The French SAFER Model and Hungarian Land Governance: A Comparative Assessment from the Perspective of Rural Sustainability

A francia SAFER-modell és a magyar földforgalmi szabályozás összehasonlító értékelése a vidéki fenntarthatóság szempontjából

Nikolett Faragó*, Anna Dunay and Róbert Magda

John von Neumann University, Doctoral School of Management and Business Administration

**Correspondence: farago.nikolett.66@gmail.com*

Abstract: Land is a limited and multifunctional production factor, while land policy determines who may gain access to it, under what conditions, and for which rural development purposes. This paper compares the French SAFER model with Hungarian land governance from the perspective of the economic, social and environmental pillars of rural sustainability. The analysis is based on a qualitative comparison of legal instruments, official institutional documents, CAP Strategic Plan materials, Eurostat data and international land tenure guidelines. The French model is characterised by a specialised land agency network, systematic market information, pre-emption powers, public-interest allocation and post-sale commitments. The Hungarian system relies more strongly on statutory acquisition limits, pre-emption order, administrative approval and local land-commission type control. The findings indicate that both systems aim to protect agricultural land and family farming, but they differ in institutional capacity, transparency mechanisms and direct steering of land allocation. The SAFER experience suggests that land governance can support generational renewal and environmental objectives when market monitoring, public-interest selection criteria and long-term land-use commitments operate together.

Keywords: *land policy, SAFER, land governance, generational renewal, rural sustainability, Hungary, France*

Összefoglalás: A föld korlátozott és többfunkciós termelési tényező, a birtokpolitika pedig alapvetően meghatározza, hogy ki, milyen feltételekkel és milyen vidékfejlesztési célok érdekében juthat földhöz. A tanulmány a francia SAFER-modellt és a magyar földforgalmi szabályozást hasonlítja össze a vidéki fenntarthatóság gazdasági, társadalmi és környezeti pillérei szerint. A vizsgálat jogszabályok, hivatalos intézményi dokumentumok, KAP Stratégiai Tervek, Eurostat-adatok és nemzetközi földhasználati irányelvek kvalitatív elemzésén alapul. A francia modellt specializált földintézményi hálózat, rendszeres földpiaci információs rendszer, elővásárlási jog, közcélú földjuttatás és utólagos vállalások jellemzik. A magyar rendszer inkább a szerzési korlátokra, az elővásárlási sorrendre, a hatósági jóváhagyásra és a helyi kontrollra épül. Az eredmények szerint mindkét rendszer a termőföld védelmét és a családi gazdálkodás erősítését célozza, ugyanakkor eltérnek az intézményi kapacitás, az átláthatóság és a földallokáció aktív irányítása tekintetében.

Kulcsszavak: *birtokpolitika, SAFER, földkormányzás, generációváltás, vidéki fenntarthatóság, Magyarország, Franciaország*

1 Introduction

Land policy is not a narrow property-law question. In agriculture, land is simultaneously a production factor, a territorial resource, a landscape element, a basis of rural identity and a precondition for ecological services. The governance of land markets therefore affects the three classical pillars of sustainability: economic viability, social cohesion and environmental protection. Secure and equitable access to land is also emphasised in the FAO Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure, which link tenure governance to food security, poverty reduction and sustainable development (FAO, 2022).

The issue has become particularly important in Europe because land access is increasingly connected with demographic renewal. The European Commission notes that farmers under the age of 40 manage only a small minority of EU farms, while the average age of farmers remains high; this makes generational renewal a structural policy challenge rather than only a financial-support issue (European Commission, 2025a). The 2023–2027 CAP Strategic Plans recognise this challenge through young farmer income support, start-up support and rural development interventions (European Parliament and Council, 2021; European Commission, 2025b; 2026a).

At the same time, farm structures are changing. Eurostat data show that the number of farms in the EU has continued to decline while the total area used for agricultural production has changed only moderately, which indicates ongoing land consolidation (Eurostat, 2026a). This trend can strengthen efficiency, but it may also reduce the number of entry points for young farmers and smaller local producers. The central policy question is therefore not whether land markets should function, but how market transactions can be embedded in public-interest safeguards.

