

CHALLENGES OF USING THE IPARD PROGRAM IN FINANCING AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Katarina Đuric¹, Anton Puškarić²

Abstract

Aimed to more successful integration into the Common Agricultural Policy, the European Union provides funds to candidate countries for membership in the form of pre-accession funds. One of these forms of financial support is the IPARD program. The aim of the paper is to review the limitations, which can occur in the process of financing the agriculture and rural development from the pre-accession funds of the European Union. By method of descriptive and historical analysis in this paper, the experiences of countries are analyzed, which were users of resources from this fund in the period 2007-2013, as well as the dispersion of IPARD funds for the period from 2014-2024. With aim of as much as possible utilization of funds from the IPARD program, above all, establishing the adequate institutional capacity needed for this form of financing is recommended. Also, it is necessary to provide informing and training the potential users of IPARD funds through appropriate advisory services. Relying on experiences of other countries, it can be concluded that the best way for efficient use of this pre-accession fund is to identify a small number of real priorities in financing the agriculture and rural development.

Key words: *the European Union, IPARD, agriculture, rural development*

Introduction

The common agricultural policy presents one of the most significant sectoral policies of the European Union. Its complex system of rules, principles, mechanisms and instruments is directed to regulation of

¹ Katarina Djuric, Ph.D., Associate professor, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Novi Sad, Trg Dositeja Obradovica 8, 21 000 Novi Sad, Phone: +381 21 485-3232, E-mail: katarina.djuric@polj.uns.ac.rs

² Anton Puškarić, Ph.D., Institute of Agricultural Economics, Volgina Street no. 15, 11060 Belgrade, Serbia, E-mail: anton.puskaric@gmail.com

process of primary production, the food industry and achieving sustainable development of rural areas in twenty eight member countries. The Republic of Serbia is a candidate for membership in the European Union. As a candidate country, it has obligation of adoption and implementation of Common agricultural policy. Taking into account the complexity of the system of this policy, the European Union supports candidate countries for membership in process of adaptation of agricultural sector and rural areas, as well as in the initial steps of implementation of measures of its agricultural policy.

The Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA) presents a program for countries in process of accession to the European Union. Part of the IPA instrument is the Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance- Rural development (IPARD), and it is intended to candidate countries for membership, aimed to preparation of implementation and management of the Common Agricultural Policy of the European Union. IPARD funds are primarily intended to establish the institutional structures and their preparation for using much more significant funds from the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development, as well as introducing the stricter rules, which potential users of funds must comply with. On this path, candidate countries are faced with numerous challenges. This paper is aimed to indicate some of the potential problems, which accompany the use of funds from IPARD program.

Method and the Aim of the Research

In this paper, the subject and aim of the research have determined the application of qualitative methods of research, inherent in social sciences. The greatest application in the paper have methods of descriptive and historical analysis, based on the study of the impact of the IPARD program on the development of agriculture and rural areas in countries that are candidates for membership in the European Union in the period 2007-2013. Significant application in the paper has method of comparative analysis, considering the necessity of perceiving and comparing positive and negative experiences during the use of pre-accession funds. The aim of research is analysis of key problems with which the candidate countries for membership in the European Union have been already faced during withdrawal of resources from IPARD fund.

Based on perception of the dispersion of subsidies for individual purposes for the period from 2014-2020, in this paper, available possibilities to the Republic of Serbia are assessed, in order to prepare as efficiently as possible for the integration of its agricultural sector into the European agricultural model.

The EU Pre-accession Assistance to Candidate Countries

The common agricultural policy (CAP) presents one of the most significant sectoral policies of the EU. Its significance is indicated by the fact that about 30% of the Union's legal regulations refer precisely to this policy, and also that 40% of the budget funds are directed to agriculture and rural development (Markovic et al., 2012).

Considering the number of members of the European Union, the distinct heterogeneity of their agricultural structure and level of achieved economic development, CAP is designed as a complex system of principles, rules and instruments directed to development of agriculture and village, environmental protection and conservation of biodiversity. From its revival in 1962 to the present, CAP is constantly being reforming and adapting to new intern and extern conditions. Continuous reforming, as well as the complexity of this policy largely complicate adaptation of national agricultural policies of candidate countries to the EU regulations. For this reason, over time, the European Union has developed numerous programs of external help. The biggest enlargement of the Union, realized through the accession of ten countries of Central and Eastern Europe, was accompanied by four financial instruments. Namely, in the period of 2000 to 2006, the programs, which were intended to countries in the process of accession to the European Union, are PHARE, ISPA, SAPARD, CARDS, as well as the pre-accession instrument for Turkey.

