



# The Hungary National Report

Figeczky, G.

*March 2006*

Report commissioned by WWF, SNM & LUPG



**EUROPE'S LIVING COUNTRYSIDE**  
promoting policies for sustainable rural development

<a href="#"><u>2. Executive summary</u></a> .....	5
<a href="#"><u>2.1. Rural development programs in Hungary</u></a> .....	5
<a href="#"><u>2.2. Environmental issues and objectives</u></a> .....	6
<a href="#"><u>2.3. Recommendations</u></a> .....	8
<a href="#"><u>3. Introduction to the history of rural development in Hungary</u></a> .....	9
<a href="#"><u>3.1. The National Agri-Environmental Program</u></a> .....	9
<a href="#"><u>3.2. The SAPARD program</u></a> .....	9
<a href="#"><u>3.3. Structural Funds criteria</u></a> .....	10
<a href="#"><u>4. Review of the current rural development programmes</u></a> .....	11
<a href="#"><u>4.1. Program design</u></a> .....	11
<a href="#"><u>4.2. Implementation of the program</u></a> .....	14
<a href="#"><u>4.3 Strengths and weaknesses</u></a> .....	15
<a href="#"><u>5. Environmental issues</u></a> .....	17
<a href="#"><u>5.1 State of the rural environment</u></a> .....	17
<a href="#"><u>5.1.1. Biodiversity and landscapes</u></a> .....	18
<a href="#"><u>5.1.2. Water</u></a> .....	21
<a href="#"><u>5.1.3. Soil</u></a> .....	23
<a href="#"><u>5.1.4. Air pollution</u></a> .....	24
<a href="#"><u>5.2 Key environmental issues</u></a> .....	31
<a href="#"><u>5.3. Proposal of objectives and targets on the environmental issues selected</u></a> .....	35
<a href="#"><u>5.4 Evaluation of the program for the period 2004-2006</u></a> .....	36
<a href="#"><u>6. Addressing environmental issues</u></a> .....	39
<a href="#"><u>6.1. Main factors in Hungarian agriculture and rural development</u></a> .....	39
<a href="#"><u>6.2. Proposals how to address selected environmental issues</u></a> .....	39
<a href="#"><u>6.3. Public participation</u></a> .....	42
<a href="#"><u>6.4 Delivery mechanisms</u></a> .....	43
<a href="#"><u>6.5. Indicators and monitoring</u></a> .....	45
<a href="#"><u>7. Recommendations</u></a> .....	47
<a href="#"><u>8. Case study – Gerechát</u></a> .....	48
<a href="#"><u>8.1. Land use types in the area</u></a> .....	48
<a href="#"><u>8.2. Property and management rights in the area</u></a> .....	50
<a href="#"><u>8.3. Impacts of the present farming systems on the environment and biodiversity</u></a> .....	50
<a href="#"><u>8.4. Root causes of the environmental impacts</u></a> .....	52
<a href="#"><u>8.5. The proposed land use change using rural development measures</u></a> .....	52
<a href="#"><u>8.6. Costs and benefits</u></a> .....	53
<a href="#"><u>9. Glossary</u></a> .....	55
<a href="#"><u>Annex 1. The system of agri-environmental programmes</u></a> .....	56
<a href="#"><u>Annex 2. Objectives for agri-environmental schemes</u></a> .....	57
<a href="#"><u>References</u></a> .....	59

## 1. Preface

The second pillar of the CAP has been developed to contribute towards sustainable rural development and to help rural areas to adapt to changes in Pillar 1 support and to rural restructuring, particularly in the agricultural sector. The EU-15 Member States and the candidate countries developed and implemented a first generation of rural development programmes following the 1999 Rural Development Regulation and SAPARD. In 2005, the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) package of measures was agreed. This provides the basis for the second generation of rural development programmes in the enlarged EU-25. EC strategic guidelines for rural development will be published and will place a stronger emphasis on the need to achieve sustainable development and on EU policy priorities, which include environmental priorities. Overall the new Regulation requires Member States to take a more strategic, focussed and participative approach to rural development as they develop their plans in 2005-6 for the new programmes to be implemented for the 2007-13 period.

This study is part of *Europe's Living Countryside*, a pan-European research project sponsored by WWF Europe, the Land Use Policy Group (LUPG) of GB's conservation, countryside and environment agencies and Stichting Natuur en Milieu (SNM) in the Netherlands. National studies were undertaken in seven countries (Spain, Poland, the Netherlands, the UK, Germany, Hungary and Bulgaria – see map below). The aim was to review progress with developing and implementing rural development programmes and to explore in detail how environmental priorities and objectives might better be identified and addressed in the new rural development programmes.



