>’ 2007-12. A five-year economic development project aimed at increasing the competitiveness of Serbia’s agribusiness industry. The project worked in six agricultural sub-sectors: (1) soft fruit; (2) dairy products; (3) herbs & mushrooms; (4) livestock & meat; (5) tree fruit; (6) vegetables. Two main components: Increasing Efficiency & Competitiveness and Improving the Enabling Environment for Serbian Agribusinesses. The project also has implemented a \$3 million matching grant Programme for agribusinesses.</p> <p>USAID is now working on a Country Development & Co-operation Strategy for 2012-17 focusing on competitive markets and economic development through G2G partnerships; no specific agricultural assistance is planned.</p> <p>USDA under its agreement with Government of Serbia has been supporting the agriculture sector since 2001 with technical assistance. This currently includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addressing barriers to trade in animal health; • Food safety working with Veterinary Directorate and on inspection services; • Building capacities and skills in the existing network of accredited plant health laboratories; • Support to preparation of 2012 Census of Agriculture in Serbia; • Crop information services and improving of market analysis of agricultural products. |

| DONOR | PROGRAMME / PROJECT SUPPORT IN THE AGRICULTURE SECTOR |
|--------------------|---|
| FAO | <p><i>Strengthening policies for agriculture and rural development in Southeast Europe to join the EU - a program of technical cooperation / 430.000 USD</i></p> <p><i>Assistance in development of planning and construction of forest infrastructure in Serbia / 260,000 USD</i></p> <p><i>Assistance for Western Balkan countries to improve compliance with international standards for aquatic animal health / 377.000 USD.</i></p> <p><i>Assistance in capacity development and support for organic farming in Serbia / 467,775 USD</i></p> |
| FAO/EBRD | <p><i>Improving food quality and safety standards in the meat industry of the Republic of Serbia.</i></p> <p><i>Support for more efficient marketing chain: development of quality schemes for products of plant origin.</i></p> |
| World Bank IBRD | <p><i>Serbian Transition Agriculture Reform</i> Total project IBRD credit: US\$ 17mill including Global Environment Facility (GEF) grant. September 2008 to May 2013. The objective is to enhance the competitiveness of Serbian agriculture and amongst its interventions has supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthening the Payment Agency for delivering rural development investment grants and evaluating their impact; • The capacity of agricultural producers and processors to make use of these funds; • The training Programme for advisory service providers was expanded from 250 to 1,800 farm advisors since November 2011. • Critical investments in community infrastructure in remote rural areas supported by GEF under the Project have been initiated and contribute to improved accessibility of rural tourism ventures. <p>Danube River Enterprise Pollution Reduction Project, 9,000,000 EUR, 2005</p> |
| UN | <p>Support for Establishment of Rural Development Networks in SEE Countries (TCP/RER/3302) (regional)85, 000 USD, 2011.</p> <p>Support to Development of a Programme for Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (TCP/YUG/3203) 275,000 USD, 2010.</p> <p>Wood Energy for Sustainable Rural Development (TCP/YUG/3201) 350,000 USD, 2008.</p> |

Source: FWC Evaluation report; ISDASCON

ANNEX 2: DESCRIPTION OF THE METHODOLOGY FOR ASSESSMENT OF THE ECONOMIC VIABILITY OF RECIPIENTS

Criteria and tables to be used in assessment of economic viability of the recipient, which is to be performed in a representative year, as well as the criteria and tables to be used for assessment of economic sustainability of the project are the following:

Chart 4: Economic sustainability of the recipient

| |
|--|
| SIMPLE FORM OF THE BUSINESS PLAN (FOR INVESTMENTS UP TO 50,000 EUR) |
| Liquidity = cumulative cash flow needs to be positive |
| Income-to-expenses ratio= Total income/total expenses |
| COMPLETE BUSINESS PLAN (FOR INVESTMENTS OVER 50,000 EUR) |
| Liquidity = cumulative cash flow needs to be positive |
| Income-to-expenses ratio= Total income/total expenses |

Chart 5: Economic sustainability of the project

| |
|--|
| SIMPLE FORM OF THE BUSINESS PLAN (FOR INVESTMENTS UP TO 50,000 EUR) |
| Liquidity = cumulative cash flow needs to be positive |
| COMPLETE BUSINESS PLAN (FOR INVESTMENTS OVER 50,000 EUR) |
| Internal rate of return |
| Liquidity = cumulative cash flow needs to be positive |
| Net present value of the project |
| Return period |

ANNEX 3: NATIONAL MINIMUM STANDARDS

National minimum standards for measure: “Investments in physical assets of agricultural holdings”

- 1) Law on Agriculture and Rural Development (*“Official Gazette of the RS”*, No 41/09, No 10/13 – other law, No 101/16)*
 - Rulebook on determining areas with difficult working conditions in agriculture (*“Official Gazette of RS”*, No.39/16)*;
 - Regulations on the ways and conditions of registration and maintaining the register of agricultural holdings, forms required for registration and renewal of registration and reports, documents submitted with the request, how to store data, and the conditions for passive status farm (*“Official Gazette of RS”*, No.17/13, No 102/15, No 6/16 and No 46/17)*.
- 2) Law on veterinary matters (*“Official Gazette of RS”*, No. 91/05, 30/10 and 93/12)*.
 - Rulebook on Registration or approval of facilities for the breeding, holding and trading of animals (*“Official Gazette of RS”*, No 36/17)*
 - Rulebook on Veterinary/Sanitary Conditions of *Establishments* for Rearing and Keeping of Equidae, Bovine Animals, Poultry and Rabbits (*“Official Gazette of RS”*, No. 81/06)*,
 - Rulebook on general and specific requirements for feed hygiene (*“Official Gazette of RS”*, No. 78/10 and No 23/18)*.
- 3) Livestock Act (*“Official Gazette of RS”*, No. 41/2009, 93/12 and No 14/16)*.
 - Regulation on the requirements facilities and equipment that breeding organizations and organizations with special authorizations shall meet, as well as requirements regarding expert staff that organizations with special authorization shall meet (*Official Gazzete of RS, No 103/09*);
 - Regulation on the content and form of the request for registering into the Register of breeding organization with special authorizations, as well as the content and manner of keeping this Register (*“Official Gazette of RS”*, No. 67/09)*.
- 4) Animal Welfare Law (*“Official Gazette of RS”*, No. 41/2009)*.
 - Rulebook on the conditions for animal welfare in terms of space for animals, premises and equipment in the establishments for keeping, breeding and trade of animals, the manner of keeping, breeding and trade of specific animal species and categories, as well as the content and manner of keeping records of animals (*“Official Gazette of RS”*, No. 6/10 and 57/14)*;

- Rulebook on identification and registration of bovine animals (*“Official Gazette of RS”*, No 102/14)*;
 - Regulation on the manner of identification and registration of pig and on the official control of identification, identification and registration of pig (*“Official Gazette of RS”* No 94/10)*;
 - Rulebook laying down the manner of identification and registration of ovine and caprine animals and of official controls on identification and registration of ovine and caprine animals (*“Official Gazette of RS”* No. 6/2011 and 57/11)*;
 - Regulation on the manner of identification and registration of equidae and on the official control of identification, identification and registration of equidae (*“Official Gazette of RS”* No 72/10)*.
- 5) Law on planning and construction (*“Official Gazette of RS”* No 72/09, No81/09, No 64/10 – decision of Constitutional Court (CC), 24/2011, 121/12, 42/13 - decision of Constitutional Court (CC), 50/13- decision of CC, 98/13- decision of CC, 132/14 and 145/14)*.
- 6) Impact Assessment Act on Environment (*“Official Gazette of RS”* No. 135/2004 and 36/09)*.
- Rulebook on the content on the claim of the need of the effects of assessment and contents of the request for determination of volume i contents studies on the assessment of the environmental impact (*“Official Gazette of RS”* No. 69/2005)*.
- 7) Law on safety and health at work (*“Official Gazette of RS”* No. 101/2005, No 91/15, and No 113/17- other law)*.
- Rulebook of procedure for determining compliance requirements prescribed in safety and health (*“Official Gazette of RS”* 60/2006)*.
- 8) Law on general administrative procedure (*“Official Gazette of RS”*, 18/2016)*.

National minimum standards for measure: “Investments in physical assets concerning processing and marketing of agricultural and fishery products”

- 1) Law on Agriculture and Rural Development (*“Official Gazette of the RS”* , No 41/09, No 10/13 – other law, No 101/16)*
- Rulebook on determining areas with difficult working conditions in agriculture (*“Official Gazette of RS”* No39/16)*;
 - Regulations on the ways and conditions of registration and maintaining the register of agricultural holdings, forms required for registration and renewal of registration and reports, documents submitted with the request, how to store data, and the conditions for passive status farm (*“Official Gazette of RS”*, No 17/13, No 102/15, No 6/16 and No 46/17)*

- 2) Law on veterinary Matters (*“Official Gazette of RS” No. 91/05, 30/10 and 93/12*)*.
 - Rulebook on veterinary-sanitary requirements, and general and special conditions of hygiene of food of animal origin, as well as on the conditions of hygiene of food of animal origin (*“Official Gazette of RS” No. 25/11 and 27/14*)*;
 - Rulebook on the categorization and treatment of animal by-products, veterinary sanitary conditions for the construction of facilities for collecting, processing and destruction of animal by-products, method of implementation of official controls, as well as the conditions for animal burial and gravel pits (*“Official Gazette of RS” No 31/11, 97/13 15/15 and No 61/17*)*.
- 3) Animal Welfare Law (*“Official Gazette of RS” No. 41/2009*)*.
 - Rulebook on the conditions and means of killing of animals, the manner of handling the animals immediately before slaughter, conditions and manner of stunning and bleeding, the conditions and methods of slaughter without prior stunning as well as the training programme on animal welfare at the time of slaughtering (*“Official Gazette of RS” No 14/10*)*.
- 4) Food Safety Law (*“Official Gazette of RS” No. 41/09*)*.
 - Regulation on the hygiene of foodstuffs (*“Official Gazette of RS”, No. 73/2010*)*;
 - Regulations on general and specific food hygiene at any stage of production, processing and trade (*“Official Gazette of RS”, No 72/10 and No 62/18*)* (*“Microbiological criteria for foodstuffs”*).
- 5) Law on Surveillance of Foodstuffs of Plant Origin (*“Official Gazette of RS”, No. 25/96 and 101/05*)*.
 - Regulation on specific requirements for production and circulation of foodstuffs of plant origin (*“Official Gazette of RS”, No 50/96*)*.
- 6) Law on Planing and Construction (*“Official Gazette of RS” No 72/09, No 81/09, No 64/10 – decision of Constitutional Court (CC), 24/11, No, 121/12, No 42/13- decision of Constitutional Court (CC), No 50/13 decision of (CC), 98/13 - decision of (CC), No 132/14 and No 145/14*)*
- 7) Impact Assessment Act on Environment (*“Official Gazette of RS”, No. 135/2004 and 36/09*)*.
 - Rulebook on the content on the claim of the need of the effects of assessment and contents of the request for determination of volume i contents studies on the assessment of the environmental impact (*“Official Gazette of RS”, No. 69/2005*)*.
- 8) Law on safety and health at work (*“Official Gazette of RS”,No 101/05, No 91/15, No 113/17 - other law*)*.

- Rulebook of procedure for determining compliance requirements prescribed in safety and health (*“Official Gazette of RS”, No. 60/2006*)*.

9) Law on general administrative procedure (*“Official Gazette of RS”, 18/2016*)*.

National minimum standards for measure: “Farm diversification and business development”

1) Law on Tourism (*“Official Gazette of RS”, No.36/09, 88/10 , 99/11, 93/12 ,84/15 and 17/19*)*; Law on Catering (*“Official Gazette of RS”, No. 17/19*)*

2) Law on Agriculture and Rural Development (*“Official Gazette of the RS” , No 41/09, No 10/13 – other law, No 101/16*)*

3) Rulebook on determining areas with difficult working conditions in agriculture (*“Official Gazette of RS”, No.102/18*)*;

4) Law on planning and construction (*“Official Gazette of RS” No 72/09, No81/09, No 64/10 – decision of Constitutional Court (CC), 24/2011, 121/12, 42/13 - decision of Constitutional Court (CC), 50/13- decision of CC, 98/13- decision of CC, 132/14 and 145/14*)*;

5) Law on general administrative procedure (*“Official Gazette of RS”, 18/2016*)*.

- Rulebook on standards for categorizing a hospitality business (*“Official Gazette of RS”,No 83/16 and No 30/17*)*;
- Rulebook on the conditions and manner of performing hospitality activities, the method of providing hospitality services, the classification of hospitality facilities and minimum technical requirements for arranging and equipping hospitality facilities (*“Official Gazette of RS”, No. 48/2012, and No 58/16*)*;
- Rulebook on minimum technical and sanitary-hygienic conditions for the provision of services in home crafts and rural touristic households (*“Official Gazette of RS”, No 41/10 and 48/12 – other rulebook*)*.

ANNEX 4: AREAS WITH DIFFICULT WORKING CONDITIONS IN AGRICULTURE

In accordance with Article 3, Paragraph 4 of the Law on incentives in agriculture and rural development ("*Official Gazette of RS*", No. 10/13, 142/14 and 103/15)* and with Article 17, paragraph 4 and Article 24, Paragraph 2 of the Law on Government ("*Official Gazette of RS*", No 55/05, 71/05 - correction, 101/07, 65/08, 16/11, 68/12 - US, 72/12, 7/14 - US and 44/14)*, Minister of Agriculture and Environmental Protection, announces

RULEBOOK ON DESIGNATION OF AREAS WITH DIFFICULT WORKING CONDITIONS IN AGRICULTURE

(Published in the "*Official Gazette of RS*", No. 39 /16 of 15 April 2016)*

Article 1

This by-law designates areas with difficult working conditions in agriculture for the period of three years.

Article 2

Based on this by-law, the status of areas with difficult working conditions in agriculture is designated to municipal or town settlements, or to the entire territory of the municipality, i.e. all settlements of the municipal territory under the condition of meeting at least one of the following criteria:

- 1) located at an altitude higher than 500 meters, based on the data of the Republic Geodetic Authority;
- 2) located within the boundaries of national parks, based on the Law on National Parks ("*Official Gazette of RS* ", No. 84/15)*;
- 3) number of employees is lower than 100 per 1,000 inhabitants, according to data released in the edition "Municipalities and regions of the Republic of Serbia, 2015") by the SORS.

Article 3

Areas with difficult working conditions in agriculture that meet the criterion set out in Article 2, Paragraph 1, Item 1) are given in Annex 1 - List of villages in mountainous areas, which is printed with this Rulebook as its integral part.

Areas with difficult working conditions in agriculture that meet one of the criteria set out in Article 2, Paragraph 1, Items. 2) and Article 3) are given Annex 2 - Other areas with difficult working conditions in agriculture, which is printed with this Rulebook as its integral part.

Article 4

Former Rulebook on designation of areas with difficult working conditions in agriculture ("*Official Gazette of RS* ", No . 29/13)*, ceases to rule on the day of entering of this Rulebook into force.

Article 5

This Rulebook shall enter into force on the day following its publication in the "*Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia*".

ANNEX 4.1: LIST OF SETTLEMENTS IN AREAS WITH DIFFICULT WORKING CONDITIONS IN AGRICULTURE

Settlements in areas with difficult working conditions in Agriculture are consisted of settlements listed in mountain areas and areas presented in Table 30, which comply with following criteria:

- 1) located within the boundaries of national parks, based on the Law on National Parks ("*Official Gazette of RS* ", No. 84/15)*;
- 2) number of employees is lower than 100 per 1,000 inhabitants, according to data released in the edition "Municipalities and regions of the Republic of Serbia, 2015") by the SORS.