In the next program period, which lasted from 2007 to 2013, by the Council Europe Regulation, all existing funds were replaced by one instrument for pre-accession assistance. It was IPA I 2007-2013 system of support, which was divided into five components for the purpose of greater efficiency (EC, 2006):

1. Assistance to transition and establishing the institutions;
2. Cross-border cooperation;
3. Regional development;

4. Human resources development;
5. Rural development.

For countries, which were candidates for membership in the mentioned period, all five components of IPA program were available, while for potential candidate countries, including Serbia, only the first two components of help were available. Out of total of 11.5 billion euros, that IPA I budget amounted for period 2007-2013, about 1.4 billion euros were intended for the Republic of Serbia. Beside the first two components, within the foreseen fund, Serbia has possibilities to use part of funds for realization of project, which presented the basis for using the fifth IPA component, IPARD, respectively. The projects were mainly referred to the establishment of institutional capacities for agricultural payments.

The current program period, which has started in 2014 and will last until 2020, has brought certain changes when it comes to the system of pre-accession assistance for countries in the European integration process. Unique instrument for pre-accession assistance to countries in the European integration process for the budget period 2014-2020, has not been established by documents, adopted by EU institutions. Instead five components, which constituted the IPA I program, in the IPA II program exist so called policy area (European Parliament and the Council, 2014):

1. Reforms as a part of changes for the EU membership and establishing the institutions and capacities;
2. Socioeconomic and regional development;
3. Employment;
4. Social policies;
5. Education;
6. Improvement of gender equality and human resources development;
7. Agriculture and rural development;
8. Regional and territorial cooperation.

News that accompany IPA II program in relation to the previous accounting period, also refer to the establishment of higher degree of responsibility for candidate countries in asset management process, as

well as their application in certain sectors. Also, unlike the IPA I program, unique system of rewarding the successful users of funds is planned, as well as the cooperation with international financial institutions. The total fund of IPA II in the period 201-2020 amounts 11.7 million euros. Users are: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Macedonia, Kosovo³, Montenegro, Serbia, Turkey. About 1.5 billion euros of total support is allocated for Serbia, while 175 million euros are allocated for area of agriculture and rural development.

Institutional Framework and Programming of IPARD programs

IPARD, a component of the IPA program, which is intended for rural development, it greatly differs from other components. First of all, decentralized management without ex-ante control is required for this component. This difference causes the different structure of institutions, which administer the IPARD.

The basic condition for fund use from the IPARD fund has political character, and refers to the achievement of the candidate status for membership in the European Union. Then, the next is establishing institutions, adopting and approval of the IPARD program by the European Commission, the conclusion of all relevant agreements and the successful completion of the accreditation process.

The structure of the IPARD program consists of appropriate institutions and subjects. Two key subjects are the National IPA Coordinator and the National Accreditation Board. A part of control and management system is also the National Fund.

The IPARD operational structure consists of the Managing Authority and the IPARD Agency. The most important role in the process of money transfer has National Fund. This authority is in charge of providing undisturbed transfer of funds approved by the European Union to the national account and to the IPARD agency. In addition, the National Fund is in charge of timely submission of reports to the European Commission about realized payments. The Managing Authority, which is the most frequently responsible ministry, is responsible for the following tasks:

1. Development of IPARD programs;

³ According to United Nations Security Council Resolution 1244 of 10 June 1999

2. Supervision over the implementation of the program;
3. Evaluation;
4. Reporting.

The Managing Authority forms the Monitoring Authority, responsible for monitoring the implementation and assessment of the efficiency of the IPARD program. Timely informing potential users is also in the domain of the activities of the Managing Authority, which is engaged in operations related to rural development.

The IPARD agency, the Administration for Agricultural Payments, respectively, is responsible for approval and control of payment obligations, payment of funds to users and accounting services.

