



REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

**SUPPORT for PREPARATION of PROPOSAL on STATE LAND
MANAGEMENT in RURAL AREAS of MACEDONIA**

**Report by
Simon Keith, FAO Land Management Consultant and
others,
Adopted and presented by Kiril Georgievski**



©1997 MAGELLAN GeographixSM
(805) 685-3100 www.maps.com

SUMMARY

GoM recognise the need to improve the management of State land and accordingly have requested assistance from FAO for this project and have set up in August 2007 the 17-person sector for registration and land management within MAFWE to manage State agricultural land. The sector is in the process of development and MAFWE is aware that it lacks resources and direction. It was found that there is a lack of knowledge of what is required for the efficient management of land. Some of the required professional skills (particularly legal and accounting) are not available within the sector. There is a need for professional training.

The facts relevant for planning for improved management of State Agricultural land are these. The area is about 200,000 hectares. About half of it is subject to concessions (leases) for five or thirty year terms. The revenue for 2006 was **E 1.2 million per annum**. The total potential revenue as if the land were to be 90% let is estimated to be **less than Euro 5 million per annum**. The present full cost of management is (or should be) about E 350,000 per annum.

The capital value of the government's interest in State Agricultural land, if 90% let, would be **less than E 150 million**, which compares with the theoretical capital value as if it had vacant possession and could be sold of **more than E 500 million**.

International experience shows that all governments, including those in the developed world, have problems in managing efficiently the land and buildings in their ownership. Efficient management requires clear simple objectives. The political process frequently requires compromise and the consensus of the greatest number of people which makes it difficult for politicians to provide clear land management policies. There are therefore structural reasons why any attempt to manage public sector land, especially let land and building, is unlikely to be successful.

Therefore any good system of land management requires clear simple aims and objectives which then under pin the design and operation of the management systems. GoM/MAFWE need to articulate their policies for State-owned agricultural land. The big question is why should GoM own agricultural land. What benefits are there for the public interest? Whatever the level of success of a new system of land management, the net revenue from State agricultural will be minimal and the degree of control of it will be negligible. The present leasing arrangements do not facilitate or encourage the optimal use of the let land.

There are policy decisions to be made. FAO experts consider there are two broad options.

Option 1

The first option is the retention of all state agricultural land and the introduction of efficient management systems. The costs are unlikely to be less than **12 to 18% of the gross revenues**. The net revenue will at best be about **E 5 million per** annum and could be considerably less than that.

However the real risks and disadvantages inherent in this option are that the State will simply fail to deliver a system of good land management. If governments throughout the world have so often proved to be inefficient landowners it might be considered unwise for GoM to suppose that any different outcome is likely in Macedonia. It may be that because of the fragmented nature of the State's agricultural estate, it is not possible to manage it efficiently. Therefore they consider this option involves high risk for little potential advantage.

Option 2

FAO experts consider that GoM should consider the option of selling State agricultural land on a selective basis. (They recommend outright sales but it could be that the sale of 99 year leases at a single premium would be more politically acceptable to Macedonia.) They recommend first offering land to the concessionaires/lessees on the basis of its value as an investment. If after three years the holding has not been sold to the lessee it would be offered on the open market. They recommend the State retains the mineral rights and 50% of the development value. They consider that under this option receipts of **E 100 million** can be raised **within a seven-year period**. The management burden will be reduced although not completely eliminated because some land will prove to be un-saleable.

Whatever option is selected there is an urgent need to transform the sector responsible for management into a competent body capable of carrying out the management duties. There is a need to clarify its role, allot specific responsibilities, set targets and monitor the performance. The professional skills will need to be up-graded through recruitment (of legal and accounting expertise) and local and foreign training.

The most urgent task is to establish financial control through the compilation of a comprehensive rent roll, the establishment of a system of demanding and collecting and enforcing rent payments and the setting up of sound accounting systems.

1. INTRODUCTION

This technical cooperation project (TCP) objectives and outputs are as follows.

"Objectives:

- 1. Review and analyse the framework for the state and public land management in rural areas of Macedonia and to develop a proposal for improving state land management.*

Expected outputs:

Report on the management of state and public lands in the rural areas of Macedonia including

- a. Policy, legislative, regulatory framework as well as the practice of the management of state and public lands*
 - b. Detailed policy recommendations (including proposed changes to regulations, tax regime, etc) to improve management/productivity of state agricultural land over short and long terms*
 - c. Specific advice on the role of the Ministry of Agriculture in the management of state and public lands.*
- 2. A pilot (including data compilation and methodology development for a wider inventory) state and public land inventory and analysis of a rural/peri-urban area in Macedonia.*
 - 3. Proposal for improving state and public land management in the rural areas of Macedonia including a project proposal (or several) for external support consideration."*

It soon became apparent that the main focus of this TCP should be the 200,000 hectares State-owned agricultural land. The assistance was requested by MAFWE and there is a clearly defined and much needed project concentrating only on State-owned agricultural land. No other ministry is interested in the issue at this stage but if the project is successful it would introduce better land management methods to Macedonia which could be applied widely to other State-owned real property.

