



Comité européen de droit rural – European Council for Rural Law – Europäische Gesellschaft für Agrarrecht und das Recht des ländlichen Raums

SGAR Schweizerische Gesellschaft für Agrarrecht
SSDA Société Suisse de Droit Agraire
Sekretariat, Laurstrasse 10, 5200 Brugg

**Congrès européen de droit rural – 11–14 septembre 2013
Lucerne (Suisse)**

**European Congress on Rural Law – 11–14 September 2013
Lucerne (Switzerland)**

**Europäischer Agrarrechtskongress – 11.-14. September 2013
Luzern (Schweiz)**

organisé sous la direction du C.E.D.R. par la Société Suisse de Droit Agraire et l'Université de Lucerne – organised under the direction of the C.E.D.R. by the Swiss Society for Rural Law and the University of Lucerne – organisiert unter der Leitung des C.E.D.R. durch die Schweizerische Gesellschaft für Agrarrecht und die Universität Luzern

Commission III

Développement scientifique et pratique du droit rural – **Scientific and practical development of rural Law** – Wissenschaftliche und praktische Entwicklung des Rechts des ländlichen Raums

National report for Turkey

Selma **AYTURE**, Assistant Prof.

Summary

Turkey acts together with G-33 at WTO, a group which is called as “Friends of Special Products” in agriculture and known as a coalition pressing for flexibility for Developing Countries to undertake limited market opening in agriculture. G-33, namely “cautious traders” (i.e. those who feel vulnerable about imports), want a free hand to protect their farmers, for food security and livelihood security and rural development reasons.

The main legal developments at EU level is the new agenda on CAP : “New Challenges”. One

of the new challenges is the topic of “Climate Change”. Climate change influences both general economy, agriculture as well as rural economy in countries such as Turkey where agriculture is still a relatively significant sector.

Agricultural sector is not merely a victim of adverse climatic changes but it is also considered as one of the causes of climate change.

As an EU candidate country for which agriculture bears great significance, we are closely following the ongoing discussions on agriculture and the future of the Common Agricultural Policy. One of the main legal developments on rural law at national level is the establishment of the IPARD system. The Turkish IPARD Programme was prepared on the basis of strategic principles presented within the frame of national and Community framework.

For, our objective is to create an economically, socially and ecologically sustainable agricultural sector, to cope with the adverse effects of climate change, to ensure food security at a national level and to contribute to ensuring food security at the global level. Relevant efforts made in my country for these purposes.

When shaping the future, I do believe that agriculture should be given particular importance, even greater than today’s perspectives. I consider it of utmost benefit to follow a “**Green Growth**” approach in the solution of existing problems.

I would like to underline the need for the perception of the recent crises as an opportunity to establish closer cooperation and to develop more innovative solutions. I have faith in the creation of a more prosperous Europe through our collective efforts in the near future.

II. Questions

A. Legal developments since the last Congress (September 2011)

1. From your national viewpoint, what are the main legal developments at WTO, EU and national level in the following areas:

1.1. Rural economic and structural law

WTO:

The main legal developments at WTO on agricultural negotiations under DOHA development agenda may be summarized as follows:

The Doha Round is the latest round of trade negotiations among the WTO membership. Its aim is to achieve major reform of the international trading system through the introduction of lower trade barriers and revised trade rules. The reform programme covers about 20 areas of trade including the agriculture. The Round is also known semi-officially as the **Doha Development Agenda** as a fundamental objective is to improve the trading prospects of developing countries.

The Round launched in Doha, Qatar, in November 2001 mandated for:

- Agriculture negotiations aimed at substantial improvements in market access; reductions of, with a view to phasing out, all forms of export subsidies; and substantial reductions in trade-distorting domestic support. Talks on the subject began in early 2000 under the original mandate of Article 20 of WTO Agreement on Agriculture. Draft Modality¹ Paper, published on 6 December 2008, forms the basis of the ongoing Agriculture Negotiations.
- Further substantial reductions in tariffs, domestic support and export subsidies are prominent issues in the negotiations. In addition, some countries are of the opinion that an important objective of the new negotiations should be to bring agricultural trade under the same rules and disciplines as trade in other goods.

¹ A way to proceed. In WTO negotiations, modalities set broad outlines — such as formulas or approaches for tariff reductions — for final commitments.