Table 30: List of additional settlements in Areas with difficult working conditions in agriculture.

| No | Municipality/City | Settlement |
|----|-------------------|--|
| 1. | Bačka Palanka | Vizić |
| | | Neštin |
| 2. | Beočin | Banoštor |
| | | Beočin |
| | | Grabovo |
| | | Lug |
| | | Rakovac |
| | | Sviloš |
| | | Susek |
| | | Čerević |
| 3. | Bogatić | All populated settlements on the territory of the municipality |
| 4. | Bojnik | All populated settlements on the territory of the municipality |
| 5. | Golubac | Brnjica |
| | | Golubac |
| | | Dobra |
| 6. | Doljevac | All populated settlements on the territory of the municipality |
| 7. | Žabari | All populated settlements on the territory of the municipality |
| 8. | Žitorađa | All populated settlements on the territory of the municipality |

| | | |
|-----|---------------------------|--|
| 9. | Indija | Beška |
| | | Krčedin |
| | | Novi Karlovci |
| | | Novi Slankamen |
| | | Stari Slankamen |
| | | Čortanovci |
| 10. | Irig | Velika Remeta |
| | | Vrdnik |
| | | Grgetek |
| | | Dobrodol |
| | | Irig |
| | | Jazak |
| | | Krušedol Selo |
| | | Krušedol Prnjavor |
| | | Mala Remeta |
| | | Neradin |
| | | Rivica |
| | | Šatrinci |
| 11. | Kladovo | Tekija |
| 12. | Malo Crniće | All populated settlements on the territory of the municipality |
| 13. | Merošina | All populated settlements on the territory of the municipality |
| 14. | Niš – opština Pantelej | All populated settlements on the territory of the municipality |
| 15. | Novi Sad | Bukovac |
| | | Ledinci |
| | | Petrovaradin |
| 16. | Opovo | All populated settlements on the territory of the municipality |
| 17. | Petrovac na Mlavi | Oreškovića |
| 18. | Ražanj | All populated settlements on the territory of the municipality |

| | | |
|-----|-------------------|--|
| 19. | Ruma | Pavlovci |
| | | Stejanovci |
| 20. | Sremska Mitrovica | Bešenovački Prnjavor |
| | | Grgurevci |
| | | Divoš |
| | | Ležimir |
| | | Mandelos |
| | | Čalma |
| | | Šišatovac |
| | | Šuljam |
| 21. | Sremski Karlovci | All populated settlements on the territory of the municipality |
| 22. | Tutin | All populated settlements on the territory of the municipality |
| 23. | Šid | Bačinci |
| | | Berkasovo |
| | | Bikić Do |
| | | Bingula |
| | | Gibarac |
| | | Erdevik |
| | | Kukujevci |
| | | Ljuba |
| | | Molovin |
| | | Privina Glava |
| | | Sot |
| | | Šid |

ANNEX 4.2: LIST OF SETTLEMENTS IN MOUNTAIN AREAS

| No | Municipality/City | Settlement |
|----|-------------------|----------------|
| 1. | Aleksandrovac | Bzenice |
| | | Boturići |
| | | Bratići |
| | | Velika Vrbnica |
| | | Velja Glava |
| | | Vranštica |
| | | Gornji Vratari |
| | | Grčak |
| | | Donji Vratari |
| | | Jelakci |
| | | Koznica |
| | | Latkovac |
| | | Lesenovci |
| | | Leskovica |
| | | Pleš |
| | | Ploča |
| | | Puhovac |
| | | Ržanica |
| | | Rogavčina |
| | | Rokci |
| | | Starci |
| | | Strmenica |
| 2. | Aleksinac | Vukanja |
| | | Golešnica |
| | | Lipovac |
| | | Porodin |
| | | Prekonozi |
| | | Rsovac |

| | | |
|----|-----------|-----------------|
| | | Crna Bara |
| 3. | Arilje | Bjeluša |
| | | Brekovo |
| | | Visoka |
| | | Vrane |
| | | Grivska |
| | | Dobrače |
| | | Kruščica |
| | | Latvica |
| | | Mirosaljci |
| | | Radobuđa |
| | | Radoševo |
| | | Severovo |
| | | Stupčevići |
| | | Trešnjevica |
| 4. | Babušnica | Aleksandrovac |
| | | Babušnica |
| | | Berduj |
| | | Berin Izvor |
| | | Bogdanovac |
| | | Bratiševac |
| | | Brestov Dol |
| | | Vava |
| | | Valniš |
| | | Veliko Bonjince |
| | | Vojnici |
| | | Vrelo |
| | | Vuči Del |
| | | Gornje Krnjino |

| | | |
|--|--|------------------|
| | | Gornji Striževac |
| | | Gorčince |
| | | Grnčar |
| | | Dol |
| | | Donje Krnjino |
| | | Donji Striževac |
| | | Draginac |
| | | Dučevac |
| | | Zavidince |
| | | Zvonce |
| | | Izvor |
| | | Jasenov Del |
| | | Kaluđerovo |
| | | Kambelevac |
| | | Kijevac |
| | | Leskovica |
| | | Linovo |
| | | Ljuberada |
| | | Masurovac |
| | | Našuškovica |
| | | Ostatovica |
| | | Preseka |
| | | Provaljenik |
| | | Radinjinice |
| | | Radosinj |
| | | Radoševac |
| | | Rakita |
| | | Rakov Dol |
| | | Raljini |

| | | |
|----|--------------|---------------|
| | | Resnik |
| | | Stol |
| | | Strelac |
| | | Studena |
| | | Suračevo |
| | | Crvena Jabuka |
| | | Štrbovac |
| 5. | Bajina Bašta | Beserovina |
| | | Gvozdac |
| | | Dobrotin |
| | | Draksin |
| | | Dub |
| | | Zaglavak |
| | | Zaovine |
| | | Zarožje |
| | | Zaugline |
| | | Zlodol |
| | | Jagoštica |
| | | Jakalj |
| | | Jelovik |
| | | Konjska Reka |
| | | Lještansko |
| | | Mala Reka |
| | | Ovčinja |
| | | Okletac |
| | | Pepelj |
| | | Peručac |
| | | Pilica |
| | | Pridoli |

| | | |
|----|--------------|------------------|
| | | Rastište |
| | | Rača |
| | | Rogačica |
| | | Sijerač |
| | | Solotuša |
| | | Strmovo |
| | | Cerje |
| 6. | Bela Palanka | Babin Kal |
| | | Bežište |
| | | Veta |
| | | Vitanovac |
| | | Vrandol |
| | | Vrgudinac |
| | | Gornja Glama |
| | | Gornja Koritnica |
| | | Gornji Rinj |
| | | Gradište |
| | | Divljana |
| | | Dolac (selo) |
| | | Donja Glama |
| | | Donja Koritnica |
| | | Donji Rinj |
| | | Draževo |
| | | Klisura |
| | | Kozja |
| | | Kosmovac |
| | | Krupac |
| | | Miranovac |
| | | Miranovačka Kula |

| | | |
|----|--------|-----------------|
| | | Mokra |
| | | Novo Selo |
| | | Oreovac |
| | | Pajež |
| | | Telovac |
| | | Toponica |
| | | Crnče |
| | | Šljivovik |
| 7. | Blace | Više Selo |
| | | Vrbovac |
| | | Gornja Jošanica |
| | | Gornje Grgure |
| | | Donja Rašica |
| | | Drešnica |
| | | Kačapor |
| | | Muzaće |
| | | Popova |
| | | Prebreza |
| | | Pretrešnja |
| | | Pridvorica |
| | | Rašica |
| | | Sibnica |
| | | Džepnica |
| 8. | Bojnik | Borince |
| | | Dobra Voda |
| | | Ivanje |
| | | Magaš |
| | | Majkovac |
| | | Obražda |

| | | |
|-----|------------|----------------|
| 9. | Boljevac | Bogovina |
| | | Dobro Polje |
| | | Jablanica |
| | | Krivi Vir |
| | | Lukovo |
| | | Mali Izvor |
| | | Mirovo |
| | | Podgorac |
| | | Rtanj |
| | | Rujište |
| 10. | Bor | Bor |
| | | Bučje |
| | | Gornjane |
| | | Zlot |
| | | Krivelj |
| | | Luka |
| | | Tanda |
| | | Topla |
| 11. | Bosilegrad | Barje |
| | | Belut |
| | | Bistar |
| | | Bosilegrad |
| | | Brankovci |
| | | Bresnica |
| | | Buceljevo |
| | | Goleš |
| | | Gložje |
| | | Gornja Ljubata |
| | | Gornja Lisina |

| | | |
|-----|------|----------------|
| | | Gornja Ržana |
| | | Gornje Tlamino |
| | | Grujinci |
| | | Doganica |
| | | Donja Ljubata |
| | | Donja Lisina |
| | | Donja Ržana |
| | | Donje Tlamino |
| | | Dukat |
| | | Žeravino |
| | | Zli Dol |
| | | Izvor |
| | | Jarešnik |
| | | Karamanica |
| | | Milevci |
| | | Mlekominci |
| | | Musulj |
| | | Nazarica |
| | | Paralovo |
| | | Ploča |
| | | Radičevci |
| | | Rajčilo |
| | | Resen |
| | | Ribarci |
| | | Rikačevo |
| | | Crnoštica |
| 12. | Brus | Batote |
| | | Belo Polje |
| | | Blaževo |

| | | |
|--|--|-------------------|
| | | Bozoljin |
| | | Boranci |
| | | Brđani |
| | | Brzeće |
| | | Budilovina |
| | | Velika Grabovnica |
| | | Vitoše |
| | | Vlajkovci |
| | | Gornje Leviće |
| | | Gornji Lipovac |
| | | Grad |
| | | Gradac |
| | | Graševci |
| | | Domiševina |
| | | Donje Leviće |
| | | Donji Lipovac |
| | | Drenova |
| | | Drtevc |
| | | Đerekare |
| | | Žarevo |
| | | Žiljci |
| | | Žunje |
| | | Iričići |
| | | Kneževo |
| | | Kobilje |
| | | Kovizle |
| | | Kočine |
| | | Kriva Reka |
| | | Livađe |

| | | |
|-----|-----------|-----------------|
| | | Mala Grabovnica |
| | | Milentija |
| | | Osreci |
| | | Paljevštica |
| | | Ravnište |
| | | Radmanovo |
| | | Radunje |
| | | Ribari |
| | | Stanuloviće |
| | | Sudimlja |
| | | Tršanovci |
| | | Čokotar |
| | | Šošiće |
| 13. | Bujanovac | Baraljevac |
| | | Biljača |
| | | Bogdanovac |
| | | Bratoselce |
| | | Breznica |
| | | Brnjare |
| | | Buštranje |
| | | Veliki Trnovac |
| | | Vogance |
| | | Vrban |
| | | Dobrosin |
| | | Donje Novo Selo |
| | | Drežnica |
| | | Dordevac |
| | | Zarbince |
| | | Jablanica |

| | | |
|-----|---------|--------------|
| | | Jastrebac |
| | | Klenike |
| | | Klinovac |
| | | Končulj |
| | | Košarno |
| | | Kuštica |
| | | Letovica |
| | | Lopardince |
| | | Lukarce |
| | | Lučane |
| | | Mali Trnovac |
| | | Muhovac |
| | | Negovac |
| | | Nesalce |
| | | Novo Selo |
| | | Pretina |
| | | Pribovce |
| | | Ravno Bučje |
| | | Rusce |
| | | Sveta Petka |
| | | Sebrat |
| | | Sejace |
| | | Spančevac |
| | | Starac |
| | | Suharno |
| | | Trejak |
| | | Uzovo |
| | | Čar |
| 14. | Valjevo | Bačevci |

| | | |
|-----|--------------|------------------|
| | | Brezovice |
| | | Vujinovača |
| | | Gornje Leskovice |
| | | Donje Leskovice |
| | | Divčibare |
| | | Mijači |
| | | Prijezdici |
| | | Ravnje |
| | | Rebelj |
| | | Sitarice |
| | | Stanina Reka |
| | | Sovač |
| | | Suvodanje |
| | | Sušica |
| | | Taor |
| | | Tubravić |
| 15. | Vladičin Han | Bačvište |
| | | Belanovce |
| | | Beliševo |
| | | Bogoševo |
| | | Brestovo |
| | | Garinje |
| | | Gornje Jabukovo |
| | | Donje Jabukovo |
| | | Zebince |
| | | Jagnjilo |
| | | Jastrebac |
| | | Jovac |
| | | Kacapun |

| | | |
|-----|------------|-----------------|
| | | Koznica |
| | | Kopitarce |
| | | Kostomlatica |
| | | Kukavica |
| | | Kunovo |
| | | Lebet |
| | | Letovište |
| | | Ljutež |
| | | Manjak |
| | | Mrtvica |
| | | Ostrovica |
| | | Ravna Reka |
| | | Rdovo |
| | | Repište |
| | | Ružić |
| | | Solačka Sena |
| | | Srneći Dol |
| 16. | Vlasotince | Aleksine |
| | | Borin Do |
| | | Brezovica |
| | | Gornja Lopušnja |
| | | Gornji Dejan |
| | | Gornji Orah |
| | | Gornji Prisjan |
| | | Gradište |
| | | Gumerište |
| | | Gunjetina |
| | | Donja Lopušnja |
| | | Donje Gare |

| | | |
|-----|--------|---------------|
| | | Donji Prisjan |
| | | Dobroviš |
| | | Zlatičevo |
| | | Javorje |
| | | Jakovljevo |
| | | Jastrebac |
| | | Kozilo |
| | | Komarica |
| | | Lipovica |
| | | Ostrc |
| | | Pržojne |
| | | Ravna Gora |
| | | Ravni Del |
| | | Samarnica |
| | | Sredor |
| | | Stranjevo |
| | | Crna Bara |
| 17. | Vranje | Barbarušince |
| | | Barelić |
| | | Beli Breg |
| | | Bojin Del |
| | | Buljesovce |
| | | Buštranje |
| | | Viševce |
| | | Vlase |
| | | Vranje |
| | | Vrtogoš |
| | | Golemo Selo |
| | | Gornja Otulja |

| | | |
|--|--|-------------------|
| | | Gornje Žapsko |
| | | Gornje Punuševce |
| | | Gornje Trebešinje |
| | | Gradnja |
| | | Dobrejance |
| | | Donje Punuševce |
| | | Dragobužde |
| | | Drenovac |
| | | Dubnica |
| | | Dulan |
| | | Dupeljevo |
| | | Katun |
| | | Klašnice |
| | | Kopanjane |
| | | Kočura |
| | | Kruševa Glava |
| | | Lalince |
| | | Lepčince |
| | | Lukovo |
| | | Margance |
| | | Mečkovac |
| | | Mijakovce |
| | | Mijovce |
| | | Milivojce |
| | | Nastavce |
| | | Nova Brezovica |
| | | Oblička Sena |
| | | Oštra Glava |
| | | Pljačkovica |

| | | |
|-----|----------------|-----------------|
| | | Preobraženje |
| | | Roždace |
| | | Rusce |
| | | Sikirje |
| | | Smiljević |
| | | Soderce |
| | | Srednji Del |
| | | Stance |
| | | Stara Brezovica |
| | | Strešak |
| | | Struganica |
| | | Studena |
| | | Surdul |
| | | Tesovište |
| | | Tibužde |
| | | Trstena |
| | | Tumba |
| | | Čurkovića |
| | | Urmanica |
| | | Uševce |
| | | Čestelin |
| 18. | Vranjska Banja | Babina Poljana |
| | | Bujkovac |
| | | Duga Luka |
| | | Izumno |
| | | Klisurica |
| | | Kriva Feja |
| | | Korbevac |
| | | Korbul |