2. THE NUMBERS

The numbers and statistics relevant to the management of State-owned agricultural land are as follows.

	<i>Numbers or hectares (ha) or Euros</i>	<i>Comments and/or source</i>
Total agricultural land in Macedonia	686 949 ha	data from the State Authority for Geodetic Works from 19.12.2002
Total number of agricultural parcels		No data available in MAFWE at the moment
Agricultural land in State ownership	236 953 ha	data from the State Authority for Geodetic Works from 19.12.2002
	197 764 ha	according to the Information on registration and land management of the state owned agricultural land (Official document from MAFWE, October 2007) note: around 38 189 ha were returned to the previous owners in the process of denationalization from 2002 to 2007 according to the MAFWE data

Parcels in state ownership under the control of MAFWE		No data available in MAFWE at the moment
Number of parcels granted under formal concessions	Say 1,000 lessees	No certain data available in MAFWE. The estimated figure is extrapolated from figures extracted from three districts.
Area granted under formal concessions	102 966 ha (last available data from 01. Sep.2006)	According to information on registration and land management of the state owned agricultural land (Official document from MAFWE, October 2007)
		from 01 June 2007 until 01 June 2008 there are at least three pending tenders procedures for approximately 31 905 ha
Number of employees used in the management of agricultural lands in MAFWE	say 33 person years	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sector for land management (16 employees working full time on land management issues) 2. 33 Agricultural extension agencies (assuming one employee in each working half time on land management issues)

Direct costs of management: salaries and allowances	16.500 Euro per month	Average salary with allowances 500 euro per month
Estimated gross annual costs presently expended in managing state lands for MAFWE	360,000 euro	They have assumed the real full cost taking into account all overheads would require an addition of 80% to the gross salary costs
Revenue from MAFWE State lands	For 2003: 374.455,00 denars (approximately 6138 Euro)	According to the Report of the Ministry of Finance sent to MAFWE
	For 2004: 3.847.904,00 denars (63.080 Euro)	
	For 2005: 12.989.627,50 denars (212. 944 Euro)	
	For 2006: 74.561.313,00 denars (1.2 million Euro)	
	For 2007: 126.753.388 denars (2 million euro)	

3. EXISTING SITUATION

a) The law

The main statute governing the management of State-owned agricultural land is the Law on Agricultural Land (31st October 2007). The experts are concerned that this newly created law does not provide a sound basis for the better management of State-owned agricultural land. It is not so much the detail of the law that gives concern but the entire philosophy which appears to under-pin it. It appears predicated on the assumption that farming will remain unchanged in method and tenure. Some of the concerns are identified by these comments.

- **Article 5.** There is no reason to confine the use of agricultural land to exactly that in the record of cadastre.
- **Article 17.** The bar on the sale of state-owned agricultural land is considered to be the outcome of an incorrect policy.
- **Article 18.** The classification of user and the consequent duration terms is considered to be unnecessarily restrictive.
- **Article 21.** The respective roles of the commissions and the newly formed sector need clarification.
-

- **Article 27.** If the bid with highest annual offered rent must be accepted under the terms of this article, what is the purpose of the business plan required under Art 25. It would appear that an unsatisfactory business plan would not debar the highest bidder.
- **Article 34.** The purpose of the reports required under this article is unclear. It appears to be an expensive and unnecessary piece of bureaucracy.
 - **Article 39.** This article assumes an extension of the lease at the end of the term but under the same terms as the basic agreement. The experts consider this restrictive and unnecessary.

Consequent on the unsatisfactory statutory framework the resulting lease documents have the following defects.

- **The bar on sale or assignment prevents the lessee from raising money against the security of the leasehold title.**
- **The bar on sale or assignment excludes all the let land from the property market thus inhibiting the operation of it.**
- **The bar on sub-letting is probably in practical terms unenforceable.**

- **There is an underlying assumption that the tenant will continue to use the land for the specific classified purposes (for instance arable, vineyard, orchard, meadow etc). Farming methods, markets and priorities will change in the 30 year term and farmers should have the freedom to farm as they choose.**
- **There is no provision for compensation to an out-going tenant at the end of the lease for improvements made to or on the land. Such a provision would encourage lessees to invest. There should also be mirror-image provision for the tenant to pay for any damage caused to the holding. There appears to be no legal reason why such provisions should not be included in the leases.**
- **The rental provisions are denominated as being determined as a proportion of the average wheat yields over the last five years (which commonly equates to 0.3 tonnes per hectare) at last years wheat price. This has the merit of indexing rents in line with one measure of inflation, but there are disadvantages. Wheat is not one of the main staple crops of Macedonia. Denominating the rent of a vineyard, for instance, in the terms of wheat prices makes little sense.**

The overall result is that some 1,000 tenants are holding 100,000 hectares of agricultural land under terms that provide an unsatisfactory basis for agriculture and an exclusion from the land markets.

