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**Abstrac**

Tobacco production, with its socio-economic significance, is a source of subsistence, engagement and income for a large part of the population, as well as income from the export of the state. Over the past decade, the World Health Organization has made efforts to reduce tobacco areas through the FCTC (Framework Convention on Tobacco Control), but it succeeds only in developed EU member states, while in other parts of the world is not so. That production is maintained at a stable level.

The Republic of North Macedonia does not envisage measures to reduce tobacco production because of the sensitivity and socio-economic aspect, this issue has been left on after Macedonia's EU entry in the EU when tobacco production plans align with the EU rules.

Tobacco production in Macedonia in the last few years is around 25000 tons per year, whose real increase requires more human resources, which in the next period is not certain (there will be an aging of the population and the emigration of young people in the cities and abroad). Threats always exist, which are different developments on the external market, competition from neighboring countries producing oriental tobacco (Turkey, Greece and Bulgaria), as well as from some far-eastern countries. The spread of some new tobacco products that are not very dependent on tobacco production in the field, such as so-called electronic cigarettes and similar products, are also a real threat.

***Keywords:*** *strategy, subsidies, price policy, production trends, sustainable development*

**INTRODUCTION**

What is the meaning of tobacco for Macedonia?

The production with its socio-economic significance is a source of existence, engagement and income of a large part of the population, as well as income from the export of the state.

 Over the past decade, the World Health Organization has made efforts to reduce tobacco areas through the FCTC (Framework Convention on Tobacco Control), but it succeeds only in developed EU member states, while in other parts of the world is not so. That production is maintained at a stable level.

The Republic of North Macedonia does not envisage measures to reduce tobacco production because of the sensitivity and socio-economic aspect, this issue has been left on after Macedonia's EU entry in the EU when tobacco production plans align with the EU rules. Tobacco production in Macedonia in the last few years is around 25000 tons per year, whose real increase requires more human resources, which in the next period is not certain (there will be an aging of the population and the emigration of young people in the cities and abroad

Threats always exist, which are different developments on the external market, competition from neighboring countries producing oriental tobacco (Turkey, Greece and Bulgaria), as well as from some far-eastern countries. The spread of some new tobacco products that are not very dependent on tobacco production in the field, such as so-called electronic cigarettes and similar products, are also a real threat.

In Macedonia, tobacco arrives later from the rest of the world, in 1873, and became the center of spiritual life. Not so much as a crop that yields per unit area, because tobacco is considered a labor intensive culture, but because still tobacco cultivation carried large financial returns and was paid off. Even the local, folklore architecture was defined according to the needs for drying tobacco strings. The picturesque verandas were adapted for natural storage and drying of tobacco.

**MATERIAL AND METHODS**

During the preparation of this paper, statistical information from the World Bank, the State Statistical Office of the Republic of Macedonia, the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Economy of the Republic of Macedonia were used. Macedonia, data published by magazines: Tobacco journal, International year book, Statistics-adresses-brands, Tobacco, World Markets and Trade and wider literature

The data processing was used: analytical, mathematical-statistical and comparative method, as well as tabular and graphical representation.

We used the linear trend method for analyzing and predicting the results.

 **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

Tobacco production is gaining more strategic importance for the state economy and is a significant item in filling the state budget. On the positive balance sheets after the purchase of last year's harvest, the upward trends in the value of the exported tobacco are added.

Thus, tobacco annually provides around 100 million euro foreign exchange inflow. The growing interest in tobacco production, as well as the growing planted areas, is motivating the state to provide increased subsidies, and since the last year's harvest, the subsidy model has been introduced at three levels, for the first class 80, for the second 70 and 60 denars per kilogram for a third, fourth and for additional classes.

The production is of economic importance and our country is a well-known producer of high quality oriental type tobacco. The economic and social significance of tobacco production are supported by the number of about 40 thousand families for which it is the main source of existence. The entry of large cigarette companies like Philip Morris and Imperial mean a lot to Macedonia. These companies did not come here by chance, they believe that Macedonia has perspectives for production of quality tobacco, especially Oriental.