| | | |
|-----|----------------|------------------|
| | | Leva Reka |
| | | Lipovac |
| | | Nesvrta |
| | | Prvonek |
| | | Sebevranje |
| | | Slivnica |
| | | Stari Glog |
| | | Toplac |
| | | Crni Vrh |
| 19. | Vrnjačka Banja | Goč |
| | | Otroci |
| | | Rsavci |
| | | Stanišinci |
| 20. | Gadžin Han | Veliki Vrtop |
| | | Veliki Krčimir |
| | | Vilandrica |
| | | Gare |
| | | Gornje Dragovlje |
| | | Gornji Dušnik |
| | | Donje Dragovlje |
| | | Jagličje |
| | | Kaletinac |
| | | Koprivnica |
| | | Ličje |
| | | Mali Vrtop |
| | | Mali Krčimir |
| | | Ovsinjinac |
| | | Semče |
| | | Sopotnica |

| | | |
|-----|------------------|------------------|
| | | Čelije |
| | | Šebet |
| 21. | Gornji Milanovac | Belo Polje |
| | | Beršići |
| | | Bogdanica |
| | | Brajići |
| | | Brezna |
| | | Gojna Gora |
| | | Gornja Crnuća |
| | | Gornji Banjani |
| | | Gornji Branetići |
| | | Grabovica |
| | | Donja Vrbava |
| | | Drenova |
| | | Družetići |
| | | Jablanica |
| | | Koštunići |
| | | Majdan |
| | | Polom |
| | | Rudnik |
| | | Svračkovci |
| | | Srezojevci |
| | | Teočin |
| 22. | Despotovac | Bare |
| | | Židilje |
| | | Jelovac |
| | | Makvište |
| | | Ravna Reka |
| | | Senjski Rudnik |

| | | |
|-----|--------------|------------------|
| | | Sladaja |
| | | Strmosten |
| 23. | Dimitrovgrad | Boljev Dol |
| | | Banski Dol |
| | | Barje |
| | | Bačevo |
| | | Bilo |
| | | Braćeenci |
| | | Brebevnica |
| | | Verzar |
| | | Visočki Odorovci |
| | | Vlkovija |
| | | Vrapča |
| | | Gojin Dol |
| | | Gornja Nevlja |
| | | Gornji Krivodol |
| | | Gradinje |
| | | Grapa |
| | | Gulenovci |
| | | Dimitrovgrad |
| | | Donja Nevlja |
| | | Donji Krivodol |
| | | Dragovita |
| | | Željuša |
| | | Izatovci |
| | | Iskrovci |
| | | Kamenica |
| | | Kusa Vrana |
| | | Lukavica |

| | | |
|-----|----------|-----------------|
| | | Mazgoš |
| | | Mojinci |
| | | Paskašija |
| | | Petačinci |
| | | Peterlaš |
| | | Planinica |
| | | Poganovo |
| | | Prača |
| | | Protopopinci |
| | | Radejna |
| | | Senokos |
| | | Skrvenica |
| | | Slivnica |
| | | Smilovci |
| | | Trnski Odorovci |
| 24. | Žagubica | Žagubica |
| | | Izvarica |
| | | Jošanica |
| | | Laznica |
| | | Lipe |
| | | Milanovac |
| | | Osanica |
| | | Selište |
| | | Suvi Do |
| 25. | Žitorada | Asanovac |
| | | Zladovac |
| 26. | Zaječar | Lasovo |
| | | Marinovac |
| 27. | Ivanjica | Bedina Varoš |

| | | |
|--|--|---------------------|
| | | Bratljevo |
| | | Brezova |
| | | Brusnik |
| | | Budoželja |
| | | Bukovica |
| | | Vasiljevići |
| | | Vionica |
| | | Vrmbaje |
| | | Vučak |
| | | Gleđica |
| | | Gradac |
| | | Dajići |
| | | Devići |
| | | Deretin |
| | | Dobri Do |
| | | Dubrava |
| | | Erčege |
| | | Javorska Ravna Gora |
| | | Katići |
| | | Klekova |
| | | Kovilje |
| | | Komadine |
| | | Koritnik |
| | | Kosovica |
| | | Kumanica |
| | | Kušići |
| | | Lisa |
| | | Luke |
| | | Mana |

| | | |
|-----|-----------|-----------------|
| | | Maskova |
| | | Medovine |
| | | Međurečje |
| | | Močioci |
| | | Opaljenik |
| | | Osonica |
| | | Preseka |
| | | Prilike |
| | | Ravna Gora |
| | | Radaljevo |
| | | Rovine |
| | | Rokci |
| | | Sveštica |
| | | Sivčina |
| | | Smiljevac |
| | | Čečina |
| | | Šarenik |
| | | Šume |
| 28. | Knjčić | Bajčetina |
| 29. | Knjaževac | Aldina Reka |
| | | Aldinac |
| | | Balinac |
| | | Balta Berilovac |
| | | Banjski Orešac |
| | | Beli Potok |
| | | Božinovac |
| | | Bučje |
| | | Vasilj |
| | | Vidovac |

| | | |
|--|--|-----------------|
| | | Vlaško Polje |
| | | Vrtovac |
| | | Gabrovnica |
| | | Dejanovac |
| | | Drvnik |
| | | Zorunovac |
| | | Zubetinac |
| | | Inovo |
| | | Jalovik Izvor |
| | | Janja |
| | | Koželj |
| | | Krenta |
| | | Lokva |
| | | Manjinac |
| | | Miljkovac |
| | | Mučibaba |
| | | Novo Korito |
| | | Ošljane |
| | | Papratna |
| | | Ponor |
| | | Pričevac |
| | | Ravno Bučje |
| | | Radičevac |
| | | Repušnica |
| | | Svrljiška Topla |
| | | Skrobnica |
| | | Stanjinac |
| | | Staro Korito |
| | | Tatrasnica |

| | | |
|-----|----------|------------------|
| | | Čuštica |
| | | Crni Vrh |
| | | Šarbanovac |
| | | Šesti Gabar |
| | | Šuman Topla |
| 30. | Kosjerić | Bjeloperica |
| | | Varda |
| | | Galovići |
| | | Godečevo |
| | | Godljevo |
| | | Gornja Pološnica |
| | | Donja Pološnica |
| | | Drenovci |
| | | Dubnica |
| | | Kosjerić (selo) |
| | | Makovište |
| | | Mionica |
| | | Mrčići |
| | | Mušići |
| | | Paramun |
| | | Radanovci |
| | | Rosići |
| | | Ruda Bukva |
| | | Seča Reka |
| | | Skakavci |
| | | Stojići |
| | | Subjel |
| | | Tubići |
| | | Cikote |

| | | |
|-----|------------|---------------|
| | | Ševrljuge |
| 31. | Kragujevac | Adžine Livade |
| | | Dulene |
| | | Kamenica |
| | | Ljubičevac |
| | | Ramaća |
| 32. | Kraljevo | Bare |
| | | Bzovik |
| | | Bogutovac |
| | | Bojanići |
| | | Borovo |
| | | Brezna |
| | | Brezova |
| | | Bresnik |
| | | Vrh |
| | | Gledić |
| | | Gokčanica |
| | | Dolac |
| | | Dražiniće |
| | | Đakovo |
| | | Zamčanje |
| | | Zasad |
| | | Kamenica |
| | | Kamenjani |
| | | Lopatnica |
| | | Maglič |
| | | Mataruge |
| | | Međurečje |
| | | Meljanica |

| | | |
|-----|----------|----------------|
| | | Miliće |
| | | Mlanča |
| | | Orlja Glava |
| | | Plana |
| | | Polumir |
| | | Predole |
| | | Ravanica |
| | | Reka |
| | | Rudno |
| | | Rudnjak |
| | | Savovo |
| | | Stanča |
| | | Tadenje |
| | | Tepeče |
| | | Tolišnica |
| | | Trgovište |
| | | Ušće |
| | | Cerje |
| 33. | Krupanj | Bogoštica |
| | | Brštica |
| | | Kržava |
| | | Planina |
| | | Tomanj |
| | | Šljivova |
| 34. | Kruševac | Boljevac |
| | | Buci |
| | | Naupare |
| | | Petina |
| | | Ribarska Banja |

| | | |
|-----|-------------|----------------|
| | | Rlica |
| | | Sezemče |
| | | Srndalje |
| 35. | Kuršumljija | Babica |
| | | Baćoglava |
| | | Vasiljevac |
| | | Veliko Pupavce |
| | | Visoka |
| | | Vlahinja |
| | | Vrelo |
| | | Vukojevac |
| | | Gornje Točane |
| | | Dabinovac |
| | | Degrmen |
| | | Dedinac |
| | | Dešiška |
| | | Dobri Do |
| | | Dubrava |
| | | Đake |
| | | Žalica |
| | | Žegrova |
| | | Žuč |
| | | Zagrađe |
| | | Zebica |
| | | Ivan Kula |
| | | Igrište |
| | | Konjuva |
| | | Kosmača |
| | | Krtok |

| | | |
|--|--|--------------------|
| | | Kupinovo |
| | | Kuršumlijska Banja |
| | | Kutlovo |
| | | Lukovo |
| | | Ljutova |
| | | Ljuša |
| | | Magovo |
| | | Mala Kosanica |
| | | Matarova |
| | | Mačja Stena |
| | | Merdare |
| | | Merćez |
| | | Mehane |
| | | Mirnica |
| | | Mrča |
| | | Nevada |
| | | Orlovac |
| | | Pavaštica |
| | | Parada |
| | | Pačarađa |
| | | Perunika |
| | | Pljakovo |
| | | Prevetica |
| | | Prekorađa |
| | | Prolom |
| | | Ravni Šort |
| | | Rastelica |
| | | Rača |
| | | Rudare |

| | | |
|-----|----------|------------|
| | | Sagonjevo |
| | | Samokovo |
| | | Svinjište |
| | | Sekirača |
| | | Selište |
| | | Selova |
| | | Seoce |
| | | Spance |
| | | Tačevac |
| | | Tijovac |
| | | Trebinje |
| | | Trećak |
| | | Trmka |
| | | Trn |
| | | Trpeze |
| | | Šatra |
| | | Štava |
| 36. | Kučevo | Ceremošnja |
| 37. | Lebane | Buvce |
| | | Drvodelj |
| | | Klajić |
| | | Lipovica |
| | | Petrovac |
| | | Poroštica |
| | | Radevce |
| | | Rafuna |
| | | Slišane |
| 38. | Leskovac | Babičko |
| | | Bistrica |

| | | |
|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | Bočevica |
| | | Bričevlje |
| | | Bukova Glava |
| | | Velika Sejanica |
| | | Vilje Kolo |
| | | Vučje |
| | | Gaginca |
| | | Golema Njiva |
| | | Gorina |
| | | Gornja Kupinovica |
| | | Graovo |
| | | Dedina Bara |
| | | Jarsenovo |
| | | Kaluđerce |
| | | Kovačeva Bara |
| | | Krpejce |
| | | Ličin Dol |
| | | Melovo |
| | | Mrkovicica |
| | | Nakrivanj |
| | | Nesvrta |
| | | Novo Selo |
| | | Oraovica (kod Grdelice) |
| | | Oruglica |
| | | Padež |
| | | Palojce |
| | | Piskupovo |
| | | Predejane (selo) |
| | | Ravni Del |

| | | |
|-----|-----------|------------------|
| | | Slatina |
| | | Stupnica |
| | | Suševlje |
| | | Tulovo |
| | | Crveni Breg |
| | | Crkavnica |
| | | Crcavac |
| | | Čukljenik |
| 39. | Lučani | Beli Kamen |
| | | Viča |
| | | Vlasteljice |
| | | Vučkovica |
| | | Goračići |
| | | Gornja Kravarica |
| | | Gornji Dubac |
| | | Grab |
| | | Guberevci |
| | | Donji Dubac |
| | | Dučalovići |
| | | Zeoke |
| | | Kaona |
| | | Kotraža |
| | | Lučani (selo) |
| | | Milatovići |
| | | Pšanik |
| | | Rtari |
| | | Rti |
| 40. | Ljig | Ba |
| 41. | Ljubovija | Gornja Ljuboviđa |

| | | |
|-----|-----------|------------------|
| | | Gornja Orovica |
| | | Gornje Košlje |
| | | Grčić |
| | | Drlače |
| | | Leović |
| | | Orovička Planina |
| | | Postenje |
| | | Rujevac |
| | | Savković |
| | | Selenac |
| | | Sokolac |
| | | Tornik |
| | | Caparić |
| 42. | Majdanpek | Vlaole |
| | | Debeli Lug |
| | | Jasikovo |
| | | Leskovo |
| 43. | Medveđa | Bogunovac |
| | | Borovac |
| | | Varadin |
| | | Velika Braina |
| | | Vrapce |
| | | Gornja Lapaštica |
| | | Gornji Bučumet |
| | | Gornji Gajtan |
| | | Grbavce |
| | | Gubavce |
| | | Donja Lapaštica |
| | | Donji Gajtan |

| | | |
|-----|----------|-------------------------|
| | | Drence |
| | | Dulekare |
| | | Kapit |
| | | Lece |
| | | Mala Braina |
| | | Marovac |
| | | Maćedonce |
| | | Maćedonce (Retkocersko) |
| | | Medevce |
| | | Mrkonje |
| | | Petrilje |
| | | Poroštica |
| | | Pusto Šilovo |
| | | Ravna Banja |
| | | Retkocer |
| | | Svirce |
| | | Sijarina |
| | | Sijarinska Banja |
| | | Sponce |
| | | Srednji Bučumet |
| | | Stara Banja |
| | | Stubla |
| | | Tulare |
| | | Tupale |
| | | Čokotin |
| 44. | Merošina | Devča |
| | | Čubura |
| 45. | Mionica | Gornji Lajkovac |
| | | Mratišić |

| | | |
|-----|---------------------------|------------------|
| | | Osečenica |
| | | Krčmar |
| | | Planinica |
| 46. | Negotin | Popovica |
| 47. | Niš – opština Crveni Krst | Leskovik |
| 48. | Niš – opština Niška Banja | Bancarevo |
| | | Gornja Studena |
| | | Donja Studena |
| | | Koritnjak |
| | | Kunovica |
| | | Manastir |
| | | Ravni Do |
| | | Radikina Bara |
| | | Rautovo |
| | | Sićevo |
| 49. | Niš – opština Palilula | Berbatovo |
| 50. | Niš – opština Pantelej | Vrelo |
| | | Oreovac |
| | | Cerje |
| 51. | Nova Varoš | Akmačići |
| | | Amzići |
| | | Bistrica |
| | | Božetići |
| | | Brdo |
| | | Bukovik |
| | | Burađa |
| | | Vilovi |
| | | Vraneša |
| | | Gornja Bela Reka |

| | | |
|-----|------------|-----------------|
| | | Gornje Trudovo |
| | | Debelja |
| | | Donja Bela Reka |
| | | Draglica |
| | | Draževići |
| | | Drmanovići |
| | | Jasenovo |
| | | Komarani |
| | | Kučani |
| | | Ljepojevići |
| | | Miševići |
| | | Negbina |
| | | Nova Varoš |
| | | Ojkovica |
| | | Radljevići |
| | | Radoinja |
| | | Rutoši |
| | | Seništa |
| | | Tikva |
| | | Tisovica |
| | | Trudovo |
| | | Čelice |
| | | Šitkovo |
| 52. | Novi Pazar | Aluloviće |
| | | Bajevica |
| | | Banja |
| | | Bare |
| | | Batnjik |
| | | Bekova |

| | | |
|--|--|-----------------|
| | | Bele Vode |
| | | Boturovina |
| | | Brđani |
| | | Brestovo |
| | | Varevo |
| | | Vever |
| | | Vidovo |
| | | Vitkoviće |
| | | Vojkoviće |
| | | Vojniće |
| | | Vranovina |
| | | Vučiniće |
| | | Vučja Lokva |
| | | Golice |
| | | Gornja Tušimlja |
| | | Goševo |
| | | Građanoviće |
| | | Gračane |
| | | Grubetiće |
| | | Deževa |
| | | Dojinoviće |
| | | Dolac |
| | | Doljani |
| | | Dragočevo |
| | | Dramiće |
| | | Žunjeviće |
| | | Zabrđe |
| | | Zlatare |
| | | Ivanča |