The organisational structure
Existing organisational structure within institutions of GoM is shown in
the tables hereunder:

Responsibility	SAGW	MoF	MAFWE
Cadastral and title registration	√		
Denationalisation of state land		√	
Lease of state agricultural land and preparation of contracts			√
Agricultural land conversion			√

Organizational structure within MAFWE:

Responsible bodies within MAFWE	No of employees	Responsibilities
Sector for Registration and Land management		
Head of Sector	1	
Unit 1: Management of agricultural land	3	Not clearly defined
Unit 2: Registration of agricultural land	3	
Unit 3: Exchange of agricultural land	2	
Unit 4: Improvement of the quality of agricultural land	2	
Agricultural extension agencies	33 agencies, at least one employee in each working on land management issues	not clearly defined , role in terms of preparing lists of available areas for leasing, collection of payment orders from the leases as proof for paid rent, Members of the commissions in cases of usufruct
State Counsellor for Land Management	1	
Commission for leasing agricultural land established by the Minister	President + four members	Not clearly defined, valuation of the offers and making decisions on most favourable bidders on tenders for leasing of state-owned agricultural land

Practice

Over the last decade 100,000 hectares of land have been let and hundreds of lease have been created. The administrative burden of carrying out this work should not be under-estimated. It was mostly carried out with the equivalent of one person in MAFWE HQ, support from the 33 extension offices and much work from local statutory empowered 'commissions' appointed by the Minister of Agriculture. Whatever may be the short-comings of the leasehold tenure created or the irregularities that may have occurred during the processes, it is never-the-less a considerable administrative achievement. The work is now to be controlled by the newly set up sector in MAFWE. The relative responsibilities of the extension offices and those of the commissions were not made clear.

The mechanism for demanding and collecting the rents and enforcing payment has not been properly developed. It appears to depend mainly on the local knowledge of the extension offices. Payments are made to the Ministry of Finance through a bank.

FACTORS RELEVANT TO MANAGEMENT

Land management is made easier and cheaper if the separate holdings are relatively large and the whole is within one ring fence or location. By contrast the State-owned agricultural land comprises many holdings, some relatively small, in many scattered locations. This structure will always therefore be expensive to manage.

Other adverse temporary factors that inhibit good management of State-owned agricultural land include the lack of clear policies, lack of management priorities, lack of experience, lack of resources and lack of training in many aspects of land management. All these factors can be corrected.

On the other hand the strengths with which to work are the good cadastral records (even if imperfect in respect of State ownership in rural areas) and the large volume of information on agricultural matters. There is also the advantage that the land contains very few buildings in the ownership of the State. Buildings add another dimension to the problems of land management.

Towards better land management in Macedonia

FAO experts assume that the continuation of the status quo is not an option. As will be shown below they also consider that a completely commercial approach to the problem is not politically feasible. There are then probably only two feasible options for better land management in Macedonia.

The underlying figures which should influence policy decisions are these.

1. The potential rental revenue taking into account the present leases is less than E 6 million **2.** The capital value of the State's interest in State-owned Agricultural land as let on the basis of present concessions is probably less than E 150 million.

3. The theoretical open market capital value of the State-owned Agricultural land may be about E 500 million. This theoretical value is not realisable because much of the land is let, and even if it was not the full value could not be realised without flooding the market.

Nevertheless this figure indicates the underlying potential of the land which can be released. it should be noted that **the difference between the figures 2 and 3 above is at least E 350 million.** This hidden value has in part been transferred to tenants due to the favourable terms of the concessions. But in larger part it represents capital unusable at present.

OPTION 1: RETAIN ALL LAND & MALYNAGE IT ACTIVE

The first option is the retention of all state agricultural land and the introduction of efficient management systems. The land management functions and duties are comprehensive . Land management is expensive and time consuming. It is not simply a matter of collecting the rents (which function is in any case not simple) nor is this primarily a mapping exercise. Many of the functions require individual contact with individual lessees or potential lessees, and that is inevitably time consuming. The skills required relate as much to valuation, law and accounting as they do to agriculture and land surveying. Not surprisingly the fees charged by private sector land managers to private owners is seldom less than 10% of the total annual rents.

- The expert note that the last estimate of the rents received is E 1.2 million (2006) and E 2 million(2007).
- The expert estimate that the gross rent roll for State Agricultural land is unlikely to exceed E 5.5 million per annum (on the basis of present prices) and could be significantly less than this.
- On the basis of experience elsewhere it is consider that that the costs of good land management would amount to not less than 12% of the rent totals, which amounts to a cost of up to about E 0.8 million.
- On the most optimistic assumptions the net revenue accruing to the State would be unlikely to exceed E 5 million.

The main advantage of this option is that is better than the status quo.

There would be a certain, if restricted, revenue stream. The management systems would better safeguard the State's interest. However it is hard to see any real advantages to the State in owning agricultural land and there are these definite disadvantages.

- **The rental revenue will always be small and not significant to the national budget.**
- **The public ownership of land provides opportunity for political patronage and outright corruption.**
- **Farmers are more restricted in their freedom to farm under the terms of the present leasehold interest than they would be if they owned the land. The current leasehold tenure strongly inhibits investment nor does it facilitate agricultural production.**
- **There must also be concern that the restrictions on sale and sub-letting that potentially could effect up to two seventh of the national agricultural land does not accord with the EU requirements for a functioning land market as specified in Chapter 4 Aquis Communautaire.**

All these structural defects affect the ability of Macedonia to realise the full potential from its agricultural land. Additionally however the real risks and disadvantages inherent in this option are that the State will simply fail to deliver a system of good land management. It may be that because of the fragmented nature of the State's agricultural estate, it is not possible to manage it efficiently.