Our research builds on *Europe's Rural Futures*, an earlier LUPG and WWF Europe pan-European project which analysed MSs' initial progress with developing and implementing the 2000-6 plans. Areas highlighted where improvements could be made included the need for a more strategic, coherent and integrated approaches to addressing environmental issues.

The *Europe's Living Countryside* national research was carried out using an agreed common framework. This included analysing the evidence on environmental data and trends, using the results of mid-term evaluations and holding discussions and/or seminars with key stakeholders to help identify environmental priorities and to consider how the tools in the new regulation might be used to address environmental priorities and improve integration of environmental issues. Each national study includes at least one local case study to illustrate how this could be achieved.

National experts from the LUPG, WWF and SNM partnership co-ordinated the in-depth national research, supported in some countries (Germany, the UK and Poland) by consultants commissioned to undertake the detailed work.

For further information about the *Europe's Living Countryside* project please see [www.lupg.org.uk](http://www.lupg.org.uk) or [www.panda.org/europe/agriculture](http://www.panda.org/europe/agriculture) or contact:

**Rosie Simpson**, Senior European Policy Adviser (Sustainable Land Management), Countryside Agency: Tel: 00 44 1242 521381, E-mail: [rosie.simpson@countryside.gov.uk](mailto:rosie.simpson@countryside.gov.uk)

**Elizabeth Guttstein**, Head of European Agriculture and Rural Development, WWF European Policy Office: Tel: 00 322 740 0924, E-mail: [EGuttstein@wwfepo.org](mailto:EGuttstein@wwfepo.org)

**Arjan Berkhuisen**. EU Nature and Agricultural Policies, Stichting Natuur en Milieu: Tel: 00 31 30 234 8218, E-mail: [a.berkhuisen@natuurenmilieu.nl](mailto:a.berkhuisen@natuurenmilieu.nl)

## 2. Executive summary

### 2.1. Rural development programs in Hungary

The evaluation of the SAPARD program has shown that it has neither made a significant impact on the Hungarian agricultural sector as a whole, nor delivered anything towards the objectives of sustainable farming. It is due to the limited budget that was available, to the delay with which it was started and the lack of environmentally targeted measures implemented. However it has contributed to some extent to the development of Hungarian rural areas by the village renewal measure. But its delayed launch started to generate mistrust among rural communities towards EU rural funds.

Two Hungarian rural development programs funded by EAGGF were developed for the period of 2004-2006, the Agricultural and Rural Development Operational Program (ARDOP) and the National Rural Development Plan (NRDP). These were designed by different sets of people, without taking into account each other's objectives. The ARDOP is more focused on competitiveness; the NRDP has more relevance to environment. The first NRDP for Hungary was approved by the European Commission in July 2004.

The measures in the NRDP selected for implementation seem to show a fairly strong grasp of the environmental measures, with funds allocated for agri-environment and LFA amounting to more than half of the total budget. However the assessment of the plan showed that it lacks clear, quantified environmental objectives and the indicators to measure these. There are some very environmentally targeted measures, especially the agri-environmental ones, whereas for example the LFA scheme completely failed to address the issue adequately. In addition, the plan has an overall production-based approach with soil erosion being the top priority when environmental concerns are discussed.

The environmental analysis has shown that Hungary is a priority country for the EU in terms of biodiversity and that rural funds are more than relevant to preserve many of these values at least in their present state. Compliance with EU environmental legislation, with the Habitats and the Birds Directives and then with the Water Framework Directive are priority issues for the national administration as well as for stakeholders/NGOs. However, the ways to achieve this are not very well identified and the processes in both cases are very slow.

When delivery mechanisms were analysed, special attention was paid to the farm advisory services. These services proved to be a major weakness for the whole agricultural sector, but particularly for rural development.

- The service network operated by the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development usually lacks flexibility and innovative thinking. Members of this network are generally characterised by a fairly poor knowledge on rural development and environmental issues. However their role is to help farmers with applications. The efficiently operating regional rural development offices have been closed recently.
- Private extension services are in most cases specialised in products used in intensive agriculture, i.e. fertilisers, pesticides, seeds, machinery; they are actually representatives of agricultural companies.
- There is a new initiative to set up a national agri-environmental advisory service on a voluntary basis, supervised by the ministry.

No other delivery mechanisms are operated by the state at present. No regional planning is apparent, i.e. when the allocation of funds among the applicants is decided upon, only a single

national scoring system exists for each measure. Neither regional interests are taken into account, nor possible synergic effects of different measures (except in the case of LFAs).

On the non-state side some successful initiatives exist, driven by NGOs, local municipalities, or the so-called regional managers, in most cases using funds of the MEW or foreign sponsors.

