

SOCIAL FARMING IN ROMANIA: A SYNCHRONIC APPROACH

SĂLĂȘAN COSMIN^{*1}, RAȚĂ GEORGETA²

¹*Banat University of Agricultural Science and Veterinary Medicine
"King Michael I of Romania" from Timișoara, Faculty of Management and Rural Tourism,
Timișoara, Romania*

²*Center for Promoting Lifelong Learning, Timișoara, Romania*

*Corresponding author's e-mail: cosminsalasan@gmail.com

Abstract: *Social farming, a form of social and health care combining social work services and farming, has been practiced in Romania for decades. The paper presents the most important features of social farming at international and European levels, and analyses its current state at national, regional and local levels based on interviews with representatives of authorised protected entities, cooperatives, family farms, houses of mutual aid, NGOs (associations and foundations), and SMMs. Social farming needs recognition at national level, establishment of a social farming regulatory framework, building up of social farming networks, creation of a social farming database, inclusion in education programmes, in research programmes and in the sustainable development strategy, as well as strengthening of the role of civil society.*

Key words: *social farming, Romania, green care, social and health policies*

INTRODUCTION

Care farming or **green care** or **social farming** describes “those farming practices aimed at *promoting disadvantaged people's rehabilitation and care* and/or at *integrating people with 'low contractual capacity'*” [1].

Care farms or **health farms** or **social farms** [13]: are operated by social cooperatives of work integration; are operated on common ground; are operated “on residual land resources left in condition of abandonment”; employ a significant number of women; integrate a large number of local outer networks; practice biological production; produce added high value products; produce multiple products; provide “a sharply ‘open’ reality to territory and local community”; request a lot of manual labour; support connected activities (didactic-educative activities, direct sale of products, hospitality and catering industry, transformation inside the company, etc.); support small-medium farming activities; use eco-compatible productive techniques.

There are five stages in **social farming** that disadvantaged people have to go through: *Technical / procedural interaction with plants, animals and tools* → *Dialogue and relationship with a tutor, with a guiding farmer* → *Enlargement of the relationships with a larger group of people* → *Full inclusion and recognition of the work* → *Economic recognition of the active participation of participants / users* [2].

Social farming is in line with U.N.O. [18], which aims at promoting, protecting and ensuring equal and complete access and practice of the entire set of rights and basic liberties by all people presenting any form of incapacities promoting respect and guided by the acknowledgement of personal freedom in making individual choices, non-discrimination, acting within the frame of an inclusive society, respecting the dissimilarities and accepting the incapacities as measure of diversity, fairness in access to opportunities, gender non-discrimination and respect for the evolving capacities of children with disabilities and respect to the development and achievements of incapacitated children.

The **target groups** as defined at the **EU level** consist of the following types, groups and categories [13]: refugees seeking protection, asylum applicants, expecting to be granted the habitation rights willing to actively integrate the society and customs including employment; infant carefulness and watchfulness for incapacitated children aged 0-4 and

extra-school watch and care kids until 12 years of age; people aged over 55 presenting specific symptoms or being affected by dementia; seniors over 55 years of age requiring assistance in spending their time; former and current addicted persons isolated from the active part of the society; former and current convicted persons having difficulties to reintegrate into the society after having served time for their unlawful conduct; immigrants; people failing to get employed over long periods of time and with no defined perspective of re-employment; persons affected by autism, children or adults presenting specific autistic syndrome symptoms combined or not with other forms of incapacities; persons affected by the burn-out syndrome or presenting the distress of burn-out symptoms originating from professional or private environment and where the full employment is provisionally not possible; persons presenting incapacities of psychical or physical nature, challenged or impaired preventing them from complete non-discriminatory interaction with the society; persons previously affected by accidents or diseases resulting in severe brain damage impact and facing constraints when attempting to normally act in society; youngsters originating from or integrated in education systems dealing with special needs related to psychological challenges and/or interaction issues; youngsters somewhat mentally challenged and requiring assistance and support to actively integrate into society.

Several EU countries have adopted Social Farming (and, implicitly, Animal-Assisted Therapy, Animal-Assisted Pedagogic Therapy, and Horticultural Therapy) as a multifunctional innovative strategy: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, The Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Luxemburg, Macedonia, The Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom. Romania is not among them.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This paper presents a synchronic approach in the comparative study of social farming in Europe and Romania [2] based on both literature and official documents.

