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Abstract. The aim of present work is to attempt a comparative analysis of the situation of agriculture and rural development between two countries, Romania in Eastern Europe and Algeria in North Africa. Agriculture and Rural Area in these two countries are still significant - economically and socially - as they are home and livelihoods of millions of people. The agricultural sector can thus claim to be in each country an important link in the economy, though often lag behind other sectors (energy and mining in Algeria, wood industry, engineering industry, SMEs and tourism in Romania). Nevertheless, this sector participates to the consolidation of the national GDP and to the maintenance of rural population, despite the strong migration trend and the profound changes in consumption patterns. In both countries, there is also a strong movement for reform and sweeping changes in agrarian structures and the whole rural economy. But, if at the macroeconomic level there has been a real change (changing from one state manager to a regulatory state, partial or full privatization of agricultural land, trade liberalization and agricultural markets, subsidies reduce, liberalization of producer prices and consumption) in terms of regional development, farm development and rural population, the progress is quite concerning. Thus, the two countries meet the same difficulties in terms of complexity of agrarian structure, fragmentation and cramped conditions of agricultural land, low agricultural production (food, etc.), deficiency, food dependency and rural poverty.
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INTRODUCTION

The analysis tries to show the similarities between the situations of each country, through a few key indicators, but it also tries to show some notable differences. The objective is to make an inventory to understand the real situation and to shed light on issues concerning agriculture and rural development in these countries. The main key indicators on which it was possible to work are: macroeconomic indicators related to agriculture, population, agriculture and rural land structures, production capacity, indicators related to the coverage food consumption and the resulting food dependency, and indicators on human development in rural areas.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The research is based on a comparative analysis of statistics, facts and events observed in both agricultural and rural parts of Algeria and Romania, in terms of their structures and political aspects of agricultural and rural development. It takes into account recent periods and emphasis on the problems of production, organization and development models. It analyses the situation in terms of living standards of rural populations. The quantitative and qualitative
information comes from literature reviews, statistical journals and monographs, national and international (including ethnic databases Mediterranean CIHEAM and FAO). At the micro economic level (zone), it has been used the own observations and analysis made by the authors during the last ten years in several rural areas in Algeria and Romania. The research focuses on the Romanian state, on the management of natural resources, on the land ownership patterns, on the production systems, as well as on the development indicators of rural economy. It was also used various materials, informational, scientific and methodological issues, including local and regional statistics, conclusions and lessons drawn from the authors from their practical experience.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. General situation: the real-life situations, the demographic, economic and socio-political contexts differ between the two countries: the size and number of people are relatively more important in Algeria, but the area reserved for agriculture and forests and the weight of rural economic life seem much more important in Romania. The histories and cultures of each of these countries have significant differences, although we are aware that the Romanian and Algerian peasants have suffered disruption and similar tragic events (wars, foreign invasions, revolts against the feudal lords and dictators, agrarian reform). The recent history of these two countries is also illustrated by the design and the implementation of a development model focused on state intervention, on high rates of collectivization, on the agricultural cooperative system, although a private or family system has continued to provide basic food for the rural population (and for an important part of the city population) and to provide a workforce often abundant. This model has been challenging since the late '80s, resulting in significant structural changes - patterns of production and consumption. Despite the differences (tab 1.), there are - relatively speaking - the same difficulties and the same structural constraints. The share of agriculture in GDP and the employment in agriculture in total employment in both countries remain modest and have a strong tendency to regress.

In Algeria, agriculture and rural life are important sectors for the economy. The agricultural sector has significantly contributed to the development of the country during the colonial and early independence. But it took more than three decades to have a relatively modest contribution to the gross domestic product (10-12%). This sector has also directed 10% of the total value added (VAT) and has attended at all and for all that 20-25% of the total workforce (Bedrani, 2008; Sahli, 2003). This sector had still had to deal with many agricultural policy reforms and several remedial actions of its production structures. Starting in the late 80s, the economic reforms permitted a revival of agricultural activity and a profound restructuring of agrarian structures.