Table 1. Production, surfaces and average yield (kg/ha) of tobacco in the Republic of North Macedonia

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | years | Tobacco production in kilograms | Indeks-base1953 | kilograms per hectare(average yield per ha) | Indeks-base 1953 | planted hectares | Indeks-base1953 | number of signed contracts of tobacco growers | planting hectares according to the manufacturer |
|  |   |   |   |   |  |   |   |   |  |
| 1 | 1953 | 13.715.000  |  1,00  |  790  | 1,00  | 17.361  |  1,00  | 78.296  | 0,22 |
| 2 | 1954 | 13.280.000  |  0,97  |  710  | 0,90  | 18.704  |  1,08  |  78.311  | 0,24 |
| 3 | 1955 | 19.670.000  |  1,43  |  900  |  1,14  | 21.856  |  1,26  |  79.327  | 0,28 |
| 4 | 1956 | 13.900.000  |  1,01  |  660  |  0,84  |  21.061  |  1,21  |  76.876  | 0,27 |
| 5 | 1957 | 29.300.000  |  2,14  | 1.030  |  1,30  |  28.447  |  1,64  |  92.987  | 0,31 |
| 6 | 1958 | 18.000.000  |  1,31  |  710  |  0,90  |  25.352  |  1,46  |  85.267  | 0,30 |
| 7 | 1959 | 20.600.000  |  1,50  |  860  |  1,09  |  23.953  |  1,38  |  78.481  | 0,31 |
| 8 | 1960 | 14.100.000  |  1,03  |  690  |  0,87  |  20.435  |  1,18  |  60.343  | 0,34 |
| 9 | 1961 |  8.040.000  |  0,59  |  570  |  0,72  |  14.105  |  0,81  |  62.409  | 0,23 |
| 10 | 1962 | 14.200.000  |  1,04  |  700  |  0,89  |  20.286  |  1,17  |  74.809  | 0,27 |
| 11 | 1963 | 25.100.000  |  1,83  |  880  |  1,11  |  28.523  |  1,64  | 101.375  | 0,28 |
| 12 | 1964 | 31.000.000  |  2,26  |  950  |  1,20  |  32.632  |  1,88  | 104.697  | 0,31 |
| 13 | 1965 | 28.000.000  |  2,04  |  870  |  1,10  |  32.184  |  1,85  |  96.507  | 0,33 |
| 14 | 1966 | 26.100.000  |  1,90  |  760  |  0,96  |  34.342  |  1,98  | 103.910  | 0,33 |
| 15 | 1967 | 27.491.000  |  2,00  |  870  |  1,10  |  31.599  |  1,82  |  98.420  | 0,32 |
| 16 | 1968 | 20.169.000  |  1,47  |  670  |  0,85  |  30.103  |  1,73  |  79.584  | 0,38 |
| 17 | 1969 | 22.000.000  |  1,60  |  810  |  1,03  |  27.160  |  1,56  |  77.558  | 0,35 |
| 18 | 1970 | 23.643.000  |  1,72  |  820  |  1,04  |  28.833  |  1,66  |  69.586  | 0,41 |
| 19 | 1971 | 21.589.000  |  1,57  |  800  |  1,01  |  26.986  |  1,55  |  65.392  | 0,41 |
| 20 | 1972 | 28.983.000  |  2,11  |  1.000  |  1,27  |  28.983  |  1,67  |  69.770  | 0,42 |
| 21 | 1973 | 32.437.000  |  2,37  |  1.120  |  1,42  |  28.962  |  1,67  |  71.886  | 0,40 |
| 22 | 1974 | 27.978.000  |  2,04  |  930  |  1,18  |  30.084  |  1,73  |  69.913  | 0,43 |
| 23 | 1975 | 34.126.000  | 2,49 | 1.030 | 1,30 | 33.132 | 1,91 | 78.776 | 0,42 |
| 24 | 1976 | 33.721.000  | 2,46 | 1.030 | 1,30 | 32.739 | 1,89 | 79.408 | 0,41 |
| 25 | 1977 | 32.296.000  | 2,35 | 1.030 | 1,30 | 31.355 | 1,81 | 74.313 | 0,42 |
| 26 | 1978 | 31.154.000  | 2,27 | 1.070 | 1,35 | 29.116 | 1,68 | 67.536 | 0,43 |
| 27 | 1979 | 29.447.000  | 2,15 | 1.090 | 1,38 | 27.016 | 1,56 | 59.677 | 0,45 |
| 28 | 1980 | 23.587.000  | 1,72 | 890 | 1,13 | 26.502 | 1,53 | 55.355 | 0,48 |
| 29 | 1981 | 31.294.000  | 2,28 | 1.230 | 1,56 | 25.442 | 1,47 | 50.831 | 0,50 |