It is consider that this option involves high risk for no potential advantage.

OPTION 2: DISPOSE OF ALL NON-OPERATIONAL LAND

The experts considered and **rejected this option** which would result in the GoM acting in a completely commercial manner. If the entire estate was owned by a commercial company it might well decide that it was unmanageable and seek to realise as high a price as possible by selling as soon as possible to the highest bidders. The lands would be offered in lots. The highest price would often be obtainable from lessees who would not wish to have the land sold from under them. **The threat of this happening would often induce bids well above the investment value.** There is a substantial difference between the investment value and the vacant possession value. When concessionaires/lessees purchase they then have an asset which is worth the vacant possession value, therefore there is every incentive to purchase. It would be politically impossible for the State to act in this way.

OPTION 3: RETAIN STRATEGIC AND SPECIAL LAND, DISPOSE OF REMAINDER

The experts consider that GoM should consider the option of selling State agricultural land on a selective basis and recommend outright sales but it maybe that the sale of 99 year leasehold interests for a single premium would be more politically acceptable. The proposals in outline are these.

- All 'designated' State agricultural land under lease or concession at a specified date should be offered for sale to the concessionaires/lessees at the investment value. The option for the lessee to purchase would be kept open for three years.**
- All State agricultural land would be 'designated' as being for sale unless the Minister of MAFWE considers it will be required within ten years for a scheme of consolidation of scattered holdings or for development for a use other than agriculture or is required for a strategic agricultural purpose or which is land that requires special environmental protection. No upland pasture-land would be designated as being for sale.**

- **After the three-year period the land would be offered for sale on the open market, at its market value but subject to the existing lease/concession. The lands would be grouped or lotted in a way that would best facilitate the sale.**
- **The State would offer a clean and unchallengeable title to the lands sold and compensate any person who can subsequently show title or claim to it.**
- **The purchasers (whether of the outright interest or a 99 year lease) would be free to sell, lease, mortgage or bequeath the land as they please. They would also be free to farm and crop the land without being restricted by the present agricultural classification.**
- **The State would reserve title to any part of the lands to which there could be privatisation claims (possibly normally 15% of the area in a convenient location) in order to meet these claims. In the meantime the purchaser could farm that land freely and it would revert to the purchaser, or their successor in title, if no claim had arisen within 10 years.**
- **The State would retain the rights to all minerals.**
- **The State would retain a 50% right to any development value arising from a sale or lease of land within 10 years of purchase.**

The timescale for the execution of this option will be up to seven years. It is consider that such a scheme would take one year to prepare, that about 50% the agricultural land would be sold in the first three-year option period, that a further 25% would be sold within the next three years. There will be a residue of unsold land, possibly 15%, even after ten years that will have to be managed.

There will be a cost to the State at the outset because the administrative machinery needs to be set up. Returns from sales will start to accrue from year two but might not peak before year four. It is consider that there could be net return of E 100 million over seven years. If need be it could make financial sense for GoM to borrow money for the initial expense and to use the proceeds of the sales to re-pay over a period of seven years. However the financial projections suggest that the exercise might never be in deficit and there is no need to borrow.

The two main direct advantages for the GOM in adopting this option is that over the long run it will reduce MAFWE's management burden and realise a significant amount of cash.

The indirect advantages are very much greater. They will put the tenant farmers in direct control of the land with the freedom to farm as they please and will thus be better able to compete in the EU. They will facilitate the land market, which will in turn lead to the more rationale occupation of farm holdings.

***The experts recommend this option.
And appreciate that this will require a change in policy and law.***

RECOMMENDATIONS

FAO consolidated recommendations are these.

- MAFWE should as soon as possible reorganise the new sector office in MAFWE so that it has the mandate, the resources and the expertise to carry out its functions**
- MAFWE should urgently take control of the financial management of the State agricultural land.**
- GoM should decide on the policy options to be adopted.**
- GoM should review any legal changes needed to implement the policy options.**
- GoM/MAFWE should determine whether it wishes to seek international land management expertise and, if so, make a request accordingly.**

Preparation for EMERALD pilot project for land consolidation

- **Following up the interest expressed by Macedonia a first short fact finding mission was planned on 3-4 October 2007 in close cooperation with the Dutch Embassy. The mission was carried out by Mr Frank van Holst, coordinator for international projects in DLG and involved in various land development projects. He was joined by Mr Kiril Stoyanov, an expert on land consolidation in the Bulgarian Ministry of Agriculture and Food Supply and involved in the bilaterally project called: 'Land Consolidation Strategy and Programme in Bulgaria'. The mission confirmed the need for assistance and offered some opportunities to join forces with other organisations active in Macedonia. As a result, Mr Frank van Holst participated in a workshop by World Bank and FAO about management of state land on 6th of December. Relations between management of state land and a possible set up of a land fund to support structural changes in land use were discussed in this meeting. In the debriefing meeting with the Vice Minister of MAFWE, Mr Pero Dimsovsky on 7th December it was mutually agreed to start preparations for a pilot project on land consolidation supported by the Dutch Embassy. A project identification mission was planned from 26th to 28th of March 2008. Several organisations were consulted about the proposed project. Moreover, a field trip was organised to get more clarity about practical problems in the field. A general outline of the project was discussed in a meeting with about 20 key persons involved. On the 25th of April the Dutch Embassy requested DLG to develop a project proposal.**