Domestic Support

Overall trade distorting domestic support (Amber + de minimis + Blue). EU to cut by 80%; US/Japan to cut by 70%; the rest to cut by 55%. “Downpayment” (immediate cut) of 33% for US, EU, Japan, 25% for the rest. Bigger cuts from some other developed countries, such as Japan, whose overall support is a larger % of production value. Cuts made over 5 years (developed countries) or 8 years (developing). (New: single figures from mid-points of ranges)

Amber Box (AMS). Overall, EU to cut by 70%; US/Japan to cut by 60%; the rest to cut by 45%. Bigger cuts from some other developed countries, such as Japan, Norway and Switzerland, whose AMS is larger % of production value. Also has downpayment. (Unchanged)

Per product Amber Box support: capped at average for notified support in 1995-2000 with some variation for the US and others. (Unchanged)

De minimis. Developed countries cut to 2.5% of production immediately. Developing countries to make two-thirds of the cut over three years to 6.7% of production (no cuts if mainly for subsistence/resource-poor farmers, etc). (Applies to product-specific and non-product specific de minimis support) (Minor change)

Blue Box (including “new” type). Limited to 2.5% of production (developed), 5% (developing) with caps per product. (Modified flexibilities for more vulnerable countries)

Green Box. Revisions — particularly on income support, to ensure it really is “decoupled” (ie, separated) from production levels, and on developing countries’ food stockpiling — and tighter monitoring and surveillance

Market Access

What would this mean for wheat, rice, beef, sugar, milk, cheese, potatoes, pineapples, etc? How deep the cuts in their tariffs would be depends on:

- **how high the current tariff is:** higher tariffs have higher cuts, ranging from 50% to 70% subject to a 54% minimum average for developed countries, 33.3% to 46.7% for developing or less if they meet a 36% average cut
- **whether the product is “sensitive” (all countries) or “special” (developing countries):** sensitive products would have cuts of only 1/3, 1/2 or 2/3 of the normal cut but with a quantity allowed in at a

lower quota; special products would also have smaller cuts, and some might be exempt completely

- **whether the applied tariffs are lower than the bound tariffs:** Cuts are made from legally bound rates. Tariffs actually charged can be lower. If a developing country has a bound tariff of 100% but only charges 25%, the bound tariff would be cut by 42.7% ie, cut to 57.3%. That means no change in the 25% tariff actually charged, with room to more than double the tariff
- **the country's status:** least-developed countries would make no cuts on any products, developing countries in general would make smaller cuts and have more flexibilities than developed ones, small and vulnerable economies would make even smaller cuts with even more flexibilities, and countries that recently joined the WTO and some individual countries would also have special terms
- **Including if imports increase sharply or their prices fall a lot:** Although the tariff will be cut, developing countries will be able to use a “special safeguard mechanism”, allowing them to increase the duty temporarily.

Export Competition

Export subsidies to be eliminated by end of 2013 (longer for developing countries, it varies from 2016 to 2021).

Revised provisions on export credit, guarantees and insurance, international food aid (with a “safe box” for emergencies), and exporting state trading enterprises.

POSITION OF TURKEY

Given its sensitivity and vulnerability to the import of agricultural products, Turkey forms its position not only to maximize the privileges to be granted to the Developing Countries under Special and Differential (S&D) Treatment but also to minimize the adverse effects of reform programme which is expected to be concluded with the end of the Agricultural Negotiations conducted under Doha Development Agenda. Therefore, Turkey acts together with G-33, a group which is called as “Friends of Special Products” in agriculture and known as a coalition pressing for flexibility for Developing Countries to undertake limited market opening in agriculture. G-33, namely “cautious traders” (i.e. those who feel vulnerable about imports), want a free hand to protect their farmers, for food security and livelihood security and rural development reasons.

Within the scope of Market Access pillar of the current agriculture negotiations, Turkey, like other Developing Country Members, is supposed to undertake 2/3 reduction of that of the Developed Country Members and implement it in a longer period than Developed Countries. Moreover, Turkey's position is basically to include maximum number of its tariff lines to the scope of Special Products, a privilege for Developing Countries to undertake lower or no tariff reduction for a certain number of their tariff lines. Another S&D Treatment Clause, Special Safeguard Mechanism (SSM) serves as an instrument to increase temporary tariff, increase protect domestic producers and industry against additional tariff reductions to be made for the liberalisation is of utmost importance for Turkey. Turkey aims maximum benefit from SSM and and like other members of G-33 is opposed to the efforts made by the Developed Countries to harden the functioning of the mechanism.

