Policies for Rural Development Financing
Comparative Analysis: Portugal and Asturias

Miguel Santos
Instituto Superior Técnico
Abril, 2010

Abstract
Rural areas are now places where we can find specific ecosystems, rich in fauna and flora, human landscapes, ways of settlement, historic places, beautiful villages, traditions, as central events, among others. (Covas, 1999). Undergone profound changes, since the middle of last century, these areas in Portugal, are now present with severe constraints, especially due to the rural exodus and abandonment of agriculture.

Recently, the European Union created mechanisms, mostly on the Common Agricultural Policy, and on the Structural Funds, in order to reverse this situation, mainly through the creation of funding programs to specific measures to support rural development. Its implementation in Portugal, since 1994, has been marked by a very large bet on measures, essentially structural, linked directly to the investment in agricultural structures and food processing, devaluing some measures that directly contribute to the diversification and sustainability of rural areas.

Comparative analysis with the Asturian region, characterized by the maintenance of its rural areas with enough force, demonstrated the effectiveness of a strong focus on measures that promote, in addition to the rejuvenation of its agriculture, its amenities through the development of rural tourism.

Proved essential in the process of rural development, the "actors" play a vital role on the promotion and maintenance of rural areas. “Quinta da Caramuja” appears to be a living example of this dynamic, marked by the recovery of an entire countryside, along with a sustainable agriculture, supported by tourism in rural areas.
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1. Introduction
It was during the middle age, that the rural areas expanded by them self, eliminating, gradually, the wild ecosystems, in order to be replaced by the traditional rural agro-systems (Pardal, 1997). Despite all the ecological implications caused by this transformation, like the loss of the fauna and flora, as well the extinction of several species, nowadays, these systems might present high levels of biodiversity (Aranzabal, Schmitz, Aguilera, & Pineda, 2009), due to the slow evolution of the
ecosystems with the society. After the I World War, the European agriculture began, once again, suffering significant changes. The strong need of agricultural products motivated an increase on the production, which provided the intensification of the agriculture (Heitor, 2003). Recently, already in the second half of the XX century, the results of the several policies of the European Union and its countries, as well from a demanding market production, continue to verify the intensification of the agriculture, now in a faster rhythm. The homogenization of rural landscapes (Lasanta, Hidalgo, Serrano, & Sferi, 2006), (Jongman, 2002) became evident, being notorious the abandonment of the agriculture activity, due to the difficulty of some farmers learning the new ways of production, which were necessary at the time, in order to face the intense request of agricultural products. The abandonment of the traditional agricultural systems, which until then, were hard to keep, is now a reality, due to the result of an economical development, and profound social changes that marked substantially that specific age, promoting an industrial agriculture instead an extensive agriculture, and killing the rural communities. By the loss of the family farms, associated to the traditional agricultural practices for sustainability that marked the rural communities by its vitality, there was a transformation in some areas that until then were only cultivated in abandoned places, which is exactly what happens in most of the European Union countries. Besides the loss of large areas of agricultural and ecological value, this rapid transformation facilitated the exodus from rural areas, giving rise to cultural and economic losses, besides destroying the social structures of communities. In addition, some aggravated environmental problems related to rural areas, an intensification of forest fires, agricultural diffuse pollution, habitat destruction, biodiversity loss and deterioration of the landscape (Aranzabal, Schmitz, Aguilera, & Pineda, 2009).

Because of the sequels shown previously, it is now, urgent, revitalize rural areas, making them more competitive and sustainable approaches to urban centers. This requires an extensive commitment in agricultural systems and makes them a multifunctional activity (Brouwer, 2004), both sustainable, not just targeted for production, but also promote other activities related to rural and primarily as a preservative activity agro-ecological landscapes and their biodiversity. The recovery and preservation of rural amenities emerge as part of a sustainable rural development, from the moment its trivialization is neglected. Acting as an instrument of diversification (Covas, As amenidades rurais um contributo para o desenvolvimento de zonas desfavorecidas, 1999), these amenities act as a means of attracting and maintaining rural communities, further promoting the rural tourism and enhancing a range of economic activities associated with rural areas.