Consolidation of scattered agricultural holdings → EMERALD project

The general issue of the consolidation of scattered holdings has been addressed internationally by FAO and other organisations. There is international expertise available and there clearly is a need for consolidation projects in Macedonia. Project proposal EMERALD regarding land consolidation issues was approved and signed by the Ministry in July 2008, in cooperation with DLG Government Service for Land and Water management –public agency under the Dutch Ministry of Agriculture.

The use of State-owned agricultural land could facilitate the consolidation process. This may be so in some local instances but of course the 100,000 hectares already let are not available for this purpose. The experts do not consider action on the better management of State-owned agricultural lands should delay the possible use of state land to facilitate consolidation.

➤ Big wine producing company SKOVIN faces many disputes with more than 10 private owners



Marks indicating a claim on land rights

Arondation issues



Denationalisation issues



Amalgamation of small uneconomic agricultural holdings

The small average size of agricultural holdings in the private sector is a well-recognised economic weakness. It is an issue separate from that of consolidation and more difficult to address directly. A functioning land market is the best remedy and the proposed project could facilitate this.

The improvement of the legal code governing letting of land and buildings

It is known from many examples from many countries over most of the 20th century that excessive intervention in the letting markets is counter-productive. However there are helpful actions that governments can take. It may be that the legal codes in Macedonia governing the letting of property can be improved. It might help to produce model leases for different classes of property. Facilitating the rental market will help the consolidation of the farming units and the more rational occupation of agricultural holdings. A short project bringing knowledge of the best practice could be beneficial.

The introduction of a robust system of annual property taxes

Taxation is not strictly a land management issue . However they have noted the legal provisions in the Law of Property Taxes (80/93 & 3/94 & 71/96 & 54/2000), which at first sight provides an inadequate basis for the taxation of real property. There is very restricted impact of annual property tax.

The experts deplore the impact of Part Three of the Act and particularly Article 18 et seq which imposes a **3% transfer tax** as it could discourage the registration of changes in ownership (particularly on inheritance). It is unlikely to have any effect on the fragmentation of agricultural holdings, which is one of the original aims.

The tax issue is relevant because, if public revenue is required, a broadly based annual market value property tax might have a potential *annual net yield* of about *Euro 50 million*. This figure should be compared with the much smaller potential yields from State land. (The experts appreciate that at present increased tax revenue is not required but this will not always be the case.)

A sound annual property tax may also be important in relation to decentralisation of government functions.

There are no technical reasons that would prevent its introduction.

Calculations of approximate valuations for State owned land

Total agricultural State Land	Rounded total in ha		200,000
Capital value with vacant possession	%	E/ha	
Good quality land	40%	5.000	400.000.000
medium quality land	25%	2.500	125.000.000
Poor quality land	15%	1.000	30.000.000
Unlettable land	20%	0	0
		TOTAL	555,000,000
<i>Figure rounded to</i>	<i>500 million</i>		
Rental income as if 90% let			
Assume wheat price in Euros per tone	150		
		tones per ha	
Good quality land	40%	0,3	3.600.000
medium quality land	25%	0,2	1.500.00
Poor quality land	15%	0,1	450.000
		TOTAL	5,550,000
<i>Figure rounded to</i>	<i>5 million</i>		

Leasing agreements -

summary dates

P. б		Вкупно огласени површини				Вкупно доделени површини			
		ха	ар	м ²		ха	ар	м ²	
1.	ПРИЛЕП	478	66	25	11	44	66	28	
2.	КОЧАНИ	304	00	99	15	73	49	97	
3.	ВЕЛЕС	113	15	69	2	10	00	00	
4.	Д.ХИСАР	54	07	98	1		41	83	
5.	ГОСТИВАР	26	39	75	0	0	0	0	
6.	КАРПОШ	12	25	36	1	3	57	90	
7.	КАВАДАРЦИ	5	12	16	1	5	12	16	
СЕ ВКУПНО:		993	68	18	31	137	28	14	

P. б	03/07	Вкупно огласени површини				дог ово	Вкупно доделени површини			
		ха	ар	м ²			ха	ар	м ²	
1.	БЕРОВО	116	45	43	1		5	96	10	
2.	БИТОЛА	479	08	46	18		75	17	47	
3.	СТРУМИЦА	572	69	83	49		123	88	11	
4.	ПРОБИШТИП	60	42	37	1		4	75	91	
5.	ВИНИЦА	247	38	75	20		84	98	77	
6.	ПРИЛЕП	430	05	42	27		128	01	37	
7.	КОЧАНИ	225	61	60	28		118	51	30	
8.	ВЕЛЕС	123	15	69	1		5	00	00	
9.	Д.ХИСАР	53	66	15	4		16	99	21	
10.	ГОСТИВАР	26	39	75	5		21	28	00	
11.	КАРПОШ	8	67	66	0		00	00	00	
12.	РАДОВИШ	200	82	00	7		34	50	00	
СЕ ВКУПНО:		2544	43	11	161		619	06	24	