RESEARCH RESULTS

Back in 2014, the **National Rural Development Program (NRDP)** published a booklet on the **adaptation and implementation of social farming** [12] in which it is seen as a way to reduce disparities between regions through the consolidation of economic, social and territorial cohesion. It is seen as playing an important role in rural development programmes by supporting the setting up of rural enterprises involved in co-therapy, social development and inclusion on the labour market, and services for disadvantaged people using agricultural resources. Thus, through cooperation between different administrative and political entities (agriculture, education, employment, health, justice, social affairs), agricultural services turn into social services: in addition to basic agricultural activities, social farms invite people from disadvantaged groups to participate in agricultural activities, and social farmers are rewarded.

According to Mihalache [8], in social economy the conventional operations include farming crop or animal production and agri-touristic activities. These types of actions are adapted basically in regions where the entrepreneurship benefits of a greater acceptance and subsequently the social economy. Particular productions based on bio-production and processing are encouraged including various forms of short food chains. Aside from the agriculture and food processing traditional rural crafts are included incorporating manufactures and handmade local products.

As far as social farming is concerned, in Romania: they adopted two important laws – **Law No. 221 from November 11, 2010** [5]”and **Law No. 219 from July 23, 2015** [4] and a national strategy [3]; they developed guides to setting up “social enterprises for

beneficiaries of guaranteed minimum income”, for persons with disabilities, for Roma people, and for “young people over 18 who leave the institutionalised child protection system” [14-17]; they conducted studies on social economy developing occupations, including their growth potential in agriculture, with gender mainstreaming on the labour market [7]; they established 247 LAGs in 17 counties: 18 (Alba), 19 (Argeș), 11 (Brăila), 12 (Constanța), 23 (Dâmbovița), 14 (Dolj), 13 (Galați), 14 (Gorj), 8 (Hunedoara), 24 (Iași), 4 (Ilfov), 18 (Maramureș), 8 (Neamț), 10 (Satu Mare), 14 (Sibiu), 15 (Suceava), 11 (Timiș); and they published a brochure on **Social Farming** [12], but that was a unique occurrence of the term in both official and non-official approaches.

However, **the current state of Social Farming in Romania** should be assessed from several points of view:

Dimension. Romania has experienced different forms of social farming beginning with the 90s' by integrating these practices as a novel experience with increased sustainability. Though they do not use such phrases as care farming, farming for health, green care, green therapies, or social farming, the Romanians have unknowingly practiced social farming under the form of different operations or practices in the care, rehabilitation, social reintegration, and training of the disadvantaged people or of people with particular needs, aiming at enabling them to boost self-esteem and participation in social life, to contribute to their well-being, to facilitate learning, to improve health and social inclusion, to re-establish contact with the natural environment and productive activity. One last mention: **it takes place on farm-like sites.** "In Romania, they are familiar with **social economy, social entrepreneurship** and **social housing** rather than with **social farming**. However, **social farming** belongs to both **social economy** (since agriculture is a main branch of economy), **social entrepreneurship** (since entrepreneurship also belongs to agriculture), and **social housing** (because it also refers to people without homes in the rural area)".

Stakeholders. Ideally, **social economy** relies on the following entities [6], but only black-faced ones are operating in Romania [9]: **Authorised Protected Entities; Cooperatives; Family farms; Houses of mutual economic aid; Non-Governmental Organisations (associations and foundations); Small and Medium Enterprises.** In January 2019, in Romania, there were 304 **Authorised Protected Entities** of which none agriculture-related, 1644 **Houses of Mutual Economic Aid**, of which 6 agriculture-related, and 114,363 **Non-Governmental Organisations (associations and foundations)** [11]: of the 92,403 NGOs labelled *associations*, only 3,860 are related to people with disabilities and to disadvantaged people, but none of them social-farming related; of the 19,707 NGOs labelled *foundations*, only 880 are related to people with disabilities and to disadvantaged people, but none of them social-farming related. The 12 *associations* contacted deal with problem-solving linked to the community issues where Roma people minorities live; building healthy and accessible buildings and new community centres; supporting novel and innovative approaches in Romania's rural area, such as the first travel social business entirely based on community”; developing senses in the sensory garden; introducing and emboldening the rural communities rich in nature and traditions heritage suitable for tourism to introduce forms of responsible tourism with the assistance and the involvement of the community; exchanging knowledge in organic farming; facilitating collaboration between volunteers and host farmers; finding active citizens and developing community-based organizations; Integrating children in loving families; organising annual horse-riding contests for children; organising annual international conferences on complementary therapies in children with disabilities; promoting children's rights and community-supported agriculture; providing building materials, consultancy and training, cultural exchange, education until adulthood, food and accommodation to volunteers in