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| | Izbice |
| | Jablanica |
| | Javor |
| | Janča |
| | Jova |
| | Kašalj |
| | Kovačevo |
| | Kožlje |
| | Koprivnica |
| | Kosuriće |
| | Kruševo |
| | Kuzmičevo |
| | Leča |
| | Lopužnje |
| | Lukare |
| | Lukarsko Goševo |
| | Lukocrevo |
| | Miščiće |
| | Mur |
| | Muhovo |
| | Negotinac |
| | Novi Pazar |
| | Odojeviće |
| | Okose |
| | Osaonica |
| | Osoje |
| | Oholje |
| | Pavlje |
| | Paralovo |

| | | |
|--|--|---------------------|
| | | Pasji Potok |
| | | Pilareta |
| | | Pobrđe |
| | | Požega |
| | | Požezina |
| | | Polokce |
| | | Pope |
| | | Postenje |
| | | Prćenova |
| | | Pusta Tušimlja |
| | | Pustovlah |
| | | Radaljica |
| | | Rajetiće |
| | | Rajkoviće |
| | | Rajčinovička Trnava |
| | | Rajčinoviće |
| | | Rakovac |
| | | Rast |
| | | Sebečevo |
| | | Sitniče |
| | | Skukovo |
| | | Slatina |
| | | Smilov Laz |
| | | Srednja Tušimlja |
| | | Stradovo |
| | | Sudsko Selo |
| | | Tenkovo |
| | | Trnava |
| | | Tunovo |

| | | |
|-----|---------|----------------|
| | | Hotkovo |
| | | Cokoviće |
| | | Čašić Dolac |
| | | Šavci |
| | | Šaronje |
| | | Štitare |
| 53. | Osečina | Dragodol |
| | | Skadar |
| | | Carina |
| 54. | Paraćin | Klačevica |
| | | Gornja Mutnica |
| | | Buljane |
| 55. | Pirot | Bazovik |
| | | Basara |
| | | Bela |
| | | Berilovac |
| | | Berovica |
| | | Brlog |
| | | Velika Lukanja |
| | | Veliki Suvodol |
| | | Visočka Ržana |
| | | Vlasi |
| | | Gornja Držina |
| | | Gostuša |
| | | Gradašnica |
| | | Dobri Do |
| | | Dojkinci |
| | | Zaskovci |
| | | Izvor |

| | |
|--|--------------|
| | Jalbotina |
| | Jelovica |
| | Kamik |
| | Koprivštica |
| | Kostur |
| | Krupac |
| | Kumanovo |
| | Mali Suvodol |
| | Milojkovac |
| | Mirkovci |
| | Nišor |
| | Novi Zavoj |
| | Obrenovac |
| | Oreovica |
| | Orlja |
| | Osmakova |
| | Pakleštica |
| | Pasjač |
| | Petrovac |
| | Planinica |
| | Pokrevenik |
| | Ponor |
| | Prisjan |
| | Ragodeš |
| | Rasnica |
| | Rosomač |
| | Rsovc |
| | Rudinje |
| | Sinja Glava |

| | | |
|-----|---------|------------------|
| | | Slavinja |
| | | Srečkovac |
| | | Staničenje |
| | | Temska |
| | | Topli Do |
| | | Cerev Del |
| | | Cerova |
| | | Crnoklište |
| | | Činiglavci |
| | | Šugrin |
| 56. | Požega | Velika Ježevica |
| | | Gornja Dobrinja |
| | | Donja Dobrinja |
| | | Dražinovići |
| | | Duškovci |
| | | Zaselje |
| | | Loret |
| | | Ljutice |
| | | Mala Ježevica |
| | | Mršelji |
| | | Papратиште |
| | | Rečice |
| | | Roge |
| | | Rupeljevo |
| | | Svračkovo |
| | | Srednja Dobrinja |
| | | Tabanovići |
| | | Tometino Polje |
| 57. | Preševo | Alidërce |

| | | |
|-----|--------|---------------|
| | | Berčevac |
| | | Bujić |
| | | Bukovac |
| | | Buštranje |
| | | Gare |
| | | Golemi Dol |
| | | Gornja Šušaja |
| | | Gospođince |
| | | Depce |
| | | Ilince |
| | | Kurbalija |
| | | Ljanik |
| | | Mađare |
| | | Miratovac |
| | | Norča |
| | | Oraovica |
| | | Pečeno |
| | | Preševo |
| | | Rajince |
| | | Ranatovce |
| | | Reljan |
| | | Svinjište |
| | | Sefer |
| | | Slavujevac |
| | | Stanevce |
| | | Strezovce |
| | | Trnava |
| | | Cerevajka |
| 58. | Priboj | Banja |

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| | Batkovići |
| | Brezna |
| | Bučje |
| | Dobrilovići |
| | Živinice |
| | Zabrđe |
| | Zabrnjica |
| | Zagradina |
| | Zaostro |
| | Jelača |
| | Kalafati |
| | Kaluđerovići |
| | Kasidoli |
| | Kratovo |
| | Krnjača |
| | Kukurovići |
| | Mažići |
| | Miliješ |
| | Plašće |
| | Požegrmac |
| | Pribojska Goleša |
| | Pribojske Čelice |
| | Rača |
| | Ritošići |
| | Sjeverin |
| | Sočice |
| | Strmac |
| | Hercegovačka Goleša |
| | Crnogovići |

| | | |
|-----|------------|------------------|
| | | Crnuzi |
| | | Čitluk |
| 59. | Prijepolje | Aljinovići |
| | | Balići |
| | | Bare |
| | | Biskupići |
| | | Bjelahova |
| | | Brajkovac |
| | | Brvine |
| | | Brodarevo |
| | | Bukovik |
| | | Vinicka |
| | | Vrbovo |
| | | Gojakovići |
| | | Gornje Babine |
| | | Gornje Goračiče |
| | | Gornji Stranjani |
| | | Gostun |
| | | Gračanica |
| | | Grobnice |
| | | Divci |
| | | Donje Babine |
| | | Donji Stranjani |
| | | Drenova |
| | | Dušmanići |
| | | Đurašići |
| | | Zabrdnji Toci |
| | | Zavinograđe |
| | | Zalug |

| | | |
|--|--|-------------|
| | | Zastup |
| | | Zvijezd |
| | | Ivanje |
| | | Ivezići |
| | | Izbičanj |
| | | Jabuka |
| | | Junčevići |
| | | Kamena Gora |
| | | Karaula |
| | | Karoševina |
| | | Kaćevo |
| | | Kašice |
| | | Kovačevac |
| | | Koprivna |
| | | Kosatica |
| | | Koševine |
| | | Kruševo |
| | | Kučin |
| | | Lučice |
| | | Mataruge |
| | | Međani |
| | | Mijani |
| | | Mijoska |
| | | Milakovići |
| | | Mileševo |
| | | Milošev Do |
| | | Miljevići |
| | | Mrčkovina |
| | | Muškovina |

| | | |
|-----|-----------|---------------|
| | | Oraovac |
| | | Orašac |
| | | Osoje |
| | | Oštra Stijena |
| | | Potkrš |
| | | Potok |
| | | Pravoševo |
| | | Pranjci |
| | | Prijepolje |
| | | Rasno |
| | | Ratajska |
| | | Sedobro |
| | | Seljane |
| | | Seljašnica |
| | | Skokuće |
| | | Slatina |
| | | Sopotnica |
| | | Taševo |
| | | Hisardžik |
| | | Hrta |
| | | Crkveni Toci |
| | | Čadinje |
| | | Čauševići |
| | | Džurovo |
| 60. | Prokuplje | Arbanaška |
| | | Babotinac |
| | | Bajčince |
| | | Balčak |
| | | Beli Kamen |

| | | |
|--|--|-----------------|
| | | Bogujevac |
| | | Bregovina |
| | | Bresnik |
| | | Bukuloram |
| | | Bučince |
| | | Velika Plana |
| | | Vidovača |
| | | Vlasovo |
| | | Vodice |
| | | Glasovik |
| | | Gornja Bresnica |
| | | Gornja Rečica |
| | | Gornji Statovac |
| | | Grabovac |
| | | Dobrotić |
| | | Donja Bresnica |
| | | Donji Statovac |
| | | Dragi Deo |
| | | Žitni Potok |
| | | Jabučevo |
| | | Jovine Livade |
| | | Klisurica |
| | | Kruševica |
| | | Kožince |
| | | Kostenica |
| | | Mikulovac |
| | | Miljkovica |
| | | Mrljak |
| | | Novi Đurovac |

| | | |
|-----|--------|------------------|
| | | Obrtince |
| | | Pasjača |
| | | Pestiš |
| | | Piskalje |
| | | Rankova Reka |
| | | Rgaje |
| | | Srednji Statovac |
| | | Stari Đurovac |
| | | Staro Selo |
| | | Tovrljane |
| | | Trnovi Laz |
| | | Džigolj |
| | | Šević |
| | | Široke Njive |
| 61. | Ražanj | Grabovo |
| 62. | Raška | Badanj |
| | | Baljevac |
| | | Bela Stena |
| | | Belo Polje |
| | | Beoci |
| | | Biniće |
| | | Biočin |
| | | Boroviće |
| | | Boće |
| | | Brvenica |
| | | Varevo |
| | | Vojmilovići |
| | | Vrtine |
| | | Gnjilica |

| | | |
|--|--|-----------------|
| | | Gostiradiće |
| | | Gradac |
| | | Draganići |
| | | Žerađe |
| | | Žutice |
| | | Zarevo |
| | | Jošanička Banja |
| | | Kaznoviće |
| | | Karadak |
| | | Kovači |
| | | Kopaonik |
| | | Korlaće |
| | | Kraviće |
| | | Kremiće |
| | | Kruševica |
| | | Kurići |
| | | Kučane |
| | | Lisina |
| | | Lukovo |
| | | Milatkoviće |
| | | Mure |
| | | Novo Selo |
| | | Nosoljin |
| | | Orahovo |
| | | Pavlica |
| | | Panojeviće |
| | | Piskanja |
| | | Plavkovo |
| | | Plešin |

| | | |
|-----|---------|--------------------|
| | | Pobrđe |
| | | Pokrvenik |
| | | Pocesje |
| | | Radošiće |
| | | Rakovac |
| | | Rvati |
| | | Rudnica |
| | | Sebimilje |
| | | Semeteš |
| | | Supnje |
| | | Tiodže |
| | | Trnava |
| | | Crna Glava |
| | | Šipačina |
| 63. | Rekovac | Bogalinac |
| | | Dobroselica |
| | | Županjevac |
| | | Kalenički Prnjavor |
| | | Nadrlje |
| | | Siljevica |
| | | Šljivica |
| 64. | Svrljig | Beloinje |
| | | Burdimmo |
| | | Bučum |
| | | Vlahovo |
| | | Galibabinac |
| | | Grbavče |
| | | Gulijan |
| | | Guševac |

| | | |
|-----|---------|-------------|
| | | Davidovac |
| | | Drajinac |
| | | Đurinac |
| | | Izvor |
| | | Kopajkošara |
| | | Labukovo |
| | | Lalinac |
| | | Lozan |
| | | Lukovo |
| | | Manojlica |
| | | Mečji Do |
| | | Okolište |
| | | Okruglica |
| | | Periš |
| | | Prekonoga |
| | | Radmirovac |
| | | Ribare |
| | | Slivje |
| | | Tijovac |
| | | Crnojlevica |
| 65. | Sevojno | Sevojno |
| 66. | Sjenica | Aliveroviće |
| | | Bagačiče |
| | | Bare |
| | | Bačija |
| | | Bioc |
| | | Blato |
| | | Boguti |
| | | Božov Potok |

| | | |
|--|--|---------------|
| | | Boljare |
| | | Borišće |
| | | Boroviće |
| | | Breza |
| | | Brnjica |
| | | Buđevo |
| | | Vapa |
| | | Veskoviće |
| | | Visočka |
| | | Višnjeva |
| | | Višnjice |
| | | Vrapci |
| | | Vrbnica |
| | | Vrsjenice |
| | | Goluban |
| | | Gornje Lopiže |
| | | Goševo |
| | | Grabovica |
| | | Gradac |
| | | Grgaje |
| | | Doliće |
| | | Donje Goračće |
| | | Donje Lopiže |
| | | Dragojloviće |
| | | Draževće |
| | | Družiniće |
| | | Dubnica |
| | | Duga Poljana |
| | | Dunišće |

| | |
|--|-------------------|
| | Dujke |
| | Žabren |
| | Žitniće |
| | Zabrđe |
| | Zaječiče |
| | Zahumsko |
| | Jevik |
| | Jezero |
| | Kalipolje |
| | Kamešnica |
| | Kanjevina |
| | Karajukića Bunari |
| | Kijeveci |
| | Kladnica |
| | Kneževac |
| | Koznik |
| | Kokošiče |
| | Krajinoviće |
| | Krivaja |
| | Krnja Jela |
| | Krstac |
| | Krće |
| | Lijeva Reka |
| | Ljutaje |
| | Mašoviće |
| | Medare |
| | Međugor |
| | Milići |
| | Papiće |

| | | |
|--|--|---------------|
| | | Petrovo Polje |
| | | Plana |
| | | Poda |
| | | Ponorac |
| | | Pralja |
| | | Raždaginja |
| | | Rasno |
| | | Raspoganče |
| | | Rastenoviće |
| | | Raškoviće |
| | | Sjenica |
| | | Skradnik |
| | | Strajiniće |
| | | Stup |
| | | Sugubine |
| | | Sušica |
| | | Trešnjevica |
| | | Trijebine |
| | | Tuzinje |
| | | Tutiće |
| | | Uvac |
| | | Ugao |
| | | Ursule |
| | | Ušak |
| | | Fijulj |
| | | Caričina |
| | | Cetanoviće |
| | | Crvsko |
| | | Crčevo |

| | | |
|-----|-----------|-------------------|
| | | Čedovo |
| | | Čipalje |
| | | Čitluk |
| | | Šare |
| | | Štavalj |
| | | Šušure |
| 67. | Sokobanja | Blendija |
| | | Vrbovac |
| | | Vrmdža |
| | | Dugo Polje |
| | | Jezero |
| | | Jošanica |
| | | Levovik |
| | | Milušinac |
| | | Mužinac |
| | | Nikolinac |
| | | Novo Selo |
| | | Radenkovac |
| | | Resnik |
| | | Rujevica |
| | | Sesalac |
| | | Sokobanja |
| | | Cerovica |
| | | Čitluk |
| | | Šarbanovac |
| 68. | Surdulica | Bacijevice |
| | | Bitvrđa |
| | | Božica |
| | | Vlasina Okruglica |

| | | |
|--|--|----------------------|
| | | Vlasina Rid |
| | | Vlasina Stojkovićevo |
| | | Vučadelce |
| | | Gornja Koznica |
| | | Gornje Romanovce |
| | | Groznatovci |
| | | Danjino Selo |
| | | Dikava |
| | | Donje Romanovce |
| | | Drajinci |
| | | Dugi Del |
| | | Jelašnica |
| | | Kijevac |
| | | Klisura |
| | | Kolunica |
| | | Kostroševci |
| | | Leskova Bara |
| | | Masurica |
| | | Mačkatica |
| | | Novo Selo |
| | | Palja |
| | | Rđavica |
| | | Stajkovce |
| | | Strezimirovci |
| | | Suvojnica |
| | | Surdulica |
| | | Suhi Dol |
| | | Topli Do |
| | | Topli Dol |