France and Hungary provide a useful comparison. France operates the SAFER system, a territorially organised network of land agencies with information, acquisition, pre-emption and allocation functions. Hungary regulates farmland through detailed statutory acquisition rules, pre-emption rights, administrative approval and local community control under the Act CXXII of 2013 on agricultural and forestry land transactions (Nemzeti Jogszabálytár, 2026). The aim of this paper is to assess how these two models contribute to rural sustainability and to identify transferable lessons for Hungarian land governance.

2 Materials and Methods

The study applies a qualitative comparative institutional method. The two cases were selected because both countries are EU Member States operating within the same CAP framework, but their land-policy instruments are institutionally different. The French case represents a specialised land-agency model, while the Hungarian case represents a statutory land-market control model. The comparison focuses on instruments that influence farmland access, land-market transparency, generational renewal and long-term land use.

The documentary basis consists of official legal and policy sources: the French Code rural et de la peche maritime, the Hungarian Act CXXII of 2013, SAFER official material and activity reports, CAP Strategic Plan documents, Eurostat agricultural structure statistics, FAO tenure guidelines and OECD land-use policy reports. These sources were assessed according to four analytical dimensions: (1) institutional design, (2) market intervention tools, (3) social effects with special attention to young farmers, and (4) environmental and territorial sustainability effects.

The paper does not measure causal impacts statistically. Instead, it develops an evaluative framework that can be used as a basis for later empirical research. This is appropriate because land governance systems differ not only in legal text but also in administrative practice, information flows, stakeholder participation and enforcement capacity.

3 The French SAFER model

The Sociétés d'aménagement foncier et d'établissement rural (SAFER) were created to steer rural land transfers in line with public-interest objectives. The Code rural defines SAFER missions broadly: they contribute to the protection of agricultural, natural and forest areas; support the installation, maintenance and consolidation of viable agricultural holdings; contribute to landscape diversity, natural-resource protection and biodiversity; support sustainable rural development; and ensure transparency in the rural land market (Légifrance, 2026a).

The model combines market observation with intervention capacity. SAFER bodies receive information on intended rural land sales, which makes them an institutional observatory of land-market movements. Their pre-emption right allows them, under legal conditions, to purchase before the initially selected buyer and then reallocate the land to another candidate whose project better fits local planning, agricultural or environmental objectives (SAFER, 2026a; Légifrance, 2026b). This does not mean that every transaction is interrupted, but it means that the market operates under a public-interest review mechanism.

SAFER allocations are not only sales. They may involve temporary holding, resale, substitution mechanisms, leasing support and cooperation with local authorities. The selected acquirer undertakes commitments through a cahier des charges, which can preserve the agricultural or natural vocation of the property and restrict later transfer for a defined period. According to the national 2024 activity synthesis, the SAFER network organised 14,340 sales covering 96,900 ha and a value of EUR 1.859 billion, and 1,088 departmental technical committees were held in 2024 (FNSafer, 2025a). These figures indicate that SAFER is not a marginal advisory body, but a land-governance infrastructure.

The French model is especially relevant for generational renewal because land allocation can be connected directly with installation projects. Where a young farmer has a viable business plan but lacks access to land, SAFER can use information, mediation, temporary holding or acquisition instruments to connect land supply with entrant demand. This is a qualitative advantage compared with systems that provide grants but leave the applicant to compete in the open land market. The model also supports environmental goals when allocation criteria give weight to organic farming, parcel restructuring, water protection, landscape management or biodiversity-related objectives.

The model is not without limitations. Because SAFER decisions affect private transactions, legitimacy depends on transparent criteria, balanced representation in technical committees and effective appeal possibilities. Local conflicts can occur when several candidates present credible projects or when established farms and new entrants compete for the same land. For this reason, the institutional lesson is not only that a land agency should have strong powers, but also that those powers must be embedded in procedural safeguards, published reasoning and measurable follow-up of commitments.

4 Hungarian land governance

Hungarian land governance after 2013 is based on the protection of agricultural land, the priority of farmers, acquisition limits and administrative approval. Act CXXII of 2013 regulates the acquisition of ownership of agricultural and forestry land, the establishment of usufruct, land use, control of acquisition restrictions and the operation of local land committees (Nemzeti Jogszabálytár, 2026). The law reflects several objectives: preventing speculative acquisition, supporting local agricultural producers, limiting excessive concentration and maintaining land for agricultural use.