Relevant institutions in the Republic of Serbia, which are responsible for implementation of the IPARD program, are the Ministry of Finance, in the function of the National Fund and the National Approval Officer; Sector for Rural Development of the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Management, in the role of the Managing Authority and the Administration of Agricultural Payments as part within the Ministry of Agriculture, which the work of the IPARD Agency are delegated.

Key Problems that accompany candidate countries in the process of using the IPARD considering the experience of the candidate countries, the European Commission highlights the existence of a number of factors that limit effective use of support funds from pre-accession funds.

When it comes to the IPARD, the European Commission states in its reports that the most candidate countries do not dispose with appropriate capacities for the preparation of quality documentation for the implementation of infrastructure projects, as well as for realization of public procurement procedures (European Commission, 2014).

Since rural development policy is maintained at the state level and operatively is conducted at the level of local communities, as one of the reasons for insufficient utilization of the IPARD funds is the unpreparedness of local self-government, both in infrastructure and in personnel potential. Regarding that agriculture development, as well as rural development present the areas which require multisectoral approach, the problem, which is frequent companion of candidate countries in the

process of using the IPARD, are administrative obstacles and insufficient coordination of the Ministry of Agriculture with the Ministries of other departments.

The age and educational structure of the rural population in the most of the candidate countries for membership in the European Union is less or more unfavorable. Namely, due to low living standards and poor living conditions for life and work, young and working population leaves rural areas, which directly affects declining birth rate and aggravation of the age structure. As the experience of certain countries from our direct environment confirms, which members of the European Union became, older population of low education is less willing to accept any kind of innovation. In addition, it is more prone to mistrust the institutions, and, as rule, it is unprepared to meet the requirements of complex administrative procedures that are an integral part of the IPARD program.

Regarding the purpose of the pre-accession funds in the area of agriculture and rural development, it seems as necessary to raise the level of informing and awareness of rural population about the significance of the utilization of available funds. In this regard, every candidate state, including the Republic of Serbia, should make efforts in order to improve possibilities for resource withdrawal from European pre-accession funds through education of local population, as potential end users of support. There are various options for that purpose, from field work of agricultural advisors, through organizing the seminars, workshops and similar forms of informal education and information. Adequate training for the drafting of projects and business plans is crucial for the efficient use of resources from pre-accession funds, given that poor initial experiences, in terms of projects that do not meet the prescribed standards, can further discourage potential users.

Also, one of the challenges, which are in the way of successful implementation of projects and the withdrawal of funds from the IPARD fund, is the existence of national measures, which are competitive with the European Union funds. As rule, such national level measures are less demanding in terms of administrative procedures and documentation, and consequently result in significantly higher user response. In order to avoid such 'overlap' in the purpose of available funds and thus improve the use of the IPARD fund, it is important that structure and purpose of the agricultural budget is planned in coordination with the European Union plan on granting pre-accession support funds.

Beside mentioned factors, the coordination between all relevant participants in the IPARD program affects the absorption of funds. The national administration has a key role in the process of fund absorption, primarily the agency or the administration for agricultural payments. As far as it is determined by external factors, the work of administration must be technically and personally trained for the extensive work of applying, allocating resources and controlling their intended use. Additionally, the successful work of the administration depends on level of achieved cooperation with other subjects such as users, financial institutions, consultants and the European Commission. Unresolved property relations, extensive documentation, and lack of confidence of potential users have been identified as key challenges in using funds from the IPARD funds, in the case of individual countries in our environment. According to data from 2013, Croatia used 130, FYR Macedonia 65, and Turkey 650 million euros in the period from 2007 to 2012, which is only one fifth of the total allocated funds intended for rural development (Zekic et al., 2016). The thing that is often not taken into account is the fact that investment projects and development plans should not be made solely regard to the purpose of the funds approved by the European Union, but that such development projects are result of long-term view of development based on own needs.

The consulting sector in charge of education, information and providing of legal and administrative support should have key role in resolving such potential challenges and limitations. The most common problems that accompany this part of work, indicated by users countries of the IPARD, are insufficient information the consultants, whether it is agricultural advisory services or other institutions under the authority of the Ministry of Agriculture. Given that the IPARD program is primarily aimed to establishing institutions and their training to manage much greater funds of the European Union after becoming a full member, it is necessary to understand seriously this possibility and to invest all available, above all, human capacities, in order to bring the work of the relevant institutions to a higher level of efficiency.