exchange for labour, health care particularly to the elderly (including home visits), information about organic and traditional farms, positive examples of people who overcome their limits, and know they can live an ordinary life; reducing disaster risks and responding to disasters; repairing and rehabilitating buildings; revitalising horse-riding as a sport for children and teenagers; rising awareness on the society, regarding the difficulties a person with disabilities has to face; selling produce directly from the producer; supporting art production (icons on wood and glass, souvenirs), social integration of young people aged 18+ that can no longer be institutionalised and that are involved in fruit, vegetable, herbs, and Italian cheese production (fresh and matured cheeses), in preserving fruit and vegetables, and in animal breeding (cows, rabbits, chickens) and vulnerable families; training horses; treating children through horse-assisted therapy, people with special needs through horse-assisted therapy, children through horse and dog therapy for neuro-motor disorders (ataxia, dystonia, hemiparesis, infantile cerebral palsy, muscular dystrophy, muscular hypotony, paraparesis, post-traumatic sequelae, Prader-Willi syndrome, pyramidal syndrome, spastic tetra-paresis); psycho-motor disorders (attention deficit hyperactivity syndrome, Down syndrome, psychomotor retard); psychiatric disorders (autism, autistic spectrum disorder, behavioural disorders, depression, mental retard, psychosis, schizophrenia, self-harming), and through horse-riding therapy: arthritis, autism, behavioural disorders, depression, encephalitis, hydrocephalus, polio sequelae; orthopaedic conditions (amputation, congenital hip dislocation, scoliosis); neurological disorders (cranio-cerebral trauma, Down syndrome, emotional disturbance, epilepsy, growth disorder, multiple sclerosis, muscular dystrophy, paralysis, Spina Bifida, spinal cord diseases, visual disturbance). The 6 *foundations contacted deal with*: building Community-Based Organisations capacity; conducting instructive-educational programmes; improving housing and living conditions; organising summer camps for children in foster care or at risk; preventing family abandonment and school dropout; promoting children's rights to prevent abuse, neglect, and exploitation, juvenile justice, migrants' integration and social inclusion, children's rights to prevent abuse, neglect, and exploitation; providing access to health services, community prevention services, education for children and for youth, educational support for children with disabilities, employment services for young people from vulnerable groups, entrepreneurship and financial education for disadvantaged people, family houses and children's access to hosting, care, breeding, education, emotional support, counselling, independent life skills, preparation for family, social, and professional re-integration or integration, family placement, lobby and advocacy for the NGO sector, protected employment for people with disabilities, services protecting and promoting the rights of persons presenting different incapacities, special services for children and their parents, specialised social services for people from vulnerable groups, vocational counselling and pre-professional training; supporting children in trafficking and migration situations, children with severe, medium, and light mental handicap, inclusion of Roma and other minorities communities, young people aged 18+ to integrate socially and professionally; taking care of foundlings; training foster parents and teachers. The 9 *Local Action Groups* contacted deal with: creating and promoting local brands and association in the agri-food sector, associative forms, networks and clusters, operational groups to diversify rural activities, support centres for rural and small urban population: starting associative organisations; developing and modernising villages, associative forms for the diversification of rural activities, non-agricultural activities, rural and micro-urban localities through investments in small scale infrastructure, basic services for population and investments associated to cultural and natural patrimony, social infrastructure, the micro-region through investments in infrastructure and equipment, the social and health infrastructure, villages; encouraging