Regarding Domestic Support pillar of the Agriculture Negotiations; given that it has not made an AMS commitment on the grounds that the Amber Box support granted on the basis of each specific product did not exceed 10% of total value of production Turkey is bound by the product specific de minimis level, which is equal to 10% of its total value of production. The abovementioned 10% de minimis level is not foreseen to be subject to reduction in this round of negotiations. Turkey also aims maximum benefit from the Blue Box measures, a tool which has not been used much by Turkey so far. The scope of Blue Box measures is broadened. At his juncture, not only support given under production limiting programmes but also the support given under programmes that do not require production is supposed to be within the scope of Blue Box.

As for export subsidies, negotiated under the pillar of export competition; Turkey expects Developed Countries to end their export subsidies rather than limited subsidy commitments.

EU:

The main legal developments at EU level is the new agenda on CAP : "New Challenges". One

of the new challenges is the topic of "Climate Change". Climate change influences both general economy, agriculture as well as rural economy in countries such as Turkey where agriculture is still a relatively significant sector.

The adoption of the new EU climate and energy package implies that the EU has engaged itself in an ambitious climate policy based on recent

discussions and public announcements. Development of the EU towards the new challenges must continue in an accelerating pace and focus particularly on the financing of such activities to respond the expectations of the members and developing countries associated with the EU.

The EU has an important role to play in relation to the developing countries, which are often particularly at risk and vulnerable to climate change. A central issue, both ahead of the Copenhagen Summit and in the longer term, is the need of effective support to facilitate adjustment of countries and people to the effects of the adverse climatic changes.

Not only the food safety itself but also enabling consumers to make conscious food choices for a healthy and sound lifestyle is an extremely important issue and challenging task particularly for the developing countries.

Climate change may also lead to a change in the conditions for agricultural production in that, for example, new plant and animal diseases may emerge and water regimes may change. Legal steps and developments associated with agriculture must help to minimize adverse climatic impacts on the production and rural life and restructure the rural sector so that it adapts itself to changes in the climatic conditions. This is necessary in order to deal with future climate change and enable environmental and resource efficiency. The production of sustainable energy and energy efficiency measures are important aspects of these efforts. The views above are important issues to be addressed in order to ensure sustainable food security.

Agricultural sector is not merely a victim of adverse climatic changes but it is also considered as one of the causes of climate change.

National :

Turkey has an agricultural employment rate amounting to 24% of the population, and an agricultural share of 8% in GDP. My country is capable of feeding its 70 million people as well as 30 million tourists in addition to a significant amount of net exports each year. As an EU candidate country for which agriculture bears great significance, we are closely following the ongoing discussions on agriculture and the future of the Common Agricultural Policy. Furthermore, as we have also initiated strategic planning in the agricultural sector, we are watching with keen interest the long-term planning of the EU. Turkey has been appreciating the EU's long-standing position in agriculture and rural development that

is based on the participation of all stakeholders in the process of implementation.

One of the main legal developments on rural law at national level is the establishment of the IPARD system.

The Turkish IPARD Programme² was prepared on the basis of strategic principles presented within the frame of national and Community framework. In terms of national framework, programming based on 9th Development Plan covering the period of 2007-2013 and Agricultural Strategy and National Rural Development Strategy covering the years of 2006-2010. In terms of the principles included in Community documents, IPARD Programme was prepared in line with the principles within the Enlargement Package, National Programme regarding the Commitment of Acquis and especially the recommendations of MIPD regarding the IPARD.

On the basis of this strategic framework, the main policy objectives to be performed within the frame of IPARD are as follows: contributing to the sustainable modernization of agriculture sector via the targeted investments (including processing) and encouraging the improvement of food safety, veterinary services, plant health, environmental standards or the other standards stated in Enlargement Package in line with EU Acquis.

42 provinces among 81 provinces were selected for 2007-2013 IPARD implementation in order to implement IPA in Turkey regarding geographical and sectoral focusing and increasing the IPARD supports to maximum levels. During the selection process, the levels of provinces in terms of GDP, their migration rate from rural to urban and the need of re-organization and sectoral potential of the provinces selected on the basis of their compliance to acquis regarding agriculture, food safety, veterinary services and plant health but weak in terms of related production, processing and marketing chains, were taken into consideration. Among 42 selected provinces, only in 20 provinces the implementation were initiated for the purpose of improving the experience and capacity incrementally³. During the second

² www.tkd.gov.tr

³ Provinces selected for the first implementation phase: Afyon, Amasya, Balıkesir, Çorum, Diyarbakır, Erzurum, Hatay, Isparta, Kahramanmaraş, Kars, Konya, Malatya, Ordu, Samsun, Şanlıurfa, Sivas, Tokat, Trabzon, Van, Yozgat

implementation phase 22 provinces were added⁴. Besides, among the first 20 IPARD provinces, the most appropriate provinces for each measure and sub-measure, were selected by considering the production, processing and marketing potentials and weaknesses and rural economic potentials regarding diversification. Thus, IPARD funds were intensified within the provinces in which the effect and contribution of programme will be at maximum levels in terms of Turkish IPARD objectives.

