

SWG
RRD

Agriculture products and tourism value chain



Agriculture products are ranked after the analysis of regional strategies, general brochures, personal experiences from each region

Main criteria used for ranking: total investments in the region per individual product, employability, revenues from the production, possibility of each product for the farmer diversification, possibility to include more women and youth per each product

PRESPA

- Apple production
- Cherries
- Honey production
- Medicinal and aromatic plants
- Beans,
- Nuts and almonds

RECOMMENDATIONS

Main potential: favourable conditions for growing apple and strong tourism in the region

Main gaps: small number of processors and bad links with local catering

Main stakeholders: apple producers in the region willing to introduce apple processing and gastronomy operators willing to develop dishes with apples and to use locally produced preserves

Type of support

- Investments in processing and development of new products (including gastronomy)
- Provision of equipment for processing to small rural households
- Assistance with regulating processing of apples in rural households and their marketing, including direct marketing



Apple Value chain

(...the product which is destroying its own environment...)



Main motive: adding value to the apple for creating new local market and decreasing intensification of the production considering use of chemicals...

Strength: huge production with long tradition

Weakness: low level or no processing in the region, huge pressure on local natural resources;

Opportunity: marketing of apple preserves within the local tourism/catering

Major threat: processed products do not respond to required standards since GAP is not introduced in row apple production, neither processing in rural households is regulated

Good practices to look at: Processing of apples and placement of apple products in UNESCO MAB Reserve in Rhon, Germany

RECOMMENDATIONS

Main potential: numerous nature protected areas in the region

Main gaps: lack of continuous support to nature conservation and adjacent activities for valorising this sector through tourism and environmental protection

Main stakeholders: authorities of nature protected areas, CSO, academic, educational and research institutions

Type of support

- ✓ Establishment of regional DMO...
- ✓ Development of integrated tourist offer through establishment of partnerships between operators including professional knowledge providers (birdwatching, fun tours, caves visits...)
- ✓ Standardisation of accommodation
- ✓ Establishment of stronger cooperation with specialized (avitoourism & other specialized eco-tourism) tour operators from abroad (Germany, Holland, Bulgaria, USA)
- ✓ Development of new services (sailing boats, kayaking, etc.)
- ✓ Placing new signposts and maintaining the mountain routes

Tourism

(...valorising exceptional nature protected areas – the opposite to developed mass tourism...)

Main motive: utilizing numerous nature protected areas and their biodiversity, geodiversity and waters for income and employment creation in the region



Strength: 3 national parks and number of other protected areas, wetlands, lakes and mountains, exceptional biodiversity of birds etc.

Weakness: non existing integrated products from the specialized branches of eco-tourism; lack of local partnerships between VC operators for managing this VC

Opportunity: linking locally active CSO, academic and research institutions with service providers offering accommodation and catering and employing young people to guide and animate guest

Major threat: further pollution of waters from agriculture; big fluctuation in group of people who were running quality activities in the area due to weak support to this kind of tourism

Good practices to look at: National parks and Ramsar areas in Europe