In Romania, the importance of rural areas is given by the great weight of it in the surface of the country. Thus, 87.1% of national territory is divided into areas with high growth potential and a vital social role. Throughout the economy, agriculture is a major sector. But the declining share of agriculture in GDP and the growth rates of non-agricultural sectors has become a phenomenon in Romania, particularly in the recent years, despite the fact that this has not benefited other sectors. In fact, Romania has not kept pace with the trend of the developed European countries. Thus, since 1998, services in Romania have recorded significant increases in non-agricultural sectors and the holding of agriculture to the creation of GDP was over 38%. It has sharply decreased from 21.8% in 1990 to 5.68% in 2007 (Merce and. Pocol, 2009).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specification</th>
<th>Romania</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Algeria</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Similarities (+)</th>
<th>Differences (-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface (in km²)</td>
<td>237.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>2340.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population (1000 inh.) (1)</td>
<td>21.537</td>
<td>35.600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-) A larger population in Algeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population density (inh. per km²)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-) Average density low in Algeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural population (2)</td>
<td>9.659</td>
<td>12.300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(+) A relatively large rural population despite a regressive evolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)/(1)</td>
<td>44,85%</td>
<td>42,48%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(+) About the same rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total active population (3)</td>
<td>9.994</td>
<td>10.544</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(+) About the same proportions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total occupied population (5)</td>
<td>9.353</td>
<td>9.472</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-) More rural and agricultural population occupied in Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural occupied population (6)</td>
<td>4.281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-) More agricultural assets in Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population occupied in agriculture (7)</td>
<td>2757</td>
<td>1.105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-) More population employed in agriculture in Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAA (millions of ha) (1)</td>
<td>14,73</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>(-) Romania has more farmland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigated area (millions of ha) (2)</td>
<td>0,32</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(+) Similar weakness in irrigated land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total GDP (Mill. of Lei)</td>
<td>412,761</td>
<td>67,920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-) More irrigated land in Algeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural GDP (Mill. of Lei)</td>
<td>23,454,8</td>
<td>6,792</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-) More irrigated land in Algeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural GDP/ Total GDP (%)</td>
<td>5,68</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-) The share of agricultural GDP is higher in Algeria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own processing data
Both countries have a problem to present a clear vision for agriculture and rural development. They have also the same technical and managerial problems to revive the productive apparatus, in spite of natural resources, programs and multiple projects often financed on the basis of oil revenues (as in Algeria) and aid from the outside (the European Union in the case of Romania).

2. The rural and agricultural population: Overall, it can consider that there is a similarity between the rural populations because, despite everything, there are between 40-45% rural populations in total populations of each country. The phenomenon, still fresh, of rural and agricultural exodus and the emigration may also be a similar feature that leads, in fact, some decay of the countryside. However in the case of Algeria, the situation is different because of the country's youth and positive demographic trends in the last thirty years. Although there was a strong tide of rural exodus, it is much slower at present. There is a trend of farming depopulation, but, finally, the active people don’t leave the countryside or they are oriented through non-agricultural sectors. The similarities are more important in the economic situation of rural families. The indicators in agricultural and rural employment, the participation rates, but also the access to decent living conditions (isolation, housing, water sanitation, health, education) reveal, in both countries, the same problems for the rural families.

The latest estimates show that Algeria had 35.6 million inhabitants (January 2010); the average density is relatively low (16 inhabitants per km$^2$), but densities in the north of the country are quite high (over 50 people/km$^2$, or 100 to 500 people per km$^2$ in mountainous areas) (ONS-2009 et ONS/RGPH, 2008). The country is characterized by the existence of a young and dynamic population (over 70% aged under 30 and over 60% have exceeded the level of secondary school), but also by an increasing saturation of rural areas, and in other cases by a wide dispersion of the population. The most common rural areas house a large population (more than 13 million inhabitants, about 40% of the total population, spread over more than 60% of municipalities). The rural population faces significant difficulties due to the weak basic infrastructure, to the living conditions, to the access to facilities and to the work opportunities (Sahli, 2003, 2004). But the rural population is at present and can be in the future an issue with great potential. There are 1.500.000 farmers (MADR/R.G.A 2002, 2003), in majority concentrated in the foothills of mountains, coastal plains, interior plains and in some oases of the Sahara.