On the basis of MIPD, the following priority axes are included within the Programme:

Priority axis 1: Sustainable adaptation of agriculture and fisheries sector and implementing the related Community Standards

Priority axis 2: Preparation for the implementation of agri-environment measures and LEADER.

Priority axis 3: Development of rural economic activities.

Technical Assistance are implemented in line with the Article 182 of IPA Implementing Regulation No 718/2007.

Latest developments in the implementation of IPARD:

Agriculture and Rural Development Support Institution (ARDSI) has been established by Law on Establishment and Duties of ARDSI No: 5648 dated 04 May 2007. As per the Commission Decision dated 29 August 2011 and No: C(2011)6079, Conferral of Management (CoM) has been received for ARDSI HQ and 17 Provincial Coordination Units (PCU) and hence one of the opening benchmarks for Chapter 11 has been realized. Until now, following to the CoM approval; 9 calls for applications have been launched by ARDSI .

Latest Developments in Rural Economic and Structural Law:

For, our objective is to create an economically, socially and ecologically sustainable agricultural sector, to cope with the adverse effects of climate change, to ensure food security at a national level and to contribute to ensuring food security at the global level.

⁴ Provinces selected for the second implementation phase: Ağrı, Aksaray, Ankara, Ardahan, Aydın, Burdur, Bursa, Çanakkale, Çankırı, Denizli, Elazığ, Erzincan, Giresun, Karaman, Kastamonu, Kütahya, Manisa, Mardin, Mersin, Muş, Nevşehir, Uşak.

Relevant efforts made in my country for these purposes.

- Measures have been taken for land consolidation.
- A certified agriculture consultancy system has been launched. Organic agriculture, and the production of certified seeds and seedlings is supported, and the performance of soil analysis for the use of appropriate fertilizers is encouraged.
- The use of pesticides is subject to stricter inspection.
- In the framework of the Environment Support Scheme (the Environmentally Based Agricultural Land Protection Programme), no tillage farming is encouraged.
- Agricultural Insurance has been launched.
- With an aim to integrate agriculture and industry, the Programme for the Support of Rural Development Investments with a 50% grant rate has started to be implemented. Thereby, economic investments such as the processing, packaging and storage of agricultural products and the purchase of machinery and equipment are supported.
- In order to preserve the well-known biodiversity of our country, one of the largest plant seed gene banks has been established in Ankara. In the framework of the “Project for the Protection of Local Genetic Resources”, over twelve thousand of crops grown in Turkey, and of these, nearly four thousand of endemic crops will be taken under protection through official registry.
- In order to increase yields, conduct new research, train human resources and secure the future of agriculture in our country, my Ministry is establishing scientific and technological agriculture centres and is supporting agriculture research.
- Organization of the actors in the agricultural sector is encouraged.
- Specific regional development programmes, including the South Eastern Anatolia Project, Eastern Anatolia Development Programme and Eastern Black Sea Development Project, are implemented in backward regions.
- An inventory consisting of 527 million data for climate, soil, topography, land classification and use has been assessed by my Ministry, and accordingly, a Production and Subsidization Model for Agricultural Basins has been developed. This study, which is the first to be conducted in Turkey, has defined thirty agricultural basins.

Thereby, the determination of the steps to be taken for the increase of productivity and the assessment of the potential effects of each intervention on the environment will be facilitated.

- It should also be noted that Turkey plays a major role in ensuring food security in the Middle East, Central Asia and Africa through the implementation of projects aimed at food security and training programmes.

The other main legal development on rural law at national level was the reorganization of the Ministry. The new title of the Ministry of agriculture is “**MINISTRY OF FOOD AGRICULTURE AND LIVESTOCK**” (*MoFAL*)» based on the Decree Law No. 639, dated June 3, 2011.

The necessities of the ministerial reorganization are listed as follows:

- ✓ EU harmonization process,
- ✓ The competition in effect of globalisation,
- ✓ To ensure agriculture is not limited to production,
- ✓ Acceptance of new concepts and strategies.