| 30 | 1982 | 34.000.000  | 2,48 | 1.260 | 1,59 | 26.984 | 1,55 | 60.259 | 0,45 |
| 31 | 1983 | 22.490.000  | 1,64 | 830 | 1,05 | 27.096 | 1,56 | 58.757 | 0,46 |
| 32 | 1984 | 30.719.000  | 2,24 | 1.185 | 1,50 | 25.923 | 1,49 | 53.692 | 0,48 |
| 33 | 1985 | 30.728.000  | 2,24 | 1.078 | 1,36 | 28.505 | 1,64 | 71.033 | 0,40 |
| 34 | 1986 | 35.020.000  | 2,55 | 1.159 | 1,47 | 30.216 | 1,74 | 80.256 | 0,38 |
| 35 | 1987 | 28.648.000  | 2,09 | 1.125 | 1,42 | 25.465 | 1,47 | 57.826 | 0,44 |
| 36 | 1988 | 22.259.000  | 1,62 | 1.201 | 1,52 | 18.534 | 1,07 | 54.440 | 0,34 |
| 37 | 1989 | 27.537.000  | 2,01 | 1.126 | 1,43 | 24.456 | 1,41 | 49.135 | 0,50 |
| 38 | 1990 | 16.452.000  | 1,20 | 790 | 1,00 | 20.825 | 1,20 | 38.809 | 0,54 |
| 39 | 1991 | 25.195.000  | 1,84 | 1.375 | 1,74 | 18.324 | 1,06 | 40.750 | 0,45 |
| 40 | 1992 | 26.502.000  | 1,93 | 1.178 | 1,49 | 22.497 | 1,30 | 49.348 | 0,46 |
| 41 | 1993 | 24.002.000  | 1,75 | 1.123 | 1,42 | 21.373 | 1,23 | 53.809 | 0,40 |
| 42 | 1994 | 18.862.000  | 1,38 | 1.269 | 1,61 | 14.864 | 0,86 | 35.416 | 0,42 |
| 43 | 1995 | 15.683.000  | 1,14 | 1.440 | 1,82 | 10.891 | 0,63 | 24.752 | 0,44 |
| 44 | 1996 | 15.412.000  | 1,12 | 1.313 | 1,66 | 11.738 | 0,68 | 27.110 | 0,43 |
| 45 | 1997 | 25.308.000  | 1,85 | 1.312 | 1,66 | 19.290 | 1,11 | 33.050 | 0,58 |
| 46 | 1998 | 32.746.000  | 2,39 | 1.309 | 1,66 | 25.016 | 1,44 | 54.661 | 0,46 |
| 47 | 1999 | 29.368.000  | 2,14 | 1.189 | 1,51 | 24.700 | 1,42 | 44.822 | 0,55 |
| 48 | 2000 | 22.175.000  | 1,62 | 973 | 1,23 | 22.790 | 1,31 | 37.617 | 0,61 |
| 49 | 2001 | 23.217.000  | 1,69 | 1.157 | 1,46 | 20.067 | 1,16 | 33.906 | 0,59 |
| 50 | 2002 | 22.911.000  | 1,67 | 1.116 | 1,41 | 20.530 | 1,18 | 26.971 | 0,76 |
| 51 | 2003 | 23.986.000  | 1,75 | 1.332 | 1,69 | 18.008 | 1,04 | 32.000 | 0,56 |
| 52 | 2004 | 21.630.000  | 1,58 | 1.221 | 1,55 | 17.715 | 1,02 | 27.343 | 0,65 |
| 53 | 2005 | 27.691.000  | 2,02 | 1.498 | 1,90 | 18.485 | 1,06 | 38.000 | 0,49 |
| 54 | 2006 | 25.036.000  | 1,83 | 1.436 | 1,82 | 17.507 | 1,06 | 29.230 | 0,60 |
| 55 | 2007 | 22.056.000  | 1,61 | 1.287 | 1,63 | 17.183 | 1,06 | 29.771 | 0,58 |
| 56 | 2008 | 17.087.000  | 1,25 | 1.001 | 1,27 | 17.064 | 1,06 | 30.519 | 0,56 |
| 57 | 2009 | 24.122.000  | 1,76 | 1.355 | 1,72 | 17.809 | 1,06 | 38.710 | 0,46 |
| 58 | 2010 | 30.280.000  | 2,21 | 1.492 | 1,89 | 20.300 | 1,06 | 40.743 | 0,50 |
| 59 | 2011 | 26.537.000  | 1,93 | 1.348 | 1,71 | 19.693 | 1,06 | 33.234 | 0,59 |
| 60 | 2012 | 27.333.000  | 1,99 | 1.392 | 1,76 | 19.656 | 1,06 | 29.090 | 0,68 |
| 61 | 2013 |  27.859.000  | 2,03 | 1.453 | 1,84 | 19.178 | 1,06 | 42.367 | 0,45 |
| 62 | 2014 |  27.578.000  | 2,01 | 1.553 | 1,97 | 17.758 | 1,06 | 34.445 | 0,52 |
| 63 | 2015 | 24.237.000  | 1,77 | 1.503 | 1,90 | 16.126 | 1,06 | 28.454 | 0,57 |
| 64 | 2016 |  25.443.000  | 1,86 | 1.554 | 1,97 | 16.373 | 1,06 | 27.380 | 0,60 |
| 65 | 2017 | 23.559.000  | 1,72 | 1.643 | 2,08 | 14.342 | 1,06 | 29.132 | 0,49 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Based on these data, using the linear trend method, we determined the following absolute and estimated values by 2022 .