The Hungarian system uses pre-emption rights, but their logic differs from the French SAFER model. Instead of a specialised land agency selecting among projects and reallocating

land, the Hungarian framework mainly defines priority categories of eligible buyers. The sale contract is subject to administrative review and publication so that pre-emption right holders may step in. This protects certain categories of local and agricultural actors, but it is less project-based than SAFER allocation. In practice, the effectiveness of the system depends on the clarity of priority rules, the quality of administrative review, the functioning of local opinions and the accessibility of information for potential entrants.

Generational renewal is addressed mainly through CAP and national support schemes rather than through a land agency. Hungary's CAP Strategic Plan includes young farmer income support, start-up support and rural development interventions, together with climate and environmental measures (KAP, 2026; European Commission, 2025b). These instruments can improve the financial position of young entrants, but the land-access problem remains if land is scarce, expensive, fragmented or tied up in long-term use relations.

Hungary also has a specific structural context. Agricultural census materials show that Hungarian agriculture combines many small holdings with a considerable area operated by larger farms, and the utilised agricultural area remains a key national resource (KSH, 2020; FAO, 2023a). This dual structure makes land policy sensitive: overly rigid rules can reduce mobility, while overly liberal rules can accelerate concentration. A balanced system has to support viable family farms, allow efficient farm development and reserve real opportunities for new entrants.

A further issue is that land policy and farm-transfer policy are often treated separately. A young farmer may satisfy professional criteria and may receive CAP support, yet still face high land prices, weak information about available land, or competition from farms that already have stronger capital positions. In such cases, the formal priority order alone may not create a functioning pathway into farming. Hungarian land governance would therefore benefit from closer coordination between land transactions, farm succession advisory services, credit instruments and rural development calls.

5 Comparative assessment

The comparison shows that the two systems are built on different governance philosophies. France uses a delegated public-interest land agency with operational tools, while Hungary relies on legal eligibility rules and administrative approval. Both systems restrict a purely liberal land market, but they do so through different instruments and therefore create different sustainability effects.

Table 1 Comparative elements of the French SAFER model and Hungarian land governance

Analytical dimension	France - SAFER model	Hungary - land governance	Sustainability relevance
Institutional design	Specialised land-agency network under state supervision; local technical committees and market observatory role.	Statutory regulation, administrative approval, pre-emption hierarchy and local land-committee type involvement.	Determines transparency, steering capacity and accountability.
Market intervention	Information on sales, pre-emption, temporary holding, resale and project-based allocation.	Eligibility rules, ownership and use limits, publication of contracts and exercise of pre-emption by priority holders.	Shapes who can enter the land market and at what speed.
Young farmers	Direct link between land allocation and installation projects; possibility of	Financial support through CAP and national schemes; land access	Important for social sustainability and rural renewal.

Analytical dimension	France - SAFER model	Hungary - land governance	Sustainability relevance
	prioritising viable entrants.	mediated mainly by legal priority and market availability.	
Environmental goals	Allocation criteria and post-sale commitments can protect agricultural, natural and forest vocation of land.	Environmental goals mainly linked to CAP conditionality, eco-schemes and land-use rules.	Affects soil, water, biodiversity and landscape functions.
Main risk	Discretion, local conflicts and possible pressure from established interests if transparency is weak.	Formalism, administrative complexity and limited project-based steering of land transfers.	Risks must be managed to maintain legitimacy.

Economically, the SAFER model can reduce information asymmetry and help match land with economically viable projects. Its strength lies in connecting market monitoring with active allocation. Hungary's strength is legal predictability: parties can identify statutory categories and acquisition limits. However, predictability does not automatically guarantee that the best long-term rural project receives land. A more project-sensitive review could improve the economic pillar without abandoning legal safeguards.

Socially, the decisive issue is access for young and new farmers. Financial support is necessary but insufficient when suitable land is unavailable. France's system creates an institutional channel through which land can be directed to installation projects. Hungary has several support instruments, but the land-access channel remains more fragmented. This matters for village population retention, local employment, farm succession and the renewal of agricultural knowledge.

Environmentally, both systems recognise that land has public-good functions. The difference is operational. In France, environmental objectives may be built into the land-allocation decision and into commitments attached to the transfer. In Hungary, environmental sustainability is more strongly linked to CAP conditionality, agri-environmental payments, eco-schemes and general land-use rules. A stronger connection between land-transfer approval and environmental land-use commitments could make Hungarian land governance more integrated.