Beside all mentioned challenges, using of the IPARD program in financing agriculture and rural development can be limited by extremely weak economic performances of the largest part of agricultural producers in our country. Namely, finance system from the European Unions funds includes that the applicants dispose with the total amount of funds necessary for the realization of the investment, in order to refund a certain

amount of funds, after realization of the same. If it comes from the fact that the income of most agricultural holdings in Serbia is extremely low, it is not necessary to exclude the possibility of excluding a large number of farms from the system of the IPARD support.

Institutional Framework for the Use of the IPARD Fund in the Republic of Serbia

The chronic lack of budget for financing the agriculture and rural development is one of the key problems of our agricultural sector. The need for increasing the resources, which are directed to these purposes, is enhanced, which can be achieved by accrediting the relevant institutions for the use of the IPARD funds (Vasiljevic et al., 2016). In the framework of reform activities and preparations for the process of negotiations of the EU membership, the Republic of Serbia conducted certain steps in the creation of institutions for the use of pre-accession funds in 2007. Within the Ministry of Finance, the authorities are established for conducting performances of the management and control system, the National Approval Officer and the National Fund, respectively. Law on Agriculture and Rural Development of 2009, the Agency for Agricultural Payments was established, as institution within the Ministry of Agriculture, while during 2010, within the same ministry, the Managing Authority was established, Sector for Rural Development, respectively (Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia, 2009).

At the beginning of 2011, the Government of the Republic of Serbia adopted the National Program for Rural Development for the period 2011-2013. Within this program, among other things, two pilot the IPARD measures have been defined, whose purpose was reflected in certain preparation of potential users to the standards and requirements that the European Union sets in the process of financial support to rural development (Official gazette of the Republic of Serbia, 2011).

By obtaining the status of the candidate country in March 2012, the Republic of Serbia formally met the first condition for the use of the fifth component of the IIPAD Fund for rural development. However, difficulties in accessing these funds are current, considering that the Administration for Agricultural Payments, respectively, the IPARD Agency has not yet been accredited by the European Commission. Namely, although the dedicated funds for support to development of rural areas were ready and available, institutional support to the IPARD

program in our country did not meet European standards. Agency for Agricultural Payment from that time, based in Sabac, was not ready for national accreditation, nor for the accreditation procedure by the European Commission. By the end of 2012, Serbia gave up the accreditation of the current IPARD program, because the date for the start of the new finance cycle was approaching, new IPARD program 2014-2020, respectively.

The European Commission approved the IPARD program of the Republic of Serbia for the period 2014-2020, however, problems related to accreditation of the Administration for Agricultural payments still do not allow the announcing the first open competitions and withdrawal funds dedicated to recovery and agriculture development and development of rural areas.

The IPARD II 2014-2020 Program – Financial Framework for the Republic of Serbia

Bringing the Common Agricultural Policy for the period 2014-2020, the European Union defined the measures, activities and essence of the IPARD II program. Compared with IPARD I program, which was actual in the period from 2007-2013, IPARD II provides opportunity of financing a number of measures. In the current period, there are eleven measures by which the support is provided to different targeted areas of agriculture and rural development, through various forms of help to end users.

By the Regulation of the European Parliament and Council NO 231/2014, the following measures of the IPARD program are defined:

1. Investment in the physical property of agricultural holdings;
2. Support for the establishment of producer groups;
3. Investments in the physical property related to the processing and marketing of agricultural products and fishery products;
4. Measures in the field of agriculture, environmental protection, climate and organic production;
5. Raising and protection of forests;
6. Investing in rural public infrastructure;
7. Farm diversification and business development;

8. Preparation and implementation of local development strategies (LEADER approach);
9. Education and training;
10. Technical assistance;
11. Advisory services.

Every country determines the choice of measures on the basis of previously conducted SWOT analysis of the agriculture and rural sector, but due to limited resources it is necessary to create a list of development priorities. When it comes to the Republic of Serbia, it is planned to complement the IPARD measures with measures from the National Program for Agriculture and Rural Development for period 2015-2020. Thereby, it is necessary completely to respect the principle of complementarity between national and the IPARD measures, in order to cover as bigger as possible number of potential users of support.