cooperation through association aiming at finding innovative solutions and at facilitating market access; establishing and developing farms and non-agricultural activities; improving the performance of agricultural holdings, access to affordable services; integrating ethnic minorities (including the Roma), minorities through culture and traditions; investing in broadband infrastructure, in creating and developing activities, in infrastructure and equipment, in renewable energy and energy saving, in social and education infrastructure for marginalized groups, in social and health infrastructure; modernising agricultural and agri-tourism businesses, agricultural and fruit holdings; preventing depopulation through job creation in non-agricultural domains; promoting associativity, innovation and transfer of knowledge, innovative solutions for competitive agriculture / food industry, multiethnicity, social inclusion, sports, cultural and local activities and supporting the administrative capability of civil society, innovative solutions for competitive agriculture, services and renewing the GAL area; renewing farmer generations through support for young farmers; restoring, consolidating and promoting ecosystems and biodiversity; setting up and developing businesses, non-agricultural activities; supporting associative structures through investments in real estate, innovative solutions for competitive agriculture / food industry, small and medium farms, the establishment of non-agricultural activities, the integration and promotion of quality schemes for local products, young farmers; transferring knowledge, training and lifelong learning.

The case studies carried out on the 25 Romanian stakeholders, indicate that, of the three main **approaches in social farming** at EU level, “*institutional approach* with the prevalence of health/public institutions, *private approach* based on therapeutic farms, and *mixed approach* based on social cooperatives and private farms”, only the second and third seem to somehow fit social farming in Romania: the *private approach* rarely concerns therapeutic farms and the *mixed approach* concerns LAGs and private farms. The Romanian social farming is apparently more oriented towards the public system of health and social care than towards the rural economy and agriculture.

Financing of social farming in Romania relies on assistance originating from NGOs (associations, foundations, social enterprises), on un-intermediated presence on markets (where they can practice direct selling), on public projects, on rural development policies aiming at supporting social farming launch and development, and on social cooperatives.

Social farming in Romania contain several elements: relays on NGOs involvement and support for private farming as a supplementary income without altering the initial productive activities oriented to the market and **happening on agricultural household sites.**” Social farming in Romania consists in activities that use both plant and animal agricultural aiming at generating social services (lifelong learning, rehabilitation, sheltered jobs, therapy) in semi-rural and rural areas.

The main Romanian institutions dealing with aspects of social farming are: the **Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development**, the **Ministry of Justice**, the **Ministry of Labour and Social Justice**, and the **Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration**.

As far as social farming networks are concerned, the stakeholders are linked individually since there is no national database and no official network for Social Farming in the country.

There is both state and public **support** for Social Farming activities in general.

As for the current state of social farming in **the West Development Region**, in January 2019, there were 28 **Authorised Protected Entities**: 8 (Arad), 1 (Caraș-Severin), 6 (Hunedoara), and 13 (Timiș); 233 **Houses of Mutual Economic Aid**: 81 (Arad), 54 (Caraș-Severin), 48 (Hunedoara), and 50 (Timiș), of which none agriculture related; and

3,649 **Non-Governmental Organisations (associations and foundations)**: of the 2,988 NGOs labelled *associations*, only 240 (57 in Arad County, 9 in Caraş-Severin County, 57 in Hunedoara County, 107 in Timiș County) are related to people with disabilities and to disadvantaged people, but none of them social-farming related; of the 661 NGOs labelled *foundations*, only 50 (18 in Arad County, 2 in Caraş-Severin County, 7 in Hunedoara County, 23 in Timiș County) are related to people with disabilities and to disadvantaged people, but none of them social-farming related. The **West Development Region** covers 19 LAGs in the current counties of Arad, Bihor, Caraş-Severin, Hunedoara and Timiș distributed by **territorial structures** as follows: In Hunedoara County: Asociația GAL CĂLUGĂRA (Caraş-Severin); Asociația GAL CARAŞ TIMIŞ (Caraş-Severin); Asociația GAL CLISURA DUNĂRII (Caraş-Severin); Asociația GAL PĂDUREA CRAIULUI (Bihor); Asociația GAL ȚARA BEIUȘULUI (Bihor); Asociația GAL ȚARA GUGULANILOR (Caraş-Severin); Asociația MICROREGIUNEA ȚARA HAȚEGULUI-ȚINUTUL PĂDURENILOR (Hunedoara); Asociația SARGETIA GAL 1 – (Hunedoara); In Timiș County: Asociația GAL BANAT-VEST (Timiș); Asociația GAL BANATUL DE NORD (Timiș); Asociația GAL COLINELE RECAȘ (Timiș); Asociația GAL DEPRESIUNEA SEBIȘ-GURAHONȚ-HĂLMAGIU (Arad); Asociația GAL LUNCA MUREȘULUI DE JOS (Arad); Asociația GAL PODGORIA MINIȘ MADERAT (Arad); Asociația GAL TIMIȘ TORONTAL BÎRZAVA (Timiș); Asociația GAL TIMIȘUL DE CENTRU (Timiș); Asociația GAL TRIPLEX CONFINIUM (Timiș); Asociația MICROREGIONALĂ ȚARA FĂGETULUI (Timiș); Asociația MICROREGIUNEA VAILOR CRIȘURILOR ALB ȘI NEGRU (Arad).