| | | |
|-----|-----------|------------------|
| | | Troskač |
| | | Čurkovića |
| 69. | Topola | Vojkovci |
| | | Guriševci |
| | | Jarmenovci |
| 70. | Trgovište | Babina Poljana |
| | | Barbace |
| | | Vladovce |
| | | Goločevac |
| | | Gornovac |
| | | Gornja Trnica |
| | | Gornji Kozji Dol |
| | | Gornji Stajevac |
| | | Dejanice |
| | | Donja Trnica |
| | | Donji Kozji Dol |
| | | Donji Stajevac |
| | | Dumbija |
| | | Đerekarce |
| | | Zladovce |
| | | Kalovo |
| | | Lesnica |
| | | Mala Reka |
| | | Margance |
| | | Mezdraja |
| | | Novi Glog |
| | | Novo Selo |
| | | Petrovac |
| | | Prolesje |

| | | |
|-----|----------|----------------|
| | | Radovnica |
| | | Rajčevce |
| | | Surlica |
| | | Trgovište |
| | | Crveni Grad |
| | | Crna Reka |
| | | Crnovce |
| | | Šajince |
| | | Šaprance |
| | | Široka Planina |
| | | Šumata Trnica |
| 71. | Trstenik | Gornji Dubič |
| | | Loboder |
| | | Rajinac |
| | | Planinica |
| | | Stublica |
| 72. | Tutin | Arapoviće |
| | | Baljen |
| | | Batrage |
| | | Baćica |
| | | Biohane |
| | | Blaca |
| | | Bovanj |
| | | Boroštica |
| | | Bračak |
| | | Bregovi |
| | | Brniševo |
| | | Bujkoviće |
| | | Velje Polje |

| | | |
|--|--|-----------------|
| | | Veseniće |
| | | Vrapče |
| | | Vrba |
| | | Glogovik |
| | | Gluhavica |
| | | Gnila |
| | | Godovo |
| | | Gornji Crniš |
| | | Gradac |
| | | Gujice |
| | | Gurdijelje |
| | | Guceviće |
| | | Devreč |
| | | Delimeđe |
| | | Detane |
| | | Dobri Dub |
| | | Dobrinje |
| | | Dolovo |
| | | Draga |
| | | Dubovo |
| | | Dulebe |
| | | Đerekare |
| | | Ervenice |
| | | Žirče |
| | | Župa |
| | | Žuč |
| | | Zapadni Mojstir |
| | | Izrok |
| | | Istočni Mojstir |

| | |
|--|----------------|
| | Jablanica |
| | Jarebice |
| | Jezgroviće |
| | Jeliće |
| | Južni Kočarnik |
| | Kovači |
| | Koniče |
| | Leskova |
| | Lipica |
| | Lukavica |
| | Melaje |
| | Mitrova |
| | Morani |
| | Naboje |
| | Nadumce |
| | Namga |
| | Noćaje |
| | Oraše |
| | Orlje |
| | Ostrovica |
| | Paljevo |
| | Piskopovce |
| | Plenibabe |
| | Pokrvenik |
| | Pope |
| | Popiće |
| | Potreb |
| | Pružanj |
| | Raduhovce |

| | | |
|-----|-------|------------------|
| | | Raduša |
| | | Ramoševo |
| | | Rezeviće |
| | | Ribariće |
| | | Rudnica |
| | | Ruđa |
| | | Saš |
| | | Severni Kočarnik |
| | | Smoluća |
| | | Starčeviće |
| | | Strumce |
| | | Suvi Do |
| | | Točilovo |
| | | Tutin |
| | | Čulije |
| | | Crkvine |
| | | Čarovina |
| | | Čmanjke |
| | | Čukote |
| | | Šaronje |
| | | Šipče |
| | | Špiljani |
| 73. | Užice | Bioska |
| | | Buar |
| | | Vitasi |
| | | Volujac |
| | | Vrutci |
| | | Gostinica |
| | | Gubin Do |

| | | |
|-----|------------|------------|
| | | Drežnik |
| | | Drijetanj |
| | | Duboko |
| | | Zbojštica |
| | | Zlakusa |
| | | Karan |
| | | Kačer |
| | | Keserovina |
| | | Kotroman |
| | | Krvavci |
| | | Kremna |
| | | Kršanje |
| | | Ljubanje |
| | | Mokra Gora |
| | | Nikojevići |
| | | Panjak |
| | | Pear |
| | | Potočanje |
| | | Potpeće |
| | | Ravni |
| | | Raduša |
| | | Ribaševina |
| | | Skržuti |
| | | Stapari |
| | | Strmac |
| | | Trnava |
| | | Užice |
| 74. | Crna Trava | Bajinci |
| | | Bankovci |

| | | |
|-----|----------|-------------|
| | | Bistrica |
| | | Brod |
| | | Vus |
| | | Gornje Gare |
| | | Gradska |
| | | Darkovce |
| | | Dobro Polje |
| | | Zlatance |
| | | Jabukovik |
| | | Jovanovce |
| | | Kalna |
| | | Krivi Del |
| | | Krstičevo |
| | | Mlačišče |
| | | Obradovce |
| | | Ostrozub |
| | | Pavličina |
| | | Preslap |
| | | Rajčetine |
| | | Ruplje |
| | | Sastav Reka |
| | | Crna Trava |
| | | Čuka |
| 75. | Čajetina | Alin Potok |
| | | Branešci |
| | | Golovo |
| | | Gostilje |
| | | Dobroselica |
| | | Drenova |

| | | |
|-----|-------|---------------|
| | | Željine |
| | | Zlatibor |
| | | Jablanica |
| | | Kriva Reka |
| | | Ljubiš |
| | | Mačkat |
| | | Mušvete |
| | | Rakovica |
| | | Rožanstvo |
| | | Rudine |
| | | Sainovina |
| | | Semegnjevo |
| | | Sirogojno |
| | | Stublo |
| | | Tripkova |
| | | Trnava |
| | | Čajetina |
| | | Šljivovica |
| 76. | Čačak | Banjica |
| | | Brezovica |
| | | Vrnčani |
| | | Vujetinci |
| | | Gornja Trepča |
| | | Jančići |
| | | Premeća |
| | | Rajac |

ANNEX 5: DEFINITION OF SMALL AND MEDIUM ENTERPRISES

Micro, small or medium enterprises are defined in accordance with the regulations governing the field of accounting and auditing (Law on Accounting, *Official Gazette of the RS*, No. 62/2013,* Article 6).

| The micro-entities are those entities that fulfill two of the following criteria: | The small entities are those entities that exceed two criteria for micro-entities, but fulfill two of the following criteria | The medium-sized entities are those entities that exceed two criteria for small entities, but fulfill two of the following criteria: | The large entities are legal entities that exceed two criteria for medium-sized entities |
|---|--|--|--|
| Average number of employees less than 10 | Average number of employees less than 50 | Average number of employees less than 250 | |
| Turnover in the amount less than EUR 700,000 in RSD equivalent | Turnover less than EUR 8,800,000 in RSD equivalent | Turnover less than EUR 35,000,000 in RSD equivalent | |
| The average value of the balance sheet less than EUR 350,000 in RSD equivalent | The average value of the balance sheet less than EUR 4,400,000 in RSD equivalent | The average value of the balance sheet less than EUR 17,500,000 in RSD equivalent | |

ANNEX 6: RESULTS OF CONSULTATIONS – SUMMARY

| Subject of the consultation | Date of the consultation | Time given to comment | Names of institutions/bodies/ persons consulted | Summary of the results |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| 8.3.3.1 Sector 1: Milk and milk processing sector | 21/07/2014 | 11/07-21/07/2014 | The Union of Agricultural Producers Zlatan Đurić | <p>Proposal: Introduce new item into the dairy sector, which provides support for those who collect and process 2,000 to 5,000 liters of milk per day for areas with difficult working conditions. This concept would give a chance for the development of producers and processors in the mountainous areas in particular for model-dairies with specific products such as goat cheese, sheep cheese, melted cheese – <i>kackavalj</i>, etc.</p> <p>Response: Will be supported in NPRD</p> |
| 8.3.3.1 Sector 2: The meat processing sector | | | | <p>Proposal: To add an item: encourage investment in slaughter facilities with a minimum capacity of 5 slaughtered heads of cattle, 10 heads of pigs, 2,000 poultry birds per day. Introduction of this category of incentives would contribute to legalizing of existing slaughterhouses which currently operate as gray economy and they could be a developing component in rural areas, especially in poultry industry.</p> <p>Response: Will be supported in NPRD</p> |
| 8.2.3.1 Specific objectives and measures Sector 1: Milk | | | | <p>Proposal: The milk production support should be given to households holding 5 to 500 cattle; Lack of support for small households holding up to 5 cattle would mean that 90% of households could expect nothing from the IPARD Programme and the EU.</p> <p>Response:</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | Small scale producers will be covered in NPRD |
| 8.2.3.1. Specific objectives and measures Sector 2: Meat | | | | <p>Proposal: Support should be provided for households keeping 5-500 heads of cattle, 100-1,000 heads of sheep or goats, 100-5,000 heads of pigs, 1,000-5,000 heads of poultry, etc. The reasons for these restrictions are the same as in the previous paragraphs for milk producers.</p> <p>Response: Holdings with more than 1000 cattle are considered as sufficiently strong to conduct investments without additional support, and those with less than 20 will be covered in the NPRD.</p> |
| Specific objectives and measures Sector 4: Other crops (cereals, oilseeds, sugar beet) | | | | <p>Proposal: introduce new item which enables for small households with 2 -50 ha to benefit from partnerships such as business associations or producer organizations and build their storage capacities (silos) with accessories (5,000-30,000 tons capacity) and ULO-controlled storages. Only with such a concentration of goods in place that allows them to jointly access market makes them serious players in the competition, especially if we consider the fact that more than 90% of arable land in Serbia is in their possession. Construction of storages for each individual household would lead to nothing more but an even greater fragmentation and exposure to monopoly of processing industry which uses its storage capacities for their policy of depressed prices. This is one of the biggest problems associated with the primary agricultural sector in Serbia i.e. lack of storages owned by individual households.</p> <p>Response: Covered in the NPRD</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| <p>8.2.7. Specific eligibility criteria (by sector) Sector 3: Fruits and vegetables</p> | | | | <p>Proposal: Limit incentives for berries for households with 1 to 10 hectares and for other fruits for households from 1 to 50 hectares so as to save portion of support for small households.</p> <p>Response: Too small households have no capabilities for bigger investments and are not included under the IPARD support scheme, will be considered in NPRD</p> |
| <p>8.2.9. Criteria for selection</p> | | | | <p>Proposal: The fourth item needs to raise the number of points for persons under 40 years of age from 15 to 25 points as that would encourage young people to stay in rural areas.</p> <p>Response: Provided scores make sufficient difference</p> |
| <p>Note</p> | | | | <p>As a country we enter the IPARD without having adopted strategies and national agricultural development programmes as well as without reliable sector analyses which are reduced to simple statistics. In addition a number of unresolved things follow, such as non-implementation of restitution although it is required by the EU and our failure to pass a series of laws needed. All these warns us that we need to take into full account our reality and apparent facts, just as we do need to be aware what is requested by the EU from us. Based on that we could create our agricultural policy since the majority of our businesses and households are unprepared for IPARD, but they are also incompetent investment-wise. Therefore, the state and local governments should make greater national contribution and participate in a much larger percentage, but the EU should also provide much larger volume of funds especially for 2015.</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|-------------------|-------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | <p>Response:</p> <p>Document is fully elaborated in line with Strategy for Agriculture and rural development which is in the process of adoption and which is fully in line with internal and external requirements and legal documents.</p> |
| <p>General comments regarding eligibility criteria - the farm size</p> | <p>20/07/2014</p> | <p>11/07-21/07/2014</p> | <p>Women's Association "Ethno Forum"</p> <p>Jelena Radojković -President of the Association of Women "Ethno forum" and Deputy Mayor of Svrlijig</p> | <p>We believe that the planned measures are completely unacceptable when it comes to southern Serbia.</p> <p>The poor southern part of the Republic of Serbia has households considered as "large" if they keep only 10 cattle, and hence they cannot be small if they keep 20 heads of cattle or medium with 1,000 heads of cattle. Also they could be considered as "big" if they keep 100 heads of sheep, and they cannot possibly be small if they keep 150 heads sheep, or medium with 1,000 heads of sheep as it is in the IPARD Programme. The impression is that the planned measures in the first accreditation package of IPARD Programme are not going to be of any help for the holdings in southern Serbia in general as they would be restricted by the set eligibility criteria to apply for any of these incentives, as they do not meet the requirements.</p> <p>Proposal: Shift the lower limit of farm size for applications, so that we from the south of Serbia could be eligible for applying for the incentives.</p> <p>If not, the big players will have even more, while the small ones will have to be shut down and migrate to the cities, which are already overcrowded, and the question is who is going to stay in the rural regions and produce food for people living in the cities, during the coming years.</p> <p>Response:</p> |

| | | | | |
|-----------|------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | As described above, small scale farms will be supported under the NPRD. |
| General | 17/07/2014 | 11/07-21/07/2014 | Cooperative Association of Serbia - Dragan Marković | <p>Failure to pass the documents such as: Strategy - national programme, operating documents, makes it difficult to offer a high quality operating document (IPARD) without having the prior acts adopted as they should be showing the ultimate orientation regarding the goals of development, measures of economic and agricultural policy.</p> <p>The most important act of all these is the programme in which virtually all the goals should be elaborated and recipients and measures should be identified.</p> <p>Response: IPARD is prepared in line with Strategy and although it is not yet officially adopted the document is in the procedure and the final text will not be changed and therefore it could be used as a base for elaboration of this programme.</p> |
| Farm size | 17/07/2014 21/07/2014 | 11/07-21/07/2014 11/07-21/07/2014 | <p>Cooperative Association of Serbia - Dragan Marković</p> <p>Union of Agricultural Associations of Vojvodina 24400 Senta, Doža Đerđa 3434 - Mikloš Nađ, President</p> <p>Milorad Cosis, NGO, Green Circle</p> | <p>Concept of the paper is the assumption that we have established sufficient number of farms that are functional and meet the minimum criteria offered, such as: 20 heads of dairy cattle; 20 heads of fattening cattle; 100 heads of fattening pigs; 150 heads of sheep or goats; or 2 hectares under berry fruits and 5 hectares under other vegetables.</p> <p>The census results show that there are only a minor number of farms meeting these criteria. Thus, based on the census results, there are 177,252 households keeping cattle, and only 5,697 households keep more than 20 heads of cattle. The highest concentration of households (83,090) keeps between 3 and 9 heads and logically, a good portion of them should be responsible</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | <p>for the development of cattle breeding of Serbia. More drastic indicators are in sheep and goat breeding where only 992 households keep more than 100 heads, and 1,657 households keep 100 heads of pigs respectively.</p> <p>It is necessary to include farms with small number of animals or hectares in the programme. Moreover, the programme should allow for the same recipients to use the funds for basic herds, and establishing new area under crops/plantations.</p> <p>Response: Smaller farms as well as purchase of animals will be covered under the NPRD.</p> |
| <p>Production of high quality beef - "Baby beef"</p> | | | | <p>This challenge assumes adequate solutions in the provision of basic resources, quality calves for fattening. Assuming that in cattle production the specialization goes into holdings opting primarily for milk production and fattening farms, along with the fact that most of the existing breeding herds of cattle that hold between one and two heads of cattle are going to disappear, there is a necessity for the development of new production in Serbia in the system "cow-calf" where the basic products is calf for further fattening. This type of production can be said to be neglected at the moment and for these reasons it could be included in the potential usage of funds for purposes ranging from providing high quality breeding material of beef breeds to other usage of the funds provided for the purpose.</p> <p>Response: Will be proposed for the NPRD programme.</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|-----|--|--|--|
| PDO products | PGI | | | <p>Additional type of production should be strongly promoted in the production of the so-called traditional products or "products with geographical indications", which should be included in the system of using these funds.</p> <p>Response: Taken in consideration in NPRD.</p> |
| Slaughterhouses for 8 heads of cattle or 50 heads of pigs | | | | <p>It is necessary to consider the offered concept of slaughterhouses for 8 heads of cattle or 50 heads of pigs from the standpoint of ecology and meeting other necessary veterinary and sanitary requirements, and the economics of this production goes beyond the need to be commented.</p> <p>Request to fulfill all national standards in the field of environment protection is not realistic.</p> <p>Response: All recipients have to fulfill the National Standards at the end of the investment, prior to final payment.</p> <p>Recipients have to fulfill only minimum national standards described in the IPARD II Programme.</p> |
| Infrastructural investments | | | | <p>The limiting factor in the development of rural areas is infrastructure, primarily roads. Starting from the current state of the rural road network which does not meet the minimum needs of the rural population this may be an opportunity to withdraw significant funds and resolve this hot topic.</p> <p>Response: Initial number of measures is aligned with capacities of institutions and financial allocations for the programming period. Infrastructure could be covered in NPRD and in later</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|------------|------------------|--|---|
| | | | | stage of IPARD or in another programming period. |
| Production at altitudes higher than 400 meters | | | | <p>It is of critical importance to plan type of production at altitudes above 400 meters above sea level, where we abandoned production of produce with comparative advantages (lamb, beef, certain fruit types, etc..). Hopefully, concrete solutions, would be offered by the programme of agricultural development.</p> <p>Response: It is allowed and has higher support rate for those above 500meters.</p> |
| 8.2 Investments in physical assets of agricultural holdings | | | | <p>1) In the fruit and vegetable sector more emphasis should be put on pooling interests of farmers into cooperatives.</p> <p>2) In the dairy sector, the minimum number of cattle should be reduced to 10 heads</p> <p>3) In the meat production sector the minimum number of animals should be halved down to - 10 heads of cattle, 75 heads of sheep, 50 heads of pigs, etc.</p> <p>3) Suggestion to increase the aid intensity for young farmers from 65% to 70%, and to envision a special opportunity to assist young agricultural producers who are beginners.</p> <p>Response: Covered in the NPRD, and reduction in criteria will significantly increase the number of potential recipients which will raise the issue in work load analysis of the IPARD Agency.</p> |
| 8.3 Investments in physical assets concerning processing and marketing of | 21/07/2014 | 11/07-21/07/2014 | Union of Agricultural Associations of Vojvodina 24400 Senta, Doža | 1) In our opinion, the conditions for interested companies should include additional requirement of operating for at least 3 years and being liquid during the same period. |