P. б	04/07	Вкупно огласени површини				дог ово	Вкупно доделени површини			
		ха	ар	м ²			ха	ар	м ²	
1.	ПРОБИШТИП	534	00	47	8		388	41	52	
2.	К. ВОДА	511	50	63	0		0	00	00	
3.	ВИНИЦА	148	58	10	3		67	87	66	
4.	КАВАДАРЦИ	2102	36	78	13		1222	85	11	
5.	ВЕЛЕС	2226	17	52	16		1341	69	86	
6.	ПРИЛЕП	4219	95	81	25		1855	69	35	
СЕ ВКУПНО:		9742	59	31	65		4876	53	50	

P. б	05/07	Вкупно огласени површини				дог ово	Вкупно доделени површини			
		ха	ар	м ²			ха	ар	м ²	
1.	СТРУГА	70	04	69	1		5	00	00	
2.	ОХРИД	29	66	24	2		18	10	67	
3.	К ПАЛАНКА	317	75	28	19		80	20	89	
4.	КРАТОВО	78	68	42	0		0	00	00	
5.	ШТИП	961	39	54	82		475	53	66	
СЕ ВКУПНО:		1457	54	17	104		578	85	22	

P. б	06/07	Вкупно огласени површини				дог ово	Вкупно доделени површини			
		ха	ар	м ²			ха	ар	м ²	
1.	КРУШЕВО	16	87	31	1		5	28	77	
2.	ГОСТИВАР	115	08	00	1		2	00	00	
3.	КИЧЕВО	23	07	00	0		0	00	00	
4.	ТЕТОВО	22	03	37	6		17	59	18	
5.	БИТОЛА	983	30	39	79		206	17	75	
6.	ГЕВГЕЛИЈА	124	88	29	30		66	83	47	
7.	ВАЛАНДОВО	69	28	64	38		38	99	28	
8.	РЕСЕН	195	90	06	0		0	00	00	
СЕ ВКУПНО:		1550	43	06	155		336	88	45	

P. б	01/08	Вкупно огласени површини				дог ово	Вкупно доделени површини			
		ха	ар	м ²			ха	ар	м ²	
1.	БЕРОВО	728	34	20	25		220	79	17	
2.	ВАЛАНДОВО	259	32	68	8		43	10	99	
3.	ГЕВГЕЛИЈА	546	88	49	37		202	57	27	
4.	КАВАДАРЦИ	75	53	51	8		31	89	57	
5.	НЕГОТИНО	530	41	66	4		30	33	18	
СЕ ВКУПНО:		2140	50	54	82		528	70	18	

P. б	02/08	Вкупно огласени површини				дог ово	Вкупно доделени површини			
		ха	ар	м ²			ха	ар	м ²	
1.	К ПАЛАНКА	123	77	48	5		45	89	84	
2.	КУМАНОВО	244	43	28	3		29	64	91	
3.	ГАЗИ БАБА	511	82	97	14		91	20	47	
4.	К. ВОДА	534	76	43	4		24	75	10	
5.	ЧАИР	154	08	58	6		34	49	72	
СЕ ВКУПНО:		1568	88	74	32		226	00	04	

P. б	03/08	Вкупно огласени површини				дог ово	Вкупно доделени површини			
		ха	ар	м ²			ха	ар	м ²	
1.	ВИНИЦА	237	48	25	17		107	89	89	
2.	КОЧАНИ	402	46	12	36		138	93	50	
3.	ШТИП	1695	15	25	22		190	30	27	
СЕ ВКУПНО:		2335	09	62	75		437	13	66	

P. б	04/08	Вкупно огласени површини				дог ово	Вкупно доделени површини			
		ха	ар	м ²			ха	ар	м ²	
1.	ДЕЛЧЕВО	74	82	21						
2.	ПРОБИШТИП	28	21	80						
3.	СВ. НИКОЛЕ	2296	74	91						
СЕ ВКУПНО:		2399	78	92						

P. б	05/08	Вкупно огласени површини				дог ово	Вкупно доделени површини			
		ха	ар	м ²			ха	ар	м ²	
1.	БИТОЛА	2944	54	64						
2.	ДЕМИР ХИСАР	42	11	40						
3.	КРАТОВО	98	50	84						
4.	КРУШЕВО	25	93	38						
5.	М. БРОД	7	99	90						
6.	ОХРИД	103	24	59						
7.	ПРИЛЕП	1313	02	10						
8.	РЕСЕН	75	35	42						
9.	СТРУГА	718	34	44						
10.	КУМАНОВО	941	68	55						
СЕ ВКУПНО:		6270	75	26						