At the end of 2014, the European Union Directorate for Agriculture (DGAGRI), approved a support program through the IPARD Fund for the Republic of Serbia. It is intended that the realization of measures within the program for the period 2014-2020 will occur in two phases (Table 1).

Table 1. *Measures within the IPARD II program for the Republic of Serbia*

The first phase – the period until 2015	The second phase – the period after 2017
Investments in the physical property of agricultural holdings	Implementing the local rural development strategies (LEADER approach)
Investments in the processing and marketing of agricultural products and fishery products	Agro-ecological-climate measures and organic production
Diversification of agricultural holdings and business development	
Technical assistance	

Source: *Pejovic et al., 2014*

Identically to the previous program period, total investment aid for the user of funds amounts between 50% and 80% of total investment value. Thus, the volume of help through the IPARD program is limited to the appropriate percentage of co-financing, while the rest of the fund, user

provides from their own or other sources. In addition, public expenditures in financing the IPARD II program can not exceed the amount of 50% of the total of eligible expenses of investments, except in the following cases:

- 60% for investments in physical property of agricultural holdings, and 65% if the holders of the holdings are young farmers, as well as for measures of diversification of economic activities in the farms;
- - 70% for investments in physical property of agricultural holdings in mountainous areas, and
- 100% for support to the construction of rural infrastructure, which does not generate significant income, then activities, which are financed within the measure of technical help, measures for raising and protecting forests, LEADER approach, measures of foundation of producer groups, measure in the field of environmental protection, climate and organic production, training measures and advisory services.

On the other hand, the participation of the IPA funds in public expenditures is maximum 75%, except in the case of the following measures:

- 85% for measures in the area of agriculture, environmental protection, climate and organic production, promotion and training measures, advisory services, measures for raising and protection of forests and investment projects, which are conducted in areas where occurred special natural disasters, and
- 100% for preparation and implementation of local development strategy – LEADER approach.
- For the period from 2014-2020, total public help, which includes resources from the IPARD fund and national budget, for the Republic of Serbia, amounts 229.970.588 dinars. The amounts of support resources are increasing from year to year, and the largest part is determined for investing in physical property of agricultural holdings (Table 2).

For each of the measures within the IPARD program, potential users are defined, as well as the general eligibility criteria for the projects. In addition, specific criteria for certain sectors are defined, harmonized with

the size of the holding and the type of the production, or the type of activity that the holding wants to perform next to agriculture.

Table 2. *Total resources of public support for agriculture and rural development of the Republic of Serbia in the period from 2015-2020 (in thousands of euros)*

Measure	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Total 2014-2020.
Investments in the physical property of agricultural holdings	10.046	13.200	14.162	14.932	22.669	26.373	101.386
Investments in the physical property relating to the processing and marketing of agricultural products and fishery products	8.219	10.799	11.587	12.217	18.546	21.576	82.946
Agro-ecological-climate measures and organic production measures	-	-	2.573	2.573	2.573	2.573	10.294
Implementation of local rural development strategies – LEADER approach	-	-	555	1.111	2.111	2.055	5.833
Diversification of agricultural holdings and business development	1.333	2.000	2.666	6.666	5.333	5.333	23.333
Technical support	352	588	1.176	1.705	1.176	1.176	6.176

Source: *Ministry of Agriculture and Environmental Protection of the Republic of Serbia, 2014*

The total resources of the IPARD fund for the Republic of Serbia in the period 2015-2020 amount 175 million euros. The European Union allocated the largest part of the funds for projects for the construction of the physical property of agricultural holdings, their modernization, respectively (Table 3).

Table 3. *The amount of the IPARD funds by individual measures for the Republic of Serbia for the period 2014-2020 (in thousand of euros)*

Measure	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	Total 2014-2020.
Investments in the physical property of agricultural holdings	7.535	9.900	10.622	11.199	17.002	19.780	76.040
Investments in the physical property relating to the processing and marketing of agricultural products and fishery products	6.164	8.099	8.690	9.162	13.910	16.182	62.210
Agro-ecological-climate measures and organic production measures	-	-	2.187	2.187	2.187	2.187	8.750
Implementation of local rural development strategies – LEADER approach	-	-	500	1.000	1.090	1.850	5.250
Diversification of agricultural holdings and business development	1.000	1.500	2.000	5.000	4.000	4.000	17.500
Technical assistance	300	500	1.000	1.450	1.000	1.000	5.250
TOTAL	15.000	20.000	25.000	30.000	40.000	45.000	175.000

Source: *Ministry of Agriculture and Environmental Protection of the Republic of Serbia, 2014*

Consequently to experiences with other candidate countries, the European Union has planned the biggest amounts of financial support for the last years of program period, and the lowest amounts in the early years, where the candidate country adapts to the new funding system, as a rule. All the challenges, which stand in the way of efficient fund use of the IPARD program, whether it is about personnel potential, administrative procedures or mistrust of farmers, during the first few years are mitigated or overcome.