In January 2019, in **Banat**: there were 14 **Authorised Protected Entities**: 1 (Caraş-Severin) and 13 (Timiș); 104 **Houses of Mutual Economic Aid**: 54 (Caraş-Severin) and 50 (Timiș), of which none agriculture related; and 2,859 **Non-Governmental Organisations (associations and foundations)**: of the 2,529 NGOs labelled *associations*, only 97 (1 in Caraş-Severin County and 96 in Timiș County) are related to people with disabilities and to disadvantaged people, but none of them social-farming related; of the 330 NGOs labelled *foundations*, only 25 (2 in Caraş-Severin County and 23 in Timiș County) are related to people with disabilities and to disadvantaged people, but none of them social-farming related. The historical **Region of Banat** covers the current counties of **Timiș** (11 LAGs) and **Caraş-Severin** (1 LAG).

In January 2019, in **Timiș County**: there were 13 **Authorised Protected Entities**; 50 **Houses of Mutual Economic Aid**, of which none agriculture related; and 795 **Non-Governmental Organisations (associations and foundations)**: of the 718 NGOs labelled *associations*, only 100 are related to people with disabilities and to disadvantaged people, but none of them social-farming related; of the 81 NGOs labelled *foundations*, only 23 are related to people with disabilities and to disadvantaged people, but none of them social-farming related. At **Local Level**, there are **4 LAGs** in the Timiș County alone (without the associations with Arad County): Asociația Microregională Țara Făgetului; GAL Banatul de Nord; GAL Banat-Vest; GAL Triplex Confinium.

CONCLUSIONS

The analysis shows that:

- Social farms are almost inexistent, except for 2-3 cases.
- The public has never heard about Social Farming: **HOWEVER, NUMEROUS ORGANISATIONS PRACTICE SOME KIND OF SOCIAL FARMING.**
- The main institutions and organizations dealing with aspects of Social Farming are Authorised Protected Entities, Cooperatives, Family Farms, Houses of mutual

economic aid, Non-Governmental Organisations (associations, foundations, local action groups).

- The stakeholders are linked individually, since there is no national database.
- There is no official network for Social Farming.
- There is some state and public support for Social Farming activities, according to

legislation.

Therefore, **social farming** in Romania needs:

- Recognition at national level;
- Establishment of a social farming regulatory framework;
- Building up of social farming networks;
- Creation of a social farming database;
- Inclusion in education programmes;
- Inclusion in research programmes;
- Inclusion in the sustainable development strategy;
- Strengthening of the role of civil society.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was carried out by C.P.I.P. as part of the project “Engaging Farmers in Social Farming (SoEngage)”, Project Number: 2018-1-UK01-KA202-047975.