Table 2. Tobacco production (absolute/estimated values) by 2022 in the Republic of North Macedonia

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | years | Tobacco production - absolute values | Tobacco production - estimated values |
| 1 | 1955 | 19.670.000 |  23.684.937,00  |
| 2 | 1956 | 13.900.000 |  23.725.613,90  |
| 3 | 1957 | 29.300.000 |  23.766.290,79  |
| 4 | 1958 | 18.000.000 |  23.806.967,68  |
| 5 | 1959 | 20.600.000 |  23.847.644,57  |
| 6 | 1960 | 14.100.000 |  23.888.321,46  |
| 7 | 1961 | 8.040.000 |  23.928.998,35  |
| 8 | 1962 | 14.200.000 |  23.969.675,24  |
| 9 | 1963 | 25.100.000 |  24.010.352,13  |
| 10 | 1964 | 31.000.000 |  24.051.029,03  |
| 11 | 1965 | 28.000.000 |  24.091.705,92  |
| 12 | 1966 | 26.100.000 |  24.132.382,81  |
| 13 | 1967 | 27.491.000 |  24.173.059,70  |
| 14 | 1968 | 20.169.000 |  24.213.736,59  |
| 15 | 1969 | 22.000.000 |  24.254.413,48  |
| 16 | 1970 | 23.643.000 |  24.295.090,37  |
| 17 | 1971 | 21.589.000 |  24.335.767,27  |
| 18 | 1972 | 28.983.000 |  24.376.444,16  |
| 19 | 1973 | 32.437.000 |  24.417.121,05  |
| 20 | 1974 | 27.978.000 |  24.457.797,94  |
| 21 | 1975 | 34.126.000 |  24.498.474,83  |
| 22 | 1976 | 33.721.000 |  24.539.151,72  |
| 23 | 1977 | 32.296.000 |  24.579.828,61  |
| 24 | 1978 | 31.154.000 |  24.620.505,50  |
| 25 | 1979 | 29.447.000 |  24.661.182,40  |
| 26 | 1980 | 23.587.000 |  24.701.859,29  |
| 27 | 1981 | 31.294.000 |  24.742.536,18  |
| 28 | 1982 | 34.000.000 |  24.783.213,07  |
| 29 | 1983 | 22.490.000 |  24.823.889,96  |
| 30 | 1984 | 30.719.000 |  24.864.566,85  |
| 31 | 1985 | 30.728.000 |  24.905.243,74  |
| 32 | 1986 | 35.020.000 |  24.945.920,63  |
| 33 | 1987 | 28.648.000 |  24.986.597,53  |
| 34 | 1988 | 22.259.000 |  25.027.274,42  |
| 35 | 1989 | 27.537.000 |  25.067.951,31  |
| 36 | 1990 | 16.452.000 |  25.108.628,20  |
| 37 | 1991 | 25.195.000 |  25.149.305,09  |
| 38 | 1992 | 26.502.000 |  25.189.981,98  |
| 39 | 1993 | 24.002.000 |  25.230.658,87  |
| 40 | 1994 | 18.862.000 |  25.271.335,77  |
| 41 | 1995 | 15.683.000 |  25.312.012,66  |
| 42 | 1996 | 15.412.000 |  25.352.689,55  |
| 43 | 1997 | 25.308.000 |  25.393.366,44  |
| 44 | 1998 | 32.746.000 |  25.434.043,33  |
| 45 | 1999 | 29.368.000 |  25.474.720,22  |
| 46 | 2000 | 22.175.000 |  25.515.397,11  |
| 47 | 2001 | 23.217.000 |  25.556.074,00  |
| 48 | 2002 | 22.911.000 |  25.596.750,90  |
| 49 | 2003 | 23.986.000 |  25.637.427,79  |
| 50 | 2004 | 21.630.000 |  25.678.104,68  |
| 51 | 2005 | 27.691.000 |  25.718.781,57  |
| 52 | 2006 | 25.036.000 |  25.759.458,46  |
| 53 | 2007 | 22.056.000 |  25.800.135,35  |
| 54 | 2008 | 17.087.000 |  25.840.812,24  |
| 55 | 2009 | 24.122.000 |  25.881.489,14  |
| 56 | 2010 | 30.280.000 |  25.922.166,03  |
| 57 | 2011 | 26.537.000 |  25.962.842,92  |
| 58 | 2012 | 27.333.000 |  26.003.519,81  |
| 59 | 2013 | 27.859.000 |  26.044.196,70  |
| 60 | 2014 | 27.578.000 |  26.084.873,59  |
| 61 | 2015 | 24.237.000 |  26.125.550,48  |
| 62 | 2016 | 25.443.000 |  26.166.227,37  |
| 63 | 2017 | 23.559.000 |  26.206.904,27  |
| 64 | 2018 |   |  26.247.581,16  |
| 65 | 2019 |   |  26.288.258,05  |
| 66 | 2020 |   |  26.328.934,94  |
| 67 | 2021 |   |  26.369.611,83  |
| 68 | 2022 |   |  26.410.288,72  |