The emergence of an EU policy to support rural development connote the second pillar of the Common Agricultural Policy has allowed member states to apportion funds for various measures in support of various activities within the rural areas, in order to make their economies, already fragile with greater dynamism in an attempt to alleviate the constraints that are in these spaces. Thus we intend to conduct a comparative analysis of the funding policies for rural development, implemented in Portugal and Asturias (resulting from the policies of community support) for three periods 1994-1999, 2000-2006 and 2007-2013. Is it possible to analyze this effect in both cases as they evolved during the last years support policies related to economic promotion, social and environmental development.
of rural areas, as reflected by the Community Initiatives, the Common Agricultural Policy and Structural Funds, checking their convergence to the sustainability parameters previously identified, also taking into account the strengths the weaknesses that affect these two cases.

2. Methods
The fact that the Spanish region, Asturias, is an example as well known for maintaining its rural areas with enough force, combined with proximity to Portugal, led to his election as a case study along with the portuguese case, for this study. Thus, we intended to grant greater interest to policy analysis, thereby identifying the factors that positively or negatively affect the asturian and portuguese rural areas. Thus took place first, a survey of policies and related measures for the development of rural areas within the Community. Subsequently proceeded to the survey of reports of programming and implementation, for each plan or program implemented in Portugal and Asturias, which contains the measures and the funding provided for the periods 1994-1999 and 2000-2006 and the funding programmed for the period 2007-2013. Were then made eight different groups, to which were added various measures, thus allowing a better differentiation of the same regarding its purpose:

1. **Structural Investments**
   1.1. **Improvement of Productive Infrastructure** - Measures relating to the financing of agricultural infrastructure and rural, farm management, and disaster funds.
   1.2. **Improvement of Production Conditions** - Measures relating to the modernization of infrastructure for processing and marketing of agricultural products.
   1.3. **Rejuvenation of Agriculture** - Measures to essentially support for young people who wants to install as farmers and support for early retirement.

2. **Training and Research** - Measures for the training of farmers and local actors, as well as agricultural research.

3. **Income Aid** - Measures concerning aid for farmers who are active in areas considered disadvantaged.

4. **Improving the Natural Environment and Landscape** - Measures to preserve the natural values of rural areas, including afforestation and agro-environment.

5. **Forestry** - Measures to support the forestry sector.

6. **Diversification in Rural Areas** - Measures to finance projects within the diversification of economic activities in rural areas, including tourism, crafts, cultural heritage and support to small and medium enterprises.

The analysis of rural development policies, on two case studies to complete from the time it establishes a characterization of the actual situation existing at the level of rural areas of the two cases studied, particularly in relation to economic parameters, where This includes agriculture, forestry and tourism, society, considering the demographics and the environment, which contains indicators of soil conservation and biodiversity. You can thus verify the convergence of actual and projected funding for each measure, establishing an analogy to the strengths and weaknesses that affect rural areas in Portugal and in Asturias.

3. Results
The implementation of the methodology used in this study is provided by the distribution of various measures, subject to funding in each program period, the eight distinct clusters as well as the value of
funding applied (in the case of scheduled 2007-2013) in both case studies. In Table 2 are shown the respective amounts of funding for the eight groupings. Each value is the sum of the values corresponding to each measure linked to collate.

Table 1: Values supported by each group of measures. Each group corresponds to the various measures for rural development programs for Portugal and Asturias for the three programming periods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Improvement of Productive Infrastructure</td>
<td>798.084</td>
<td>2.555.365</td>
<td>1.234.100</td>
<td>99.381</td>
<td>140.147</td>
<td>79.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Improvement of Production Conditions</td>
<td>765.610</td>
<td>1.372.272</td>
<td>485.120</td>
<td>86.450</td>
<td>58.097</td>
<td>37.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3. Renewal Agriculture</td>
<td>173.276</td>
<td>123.048</td>
<td>200.401</td>
<td>54.102</td>
<td>132.473</td>
<td>110.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Training and Research</td>
<td>234.385</td>
<td>167.314</td>
<td>3.322</td>
<td>8.972</td>
<td>5.124</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Income Aids</td>
<td>203.892</td>
<td>442.645</td>
<td>755.814</td>
<td>42.107</td>
<td>89.618</td>
<td>43.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Improving the Natural Environment and Landscape</td>
<td>817.653</td>
<td>522.989</td>
<td>1.020.993</td>
<td>73.703</td>
<td>67.892</td>
<td>94.657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Forestry</td>
<td>124.997</td>
<td>318.358</td>
<td>128.111</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>82.280</td>
<td>1.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Diversification in Rural Areas</td>
<td>92.109</td>
<td>365.465</td>
<td>459.620</td>
<td>28.101</td>
<td>64.830</td>
<td>45.014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: (1)

In order to analyze the data obtained, there was a relationship between the data presented in Table 2 with the value of a specific indicator appropriate to characterize the set of measures in each group in two different moments in time (1999 and 2005). Since it is not possible yet to define the details of a date close to the end of the 2007-2013 programming, they used the 2005 values for the characterization of this period. Table 3 announced figures for funding for, depending on the respective indicator for each group in Portugal and Asturias, in the three programming periods studied.