In Romania, the rural population (9.6 million inhabitants in 2007) represents 44.85% of the total population. The Romanian population is characterized by a pronounced degree of rurality; many municipalities and villages reflect the greater incidence of rural compared with other European Union countries. The low population density in rural areas - approximately 48 inhabitants per km$^2$ - is below the national average and below the European average. The demographic situation of the rural area is characterized by a continuing decline of the population, due to the decrease of total population, to the lower birth rates and to the phenomenon of internal and external migration (NATIONAL STRATEGY PLAN FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT, 2008). Regarding the phenomenon of migration, we talk about the rural exodus, the migration to urban areas but also to the emigration abroad, especially of young people and women. This latter phenomenon is particularly critical and may lead to a general impoverishment of rural areas. All these changes have led to a process of reducing the total rural population and the active rural population. The farming population is aging, but accounts 29.48% of the employed population (out of which 36% has over 55 years).

3. The agricultural land: Romania is clearly much advantaged in terms of agricultural land resources that Algeria (more than 14 million hectares of UAA against 8.5
million hectares) and in terms of agricultural land per capita (in average: 0.64 ha per capita in Romania against 0.24 ha per capita in Algeria). In Algeria, the geographical location and the climatic conditions make it even more difficult the release of sufficient land for agriculture. However, it is curious to note that in Romania, the results in terms of agricultural production are far from reflecting the high potential of agricultural land, particularly when considering the very low share of irrigated land (2.2% of UAA against 4% of the UAA in Algeria). This fact can be explained by the current situation of land ownership patterns (small private properties fragmented, living in subsistence, against medium and large mechanized but poorly managed properties)

In Algeria, from the agricultural area of 47.5 million hectares used, there are 32 million hectares of steppe, nearly 7 million of forest and scrub, but only 8.5 million ha of agricultural useful area (approximately 3% of the total land area). On the UAS, more than 3 million ha are cultivated by dry cereals, 5.7 million ha belong to private owners, 2.5 million ha belong to the private domain of the State, granted to individual or collective operators, and nearly 300,000 ha of farms operated by government are reserved to the production of seeds and seedlings. In terms of ownership structures, the situation is relatively complicated because we are facing with various forms of organization (Sahli, 2003; 2004). Most of the farmland lies in the north of the country and the rest consists of steep mountainous terrain, arid and semi-arid steppe and desert area. This complex situation has thus largely contributed to the delay of the land-reform and has also been unable to allow consolidation of shares that would have prevented the fragmentation of land (Bessaoud, 2005). A new land law was recently enacted as part of the Agricultural Orientation Act; it is about the concession of land and the constitution of civil societies in agriculture.

In Romania, the structure of land fund highlights the large proportion of the agricultural area; about 62% of the total area of land fund, allow Romania to be considered among the most important European countries in terms of agricultural potential. The structure and the distribution of property shows that the largest share of the agricultural area of the country, 90.45% is represented by private ownership and only 9.55% by the public domain of the State. But irrigated land is low and represents only a small portion of farmland.

4. Agricultural production: Although Romania is more favoured, its production is quite volatile and does not seem to account for its high potential agricultural land. Although the results are more positive in Romania than in Algeria on commodities, they are fairly modest in terms of market garden products and meat. But, there is a certain similarity in terms of weak productivity and losses which have an impact on food addiction. Both countries import a large portion of the food for their populations. They also face the same constraints and structural problems in terms of investment in agricultural sector, despite the major programs launched in recent years.