The Ministry is organised basicy on the EU Rules and regulations. Accordingly the new organisation is in line with the EU’s tasks and requirements as follows:

- **General Directorate of European Union and Foreign Relations (EUFR)**
 - EU Harmonization Dept. (Negotiation Chapters)
 - Economic and Technical Relations Dept. (EU Projects)
- **General Directorate of Agricultural Reform**
 - Rural Development Dept. (MA)
 - Geographical Information Systems Dept. (IACS, FADN, Stat)
 - Marketing Dept. (Single CMO)
- **General Directorate of Plant Production**
(Organic Farming, single CMO)
- **General Directorate of Animal Production**
(Single CMO)

- **General Directorate of Animal Production**
(Single CMO)
- **General Directorate of Animal Production**
(Single CMO)

As regards the accession negotiations of Turkey with the EU under the chapters related to agriculture: It is clear that there is a wealth of legislation of the EU to transfer and implement. We are continuing our work with determination and devotion. As you all know, recently, at the end of June 2011, accession negotiations under Chapter 12- Veterinary, Phytosanitary and Food Safety Policy were opened. Furthermore, three of the five opening benchmarks of Chapter 11-Agriculture and Rural Development have been fulfilled.

B. Analysis

2. Which of the above (see point 1) legal developments do you consider

2.1. to be particularly successful? And for which reasons?

The reasons are as follows:

Turkish IPARD model is particularly successful. Because the total 42 branches scattered around the country have not been easy to establish and their management have particularly been a difficult task. Given the size of Turkey we have been required to enlarge the number of branches to take care of the various agricultural and rural tasks. The first category of provinces (the first phase) of IPARD have almost been ready for implementation. The second group of provinces are presently getting ready for implementation.

2.2. to be particularly unsuccessful? And for which reasons?

The preparatory work for 42 province-offices is a huge task. Despite the best efforts, preparations couldn't be finished. Some provinces which have been ready have encountered daily problems. EU annual allocations couldn't be used ultimately.

The reasons are:

- The intensity of applications for IPARD funds has fallen short of the expectations mainly because of the more complex procedural arrangements in comparison to other national support mechanisms (by the Ministry's National Rural Development Investments Support Programme, Development Agencies Grant Programmes, Turkish Development Bank Credit Programme etc.).
- After examination of the applications submitted, it is observed that applications have not been prepared at good quality in line with the procedural requirements. Accordingly, it is understood that the project preparation capacity of the potential beneficiaries / relevant institutions within the sector is not sufficient.
- In this context; publicity and training services to potential beneficiaries and consulting companies are undergoing.
- Within the scope of gained experiences through first calls, difficulties faced during implementation have been detected and accordingly, the modification proposals have been sent to the Commission. The pace of the approval of those modifications is very critical for enabling the practicability of them for the forthcoming call for applications periods and hence for the improvement of the absorption capacity.

A number of critical problems remain in the international negotiations.

3. Can you discern, in light of the above developments, new or current trends?

As I stated earlier, new challenges and climate change are the new face of CAP.

4. How do you assess the overall role of international and European legislation and jurisprudence in the development of rural law?

European Union has long been an advocate of clean environment and a **leading figure in the international arena with respect to climate issue.**

We support the initiative taken by some countries including the EU and international organizations and would like to underline our willingness to contribute to the ongoing efforts devoted to mitigate the effects on Mediterranean. The region is and will be one of the most effected regions of the world by climate change. We have already felt the effects of climate change on our agriculture. In Turkey, the effects of climate change are felt mostly as drought and temperature increase.

In 2004, to overcome and to take necessary precautions against climate change, under the coordination of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry, "The Climate Change Coordination Council" was formed. The members of the Council are from eight related Ministries, including the Ministry of Agriculture and the Turkish Union of Chambers and Commodity Exchanges. So far under the coordination of this Council eight working groups have been formed and are actively working.

My country is one of the few fortunate countries in the world that is blessed with perfect ecological conditions. Moreover, Turkey is amongst few countries in the world that could produce 150 different varieties of agricultural products. Therefore, apart from issues such as food safety, food security and public health we are also concerned about the environmental and geographical impacts of climate change.

In Turkey, we have always given priority to environment friendly development policies with special emphasis on renewable energy resources. Implication of sustainable rural development policies are on track and more emphasis are put on the environment in our agricultural policies.