| | | | | |
|--|------------|------------------|---|--|
| agricultural and fishery products | 20/07/2014 | 11/07-21/07/2014 | <p>Derđa 3434 - Mikloš Nađ, President</p> <p>PU "Poultry association" Belgrade - grad. engineer Rade Škoric</p> | <p>2) In the processing of fruit and vegetables, micro enterprises should be among recipients.</p> <p>Response: If we have too many recipients in the implementation of the programme we will amend it in second phase and introduce additional requirement.</p> <p>Taken in consideration and micro enterprises are included.</p> |
| 8.6 Diversification of the rural economy | | | | <p>In addition to developing and increasing the capacity of tourist accommodation, in our opinion, what lacks is the opportunity to develop commercial service based side of tourism. In order to raise the quality of food for the tourists, the proposal is to introduce the concept of local food products (meat, dairy products, etc.).</p> <p>Response: Not planned under the proposed measure, equipment for proposed issues are eligible and could contribute to local products, as well as marketing support which is eligible.</p> |
| 8.2; 8.3 and 8.6 Transparency of communication with interested individual farmers and entrepreneurs | | | | <p>1) Call for proposals should be posted both at the web-page of the Ministry and daily newspapers and other public media. They should be also directly addressed to farmers' associations.</p> <p>2) Ranking list should be also published in public media and sent to stakeholders either by email or post.</p> <p>Response: Will be available on time.</p> |
| Poultry sector – egg production | | | | <p>Proposal: There should be an amendment to Chapters 8.2 and 8.3 where in addition to milk and meat sector, sector of table-egg production must be anticipated, given the huge investments required in the implementation of the Animal Welfare</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | <p>Act and the requested requirements for sorting, packing, storing and transporting of eggs.</p> <p>Response: Eggs could be considered to be supported in NPRD.</p> |
| <p>Proposals extracted from the Draft version of the Strategy for agriculture and rural development 2014-2024 – Working group for Animal Husbandry</p> | <p>20/07/2014</p> <p>20/07/2014</p> | <p>11/07-21/07/2014</p> <p>11/07-21/07/2014</p> | <p>PU “Poultry association“ Belgrade - grad. engineer Rade Škoric Faculty of Agriculture, University of Novi Sad – Department of Animal Husbandry - PhD Snežana Trivunović, Director</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide subsidies to exploit breeder flocks, as there was not sufficient incentive when one takes into account the total volume of production of poultry meat and eggs; • Given the large share of "gray zone economy" in the production and marketing of poultry products, subsidies for breeding and egg production would accelerate significant progress in the transition to legal economic flows; • Subsidies are necessary for investments into facilities and equipment in order to meet legal requirements for keeping animals in terms of welfare, whereby this condition in table-egg production is met by only 5% of the farms; • Due to the high cost of broiler production, there should be subsidies for the construction and equipment for "recovery" of energy, using of solar energy and equipment for complete energy efficiency improvements in poultry production. Absence of these investments would lead into expensive produce and uncompetitive industry; • Opportunity for further development of poultry sector should be sought in reviving the production of turkeys, ducks and geese exclusively as an export programme due to the low power of their consumption and purchasing power in Serbia. This development involves significant investments in production capacity and slaughterhouses meeting all the necessary standards. Production of |

| | | | | |
|--|------------|------------------|--|--|
| | | | | <p>table-eggs would have to be developed in a number of ways of keeping (battery cage, floor system, outlet, free range, etc.).</p> <p>Response: Buildings and equipment are eligible and breeder flocks will be considered under the NPRD.</p> |
| 8.2.3.1 Specific objectives of the measure – Sector 1: Milk | | | | <p>Is it a coincidence or it was intention to omit the production of sheep and goat milk?</p> <p>Response: NPRD.</p> |
| 8.2.6.5 Other common eligibility criteria | 20/07/2014 | 11/07-21/07/2014 | Faculty of Agriculture, University of Novi Sad – Department of Animal Husbandry - PhD Snežana Trivunović, Director Faculty for applied ecology Futura, University Singidunum - Vesna Vandić, Legal Secretary | <p>University diploma - I think that any university degree is not a sufficient condition for work in agriculture! Training: What kind of training are we considering?</p> |
| 8.2.7 Specific eligibility criteria (by sector) – Sector 2: Meat | 20/07/2014 | 11/07-21/07/2014 | | <p>Meat production?</p> <p>Response: We believe University diploma is sufficient. Certified Trainings.</p> |
| 8.2.9. Criteria for selection | | | | <p>The user is a member of the cooperative or cooperative member: Why a cooperative? I think we should add associations.</p> <p>Response: We decided to keep only cooperative to give bigger emphasis.</p> |
| 8.3.8 Eligible costs Sector 1: Department of milk and dairy industry | | | | <p>It is repeated and should be deleted - Equipment for simple tests that distinguish between bad and good milk quality.</p> <p>Response: Taken in consideration.</p> |
| 8.2.1 Legal Basis Sectorial agreement | | | | <p>It is necessary to specify inter-sector general objectives in the implementation of EU CAP after these legal frameworks.</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|------------|------------------|--|--|
| | | | | <p>Response: Adequate Legal framework is presented in the document.</p> |
| 8.2.2 Explanation National Standards | 20/07/2014 | 11/07-21/07/2014 | Faculty for applied ecology Futura, University Singidunum - Vesna Vandić, Legal Secretary | <p>Which are these standards? They should be listed so as to understand them better.</p> <p>Response: List of Standards is in Annex of IPARD</p> |
| 8.2.2 Explanation Sector 1: Milk | 19/07/2014 | 11/07-21/07/2014 | Project "Support to Civil Society in Public Administration IPA II rural development with a focus on measure 202" Ivana Stefanović Ristin, Project Manager | <p>The dairy sector should include goat and sheep milk!</p> <p>Response: Will be in NPRD</p> |
| 8.2.2 Explanation Sector 1: Milk Small scale of production | | | | <p>Statistical data and data from the Census of Agriculture are missing, which should be mentioned so as to avoid arbitrary interpretation.</p> <p>Response: Detail sector analyses are not part of IPARD, just abstracts.</p> |
| 8.2.2. Explanation Sector 1: Milk Sustainable operation of a household | | | | <p>List all the specific goals and needs for investment in this sector!</p> <p>Response: Relevant list is included.</p> |
| 8.2.2 Explanation Sector 2: Meat | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SECTOR OF CATTLE BREEDING, PIG BREEDING, SHEEP, POULTRY, etc. is more appropriate than MEAT, and the proposal is that each of these sectors has a separate chapter because the problems are specific for each sub-sector, just as the needs of each sub-sector are unique! • What is with the poultry sector of egg production? • Terminology for cattle production or keeping? • Sector of cattle breeding! This raises the question again of other sectors of |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | <p>animal husbandry - pigs, sheep, goats, and poultry?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beef production? Below, the term is keeping...? Harmonize the text with the technical terms in a logical sequence of interpretation! • Environmental standards - List the standards that apply! <p>Response: Terminology is taken from the programming template provided by the DGAGRI</p> <p>Egg sector is not included</p> <p>Text harmonized in line with proposal. Standards are listed in Annex.</p> |
| 8.2.2 Explanation Sector 3: Sector of fruits and vegetables | | | | <p>What about viticulture?</p> <p>Response: NPRD.</p> |
| 8.2.2 Explanation Sector 4: Other crops (cereals, oilseeds, sugar beet) | | | | <p>What about fodders/roughage?</p> <p>Response: Not foreseen under IPARD, partly covered by NPRD and programme for Agriculture.</p> |
| 8.2.3.1 Specific objectives of the measure Sector 1: Milk | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20-100 heads of cattle: Households with less than 20 heads will be doomed! • It is necessary to identify areas in which to improve these sector incentives through the envisioned objectives! <p>Response: NPRD.</p> |
| 8.2.3.1 Specific objectives of the measure Sector 2: Meat | | | | <p>Before the measure being elaborated, it is necessary to have basic sector analysis out of which stem the resulting measures providing incentives!</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | <p>Recommendation: to separate sectors of cattle, sheep and pig breeding (sector of goat breeding is missing).</p> <p>Response: Sector analysis is elaborated before measures were created. Chapters are provided in template for programming.</p> |
| <p>8.2.3.1 Specific objectives of the measure Sector 4: Other crops (cereals, oilseeds, sugar beet)</p> | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2-50ha: Classes/types of soil and categories of ownership are missing as well as the leasing details! • 20ha: Which soil class/type, which ownership status? <p>Response: Not needed to have types of soil. Contract for renting is foreseen and described in the programme.</p> |
| <p>8.2.6.1 Types of eligible households</p> | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Liability against the state: Specify the liabilities that will be applied! • 5 years rent/lease of land: Land in RS is rented/leased for periods shorter than 5 years, reconsider this requirement! <p>Response: Will be elaborated in more details in application forms. Requirement is obligatory and pre-defined in programming template.</p> |
| <p>8.2.6.2 National Standards to be respected</p> | | | | <p>Specify what are the certificates, standards and relevant public authorities, as it is utterly unclear which of the conditions should be fulfilled and they are going to be a must!</p> <p>Response: Taken in consideration, list included in the programme.</p> |
| <p>8.2.6.3. Economic viability of the holding</p> | | | | <p>Enterprise from the text or holding/farm from the title?? The terminology is mixed and it is unclear to whom the obligations are to be applied!</p> <p>Response:</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | To the one which is applying for the investment. |
| 8.2.6.4 EU standards | | | | Specify the standards! Response: Annex of IPARD. |
| 8.2.6.5 Other common eligibility criteria | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a programme, not a treaty! • Better say recipients than applicants! <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Length of holding the status of registered farms: Registered as an active farm or both statuses are allowed!? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University degree: Basic undergraduate degree or full four year studies? <p>Response: Terminology is in line with programming template, not all recipients are going to be applicants.</p> <p>Only active, passive cannot apply, that is why they are passive.</p> <p>Full four year study, basic will be reconsidered.</p> |
| 8.2.6.6 Investments in renewable energy plants | | | | <p>Is it necessary to specify the incentives for investments in the framework of the national plan? If yes, it is absolutely necessary to enumerate them all!</p> <p>Response: Financial tables are part of IPARD.</p> |
| 8.2.9 Selection criteria | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas with difficult working conditions in agriculture: Indicate the legal basis i.e. National legislation designating the difficult working conditions in agriculture. •Organic agriculture: Are you planning a special measure for organic production? If planned, it is omitted from this review! |

| | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investment projects are in the sectors of milk or meat production: Why no other products are listed, but only milk and meat? • Applicant is a woman: Better to say farm owner or household is registered on behalf of a woman! • For a member of the cooperative, state the period of membership before applying! <p>Response: Regulation for definition, as well as list of areas with difficult working conditions in agriculture are in Annex</p> <p>Organic will be additionally elaborated in the second phase and communicated with stakeholders.</p> <p>Fruit and vegetables are included in investment support.</p> <p>Not all potential recipients have to be owners, and there is no need to say that woman has to be owner of a household. No need to say period for cooperative membership, it is just a ranking criterion.</p> |
| 8.2.12 Indicators and targets | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total number of projects supported – 6,505: What was the basis for this estimation as it seems quite unrealistic? • Total investment in physical capital by holdings supported in EUR – 155,979,487: Unrealistic amount based on the number of projects planned. <p>Response: Targets were calculated based on available statistical data, available funds, criteria, previous interventions and estimations; therefore, there can be mistakes.</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| 8.2.14 Geographical scope of the measure | | | | <p>It is necessary to specify the areas belonging to either urban or rural areas!</p> <p>Response: No it isn't, all territory of Republic of Serbia (excluding Kosovo) is eligible.</p> |
| 8.6.6 Common eligibility criteria | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on the provisions of the Law on Tourism, not all of the entities engaged in tourism activities are obliged to register, but they need to be enlisted in the Register of Tourism which is being kept in the Serbian Business Registers Agency (SBRA). Even natural persons are enlisted although they do not have the status of a legal entity, i.e. they are not registered in the SBRA. For example, owners of categorized facilities to accommodate visitors are natural persons who operate their business through an intermediary: local tourist organization or tourist agency! The recipient to be included should be OWNER OF CATEGORIZED ACCOMODATION! If this formulation remains, the owners of categorized accommodation facilities for tourism in cottage industry or owners of rural tourist households will not be able to be recipients of these incentives!! • Economic viability of the enterprise: Not the enterprise, but business holder because this measure is intended for the holders of the agricultural households or owners of facilities used for tourism! <p>Response: Taken in consideration</p> |
| 8.6.8 Eligible expenditure | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on the provisions of the Law on Tourism, not all of the entities engaged in tourism activities are obliged to register, but they need to be enlisted in the Register of Tourism which is being kept in the Serbian Business Registers Agency (SBRA). Even natural persons are enlisted although they do not have the status of a legal entity, i.e. they are not registered in the SBRA. For |