P. б	06/08	Вкупно огласени површини				дог ово	Вкупно доделени површини			
		ха	ар	м ²			ха	ар	м ²	
1.	БЕРОВО	535	43	90						
2.	ВАЛАНДОВО	74	19	99						
3.	ГЕВГЕЛИЈА	15	63	69						
4.	ДЕЛЧЕВО	37	94	98						
5.	КРАТОВО	49	59	81						
6.	К ПАЛАНКА	152	15	18						
7.	НЕГОТИНО	36	90	09						
8.	ГАЗИ БАБА		21	36						
СЕ ВКУПНО:		902	09	00						

P. б	2007	Вкупно огласени површини				дог ово	Вкупно доделени површини			
		ха	ар	м ²			ха	ар	м ²	
1.	02/07	993	68	18	31		137	28	14	
2.	03/07	2544	43	11	161		619	06	24	
3.	04/07	9742	59	31	65		4876	53	50	
4.	05/07	1457	54	17	104		578	85	22	
5.	06/07	1550	43	06	155		336	88	45	
СЕ ВКУПНО:		16288	67	83	516		6548	61	55	

P. б	2008	Вкупно огласени површини				дог ово	Вкупно доделени површини			
		ха	ар	м ²			ха	ар	м ²	
1.	01/08	2140	50	54	82		528	70	18	
2.	02/08	1568	88	74	32		226	00	04	
3.	03/08	2335	09	62	75		437	13	66	
4.	04/08	2399	78	92						
5.	05/08	6270	75	26						
6.	06/08	902	09	00						
СЕ ВКУПНО:		15617	12	08	189		1191	83	88	

P. б	2007 2008	Вкупно огласени површини				дог ово	Вкупно доделени површини			
		ха	ар	м ²			ха	ар	м ²	
1.	02/07	993	68	18	31		137	28	14	
2.	03/07	2544	43	11	161		619	06	24	
3.	04/07	9742	59	31	65		4876	53	50	
4.	05/07	1457	54	17	104		578	85	22	
5.	06/07	1550	43	06	155		336	88	45	
6.	01/08	2140	50	54	82		528	70	18	
7.	02/08	1568	88	74	32		226	00	04	
8.	03/08	2335	09	62	75		437	13	66	
9.	04/08	2399	78	92						
10.	05/08	6270	75	26						
11.	06/08	902	09	00						
СЕ ВКУПНО:		31905	79	91</						

Ministry of Agriculture Forestry and Water Supply



short term leasing agreement


Република Македонија
МИНИСТЕРСТВО ЗА ЗЕМЈОДЕЛСТВО,
ШУМАРСТВО И ВОДОСТОПАНСТВО
 Бр. _____
 2008 година
С К О П Ј Е

Врз основа на член 24-д од Законот за земјоделско земјиште (Службен весник на РМ бр. 25/98, 18/99 и 2/04), а по претходно спроведена постапка по Оглас бр. 3/07 од 21.06.2007 година се склучува

ДОГОВОР за краткорочен закуп на земјоделско земјиште

ДОГОВОРНИ СТРАНИ

1. Давател на закупот: Република Македонија - Министерство за земјоделство, шумарство и водостопанство, претставувано од министерот Ацо Спасеноски **(во натамошен текст: закуподавач)** и

2. Корисник на закуп: И.З. АЛЕКСАНДАР Симеон Стојчо Стојанов со живеалиште на ул. М. Стојчев бр.14 с. Тркање, Кочани **(во натамошниот текст: закупец)**.

1. ПРЕДМЕТ НА ДОГОВОРОТ

Предмет на овој договор е давање на земјоделското земјиште во сопственост на државата во краткорочен закуп:

Катастарска Општина	Место викано	П.Л. бр.	К.П. бр.	Површина			Закупнина по (ха)
				ха	ар	м ²	
Кочани	Слатина	13606	5641	14	38	6.500,00	
Кочани	Слатина	13606	5642/1	45	23	6.500,00	
Кочани	Слатина	13606	5642	05	56	6.500,00	
Кочани	Слатина	13606	5643	85	10	6.500,00	
Кочани	Слатина	13606	5644	10	29	6.500,00	
Кочани	Слатина	13606	5656	10	59	6.500,00	
Кочани	Слатина	13606	5647/1	1	61	6.500,00	
Кочани	Слатина	13606	5649/1	95	20	6.500,00	
Кочани	Слатина	13606	5647/2	56	25	6.500,00	
Кочани	Слатина	13606	5649/2	03	97	6.500,00	
Се вкупно:				4	87	69	

2. НАДОМЕСТ (ЗАКУПНИНА)

2.1. Закупецот е должен да плаќа годишна закупнина во вкупен износ од **31.700,00 денари (триесет и една илјада и седумсто денари)**, за вкупната површина од член 1 на овој договор.

2.2. Износот на закупнината за тековната година закупецот е должен да ја плаќа најдоцна до 31 декември во тековната година.

2.3. Надоместокот се уплаќа на сметка на Буџетот на Република Македонија. Закупецот е должен примерок од уплатницата за платена закупнина да достави до Подрачната Единица на Министерството за земјоделство, шумарство и водостопанство каде што се наоѓа земјиштето.