Rural development measures are supported on a project basis. We have initiated actions for sustainable use of land and water resources, erosion control, studies related with decreasing agricultural greenhouse gas emissions and also action plan for fighting agricultural drought. In order to encourage farmers to use water resources efficiently, the farmers using pressure irrigation instead of conventional methods are supported. Regarding land management, we have accelerated land consolidation process especially in South East Anatolia in order to achieve effective land use, prevent excessive use of energy and water loss. Land degradation is another important issue that we take measures to preserve soil quality.

5. How do you assess the overall influence of your national legislature on the development of rural law?

6. How do you assess the overall influence of your national jurisprudence on the development of rural law?

5.and 6. Together;

Currently in my country, to overcome “new challenges” we are trying to increase the awareness of our public on these drawbacks. Within this context, we enforced the Law on Preservation and Use of Land, launched the Strategy on Fight against Agricultural Drought and engaged in various Research & Development projects.

We are at the beginning of our long battle against “new challenges”. I believe that Turkey will overcome these challenges and hopefully through newly gained experiences she will provide a more stable environment to future generations. Determination and cooperation will be most important weapons in this battle.

7. Current question: what is your national approach to the proposed reforms of the CAP for the period 2014–2020?

As a candidate country, Turkey is closely following the latest changes and reforms of the Common Agricultural Policy. From the standpoint of CAP and direct payments, we are pleased to see simplification efforts, especially with respect to the Single Payment Scheme. I believe that this will decrease both the complicated structure of the current system and bureaucracy of the procedure and the discontent of farmers with respect to the unequal distribution of the payment. Moreover, with the post 2013 planning period, a more environmental friendly production; organic production rather than conventional production; simplicity and stability; supporting areas with natural handicaps; market regulations and economic productivity could be foreseen as the vital issues that will stand out in the near future. We also support efforts that would assist sectors with specific problems and that would provide flexibility under special conditions without threatening the fundamental ideologies of CAP.

When shaping the future, I do believe that agriculture should be given particular importance, even greater than today’s perspectives. I consider it of utmost benefit to follow a “**Green Growth**” approach in the solution of existing problems.

In recent years, as a consequence of global problems, including the food and agriculture crises which have brought about a recession, as well as

climate change and the shortages of related sectors, **the globe is, so to say, rediscovering agriculture**. The agricultural population and thereby, agricultural employment rates are decreasing, associated with a decline in the share of agriculture in the national and global economies. However, inversely proportional, **the strategic importance of agriculture is on the rise**.

Moreover, although food security has been on the global agenda for many years, the issue cannot be limited to access to food. As the preferences of the prospering population continue to evolve, **access to high quality and safe food** has also become a major issue. Therefore, this subject should be dealt with in view of these two aspects.

Throughout history, agriculture has served in the production of three main produces, which are referred to as the 3 Fs: food, fibre and fuel. Agriculture continues to play a central role in this production, yet, it has undertaken new roles.

In this context, it is worth to mention the role of agriculture in: ensuring food security, the management of the adverse effects of climate change, the creation of a more environmentally friendly economy, the sustainable use of resources, the protection of biodiversity, sustainable economic growth, stability in employment and the maintenance of the rural population.

As known, agriculture and agriculture-based food sectors are socially and politically important. This has become even more so true in the current global economic crisis that we are all going through. As usual the agricultural sector has once again become the locomotive sector in our economies. Apart from providing the essential nourishment for our citizens, it also plays a buffer role by providing job opportunities for people who have lost their jobs as a result of the economic crisis.

However, we are aware that this situation may not last forever unless we take the necessary precautions. As acknowledged by all, population increase, the need of protein of people, economic growth and high level demand are main determinants in the agricultural sector. However, during the last few years, environmental and geographical impacts and other side effects, such as food safety, food security, public health and social equity have become more important issues in agricultural markets.

We believe, as a global challenge, interaction between the climate change and agriculture should be responded globally by the international community and special circumstances of the countries should be

respected in this endeavor. The efforts of the countries should be proportional to their capacity. There is an urgent need for research cooperation among countries especially on emerging transboundary viral, bacterial, fungal diseases and pests which are somehow related to climate change.

I would like to underline the need for the perception of the recent crises as an opportunity to establish closer cooperation and to develop more innovative solutions. I have faith in the creation of a more prosperous Europe through our collective efforts in the near future.

REFERENCES:

www.abgs.gov.tr

www.dtm.gov.tr

www.europa.eu

www.tarim.gov.tr

www.tkd.gov.tr

www.wto.org