Figure 1 - Tobacco production (absolute/estimated values) by 2022

Table 3. Concluded contracts (absolute/estimated values) by 2022 in the Republic of North Macedonia

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **years** | **concluded contracts - absolute values** | **concluded contracts - estimated values** | Planted hectares of tobacco-Absolute values | Planted hectares of tobacco-Estimated values |
| 1955 | 79.327 |  90.202,29  | 21.856 | 29.366,39  |
| 1956 | 76.876 |  89.116,31  | 21.061 | 29.170,99  |
| 1957 | 92.987 |  88.030,34  | 28.447 | 28.975,60  |
| 1958 | 85.267 |  86.944,36  | 25.352 | 28.780,20  |
| 1959 | 78.481 |  85.858,38  | 23.953 | 28.584,80  |
| 1960 | 60.343 |  84.772,40  | 20.435 | 28.389,40  |
| 1961 | 62.409 |  83.686,43  | 14.105 | 28.194,00  |
| 1962 | 74.809 |  82.600,45  | 20.286 | 27.998,60  |
| 1963 | 101.375 |  81.514,47  | 28.523 | 27.803,20  |
| 1964 | 104.697 |  80.428,49  | 32.632 | 27.607,80  |
| 1965 | 96.507 |  79.342,52  | 32.184 | 27.412,41  |
| 1966 | 103.910 |  78.256,54  | 34.342 | 27.217,01  |
| 1967 | 98.420 |  77.170,56  | 31.599 | 27.021,61  |
| 1968 | 79.584 |  76.084,58  | 30.103 | 26.826,21  |
| 1969 | 77.558 |  74.998,60  | 27.160 | 26.630,81  |
| 1970 | 69.586 |  73.912,63  | 28.833 | 26.435,41  |
| 1971 | 65.392 |  72.826,65  | 26.986 | 26.240,01  |
| 1972 | 69.770 |  71.740,67  | 28.983 | 26.044,61  |
| 1973 | 71.886 |  70.654,69  | 28.962 | 25.849,22  |
| 1974 | 69.913 |  69.568,72  | 30.084 | 25.653,82  |
| 1975 | 78.776 |  68.482,74  | 33.132 | 25.458,42  |
| 1976 | 79.408 |  67.396,76  | 32.739 | 25.263,02  |
| 1977 | 74.313 |  66.310,78  | 31.355 | 25.067,62  |
| 1978 | 67.536 |  65.224,81  | 29.116 | 24.872,22  |
| 1979 | 59.677 |  64.138,83  | 27.016 | 24.676,82  |
| 1980 | 55.355 |  63.052,85  | 26.502 | 24.481,42  |
| 1981 | 50.831 |  61.966,87  | 25.442 | 24.286,03  |
| 1982 | 60.259 |  60.880,89  | 26.984 | 24.090,63  |
| 1983 | 58.757 |  59.794,92  | 27.096 | 23.895,23  |
| 1984 | 53.692 |  58.708,94  | 25.923 | 23.699,83  |
| 1985 | 71.033 |  57.622,96  | 28.505 | 23.504,43  |
| 1986 | 80.256 |  56.536,98  | 30.216 | 23.309,03  |
| 1987 | 57.826 |  55.451,01  | 25.465 | 23.113,63  |
| 1988 | 54.440 |  54.365,03  | 18.534 | 22.918,23  |
| 1989 | 49.135 |  53.279,05  | 24.456 | 22.722,84  |
| 1990 | 38.809 |  52.193,07  | 20.825 | 22.527,44  |
| 1991 | 40.750 |  51.107,10  | 18.324 | 22.332,04  |
| 1992 | 49.348 |  50.021,12  | 22.497 | 22.136,64  |