Table 2: Relative financing, according to an indicator for each group, in Portugal and Asturias, in the three programming periods studied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Improvement of Productive Infrastructure</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Improvement of Production Conditions</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3. Renewal Agriculture</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>10.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Training and Research</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Income Aids</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Improving the Natural Environment and Landscape</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Forestry</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Diversification in Rural Areas</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Values for this period correspond to programmed values.
3 Fontes: (INE, 2001), (INE, 2006), (INE, 2002), (INE, 2006)
3.1 Period 1994-1999

For the period 1994-1999, in both cases, the measure groups that stood out were the Improvement of the Environment and Landscape, Improvement of Production Conditions and Improvement of Productive Infrastructure. Portugal is, however, a place of evidence, demonstrating a strong commitment in the first of three (Improving of Environment and Landscape), the relative proportion of total funds applied (Figure 1), still showing a superior investment for the forestry, Training and Improvement of Conditions for Production.

![Figure 1](image)

**Period 1994-1999**

Moreover, Asturias made a bet that is stronger than the one made in Portugal, especially on groupings of Renewal of Agriculture, the Income Aid and Diversification in Rural Areas. Now, performing an analysis according to various indicators chosen for each group (Table 2), it is possible to determine the actual size of investments and comparison of two case studies. The values obtained are in general, consistent with the percentages for the funding of each group in Figure 1. Stand out, however, investment in Rejuvenation of Agriculture in Asturias, where the amount paid to each producer on the retirement age is well above the Portuguese case. Similarly, there are investments in Diversification in Rural Areas where there is clearly more support for every inhabitant on this theme, from Portugal.
3.2 Period 2000-2006

In 2000-2006, for analysis of the graph in Figure 2, it appears that Portugal has performed its funds mainly in Improvement of Production Conditions and Improvement of Productive Infrastructure, and only these two groups, along with the training, which reflects superiority in terms of percentage of funding in face of Asturias.

On the other hand, Asturias has established a distribution strategy much more uniform, highlighting the Investment and Structural Rejuvenation of Agriculture, both with values of around 21% of total financing. Analyzing the values in Table 2, first, for the Improvement of Production Conditions, it appears to Portugal, an amount paid for holding clearly superior. For the Rejuvenation of Agriculture, the amount financed by each producer with over 65 years of age in Asturias is quite higher than the value of the Portuguese case. If in Asturias this corresponds to 12.75 (€/producer with more than 65 years), while in Portugal the figure is much lower 0.42 (€/producer with more than 65 years). Similarly, there are the groups of Aid Income in disadvantaged areas, the Improvement of the Environment and the Landscape and Forestry, where values are higher paid in Asturias. For the latter, there is the amount financed rural per capita, far exceeds the amount financed in Portugal. This is a reflection not only of increasing investment in this group of Asturias, together with a lower percentage of rural population (12%), compared to 29% in Portugal.

3.3 Period 2007-2013

Analyzing now the last programming period (2007-2013), in Figure 3, the percentages of the total programmed for each case study, it is possible that once again, is Portugal that spends the most amount of funds in the Improvement of Productive Infrastructure, while Asturias continue with determination to revitalize agriculture and in both cases, it denotes an increase in funds for the Improvement of the Environment and Landscape.
Now turning to Table 2, it is possible that the set value per farm, for Improvement of Productive Infrastructure in Portugal continues to be higher than the value determined for Asturias. On the other side now regards the Rejuvenation of Agriculture, there is again a marked disparity. The same goes for Diversification in Rural Areas where there is still a far superior investment per capita in rural Asturias, although the percentage of total scheduled to be identical for both. Considering now the weight of the disadvantaged areas in the usable agricultural area (UAA) in each case (86% in Portugal and 92% in Asturias), there is a very strong bet to income in aid by Portugal, unlike what was happening in previous periods, where Asturias dominated in the payment per hectare of area disadvantage.

3.4 Rural Characterization

The analysis and rural characterization effected through the use of indicators for rural development in the years of 1999 and 2005 concluded the strengths and weaknesses that affect the two case studies. In Table 3 are described in these points.