REFERENCES

- [1]. **DI IACOVO, FRANCESCO**, 2009, Social Services in Multifunctional Farms, sofar.unipi.it/index_file/Final_activity_report_sofar.pdf, 31 p.
- [2]. **FAO**, 2014, The Implications of Social Farming for Rural Poverty Reduction. Technical Workshop Final Report. Rome: FAO. 40 p.
- [3]. **HOTĂRÂRE A GUVERNULUI ROMÂNIEI PENTRU APROBAREA STRATEGIEI NAȚIONALE „O SOCIETATE FĂRĂ BARIERE PENTRU PERSOANELE CU DIZABILITĂȚI” 2016-2020 ȘI A PLANULUI OPERAȚIONAL PRIVIND IMPLEMENTAREA STRATEGIEI NAȚIONALE „O SOCIETATE FĂRĂ BARIERE PENTRU PERSOANELE CU DIZABILITĂȚI” 2016-2020***, Monitorul Oficial Nr. 737 bis din 22.09.2016.
- [4]. **LEGE NR. 219 DIN 23.07.2015 (LEGEA ECONOMIEI SOCIALE)**, Monitorul Oficial Nr. 561 din 28 iulie 2015.
- [5]. **LEGE NR. 221 DIN 11.11.2010 (LEGEA PENTRU RATIFICAREA CONVENȚIEI PRIVIND DREPTURILE PERSOANELOR CU DIZABILITĂȚI)**, Monitorul Oficial Nr. 792 din 26 noiembrie 2010.
- [6]. **MEDELEANU, C.**, 2013, Social Economy: A Form of Inclusion and of “Reactivating” Labour in the Context of the Current Crisis. *Revista de Economie Socială*, 3(2), 89-101.
- [7]. **MESOGEIAKO SYMVOULEFTIKO SYSTEMA S.A. & MOLDOVAN-TESELIOS, C.**, 2011, Studiu privind ocupațiile în curs de dezvoltare în domeniul economiei sociale, inclusiv potențialul de dezvoltare a acestora în agricultură, cu integrarea componentei egalității de gen pe piața muncii. 107 p.
- [8]. **MIHALACHE, N. M.**, 2015, Practices and Traditional Social Economy Models. *Revista de Economie Socială*, 5(1), 122-129.
- [9]. **NICOLĂESCU, V., CACE, S., KOUMALATSOU, E & STANESCU, S.**, 2011, *Economia socială. Analiză comparată în opt state membre ale Uniunii Europene*. București: Editura Expert. 289 p.

- [10]. **OPINION OF THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL FARMING: GREEN CARE AND SOCIAL AND HEALTH POLICIES**, 2012, <https://www.eesc.europa.eu/en/agenda/our-events/events/social-farming-green-care-and-social-and-health-policies>, 5 p.
- [11]. **REGISTRUL NAȚIONAL - ONG**, 2019, <http://www.just.ro/registrul-national-ong/>.
- [12]. **REȚEAUA NAȚIONALĂ DE DEZVOLTARE RURALĂ**, 2014, Agricultura socială: reducere disparităților dintre regiunile Europei prin consolidarea coeziunii economice, sociale și teritoriale, 23 p.
- [13]. **SOCIAL FARMING IN EUROPE**, 2017, <http://www.egina.eu/documents/Del%203.1%20Social%20Farming%20in%20Europe.pdf>, 21 p.
- [14]. **STĂNESCU, S. M., ALEXANDRESCU, A. M., BOJINCĂ, M. & ERNU, S.-A.**, 2013a, Ghid pentru înființarea de întreprinderi sociale pentru beneficiari de venit minim garantat. București: Programul ONU pentru Dezvoltare România. 104 p.
- [15]. **STANESCU, S. M., ALEXANDRESCU, A. M., BOJINCA, M., ERNU, S.-A. & RADULESCU, L.**, 2013b), Ghid pentru înființarea de întreprinderi sociale pentru persoane de etnie romă. București: Programul ONU pentru Dezvoltare România. 108 p.
- [16]. **STANESCU, S. M., BOJINCA, M., ALEXANDRESCU, A. M., ERNU, S.-A. & RADULESCU, L.**, 2013c, Ghid pentru înființarea de întreprinderi sociale pentru tineri peste 18 ani care părăsesc sistemul instituționalizat de protecție a copilului. București: Programul ONU pentru Dezvoltare România. 96p.
- [17]. **STANESCU, S. M., ERNU, S.-A., ALEXANDRESCU, A. M., BOJINCA, M. & RADULESCU, L.**, 2013d, Ghid pentru înființarea de întreprinderi sociale pentru persoane cu dizabilități. București: Programul ONU pentru Dezvoltare România. 107 p.
- [18]. **UNO.**, 2006. Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. <http://www.un.org/disabilities/documents/convention/convoptprot-e.pdf>, 37 p.