The question of transparency is also different. SAFER transparency is based on institutional information flows from notaries and on the publication of opportunities and decisions within the agency system. Hungarian transparency is based mainly on contract publication and administrative procedure. The first model gives more analytical capacity to the institution; the second gives more legal certainty to the actors. A sustainable land policy should combine both: strong procedural rights for parties and a public database capable of detecting concentration, price pressure and land-use change.

The comparative lesson can be summarised as a shift from person-based priority to project-based sustainability. Person-based priority remains important because local farmers and young farmers need legal protection. However, sustainable rural development also requires asking what the land will be used for, whether the proposed project is viable, whether it contributes to local employment, and whether it protects soil, water and biodiversity. This project-based element is where the French experience offers the most relevant inspiration.

6 Effects on the pillars of rural sustainability

The economic pillar concerns viable farm structures, efficient parcel use, investment security and competitiveness. A well-designed land policy should avoid both excessive fragmentation and excessive concentration. The OECD argues that sustainable land use requires the alignment

of planning, fiscal, environmental and sectoral policies (OECD, 2017; 2020). SAFER contributes to this alignment by making land transactions visible and by allowing public-interest steering before land is locked into a new ownership structure. Hungary contributes through restrictions that aim to keep land in the hands of farmers, but the system could benefit from stronger ex ante evaluation of the economic viability and territorial value of proposed acquisitions.

The social pillar is linked to generational renewal, rural demographic stability and community trust. The European Commission's strategy for generational renewal emphasises that young people need the right conditions to build careers and lives in rural areas (European Commission, 2025a). Land access is one of these conditions. A support scheme that gives money without land may help only those who already have family assets or favourable networks. SAFER demonstrates that a land-policy institution can reduce this barrier by mediating between retiring farmers, landowners, local authorities and new entrants.

The environmental pillar relates to soil protection, water management, biodiversity, landscape continuity and climate adaptation. Agricultural land markets tend to price private productive value more easily than public ecological value. For this reason, land governance needs instruments that can incorporate ecological criteria into transactions. In the French model, the public-interest missions of SAFER include natural-resource protection, biodiversity and sustainable rural development. In Hungary, similar objectives appear in policy documents and CAP interventions, but the legal land-transfer process itself is less explicitly designed as an environmental allocation instrument.

A key lesson is that the three pillars should not be treated separately. A young farmer who gains access to an economically viable holding and accepts environmental commitments contributes to all three pillars at once. Conversely, a land transfer that is legally valid but increases concentration, reduces local employment and ignores landscape functions may weaken sustainability even if it respects formal ownership rules.

7 Policy implications for Hungary

The French model cannot be copied mechanically. Hungary has different historical land relations, constitutional sensitivities, administrative traditions and farm structures. Nevertheless, several elements are transferable at the level of policy design. The first is stronger land-market transparency. A more accessible, regularly updated and territorially detailed land-market observatory would help policymakers, municipalities and young farmers understand where land is moving and which areas are under concentration or speculation pressure.

The second transferable element is project-based evaluation. Hungarian pre-emption rules already prioritise certain persons, but a complementary assessment of the proposed land-use project could improve the link between land transfers and rural sustainability. Such assessment should be transparent, rule-based and appealable, so that it does not become arbitrary. It could give weight to first installation, farm succession, organic or low-input production, parcel rationalisation, soil and water protection, and contribution to local employment.

The third element is temporary land holding or land banking for young farmers and succession cases. Many young farmers cannot purchase land immediately when it becomes available, while retiring farmers may need a reliable transition mechanism. A public or mixed land-bank instrument, operating with strict transparency and limited holding periods, could bridge this timing problem. The experience of SAFER shows that land policy can mediate between private transactions and public territorial goals.

The fourth implication is the use of post-transfer commitments. If public policy gives a buyer priority because of a sustainability-oriented project, the buyer should maintain that project for a defined period. This could include maintaining agricultural use, respecting environmental

commitments, avoiding quick resale and cooperating with local landscape or water-management objectives. Such commitments would strengthen legitimacy because public preference would be tied to measurable public benefit.