Table 3: Strengths and weaknesses found by the characterization of rural Portugal and Asturias, using indicators of rural development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portugal</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growth of trained producers</td>
<td>-Decrease of usable agricultural area (UAA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in irrigated land</td>
<td>-Decrease of the agricultural population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant increase organic farming</td>
<td>-Age structure of producers quite old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight of agriculture, hunting and forestry in economy high</td>
<td>-Deficit-young farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farms with food processing high</td>
<td>-Decrease the weight of agriculture, hunting and forestry in the economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase of establishments and beds in rural tourism</td>
<td>-Agricultural area in less favored area quite high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Percentage of farms with very low rural tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Deficit-alternative activities within the farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-No increase in tourists in the rural tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Loss of population in rural areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-High-susceptibility to desertification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Asturias

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Age structure of producers rather aged</td>
<td>- Decrease of usable agricultural area (UAA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- High Percentage of young farmers</td>
<td>- Decrease of the agricultural population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Maintaining the weight of agriculture, hunting and forestry in the economy</td>
<td>- Decreases in producer-trained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase of establishments and beds in rural tourism</td>
<td>- Drastic decline of small farms, leading to bigger farms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- High percentage of protected areas</td>
<td>- Deficit-alternative activities within the farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Territory without susceptibility to desertification</td>
<td>- Agricultural area in deprived area quite high</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking at Table 3 where we highlight all the strengths and weaknesses of each case, you can make a conclusion about the factors that most contribute to the development of these rural areas in Portugal and in Asturias. In the case of Asturias, stands the strong tourism development in the rural areas, directly followed by the strong presence of natural values detachable. Stands out even an age structure in farming relatively young, accompanied by a weight of agriculture, hunting and forestry in the economy fairly stable. On the Portuguese side, there are activities related to the organic agriculture in order to have gained significance marked with a proportion of small farms still quite high, combined with a weight of agriculture, hunting and forestry in the economy high. Stands out even the increase of tourism establishments in rural areas.

On the other hand, there are several serious constraints in both cases. There is a clear trend to a progressive abandonment of agriculture, reflected by the decrease of usable agricultural area, population decline and the gradual aging of the agricultural producers. In addition, there is a loss of population in rural areas, affecting both the cases under study. In Portugal there still are some serious problems related to the reducing of the weight of agriculture, hunting and forestry in national economy, a lack of alternative activities on farms and the growing number of tourists in rural areas stagnated. In Asturias, there is a drastic reduction of small farms, leading to bigger farms and a very slow increase of the agricultural area in organically.

4. “Quinta da Caramuja”

“Quinta da Caramuja”, located in Gouveia, presents itself as an innovative project reference in terms of capital gains in relation to sustainable development of rural areas. With a total area of 28.5 hectares distributed by 13.5 hectares of pasture, 11 hectares of forest and olive grove 5 hectares, Quinta also features a small garden where agriculture is practiced in organically as well as a site dedicated to aromatic plant species. Though, in the beginning of the activity, were already produced some food products such as olive oil (500 liters), or jams entering the traditional market, and is expected soon, the marketing of beef breed, “Marinhoa”. Currently there are 14 animals, and is expected in the future to increase the herd in order to sustain the production of meat, which is also in organically. The forest consists mainly of indigenous species of great landscape value and environmental considerations Quercus faginea, Quercus pyrenaica, Castanea sativa mill, and there is the presence of other species in smaller quantities, as Pinus pinaster and eucalyptus. Still presenting a rural tourism service, this
consists of two cottages restored, maintaining an external architecture similar to that found in the region, and yet the interior, described as contemporary. Quinta as total accommodation capacity of 12 beds, putting even the guests a range of equipment, which can be used for activities within it.

5. Conclusions

Over the three programming periods studied in this thesis, it became quite evident, a much higher conduit of funds, in order to improve programs such as the Improvement of Productive Infrastructure. It was also notice that Portugal, over the time has made a strong bet in this type of programs, marked by a commitment of modernization and creation of agricultural infrastructures and rural areas, such as the irrigation schemes. Asturias, in turn, showed a clear downward trend in the use of funds in this area, starting to apply them in more specific topics, such as Renewal of Agriculture. In fact, the study on the characterization of the case studies showed the existence of producers in this region with an age structure rather less aged than in Portugal, plus a percentage of young farmers, much higher. The bet on a policy of early retirement and support for young farmers began to produce its results, at the initiation of a strategy of transferring land rights and production (particularly dairy quotas) by farmers retired to new farmers, thereby maintaining active agricultural land and a rejuvenation of the agricultural labor force and its producers.