| 1993 | 53.809 |  48.935,14  | 21.373 | 21.941,24  |
| 1994 | 35.416 |  47.849,16  | 14.864 | 21.745,84  |
| 1995 | 24.752 |  46.763,19  | 10.891 | 21.550,44  |
| 1996 | 27.110 |  45.677,21  | 11.738 | 21.355,04  |
| 1997 | 33.050 |  44.591,23  | 19.290 | 21.159,65  |
| 1998 | 54.661 |  43.505,25  | 25.016 | 20.964,25  |
| 1999 | 44.822 |  42.419,27  | 24.700 | 20.768,85  |
| 2000 | 37.617 |  41.333,30  | 22.790 | 20.573,45  |
| 2001 | 33.906 |  40.247,32  | 20.067 | 20.378,05  |
| 2002 | 26.971 |  39.161,34  | 20.530 | 20.182,65  |
| 2003 | 32.000 |  38.075,36  | 18.008 | 19.987,25  |
| 2004 | 27.343 |  36.989,39  | 17.715 | 19.791,85  |
| 2005 | 38.000 |  35.903,41  | 18.485 | 19.596,46  |
| 2006 | 29.230 |  34.817,43  | 17.507 | 19.401,06  |
| 2007 | 29.771 |  33.731,45  | 17.183 | 19.205,66  |
| 2008 | 30.519 |  32.645,48  | 17.064 | 19.010,26  |
| 2009 | 38.710 |  31.559,50  | 17.809 | 18.814,86  |
| 2010 | 40.743 |  30.473,52  | 20.300 | 18.619,46  |
| 2011 | 33.234 |  29.387,54  | 19.693 | 18.424,06  |
| 2012 | 29.090 |  28.301,56  | 19.656 | 18.228,66  |
| 2013 | 42.367 |  27.215,59  | 19.178 | 18.033,27  |
| 2014 | 34.445 |  26.129,61  | 17.758 | 17.837,87  |
| 2015 | 28.454 |  25.043,63  | 16.126 | 17.642,47  |
| 2016 | 27.380 |  23.957,65  | 16.373 | 17.447,07  |
| 2017 | 29.132 |  22.871,68  | 14.342 | 17.251,67  |
| 2018 |   |  21.785,70  |   | 17.056,27  |
| 2019 |   |  20.699,72  |   | 16.860,87  |
| 2020 |   |  19.613,74  |   | 16.665,47  |
| 2021 |   |  18.527,77  |   | 16.470,08  |
| 2022 |   |  17.441,79  |   | 16.274,68  |

Figure 2. Concluded contracts (absolute/estimated values) by 2022 in the Republic of North Macedonia

Figure 3. Planted hectares of tobacco(absolute/estimated values) by 2022 in the Republic of North Macedonia

**In which guidelines will take the tobacco production in Republic of North Macedonia**

Starting from the requirements of the world market, the scientific and technological achievements of the world and the available natural, production and human (labor) potentials, it can be freely stated that today, and even more in the future, the need will be expressed:

 ♠ Raising the quality of tobacco production at a much higher level, taking into account the requirements of buyers.

 ♠ Efficient and effective production, where the emerging and potential problems will be identified in an easier way and in an efficient way organisms. an entity will be able to handle them.