Algeria is mainly grown food grains like wheat and durum wheat (more than 3 million hectares in dry land alternated with fallow), pulses, but also irrigated crops (with a rate of irrigation of up to 4% of UAA): gardening crops (potato, tomato, onion), arboriculture and viticulture (grape production and table wine as an appellation of origin intended mainly for export). Strides are being made for the sheep and poultry. But cereals and pulses chains, and the dairy industry are not very productive and the coverage rate of consumption of cereals, pulses and milk rotate around 30%, 35% and 45%. Food dependency in basic foodstuffs (cereals, pulses, seeds, powdered milk, oilseeds, sugar and veterinary products) is therefore increasingly strong (Sahli, 2006), MADR, 2006 and MIPI, 2010). However, the situation began to change from 2000 with the launch of the National Plan for Agricultural and Rural Development (PNDAR). In 2004, the agriculture sector confirms, with a rate of 8.4%, its third
In terms of contribution to GDP after the oil and gas sectors and services (between 2004 and 2006 this rate rose from an average of 10 to 16% per year), mainly through the production of fruits and vegetables, red and white meat. With a value of 624 billion dinars in 2004, the average annual growth of production value is 14.8% over the last five years (Bedrani, 2008; MIPI, 2010).

In Romania, the crops account for 64% of the UAA and 60% of the value of agricultural production. Three plants occupy almost 60% of arable land: corn, wheat and sunflower. Yields and production volumes vary from one year to another, due to climatic hazards. Romania is also a major producer of potatoes (the third European producer after Germany and Poland). Romania is also the sixth largest producer of wine in Europe. Livestock production accounts for 37% of the value of agricultural production. Romania does not have a solid pipeline of beef production to meet the requirements of supermarkets. Livestock is mainly oriented towards the pig, dairy and poultry. Agricultural productivity is generally low, owing to the influence of an environment that does not encourage investment, limits the agricultural land market and because of the inadequate state, from technical and environmentally point of view.

5. Farm income: overall, we can consider that we are facing the same process, in both countries, but in rural Romania, the big part of the income comes from agricultural activities and those who agree to remain in the rural area apparently derive their income from agricultural work. In Algeria, even though more and more people invest in the field of agriculture (as a consequence of aid granted under the state programs) and derive much of their income from agricultural production (mainly fruit and vegetables and red meat). The majority of inhabitants of rural area practice commonly multiple jobs; the practice of agriculture is supported as a secondary activity.

In Algeria, although it has increased significantly, the farm income is down compared to incomes from other sectors (about half compared to the industrial income). However, it is worth noting a large difference between, on the one hand, farmers with small family farm and located in difficult areas (mountains, oases of the Sahara) and on the other hand, farmers exploiting the medium properties granted by modern governments (in the plains of the north of the country) and agro-pastoralists in the steppe zone, having a large herd of sheep. The firsts are quasi-subsistence and are forced to use multiple job holdings. The latter rely on agriculture and livestock, but also on off-farm income. The state assistance will give priority to the latter.

In Romania, the average monthly income per person in rural areas is about 95 euros compared to urban areas (135 euros). Of the 95 euros, 12 euros are revenues from non-farming activities (Source: PNDR 2008). Most income in rural areas comes, however, from agriculture (45%) and is largely represented by income in kind (food produced for the own household), a clear evidence of the nature of subsistence of agriculture. Diversified sources of income may actually reduce the risk of poverty among farmers, who obviously are a group particularly exposed at risk of poverty and social exclusion in rural areas.