| | | | | |
|------------------|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | <p>example, owners of categorized facilities to accommodate visitors are natural persons who operate their business through an intermediary: local tourist organization or tourist agency! The recipient to be included should be OWNER OF CATEGORIZED ACCOMODATION! If this formulation remains, the owners of categorized accommodation facilities for tourism in cottage industry or owners of rural tourist households will not be able to be recipients of these incentives!!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic viability of the enterprise: Not the enterprise, but business holder because this measure is intended for the holders of the agricultural households or owners of facilities used for tourism! <p>Response: Taken in consideration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant is located in the mountainous area: Correction - In rural areas, because they are not only in mountainous areas - rural areas! Basic undergraduate studies of four years curriculum! <p>Response: Mountain is correct.</p> |
| General comments | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEADER measures, according to the information we have been regularly receiving in the past two years from the representatives of the Ministry, is developed and prepared for accreditation. For some reason it is not included for accreditation in the first wave, along with measures Investments in physical assets of agricultural holdings, Investments in physical assets concerning processing and marketing of agricultural and fishery products, Farm diversification and business development and Technical Assistance? The request of representatives of Local Action Groups from all over Serbia is |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------------|------------|------------------|--|---|
| | | | | <p>that measure Leader is under no circumstances excludable from accreditation in the first wave, so as to ensure timely implementation;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The measure - Farm diversification and business development is covering tourism exclusively. This is devastating for all those engaged in other activities in rural areas, and we specifically insist on recommendation that this measure at least envisions support for the renewable energy sector and sector of on-farm processing. <p>Response: Current capacities of institutions allow only proposed measures. The rest of diversification measure is planned under NPRD.</p> |
| 8.2.1 Legal basis | 19/07/2014 | 11/07-21/07/2014 | Project "Support to Civil Society in Public Administration IPA II rural development with a focus on measure 202" Ivana Stefanović Ristin, Project Manager City of Niš, Department of Agriculture and Rural Development | <p>With the draft document, the Annexes being referred to within it should have been submitted along.</p> <p>Response: Will be available with all documents on internet site of the Ministry.</p> |
| 8.2.2 Explanation Sector 1: Milk | 21/07/2014 | 11/07-21/07/2014 | Ivan Pavlović, Group Coordinator to manage and coordinate projects | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation - includes the complete dairy sector, i.e. without excluding sheep and goat milk; • Low level of quality of milk production: No statistical data is provided to backup these claims. <p>Response: NPRD, data are taken from sector analysis.</p> |
| 8.2.2 Explanation Sector 2: Meat | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cattle is not being produced but it is being kept/reared/raised; • Not cattle sector but sector of cattle raising/breeding; • Animal welfare and environmental conditions: Recommendation is to strengthen these arguments by tangible facts. <p>Response:</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | <p>Taken in consideration, cattle changed to cows.</p> |
| 8.2.2 Explanation Sector 3: Sector of fruits and vegetables | | | | <p>What about viticulture?</p> <p>Response: NPRD.</p> |
| 8.2.3.1 Specific objectives of the measure Sector 1: Milk | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20-100 heads of cattle: It would be more efficient to make reference to particular areas rather than the number of heads (e.g. Croatia); • Sector analyses are missing and hence unrealistic extent of production is planned for all sectors. <p>Response: Sector analysis exists. Number of cows is taken as criteria in consultation with other departments of the Ministry.</p> |
| 8.2.3.1 Specific objectives of the measure Sector 4: Other crops (cereals, oilseeds, sugar beet) | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renewable energy is not mentioned as type of investment! <p>Response: Renewable energy is included after consultation process.</p> |
| 8.2.4 Linkage to other IPARD measures in the programme and to national measures | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why the Measure for rural infrastructure (301) is not included in the IPARD programme as it can be fully funded through IPARD? • Is the Measure for rural diversification planned through IPARD or through NPRD? <p>Response: No adequate analysis of needs, no capacities, small budget for the whole Programme.</p> |
| 8.2.6.1 Types of eligible households | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Liability against the state: It is not specified which liabilities; • 5 years rent/lease of land: Land in RS is usually rented/leased for periods anywhere between 1-3 years (for crops or for livestock). |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | <p>Response: Details will be elaborated in call for applications.</p> <p>5 years is required by the programme and it has to be respected.</p> |
| 8.2.6.2 National Standards to be respected | | | | <p>Specify the standards, certificates, and relevant public authorities being referred to?</p> <p>Response: List of standards is in Annex.</p> |
| 8.2.6.3. Economic viability of the holding | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enterprise from the text or holding/farm from the title? <p>Response: Refers to applicant.</p> |
| 8.2.12 Indicators and targets | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total number of projects supported – 6,505: Way too many projects. E.g. of Croatia – 277 projects; • Number of holdings investing in livestock management in view of reducing N₂O and methane emissions (manure storage): Clarify how the number was estimated; • Total investment in physical capital by holdings supported in EUR – 155,979,487: Unrealistic amount based on the number of projects planned. Croatia envisioned 151,000 EUR for 277 projects proposed. <p>Response: Taken in consideration, figures are modified.</p> |
| 8.2.13 Administrative procedure | | | | <p>It is not clear who can submit the application.</p> <p>Response: Eligible recipient.</p> |
| Measure – Diversification of rural economy - | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the overall goal of this measure is to increase the degree of diversification and the development of economic activities in rural areas, with the |

| | | | | |
|--|------------|------------------|---|---|
| General comments | | | | <p>possibility of job creation and improvement of quality of life in rural areas too, the development of TOURISM solely, as the only activity within this measure is considered as unacceptable. If this measure is based exclusively on tourism, it is logical that parallel to the measure it is important to simultaneously implement Measure of improving and developing the rural infrastructure, because as far as the south of Serbia, the only places that have the ability to provide tourism services are infrastructural undeveloped, and thus, this measure alone would be uncomplimentary. If we wish to provide a diversified economy in rural areas, it is necessary to expand the scope of activities to those activities that encourage the development of rural economy, primarily referring to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - direct sales, - traditional crafts, - on-farm processing, - renewable energies, - services in rural areas; <p>• List of eligible costs is very poorly defined, just as it is the case with the acceptable activities.</p> <p>Response: Some measures will be in NPRD and some should be covered from other funds and National programmes of other Ministries.</p> |
| Measure - Investments in physical assets on farms – General comments | 21/07/2014 | 11/07-21/07/2014 | City of Niš, Department of Agriculture and Rural Development Ivan Pavlović, Group Coordinator to manage and coordinate projects | The two envisioned measures of IPARD II (Investment in physical assets of agricultural holdings and Investments in physical assets concerning processing and marketing of agricultural and fishery products) are focused either on agricultural holdings which tend to produce quality raw material that could be used in the processing industry, or |

| | | | | |
|---------|------------|------------------|--|---|
| | 21/07/2014 | 11/07-21/07/2014 | Association of agricultural producers of, Senta Jožef Kovač, President | <p>they are focused on investments in physical assets for processing and marketing of agricultural and fishery products, whereby the processing sector would strengthen its capacities. In this way, there is no incentive for farmers who would like to step out from primary production and link it with processing. Therefore direct sales and processing on-farm should be taken into account. However, it is mentioned that these incentives are planned as part of national measures, but the distinction, which is mentioned in the document in Chapter 10 is not integral part of the recommended measures.</p> <p>Response: Demarcation between the National and IPARD programme is part of IPARD Programme.</p> |
| General | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Country's agriculture can become competitive, export oriented, if it is based on farms of rational size and cooperatives, which operate on the principles of the members of the International Alliance of Cooperatives. UN has declared the 2012 year as the International Year of Cooperatives, and thus they wanted to draw attention to the fact that without state support for cooperatives, there is no economic growth and significant job creation since successful cooperatives are among the crucial pre-conditions for finding the way out of the economic crisis. Because of the important cooperative principles and values, the cooperatives are different from all other forms of entrepreneurship, since other than solidarity, they provide support for the weak and bear economic importance which gives huge contribution in the overall development of a nation. Our goal should be achieving a competitive, income generating agriculture, which is not possible without new types of |

| | | | | |
|----------------|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | <p>cooperatives, especially the product-line based cooperatives;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IPARD programme should specifically provide conditions for establishment, operation and development of new cooperatives (under the principles of the International Alliance of Cooperatives). <p>Response: Cooperatives are legal entities and thus, eligible for support. Producer groups are new topic in Serbia and we plan to work on promotion of this concept in future. Special support can be provided to producer groups and not for cooperatives.</p> |
| Other comments | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthening the capacity and motivation of producers for various forms of associations – interest pooling, primarily through the western types of cooperatives (product-line based cooperatives); • Investments in processing and marketing of agricultural products, with emphasis on processing of local raw materials and branding of local products; increase support to producers and to new cooperatives; • Increase support for strengthening knowledge transfer - specific projects for introducing new production and technological systems. <p>Response: Motivation for various forms of associations exists through additional scoring in the selection criteria for members of cooperatives. Marketing is eligible cost, and branding is supported in the NPRD.</p> <p>Knowledge transfer is covered within the Advisory services programmes.</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|----------------|--------------------------|---|---|
| Measure - Investments in physical assets on farms – General comments | 21/07/20 14 | 11/07- 21/07/20 14 | Farmers Association “Banatski forum”, Zoran Sefkerinac, president of managing board | <p>Proposal: Proposed number of tractor power for the purchased tractors is low considering the size of the agricultural holdings and new production methodologies. Suggestion is to increase the number of the kW up to 250 kW.</p> <p>Response: DG AGRI disagrees with increasing the number of kW for tractors with explanation that the measure is accepted only temporarily for IPARD for better realization and utilization of funds and with the extent to support the smaller recipients who could benefit from having a tractor but cannot afford one.</p> |
|--|----------------|--------------------------|---|---|

ANNEX 7: LIST OF SETTLEMENTS OUTSIDE THE RURAL AREAS

| Ordinal number | ID number of the municipality | Municipalities | ID number of the settlement | Name of the settlement | Density of population people/ km ² (over 150 inhabitants/km ²) |
|----------------|-------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---|
| 1 | 70092 | Beograd-Barajevo | 703494 | Barajevo | 158,10 |
| | 70092 | Beograd-Barajevo | 703559 | Vranić | 159,23 |
| | 70092 | Beograd-Barajevo | 703567 | Guncati | 234,12 |
| | 70092 | Beograd-Barajevo | 703591 | Meljak | 334,05 |
| | 70106 | Beograd-Voždovac | 703621 | Beli Potok | 233,25 |
| | 70106 | Beograd-Voždovac | 703630 | Zuce | 167,38 |
| | 70106 | Beograd-Voždovac | 703648 | Pinosava | 344,78 |
| | 70106 | Beograd-Voždovac | 791016 | Beograd (Voždovac) | 4289,58 |
| | 70114 | Beograd-Vračar | 791024 | Beograd (Vračar) | 19631,45 |
| | 70122 | Beograd-Grocka | 703672 | Boleč | 515,32 |
| | 70122 | Beograd-Grocka | 703702 | Vinča | 371,16 |
| | 70122 | Beograd-Grocka | 703729 | Vrčin | 184,72 |
| | 70122 | Beograd-Grocka | 703737 | Grocka | 244,67 |
| | 70122 | Beograd-Grocka | 703770 | Kaludjerica | 2881,20 |
| | 70122 | Beograd-Grocka | 703796 | Leštane | 1121,56 |
| | 70149 | Beograd-Zvezdara | 791032 | Beograd (Zvezdara) | 4879,34 |
| | 70157 | Beograd-Zemun | 703915 | Ugrinovci | 214,73 |
| | 70157 | Beograd-Zemun | 791059 | Beograd (Zemun) | 1582,79 |

| | | | | |
|-------|----------------------|--------|---------------------------|---------|
| 70165 | Beograd-Lazarevac | 703982 | Veliki Crljeni | 248,25 |
| 70165 | Beograd-Lazarevac | 704091 | Lazarevac | 1455,18 |
| 70165 | Beograd-Lazarevac | 704156 | Petka | 188,13 |
| 70165 | Beograd-Lazarevac | 704288 | Šopić | 177,24 |
| 70173 | Beograd-Mladenovac | 704377 | Granice | 249,80 |
| 70173 | Beograd-Mladenovac | 704440 | Međulužje | 198,81 |
| 70173 | Beograd-Mladenovac | 704458 | Mladenovac (varoš) | 2077,93 |
| 70173 | Beograd-Mladenovac | 704466 | Mladenovac (selo) | 283,02 |
| 70173 | Beograd-Mladenovac | 704504 | Rajkovac | 219,84 |
| 70181 | Beograd-Novi Beograd | 791067 | Beograd (Novi Beograd) | 5270,50 |
| 70190 | Beograd-Obrenovac | 704563 | Barič | 471,03 |
| 70190 | Beograd-Obrenovac | 704571 | Belo Polje | 305,02 |
| 70190 | Beograd-Obrenovac | 704652 | Zabrežje | 190,23 |
| 70190 | Beograd-Obrenovac | 704679 | Zvečka | 355,69 |
| 70190 | Beograd-Obrenovac | 704725 | Mala Moštanica | 168,57 |
| 70190 | Beograd-Obrenovac | 704733 | Mislođin | 175,33 |
| 70190 | Beograd-Obrenovac | 704741 | Obrenovac | 2684,94 |
| 70190 | Beograd-Obrenovac | 704792 | Rvati | 1757,13 |
| 70190 | Beograd-Obrenovac | 704814 | Stubline | 153,13 |
| 70190 | Beograd-Obrenovac | 704849 | Urovci | 153,47 |
| 70203 | Beograd-Palilula | 704865 | Borča | 814,10 |
| 70203 | Beograd-Palilula | 704920 | Slanci | 166,57 |
| 70203 | Beograd-Palilula | 791075 | Beograd (Palilula) | 1572,89 |
| 70211 | Beograd-Rakovica | 791083 | Beograd (Rakovica) | 3615,10 |
| 70220 | Beograd-Savski Venac | 791091 | Beograd (Savski Venac) | 2781,40 |

| | | | | | |
|---|-------|--------------------|--------|----------------------|---------|
| | 70238 | Beograd-Sopot | 705055 | Ralja | 209,62 |
| | 70238 | Beograd-Sopot | 705101 | Sopot | 1565,83 |
| | 70246 | Beograd-Stari Grad | 791105 | Beograd (Stari Grad) | 8946,19 |
| | 70254 | Beograd-Čukarica | 705136 | Ostružnica | 329,69 |
| | 70254 | Beograd-Čukarica | 705179 | Rušanjski | 277,67 |
| | 70254 | Beograd-Čukarica | 705187 | Sremčica | 927,88 |
| | 70254 | Beograd-Čukarica | 705195 | Umka | 507,66 |
| | 70254 | Beograd-Čukarica | 791113 | Beograd (Čukarica) | 2261,36 |
| | 71293 | Beograd-Surčin | 703834 | Bečmen | 188,22 |
| | 71293 | Beograd-Surčin | 703869 | Dobanovci | 152,71 |
| | 71293 | Beograd-Surčin | 703877 | Jakovo | 201,27 |
| | 71293 | Beograd-Surčin | 703907 | Surčin | 297,41 |
| 2 | 80284 | Novi Sad | 802751 | Budisava | 247,23 |
| | 80284 | Novi Sad | 802778 | Veternik | 900,40 |
| | 80284 | Novi Sad | 802786 | Kač | 156,80 |
| | 80284 | Novi Sad | 802794 | Kisač | 171,57 |
| | 80284 | Novi Sad | 802824 | Novi Sad | 3023,80 |
| | 80284 | Novi Sad | 802859 | Rumenka | 229,94 |
| | 80284 | Novi Sad | 802883 | Futog | 223,87 |
| | 80519 | Petrovaradin | 802760 | Bukovac | 282,59 |
| | 80519 | Petrovaradin | 802816 | Ledinci | 242,15 |
| | 80519 | Petrovaradin | 802832 | Petrovaradin | 571,58 |
| | 80519 | Petrovaradin | 802867 | Sremska Kamenica | 402,52 |
| 3 | 71285 | Niš-Niška Banja | 729191 | Jelašnica | 157,83 |
| | 71285 | Niš-Niška Banja | 729353 | Nikola Tesla | 1753,03 |