 ♠ Raising the motivation and satisfaction in the work of the employed (engaged) people, and in particular better use of the technical and technological benefits, greater use of resources and mechanization that greatly replace the physically invested labor and reduce the time production operations and processes; and Fig.

♠ Continuous development of research, educational and advisory activities for raising the proper implementation of Good Agricultural Practices (GAP).

♠ Raising awareness of the quality of the overall performance of all engaged individuals in the firm or farm.

♠ Guaranteeing the quality of tobacco and tobacco products production and secure placement;

♠ integrating economic and environmental goals, on the one hand increasing income, and on the other hand preserving the environment for healthy plants and favorable livelihoods of all living beings.

♠ Developing opportunities for creating alternative (combined) revenues through the expansion of tobacco production and other additional products or services.

♠ Taking care of environmental protection through a publicly declared policy about it.

♠ Establishing ways to monitor tobacco production (developing monitoring) for protection.

**CONCLUDING REMARKS**

In order to contribute to the clarification of the views towards determining the strategy for development of tobacco production in the Republic of Macedonia in the following period, the activities in the field of tobacco production should be directed towards:

 ♦ Soil management and irrigation (conditions with arable and non-cultivated areas, water potential, proper soil and water management, etc.);

 ♦ Preserving the purity of tobacco purity (Tobacco selection);

 ♦ Yield management ;

 ♦ Integrated pest management;

 ♦ Agrochemical Management;

Properly manipulating and storing tobacco;

♦ Development of farm tobacco production, family business, small enterprises with basic activity for tobacco production;

♦ Farmers' training;

♦ Socio-economic issues (problems);

♦ Developing sustainable tobacco production by unifying the knowledge of the utilization of free surfaces, applying the correct management activities and the preference of the good agricultural practices;

♦ Promoting tobacco production and raising public awareness for the preservation of the environment, as well as other areas that are in the interest of clarifying the aspects of promotion of tobacco production in the Republic of Macedonia in accordance with the relevant development policy in the European Union and the positive global (world) policy.

Tobacco producers often face the question of why they most often decide to produce tobacco, and not other crops. Below are some of the strongest arguments in favor of tobacco:

 ◘ Tobacco is a legally traded agricultural crop, for which global demand remains a major demand.

 ◘ Tobacco grows on low fertility soil and some tobacco, such as Oriental type, is best grown in dry environments. Such conditions are always inadequate for the successful production of other crops.

◘ In many areas where tobacco is grown, crops are grown after tobacco cultivation, benefiting from residual fertilizers in the soil.

 ◘ As it is less perishable than most other alternative alternative cultures, tobacco can be easily stored.

 ◘ Tobacco is characterized by relative price stability.

 ◘ As a rule, sales are guaranteed, the price is agreed and it is most often respected.

alternative cultures an extremely difficult task, because tobacco is an alternative to tobacco.

The above factors, in alliance with the profitability of tobacco, contribute to making the demand for genuine
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**Апстракт**

Тутунопроизводството со своето социо-економско значење, претставува извор на егзистенција, ангажираност и приход на голем дел од населението, како и приход од извоз на државата. Во последнава декада Светската здравствена организација прави напори да се намалат површините под тутун, преку Рамковната конвенција за контрола на тутунот (FCTC – Framework Convention on Tobacco Control), но тоа успева само во развиените земји членки на ЕУ, додека во останатите делови во светот тоа не е така. Таму производството се одржува на стабилно ниво.

Република Северна Македонија не предвидува мерки за намалување на производството на тутун бидејќи поради осетливоста и социо-економскиот аспект, тоа прашање е оставено за понатаму, по евентуалниот влез на Македонија во ЕУ кога плановите за производството на тутун се усогласуваат со правилата на ЕУ.

Производството на тутун во Македонија во последните неколку години се движи околу 25.000 тони годишно за чие реално зголемување се потребни поголеми човечки ресурси, што во наредниот период не е извесно дека ќе ги има (стареење на популацијата и иселувањето на младите луѓе во градовите и во странство). Закани секогаш постојат, а тоа се различни случувања на надворешниот пазар, конкуренцијата од соседните земји производители на ориенталски тутуни (Турција, Грција и Бугарија) како и од некои далекуисточни држави. Ширењето на некои нови тутунски производи кои не се многу зависни од производството на тутун на нива како на пример таканаречените електронски цигари и слични производи, исто така се реална закана.

**Клучни зборови**: *стратегија, субвенции, политика на цени, производствени трендови, одржлив напредок*
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