6. Coverage rates of food consumption: The similarities are striking in this area; both countries have become in the space of two decades major importers of basic foodstuffs and agricultural inputs. This was, in both cases, determined by demographic changes, urbanization and the progressive change of consumption patterns on the one hand and secondly by the damage of the agricultural and rural economy. This situation could be observed in many countries in transition from socialist to market economies or in emerging countries.
In Algeria, as demand continues to grow, it was often difficult to ensure sufficient supply, including basic foodstuffs. Analyses by product pipeline have clearly demonstrated the gap that existed between the needs expressed by people on the one hand and the availability of local products, on the other hand. This gap was often filled by a heavy reliance and often expensive to import products on the world market. The analysis also showed relatively high dislocation segments of different sectors, despite the substantial state intervention in the regulation of price to support production and consumption. We are thus faced with a situation of high dependency and a fairly high extroversion of food chains. Thus, despite great progress, the coverage rate of food consumption by the local agricultural production are: 30-35% for cereals, 30% of pulses, 40-45% of milk and milk products, 10% of vegetable oil, but 90-100% of fruits and vegetables, poultry products and red meat (Sahli, 2004, 2006; Ciheam–Mediterra 2009). This has resulted in a food safety problem that was always assured thanks to the available population of primary commodities, often supported through subsidy policies of the consumer price and release financial resources for import. The food and agricultural imports in 2004 accounted for more than 25% of the country's total physical imports and over 30% of total imports by value. In 2008, the bill for food and agricultural imports totalled 7.5 billion U.S. Dollars (MIPI, 2010).

In Romania, if we analyze the coverage of domestic demand, it is clear that imports represent more than half of the food needed. The lack of a coherent agricultural policy, the land fragmentation and the poor absorption of EU funds has led the country to resort to large imports. These have cost in 2009 the equivalent of 3.7 billion euros. The largest imports were represented by the pork meat, which has recorded the value of 380 million euros. There are some agricultural sectors in which imports account for up to 80% of the national need. Romania has also significantly imported fruits, meat, poultry (157 million euros) and sugar (193 million euros). Finally, in 2009, Romania imported 766 600 tons of maize valued at 124.3 million euros, 584 800 tonnes of wheat worth 72.4 million euros and 134 400 Sunflower tons worth 65.8 million euros (www.insse.ro). Imports of food products have been greatly favoured by the large supermarket chains.

7. Agricultural and rural reforms: there are many similarities in this area, given by the historical developments and by the efforts on economic and structural reforms. Both countries are currently engaged in major reforms on ownership structures, on modernization of production systems, and on actions that support rural incomes.

In Algeria, the agricultural sector had had to deal with many agricultural policy reforms and several remedial actions of its production structures. With the launch of a comprehensive agricultural plan and rural development (PNDA in 2000 and PNDAR in 2001), the situation regarding production began to change. The situation could evolve positively with the recent law on the concession of agricultural lands of the state sector. The rural world, although often marginalized, has also focused the attention of several authorities in Algeria in terms of various activities and development plans. However, the countryside was seen as a useful set of spaces to be fitted by a large rural population whose mission was the rural exodus. The special case of the Sustainable Rural Development Strategy (SDRD) and the policy of agricultural and rural renewal (PRR) open a way toward establishing the conditions for the revitalization of a rural world still quite involved in the overall development process of the country.

In Romania, after the fall of the communist regime, the transitional government has redistributed farmland of the old cooperatives to the peasants. The former state enterprises have, in turn, been privatized, now constituting the core of large farms that can sometimes reach tens of thousands of hectares. This duality of structure is complemented by medium-
sized farms of 10-50 hectares that use only 6% of the land. Under the Common Agricultural Policy, a financial assistance of the European Union is granted to Romania by the European Fund for Agriculture and Rural Development and amounted to 8.022 billion euros. The objective of the European Union and the Romanian Government is to provide the funds necessary to bring out the projects and develop networks while preserving the attractiveness and local development sector. These measures represent a National Rural Development Plan (PNDR) which had as main objective to reduce the disparities in terms of socio-economic development of Romania as compared to other Member States of the European Union. PNDR meets the requirements of rural development in the context of sustainable development.

8. Human development indicators: Despite some differences in form, the situation in rural areas is difficult. Human development indicators in rural area are clearly below of the same indicators in urban area. In the rural regions, it is found more unemployment; more people reaching the limits of poverty. We find in both countries roughly the same rate of isolation (because of the remoteness and poor quality roads and infrastructure), the same low rate of access to social services (health care, education, cultural and sports, access to drinking water and sewerage networks). Despite the considerable investment made by the states, there are still gaps and unmet needs in the areas of food, transportation, access to markets and social progress. The commitment to new policies for agriculture and rural development financed from public budget (as in Algeria) or from the European Structural Funds (for Romania) reveal a promising future for the rural two countries.