3. ВРЕМЕТРАЕЊЕ НА ДОГОВОРОТ

Договорот за краткорочен закуп се склучува на време од 5 (пет) години, сметано од денот на стапувањето на договорот во сила.


Република Македонија
МИНИСТЕРСТВО ЗА ЗЕМЈОДЕЛСТВО,
ШУМАРСТВО И ВОДОСТОПАНСТВО
 Бр. 08-8745/2
 25 Април 2008 година
 Скопје

Врз основа на точка 7.1. од Основниот договор за долгорочен закуп на земјоделско земјиште бр. 08-8745/1 од 04.09.2002 година, склучен помеѓу договорните страни, се склучува овој

АНЕКС ДОГОВОР бр. 1

ДОГОВОРНИ СТРАНИ:

1. Давател на закупот: Република Македонија претставувана од министерот за земјоделство, шумарство и водостопанство Ацо Спасеноски **(во натамошен текст: закуподавач)**.

2. Корисник на закупот ДПТУ „АРКОМ“ ДООЕЛ увоз – извоз Штип застапувано од директорот Јордан Арсовски **(во натамошниот текст: закуппримач)**.

ПРЕДМЕТ НА АНЕКС ДОГОВОРОТ:

Предмет на овој Анекс - Договор е промена на напред наведениот основен договор за долгорочен закуп и тоа:

Во точка 1.1 површината од **609 44 09ха** се заменува со зборите "вкупна површина од **339ха 44ар 93м²**" заради изваѓање на дел од површините по основа на денационализација, дополнително остапување на слободно земјиште и површини кој немаат статус на земјоделско земјиште, за истото, подетално е прикажано во следниот преглед:

ПРЕГЛЕД бр.1

РЕКАПИТУЛАЦИЈА НА ВКУПНАТА ПОВРШИНА НА ЗАКУПОПРИМАЧОТ ДООЕЛ "АРКОМ" - ШТИП ЗА КОЈ Е НОСИТЕЛ НА КОРИСНИЧКОТО ПРАВО НА НЕДВИЖНОСТА

Р бр	КАТАСТАРСКА ОПШТИНА	Површини кој се користат по Анекс договор			Денацио-нализиран површини			Дополнително остапени површини			Површини кој немаат статус на земјоделско земјиште			Се вкупно по основен договор		
		ха	ар	м ²	ха	ар	м ²	ха	ар	м ²	ха	ар	м ²	ха	ар	м ²
1	Соколарци	18	02	04				3	98	63				22	00	67
2	Жиганци	53	44	11				4	56	24				58	00	35
3	Новоселани	31	15	43				12	12	36				43	27	79
4	Врбица	135	75	01	9	81	05	174	56	98	19	79	320	32	83	
5	Лепопелци	101	08	34				56	33	32	25	25	157	66	91	
СЕ ВКУПНО:		339	44	93	9	81	05	251	57	53	45	04	601	28	55	

Точката 2.1. се менува и гласи "Висината на закупнината за земјиштето од точка 1.1. на овој договор изнесува:

- за површините од **236ха 83ар 35м² X 150 кгр. = 35.525 кгр** зрно пченица по хектар изразена во денарска противвредност и тоа во катастарските општини:

- за површините од **102ха 61ар 58м² X 350 кгр. = 35.915 кгр.** зрно пченица по хектар изразена во денарска противвредност и тоа во катастарските општини:

Закуппримачот е должен износот од закупнината да ја плаќа на сметка на Буџетот на Република Македонија најдоцна до 31 декември од тековната година а примерок од уплатницата за платена закупнина да ја достави до Подрачната единица при Министерството за земјоделство, шумарство и водостопанство.

Овој Анекс - Договор е составен во 6 (шест) еднообразни примероци од кои 4 (четири) за закуподавачот и 2 (два) за закуппримачот.

Анекс - Договорот е склучен на ден _____ година и е составен дел на Основниот договор бр. 08-8745/1.

ЗАКУПОПРИМАЧ

ДПТУ „АРКОМ“ ДООЕЛ

Јордан Арсовски

ЗАКУПОДАВАЧ

Република Македонија
 Министерство за земјоделство,
 шумарство и водостопанство

МИНИСТЕР,
 Ацо Спасеноски

изготвил: дипл.инг.арг.Горѓе Дишленковиќ
 одобрил: дипл.инг.арг.Бошко Стојаноски

Total agricultural State Land 00	Rounded total in ha	E/ha	200,000
Rental income as if 90% let		TOTAL	5.550.000
Capital value with vacant possession		TOTAL	555.000.000
Capital value of State agricultural land as if 90% let	%	E/ha	
Value during 30 year lease term			
Rental income per annum		5.550.000	
Years Purchase 7% for 30 years		11,4	63.270.000
Reversion in 30 years		555.000.000	
<i>Deferred 30 years @ 7%</i>		0.13	72.150.000
		TOTAL	135.420.000
<i>Figure rounded to less than 150 million</i>			

Presented by Kiril Georgievski

Thank You for your attention