Table 2 Possible SAFER-inspired instruments for Hungarian land governance

Instrument	Expected benefit	Safeguard needed	Priority link to sustainability
Land-market observatory	Earlier detection of land concentration, price pressure and regional entry barriers.	Open methodology, data protection and regular public reporting.	Economic and social
Young-farmer land bank	Bridges the time gap between land availability and the financial capacity of entrants.	Limited holding period, transparent calls and independent review.	Social and economic
Project-based preference	Links priority to concrete farm, employment and land-use commitments.	Clear scoring criteria and appealable decisions.	All three pillars
Post-transfer commitments	Ensures that public preference produces lasting public benefit.	Monitoring, proportional sanctions and legal clarity.	Environmental and social
Succession mediation	Connects retiring farmers, successors and new entrants before land is sold elsewhere.	Voluntary participation and professional advisory support.	Social

An adaptation pathway should proceed in stages. The first stage would be diagnostic: create a national and regional land-market observatory using existing land registry, contract and agricultural administration data. The second stage would be experimental: pilot a young-farmer land bank in selected counties where generational renewal problems and land concentration pressures are strong. The third stage would be regulatory: introduce transparent project-based criteria into the evaluation of selected land transactions without replacing the existing legal priority order.

The proposed approach should also protect legal certainty. A common criticism of active land policy is that it may create discretion and political conflict. This risk can be reduced if the decision criteria are published, if all candidates receive written reasons, if decisions are open to review, and if the same scoring system is used across comparable cases. In other words, stronger public-interest steering should be balanced by stronger procedural transparency.

Finally, a Hungarian adaptation should be connected to CAP measures. Young farmer start-up grants, investment support, advisory services and agri-environmental commitments could be coordinated with land-access instruments. Such coordination would make public spending more effective: instead of supporting an entrant after land has already been secured, the system could help create the land-access opportunity itself.

7.1 Implementation risks and safeguards

Any strengthening of land-market steering has to confront three risks. The first is administrative overload. If every transaction were subject to a complex sustainability assessment, the system would become slow and unpredictable. A proportional approach is therefore necessary. Project-based evaluation should focus on transactions above a certain area, on strategically important parcels, on land offered with public support, or on cases where several priority holders compete.

The second risk is unequal access to information. Young farmers and new entrants often do not have the same legal, financial and local-network resources as established farms. A SAFER-inspired Hungarian system should therefore include advisory support before the transaction, not

only control after the contract has already been signed. Municipalities, chambers, advisory services and agricultural education institutions could help identify potential successors and entrants before farms leave production or are absorbed by neighbouring holdings.

The third risk is weak enforcement of commitments. If a buyer receives priority because of a young-farmer, environmental or local-employment project, the commitment must be verifiable. Monitoring should not be excessive, but it should include simple indicators such as continued agricultural use, implementation of the submitted business plan, participation in environmental measures where promised, and compliance with resale restrictions. Without monitoring, public-interest allocation becomes symbolic.

A further safeguard is territorial differentiation. Hungary's regions face different land-market problems. In some areas the key issue is fragmentation and abandonment; in others it is concentration, high prices or competition between agricultural and non-agricultural uses. A uniform national tool may therefore be less effective than a common legal framework combined with county-level implementation plans. The French experience is instructive because SAFER operates nationally but evaluates cases through territorial structures.

Finally, land policy should be communicated as a sustainability instrument rather than as a restriction on property rights alone. Farmers and landowners are more likely to accept intervention when they see clear public benefits: viable successors, preserved agricultural landscapes, improved water protection, and stronger local food systems. This communication aspect is important because land governance depends not only on rules but also on trust in the institutions applying them.

8 Conclusions

The comparison confirms that land policy is a core instrument of rural sustainability. The French SAFER model and the Hungarian land governance system share common aims: protecting agricultural land, supporting farmers and limiting undesirable land-market outcomes. Their main difference lies in the mode of governance. SAFER operates as an active institutional intermediary that can observe, acquire, reallocate and attach commitments to land. Hungary operates mainly through legal restrictions, pre-emption categories and administrative approval.

From the perspective of the sustainability pillars, the SAFER model is stronger in connecting land access with generational renewal and territorial projects. The Hungarian model is stronger in formal legal restriction and national protection of farmland ownership, but weaker in project-based allocation and integrated environmental steering. Therefore, the most useful lesson for Hungary is not to establish a direct copy of SAFER, but to strengthen those functions that the SAFER system performs well: transparency, mediation, young-farmer land access, temporary land holding and enforceable public-interest commitments.