Public participation mechanisms in Hungary do not have a long tradition. This was very clear in the way that the two rural development programs were drawn up. The process was hardly accessible to anyone, except the experts selected by the ministry for consultation. Very early versions of the plans were open to the public, without a real intention by the ministry to consider the comments. For the objectives and the design of some measures some stakeholders were asked. However, there was no overall strategy for involving them, it was very much dependant on the attitude of the official responsible for drawing up the measure. Last year the Ministry was heavily criticised by environmental NGOs and farmers' organisations for cutting the rural development budget without having proper public consultation beforehand. The European Commission's attention was drawn to the case, so the Ministry a consultation process and at the same time built up the group of stakeholders to be involved in different issues. Though the technical assistance measure has not yet been launched yet, there is a promise that it will enable the civil society, including environmental NGOs, to take part in the implementation phase of the program.

As for monitoring, only the initial steps have been made for a very limited portion of the programs. The selected indicators along which the monitoring can be carried out mostly concentrate on the direct outputs of the measures, so basically how these are taken up.

## 2.2. Environmental issues and objectives

On the basis of the analysis of environmental problems and pressures relevant to the Common Agricultural Policy, the objectives identified were classified as belonging to one of three major components of environment: biodiversity, water and forests.

The matrices show the environmental issues selected for the ELCo project, objectives and targets related to these and their possible policy solutions.

<i>Environmental issues</i>	<i>Objectives</i>	<i>Policy response</i>
<b>Biodiversity</b>		
loss of valuable semi-natural grasslands due to abandonment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• halt the loss of HNV grassland areas by 2010</li> <li>• ensure the sustainable management of all Natura 2000 grassland sites by 2013</li> <li>• 50% drop in the area of semi-natural grasslands affected by invasive plants by 2013</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• agri-environmental schemes for extensive grasslands with payments high enough to generate take-up</li> <li>• special incentives to low income farmers to buy animals (e.g. traditional species)</li> <li>• incentives to milk companies to collect milk from remote areas</li> <li>• LFA payments to cover all</li> </ul>

		<p>HNV areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GFP requirements or agri-environmental schemes to tackle invasive plant species</li> <li>• subsidies to unite small HNV farms that will not become viable</li> <li>• give priority to HNV farmers when selecting applicants given RD funds</li> <li>• Natura 2000 payments</li> <li>• reduce payments for planting fast growing, non-indigenous tree species</li> </ul>
decrease in the number of farmland birds due to intensification and monocultures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• stop the decrease of specific farmland bird species by 2013</li> <li>• 200 000 ha of arable land turned into extensive grasslands by 2013</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• payments for crop rotation, integrated and organic farming</li> <li>• all the measures listed above to maintain the mosaic landscape with grasslands</li> </ul>
<b>Water</b>		
diffuse pollution from intensive agriculture directly affecting rivers	stop intensive crop production in river floodplains by 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• set up agri-environmental schemes for all floodplain areas with high payment rates</li> <li>• adequate system to monitor diffuse water pollution</li> </ul>
point source pollution from intensive livestock units affecting underground water	stop point source pollution of underground water from intensive livestock units by 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• payments for compliance with EU standards</li> <li>• adequate system to monitor point source water pollution</li> </ul>
water consumption for agricultural purposes causing environmental problems in years and seasons of drought	water consumption do not harm the ecology of the Hungarian rivers by 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• effective measures (fines) against illegal water consumers</li> <li>• adequate system to monitor water consumption, restrictions when needed</li> <li>• give priority to water saving irrigation systems when distributing investment aids</li> </ul>
<b>Forests</b>		
valuable forest habitats lost due to bad management practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• cut the yearly level of afforestation with non-indigenous species by 50% by 2013</li> <li>• ecological forestry practices introduced in 20% of the forested area by 2013</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• substantial differentiation between grants for planting indigenous and non-indigenous tree species</li> <li>• agroforestry measures</li> <li>• development of Good</li> </ul>

		Forestry Practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natura 2000 payments</li> <li>• environmental training for foresters</li> </ul>
--	--	---

### 2.3. Recommendations

To make rural development programmes environmentally effective, we recommend using the following principles:

- Set up quantifiable environmental objectives, select and use measure to deliver against them;
- Integration among measures, make use of synergic effects;
- Start planning at a lower scale (regionally), then synthesise;
- Adjust the indicators to the quantified objectives;
- Use existing monitoring systems and networks;
- Improve the environmental knowledge of advisory services;
- Draw up a strategy for stakeholder involvement, keep planning process open from the first moment.

预览已结束，完整报告链接和二维码如下：

[https://www.yunbaogao.cn/report/index/report?reportId=5\\_11185](https://www.yunbaogao.cn/report/index/report?reportId=5_11185)