Along with the Improvement of Productive Infrastructures, there were some investments for the first two programming periods in Portugal, which include, investments in the improvement of production facilities, especially in processing and marketing of agricultural products, that eventually will turn out to be, investments in modernization of infrastructure structures. Only in the period 2007-2013 the budget foreseen for this item have been reduced, which were distributed by themes previously less appreciated, like supporting the maintenance of agriculture in disadvantaged areas, the environment and the diversification of activities in rural areas.

In turn, Asturias sooner invested their funds in diversification, primarily at the level of rural tourism, providing, currently, an exemplary touristic development, rather than Portugal in terms of both supply and demand. Rural tourism is now considered a driving force able to strongly stimulate the rural areas, bringing new sources of employment, alternative incomes for farmers, recoverability of rural housing, plus a whole range of parallel activities (eg. valuation of natural, cultural, culinary and heritage). The integration of large protected areas, especially the National Park Picos de Europa, combined with the splendid landscapes, he acted with the extensive grazing areas in extensive, attached to an enviable local architecture, result in a bonus for the Asturian region, which can thereby attracting a significant number of tourists. For Portugal, the industry is at an impasse, where there is a marked increase of TER establishments but where the number of tourists does not help increasing the business development.

Group-wide Environment Improvement and Landscape, the results were not uniform throughout the period both for Portugal and the Asturias. Between 1994 and 1999 the percentage of total funding for this issue was quite high, especially in Portuguese. In the following period (2000-2006), support, down
enough for the total funding for all measures, returning again to rise in the period 2007-2013. There was still one of the progressive increase in agri-environment, with the exception of Asturias where the amount financed for this measure has been losing importance over time. The use of environmentally sustainable agricultural practices, such as organic farming, has in recent years to assert itself as an activity with potential for agriculture development, in parallel assuming a very important role in the development of rural areas. In Portugal this mode of agriculture is booming echoing in a capital gain interesting and still showing a strong national interest of farmers in betting activity on a less polluting to the environment beyond a recognized superior quality products produced. This growth is reflected in the effort that was maintained throughout the periods increase funding for agri-environment, which includes agriculture in organically. For Asturias, the development of this type of agriculture is not significant, not only is against the regime of pasture (forage) extensive livestock, but also as a very small area of agriculture for the production of other foodstuffs, that may organically, thus following the weak financing from the agri-environment payments.

For income support for farmers in disadvantaged areas, essential for the maintenance of farming in areas with severe constraints, but very rich in terms of natural values, it was found to Portugal an increasing trend over the years, contrary to Asturias where the amounts paid per hectare of disadvantaged areas, increased considerably in 2000-2006, but in 2007-2013, these figures are once again falling. Considering the importance that farming has on these places, it is important keep their maintenance. The widespread loss of agricultural population, including farmers, the progressive aging of the same, the loss of young farmers, including the reduction of usable agricultural area, are some of the constraints affecting the activity, and consequently the rural areas in Portugal and Asturias. Disadvantaged areas such as phenomena tend to deteriorate more quickly and there is a worsening situation of rural areas, including all serious environmental damage resulting from the loss of farmland. Still not enough, sometimes, to establish a direct income support that is essential to encourage farmers looking for alternative income.

In order to meet the policies and strategies followed, it becomes necessary the participation of actors who enjoy the rural areas, in this case people, companies or even local and regional levels. This effect was presented in this thesis, as a case study in order to demonstrate the positive effects on rural development of an organization called "Quinta da Caramuja." This farm, located near Gouveia, emerges as a case example of rural diversification and protection of environmental values and landscape. Formed initially from a given abandoned agricultural area and forestry dwellings, completely degraded at this time to snail, still in the process of ecological restoration and landscape, presents a rather diverse territorial space, where you can join the nature activities, agrarian and rural tourism. Bringing other benefits to local development through the integration and display of local products, Quinta also intends to add more value added to their products produced, including beef and oil, through integration of production in organically bringing bigger improvements in the environmental sphere. In fact, this new project is an excellent example of good practice implemented in rural areas, constituting a form of rural diversification that should be supported by specific funds and analyzed in this thesis, concerning the diversification in rural areas. That fact was not observed, which only
receives funds for the production of organically. The difficulties of implementing and maintaining this type of investment became highly visible during the exchange of ideas with its proprietary, demonstrating a lack of support for this type of investment.
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