Future research should test these conclusions empirically through regional land-market data, interviews with young farmers, analysis of administrative decisions and case studies of successful and unsuccessful farm transfers. Such evidence would help determine which institutional improvements could support a more sustainable, transparent and generation-sensitive Hungarian land policy.

Acknowledgements

The author thanks the available official databases and institutional publications used for the preparation of this manuscript. Author, affiliation and funding information should be finalised before submission.

References

Agreste. 2025. Valeur vénale des terres en 2024. Chiffres et Données 2025-13. Service de la statistique et de la prospective, Ministère de l'Agriculture, Paris. https://agreste.agriculture.gouv.fr/

European Commission. 2025a. Building the future of EU agriculture with young farmers in focus. European Commission, Brussels. https://commission.europa.eu/

European Commission. 2025b. Hungary – CAP Strategic Plan 2023–2027. Directorate-General for Agriculture and Rural Development, Brussels. https://agriculture.ec.europa.eu/

European Commission. 2026a. France – CAP Strategic Plan 2023–2027. Directorate-General for Agriculture and Rural Development, Brussels. https://agriculture.ec.europa.eu/

European Commission. 2026b. Young farmers. Agriculture and rural development policy information page. https://agriculture.ec.europa.eu/

European Parliament and Council. 2021. Regulation (EU) 2021/2115 establishing rules on support for CAP Strategic Plans. Official Journal of the European Union. L 435 1–186.

Eurostat. 2026a. Farms and farmland in the European Union – statistics. Statistics Explained. Data extracted in April 2026. https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/

Eurostat. 2026b. Farm tenure. Statistics Explained. European Commission, Luxembourg. https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/

FAO. 2002. Land tenure and rural development. FAO Land Tenure Studies 3. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome.

FAO. 2022. Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security. First revision. FAO, Rome. https://doi.org/10.4060/i2801e

FAO. 2023a. Hungary – Agricultural Census 2020 – main results. World Programme for the Census of Agriculture 2020, FAO, Rome.

FAO. 2023b. France – Agricultural Census 2020 – main results. World Programme for the Census of Agriculture 2020, FAO, Rome.

FNSafer. 2025a. Rapport d'activité des Safer 2024 – synthèse. Fédération Nationale des SAFER, Paris. https://www.safer.fr/

FNSafer. 2025b. L'essentiel des marchés fonciers ruraux 2024. Le prix des terres. Fédération Nationale des SAFER, Paris. https://www.safer.fr/

KAP. 2026. Magyarország KAP Stratégiai Terve 2023–2027. Közös Agrárpolitika, Budapest. https://kap.gov.hu/strategies

KSH. 2020. Agricultural Census – FSS 2020. Hungarian Central Statistical Office, Budapest. https://www.ksh.hu/agricultural_census_fss_2020

Légifrance. 2026a. Code rural et de la pêche maritime, Article L141-1. République Française. https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/

Légifrance. 2026b. Code rural et de la pêche maritime, Article L143-1. République Française. https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/

Nemzeti Jogszabálytár. 2026. 2013. évi CXXII. törvény a mező- és erdőgazdasági földek forgalmáról. https://njt.jog.gov.hu/

OECD. 2017. The Governance of Land Use in OECD Countries: Policy Analysis and Recommendations. OECD Publishing, Paris. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264268609-en

OECD. 2020. Towards Sustainable Land Use: Aligning Biodiversity, Climate and Food Policies. OECD Publishing, Paris. https://doi.org/10.1787/3809b6a1-en

OECD. 2025. Agricultural Policy Monitoring and Evaluation 2025. OECD Publishing, Paris. https://doi.org/10.1787/a80ac398-en

SAFER. 2026a. Le droit de préemption. Sociétés d'aménagement foncier et d'établissement rural. https://www.safer.fr/les-safer/le-droit-de-preemption/

SAFER. 2026b. Nos 4 missions. Sociétés d'aménagement foncier et d'établissement rural. https://www.safer.fr/les-safer/nos-4-missions/

UNCCD. 2024. Land tenure and sustainable land management. United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification, Bonn. https://www.unccd.int/

World Bank. 2026. Land research, data, and policy insights. World Bank Group, Washington, DC. https://www.worldbank.org/en/research/brief/land

This work is licensed under a
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License.

A műre a Creative Commons 4.0 standard licenc alábbi típusa vonatkozik:
CC-BY-NC-ND-4.0.