Conclusion

Since that SAPARD presents the predecessor of the IPARD program, whose user is our country, too, it is important to consider all advantages and limitations of this type of support that the European Union offers.

In order to provide the most efficient use of the pre-accession assistance, it is necessary, above all, to form appropriate institutional capacities. Efficient institutions, as well as operational subjects are entities that can only provide that national-level plans and projects, relating to the use of the European funds, are realistic and consistent with specific developmental needs, and therefore feasible. Also, well-organized institutions and their quality staff will enable full information of all potential users of resources from funds,

which the European Union provides. This is considered as a very important segment of the work of advisory institutions, regarding that insufficient information, as well as mistrust of rural population were limitations to the successful withdrawal of the SAPARD funds in almost all Central and Eastern European countries. On the other hand, it is wrong to cherish illusions that pre-accession funds will solve all problems of agriculture and villages. On the contrary, National agricultural policy, in the period while country still has the status of candidate for membership in the European Union, should be maximally affirmative to all members of the 'agricultural community', both agricultural producers and the rural population in general. Since that the European funds function according the principle of co-financing and reimbursement of funds, it is essential to increase significantly the national budget for agriculture.

What we can also learn from the experience of other countries, and related to the use of pre-accession fund, refers to the list of national development priorities. Although, the fact that agriculture and rural areas are faced with numerous problems, it is very important, especially in the first years of using pre-accession support, to select the lower number of real priorities. In this way, higher degree of efficiency and the utilization of funds, which the European Union made available to candidate countries, are provided.

Literature

1. European Commission (2006). Regulation No 1085/2006 of 17 July 2006, Establishing an Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA)
2. European Parliament and the Council (2014). Regulating (EU) No 231/2014 of 11 March 2014, Establishing an Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA II)
3. European Parliament and the Council (2014a). Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 of 11 March 2014, Laying down common rules and procedures for the implementation of the Union instruments for financing external action
4. European Commission (2014). Regulation (EU) No 447/2014 of 2 May 2014, Regulation on the specific rules for implementating Regulation (EU) No 231/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing an Instrument for Pre-Accession assistance (IPA II)

5. Marković, K., Njegovan, Z., Pejanović, R. (2012). *Former and Future Reforms of Common Agriculture Policy of the European Union*, Economics of Agriculture 3/2012, p.p. 483-498
6. Ministarstvo poljoprivrede i zaštite životne sredine (2014). *Republika Srbija IPARD program za 2014 – 2020. godinu*, preuzeto sa sajta http://www.mpzss.gov.rs/wp-content/uploads/datoteke/korisna_dokumenta/Serbia_IPARD_II_Program_finalni_prevod-Korigovano_20_04_2015.pdf
7. Pejović, A. (2014). *Vodič kroz IPA II – Instrument za predpristupnu pomoć 2014-2020*, Evropski pokret Srbija, Beograd
8. Službeni glasnik Republike Srbije (2009). *Zakon o poljoprivredi i ruralnom razvoju Republike Srbije*, SG RS 41/2009 i 10/2013
9. Službeni glasnik Republike Srbije (2011). *Nacionalni program za ruralni razvoj Republike Srbije za period od 2011. do 2013. godine*, SG RS br. 15/2011
10. Vasiljević, Z., Zakić, V., Kovačević, V. (2015). *Najnovija zakonska regulativa u Republici Srbiji u oblasti podsticaja i finansiranja poljoprivrede i ruralnog razvoja*, Agroznanje, 16 (1), str. 33-45
11. Zekić, S., Matkovski, B., Kleut, Ž. (2016). *IPARD fondovi u funkciji razvoja ruralnih područja Republike Srbije*, Ekonomski horizonti, 18 (2), str. 169-180.