In Algeria, the majority of rural areas have to face the same constraints: the management of natural resources dominated by problems of high pressure through a process of degradation and desertification, reduction of agricultural potential, lack of mobilization of surface water and excessive fragmentation of land. The infrastructural and socio-cultural facilities are relatively good (95% electrification rate, over 50% of homes connected to drinking water and sanitation, each locality has at least one treatment centre and a bus for school transport). But there are still delays, difficult to catch: population is faced with a particularly lack of transportation roads and with poor quality of health services; economic activities are still weak and inadequate, but often dominated by a tendency to multiple developments (CENEAP, 2004; CENEAP/PNUD, 2004). The underdevelopment of economic process is largely due to the destabilization of the traditional rural society by the effects of population growth and the drastic reduction of resources. Overall, we are witnessing a situation of rural poverty that affects more and more rural families. The poverty is also reflected by the scarcity of resources and limited opportunities for employment (CENEAP, 2004; Sahli, 2009).

In Romania, despite the efforts led by the Romanian Government and the European Union aid, poverty levels are high and will increase due to the current economic crisis. Poverty in rural areas is an important aspect because rural areas account for a large part of the territory. Poverty has specific characteristics in rural areas that have been neglected by public institutions, their involvement being extremely low. We note that the standard of living, measured by GDP per capita is generally lower in rural areas compared to urban areas. The degree of poverty is more pronounced in rural than urban areas (30.6% vs. 11.8% in 2005), because of remoteness, poor infrastructure and poor access to basic services (The fourth report on economic and social cohesion, 2007). There are areas where the population is at risk of social exclusion, especially for the elderly and children. Regarding access to education, many schools in rural areas require rehabilitation and buildings more appropriate to educational needs. ICT are rare and the equipment necessary for training students is obsolete or absent. Housing is another aspect that must be analyzed when we talk about rural areas.
The comfort measured by access to drinking water and sewage networks is lower in rural compared with urban ones. Regarding the infrastructure, it is still inadequate in many rural areas. It is also necessary to emphasize that the provision of public transport services in some rural areas is characterized by a wide geographical dispersion.

CONCLUSIONS

Following the analysis results and comparing the situation of agriculture and rural areas of Algeria and Romania, it is necessary to stress the dire situation of their rural areas and the weakness of their agricultural structures. Certainly, there are big differences between the two countries on agricultural resources (including land resources and water, apparently more important in Romania) and productive performance, but the main indicators that characterize both major agricultural commodity chains and the living standards of rural people indicate risk situations. So, it is urgent to take them seriously, as it is urgent to support the expectations and the needs of rural populations. The implementations of real strategies in order to end the crisis often delayed. However, the challenges for the future seem to be important, both regarding the necessary support for the protection of natural areas and land degradation and regarding the need to establish an agricultural development policy which provides food security, employment and good income for farmers and their families. The challenges ahead remain linked also to the important role of agriculture in the economy.

The reforms undertaken in recent years by both countries herald a more optimistic future. It seems that the efforts and investments to boost agricultural production and stop the bleeding of rural gradually tend to change a situation marked by stagnation or weakness of agricultural production, as well as a deep social crisis. Applied to the rural world and especially to agricultural lands, this process could cause a movement that will affect all actors and economic and social structures. Such movement is particularly interesting insofar as it can cause a profound change in the role of the state in economic development and social regulation, and push toward accountability of social actors at local level.

The current situation in both countries is acute, but not desperate as the efforts made in the various programs can help the initiation of the development production process and the management of a number of social problems. Nevertheless, it must recognize that the actions, while important, are still below the needs expressed and the risks involved.
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