| | | | | |
|-------|-----------------|--------|--------------------|---------|
| 71285 | Niš-Niška Banja | 729370 | Niška Banja | 906,74 |
| 71285 | Niš-Niška Banja | 729477 | Prva Kutina | 150,93 |
| 71285 | Niš-Niška Banja | 729485 | Prosek | 180,30 |
| 71307 | Niš-Pantelej | 729027 | Gornja Vrežina | 157,64 |
| 71307 | Niš-Pantelej | 729094 | Donja Vrežina | 1732,04 |
| 71307 | Niš-Pantelej | 729205 | Kamenica | 193,03 |
| 71307 | Niš-Pantelej | 792012 | Niš (Pantelej) | 6481,95 |
| 71315 | Niš-Crveni krst | 729043 | Gornja Toponica | 190,06 |
| 71315 | Niš-Crveni krst | 729078 | Gornji Komren | 158,77 |
| 71315 | Niš-Crveni krst | 729167 | Donji Komren | 255,66 |
| 71315 | Niš-Crveni krst | 729329 | Medoševac | 519,36 |
| 71315 | Niš-Crveni krst | 729469 | Popovac | 408,53 |
| 71315 | Niš-Crveni krst | 729574 | Trupale | 170,21 |
| 71315 | Niš-Crveni krst | 729582 | Hum | 155,59 |
| 71315 | Niš-Crveni krst | 729612 | Čamurlija | 153,71 |
| 71315 | Niš-Crveni krst | 792039 | Niš (Crveni krst) | 1714,10 |
| 71323 | Niš-Palilula | 728004 | Mramor | 614,02 |
| 71323 | Niš-Palilula | 728942 | Bubanj | 284,97 |
| 71323 | Niš-Palilula | 729019 | Gabrovac | 156,95 |
| 71323 | Niš-Palilula | 729060 | Gornje Međurovo | 239,60 |
| 71323 | Niš-Palilula | 729159 | Donje Međurovo | 195,24 |
| 71323 | Niš-Palilula | 729264 | Lalinac | 154,90 |
| 71323 | Niš-Palilula | 729388 | Deveti maj | 968,32 |
| 71323 | Niš-Palilula | 729434 | Pasi Poljana | 503,26 |
| 71323 | Niš-Palilula | 729558 | Suvi Do | 293,38 |

| | | | | | |
|---|-------|-----------------|--------|-----------------|----------|
| | 71323 | Niš-Palilula | 729639 | Čokot | 380,41 |
| | 71323 | Niš-Palilula | 792055 | Niš (Palilula) | 2464,65 |
| | 71331 | Niš-Medijana | 728934 | Brzi Brod | 1793,82 |
| | 71331 | Niš-Medijana | 792047 | Niš (Medijana) | 10065,36 |
| 4 | 70645 | Kragujevac-grad | 718980 | Kragujevac | 1820,95 |
| | 70645 | Kragujevac-grad | 718823 | Dragobraća | 163,71 |
| 5 | 80438 | Subotica-grad | 804592 | Palić | 189,58 |
| | 80438 | Subotica-grad | 804614 | Subotica | 596,92 |
| 6 | 80152 | Zrenjanin-grad | 801534 | Ečka | 152,20 |
| | 80152 | Zrenjanin-grad | 801542 | Zrenjanin | 396,36 |
| 7 | 80314 | Pančevo-grad | 803138 | Pančevo | 472,22 |
| | 80314 | Pančevo-grad | 803111 | Kačarevo | 178,81 |
| 8 | 71242 | Čačak-grad | 745715 | Konjevići | 187,26 |
| | 71242 | Čačak-grad | 745731 | Kulinovci | 223,50 |
| | 71242 | Čačak-grad | 745855 | Ovčar Banja | 346,39 |
| | 71242 | Čačak-grad | 745880 | Parmenac | 256,82 |
| | 71242 | Čačak-grad | 746045 | Trbušani | 256,62 |
| | 71242 | Čačak-grad | 746053 | Trnava | 189,10 |
| | 71242 | Čačak-grad | 746061 | Čačak | 1994,27 |
| | 71242 | Čačak-grad | 746754 | Beljina | 551,44 |
| 9 | 70670 | Kruševac-grad | 720585 | Begovo Brdo | 416,51 |
| | 70670 | Kruševac-grad | 720747 | Veliko Golovode | 197,52 |
| | 70670 | Kruševac-grad | 720844 | Gornji Stepoš | 200,78 |
| | 70670 | Kruševac-grad | 720992 | Jasika | 211,21 |
| | 70670 | Kruševac-grad | 721034 | Kapidžija | 327,38 |

| | | | | | |
|----|-------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------|
| | 70670 | Kruševac-grad | 721085 | Koševi | 162,48 |
| | 70670 | Kruševac-grad | 721107 | Kruševac | 5202,98 |
| | 70670 | Kruševac-grad | 720895 | Dedina | 342,03 |
| | 70670 | Kruševac-grad | 721131 | Lazarica | 260,28 |
| | 70670 | Kruševac-grad | 721140 | Lipovac | 208,71 |
| | 70670 | Kruševac-grad | 721263 | Malo Golovode | 3312,99 |
| | 70670 | Kruševac-grad | 721310 | Mudrakovac | 784,60 |
| | 70670 | Kruševac-grad | 721344 | Pakašnica | 752,34 |
| | 70670 | Kruševac-grad | 721352 | Parunovac | 247,79 |
| | 70670 | Kruševac-grad | 721387 | Pepeljevac | 216,79 |
| | 70670 | Kruševac-grad | 721433 | Ribarska Banja | 179,69 |
| | 70670 | Kruševac-grad | 721611 | Čitluk | 596,54 |
| 10 | 70653 | Kraljevo-grad | 719307 | Adrani | 181,74 |
| | 70653 | Kraljevo-grad | 719528 | Grdica | 355,93 |
| | 70653 | Kraljevo-grad | 719617 | Zaklopača | 182,62 |
| | 70653 | Kraljevo-grad | 719650 | Jarčujak | 209,34 |
| | 70653 | Kraljevo-grad | 719684 | Kovanluk | 706,03 |
| | 70653 | Kraljevo-grad | 719692 | Kovači | 529,62 |
| | 70653 | Kraljevo-grad | 719706 | Konarevo | 332,13 |
| | 70653 | Kraljevo-grad | 719714 | Kraljevo | 2626,35 |
| | 70653 | Kraljevo-grad | 719811 | Mataruška Banja | 1357,05 |
| | 70653 | Kraljevo-grad | 720062 | Ratina | 227,99 |
| | 70653 | Kraljevo-grad | 720291 | Čibukovac | 311,81 |
| | 70653 | Kraljevo-grad | 746649 | Žiča | 154,50 |
| | 11 | 70874 | Novi Pazar-grad | 730017 | Banja |

| | | | | | |
|----|-------|-----------------|--------|------------------|---------|
| | 70874 | Novi Pazar-grad | 730092 | Varevo | 225,77 |
| | 70874 | Novi Pazar-grad | 730360 | Ivanča | 458,59 |
| | 70874 | Novi Pazar-grad | 730564 | Mur | 552,10 |
| | 70874 | Novi Pazar-grad | 730602 | Novi Pazar | 4338,08 |
| | 70874 | Novi Pazar-grad | 730653 | Osoje | 394,29 |
| | 70874 | Novi Pazar-grad | 730688 | Paralovo | 401,32 |
| | 70874 | Novi Pazar-grad | 730718 | Pobrđe | 1117,47 |
| | 70874 | Novi Pazar-grad | 730777 | Postenje | 208,92 |
| | 70874 | Novi Pazar-grad | 730840 | Rajčinoviće | 167,11 |
| | 70874 | Novi Pazar-grad | 731013 | Hotkovo | 227,70 |
| 12 | 70360 | Valjevo-grad | 708402 | Valjevo | 2147,39 |
| | 70360 | Valjevo-grad | 708305 | Beloševac | 167,49 |
| | 70360 | Valjevo-grad | 708470 | Gorić | 607,44 |
| | 70360 | Valjevo-grad | 708496 | Gornja Grabovica | 163,47 |
| | 70360 | Valjevo-grad | 708887 | Petnica | 196,07 |
| | 70360 | Valjevo-grad | 708895 | Popučke | 177,12 |
| | 70360 | Valjevo-grad | 708984 | Sedlari | 199,13 |
| 13 | 70432 | Vranje | 711241 | Bresnica | 162,68 |
| | 70432 | Vranje | 711306 | Vranje | 1889,90 |
| | 70432 | Vranje | 711420 | Davidovac | 173,13 |
| | 70432 | Vranje | 711497 | Donji Neradovac | 207,15 |
| | 70432 | Vranje | 711578 | Zlatokop | 257,01 |
| | 70432 | Vranje | 711977 | Ranutovac | 157,52 |
| | 70432 | Vranje | 711993 | Ribnice | 221,30 |
| | 70432 | Vranje | 712183 | Suvi Dol | 234,65 |
| 14 | 70556 | Zaječar-grad | 715689 | Zaječar | 752,05 |

| | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|------------------|---------|
| 70726 | Leskovac-grad | 723614 | Badince | 184,83 |
| 70726 | Leskovac-grad | 723657 | Beli Potok | 191,33 |
| 70726 | Leskovac-grad | 723673 | Bobište | 609,03 |
| 70726 | Leskovac-grad | 723681 | Bogojevce | 179,43 |
| 70726 | Leskovac-grad | 723738 | Brestovac | 221,31 |
| 70726 | Leskovac-grad | 723711 | Bratmilovce | 1022,74 |
| 70726 | Leskovac-grad | 723789 | Bunuški Čifluk | 197,91 |
| 70726 | Leskovac-grad | 723878 | Vinarce | 179,99 |
| 70726 | Leskovac-grad | 723991 | Gornje Krajince | 163,70 |
| 70726 | Leskovac-grad | 724009 | Gornje Sinkovce | 171,09 |
| 70726 | Leskovac-grad | 724017 | Gornje Stopanje | 307,18 |
| 70726 | Leskovac-grad | 724033 | Gornji Bunibrod | 150,77 |
| 70726 | Leskovac-grad | 724084 | Grdelica (varoš) | 1930,62 |
| 70726 | Leskovac-grad | 724092 | Grdelica (selo) | 206,05 |
| 70726 | Leskovac-grad | 724157 | Donja Jajina | 233,42 |
| 70726 | Leskovac-grad | 724181 | Donja Slatina | 151,95 |
| 70726 | Leskovac-grad | 724203 | Donje Krajince | 164,03 |
| 70726 | Leskovac-grad | 724211 | Donje Sinkovce | 600,42 |
| 70726 | Leskovac-grad | 724220 | Donje Stopanje | 154,40 |
| 70726 | Leskovac-grad | 724335 | Žižavica | 182,81 |
| 70726 | Leskovac-grad | 724378 | Zloćudovo | 176,66 |
| 70726 | Leskovac-grad | 724521 | Kumarevo | 262,57 |
| 70726 | Leskovac-grad | 724548 | Leskovac | 2379,52 |
| 70726 | Leskovac-grad | 724556 | Lipovica | 153,61 |
| 70726 | Leskovac-grad | 724572 | Mala Biljanica | 153,30 |
| 70726 | Leskovac-grad | 724629 | Manojlovce | 180,31 |

| | | | | | |
|-------|-------|---------------|--------|-------------------|-----------|
| | 70726 | Leskovac-grad | 724688 | Mrštane | 225,14 |
| | 70726 | Leskovac-grad | 724696 | Navalin | 162,73 |
| | 70726 | Leskovac-grad | 724734 | Nomanica | 274,29 |
| | 70726 | Leskovac-grad | 724866 | Predejane (varoš) | 1740,44 |
| 16 | 70734 | Loznica-grad | 725196 | Banja Koviljača | 389,49 |
| | 70734 | Loznica-grad | 725200 | Baščeluci | 351,70 |
| | 70734 | Loznica-grad | 725269 | Voćnjak | 208,91 |
| | 70734 | Loznica-grad | 725382 | Draginac | 1159,77 |
| | 70734 | Loznica-grad | 725480 | Klupci | 995,91 |
| | 70734 | Loznica-grad | 725510 | Krajišnici | 535,51 |
| | 70734 | Loznica-grad | 725528 | Lešnica | 150,65 |
| | 70734 | Loznica-grad | 725544 | Lipnički Šor | 167,44 |
| | 70734 | Loznica-grad | 725552 | Loznica | 2033,63 |
| | 70734 | Loznica-grad | 725579 | Lozničko Polje | 472,05 |
| | 70734 | Loznica-grad | 725617 | Ploča | 600,01 |
| | 70734 | Loznica-grad | 725641 | Runjani | 169,54 |
| | 70734 | Loznica-grad | 725676 | Straža | 163,07 |
| | 17 | 70939 | Pirot | 732109 | Berilovac |
| 70939 | | Pirot | 732222 | Gnjilan | 210,67 |
| 70939 | | Pirot | 732575 | Pirot | 1313,38 |
| 70939 | | Pirot | 732605 | Poljska Ržana | 170,34 |
| 18 | 70947 | Požarevac | 733083 | Požarevac | 691,19 |
| 19 | 70998 | Prokuplje | 735728 | Donja Stražava | 249,49 |
| | 70998 | Prokuplje | 736074 | Novo Selo | 209,72 |
| | 70998 | Prokuplje | 736210 | Prokuplje | 1298,86 |
| 20 | 71048 | Jagodina-grad | 737950 | Vinorača | 150,44 |

| | | | | | |
|----|-------|----------------|--------|------------------------|---------|
| | 71048 | Jagodina-grad | 737968 | Voljavče | 347,41 |
| | 71048 | Jagodina-grad | 738174 | Končarevo | 163,52 |
| | 71048 | Jagodina-grad | 738247 | Majur | 217,07 |
| | 71048 | Jagodina-grad | 738328 | Rakitovo | 523,18 |
| | 71048 | Jagodina-grad | 738336 | Ribare | 295,23 |
| | 71048 | Jagodina-grad | 738352 | Jagodina | 2078,05 |
| | 71048 | Jagodina-grad | 738417 | Stržilo | 222,34 |
| | 71048 | Jagodina-grad | 738433 | Trnava | 671,17 |
| 21 | 71099 | Smederevo-grad | 740292 | Vranovo | 165,70 |
| | 71099 | Smederevo-grad | 740314 | Vučak | 215,38 |
| | 71099 | Smederevo-grad | 740446 | Petrijevo | 222,90 |
| | 71099 | Smederevo-grad | 740454 | Radinac | 350,73 |
| | 71099 | Smederevo-grad | 740462 | Ralja | 182,41 |
| | 71099 | Smederevo-grad | 740527 | Smederevo | 1552,39 |
| | 71099 | Smederevo-grad | 740543 | Udovice | 164,21 |
| 22 | 71145 | Užice-grad | 741850 | Sevojno | 362,56 |
| | 71145 | Užice-grad | 741892 | Užice | 2531,63 |
| 23 | 71269 | Šabac-grad | 746240 | Jevremovac | 353,80 |
| | 71269 | Šabac-grad | 746258 | Jelenča | 367,60 |
| | 71269 | Šabac-grad | 746304 | Majur | 346,80 |
| | 71269 | Šabac-grad | 746380 | Mišar | 205,55 |
| | 71269 | Šabac-grad | 746479 | Pocerski Pričinović | 733,55 |
| | 71269 | Šabac-grad | 746606 | Šabac | 1745,54 |
| 24 | 80128 | Vršac | 801089 | Vršac | 233,25 |
| 25 | 80209 | Kikinda | 802158 | Kikinda | 200,91 |

| | | | | | |
|----|-------|------------------------|--------|---------------------|---------|
| 26 | 80381 | Sombor-grad | 803979 | Sombor | 164,65 |
| 27 | 80403 | Sremska Mitrovica-grad | 804177 | Laćarak | 195,15 |
| | 80403 | Sremska Mitrovica-grad | 804215 | Mačvanska Mitrovica | 1258,48 |
| | 80403 | Sremska Mitrovica-grad | 804266 | Sremska Mitrovica | 760,91 |
| 28 | 70327 | Bor | 706418 | Bor | 717,33 |