


Commons in Transition

ENVIRONMENTAL LEGISLATION AND PROPERTY RIGHTS IN ESTONIA

OLAVI HIIEMAE AND KALEV SEPP

Prague, 11-13 April 2003

ENVIRONMENTAL LEGISLATION AND PROPERTY RIGHTS IN ESTONIA

Olavi Hiiemäe and Kalev Sepp

ABSTRACT

This article gives an overview of environmental problems related to the land-use and property rights in Estonia. The article outlines features of land-use dynamics in Estonia during the 20th century and analyses the main legislative acts which are of importance concerning current land-use and property rights. The organisation of environmental management and conflicts between land-use and nature conservation policies are analysed. Property rights' are described in cases of former military areas and agricultural farms.

LAND-USE CHANGES IN ESTONIA: PAST AND FUTURE

The main features influencing land-use dynamics in Estonia in the 19th century were related to two political changes in Russia. First, in 1816 Estonian and in 1819 Livonian peasants were released from serfdom, but without any rights to land. Second, in 1861 serfdom was at last abolished in all Russia. This meant that every peasant got the right to buy land. Intensive renting and purchasing for perpetuity began as the landlords smelled a possibility to make money. Mainly land lots in marginal areas were distributed. As the established system of ancient fields still remained, new farms consisted of either many pieces often situated in different places separated by lands of other farms, or of long narrow strips. The first two decades of the 20th century changed little in the land-use structure in Estonia. The same processes of renting and buying for perpetuity of land from landlords continued up to 1918, when the Republic of Estonia was declared independent.

The land reform proclaimed on February 17, 1919, was one of the first important act of the independent state. All land belonging to the 1149 estates, to Baltic-German landlords, was nationalised and later distributed to Estonian peasants. This formed about 58% of the total territory, the remaining 42% belonging to 51,640 farms bought for perpetuity (Kasepalu, 1991). The reform also served a political aim - to involve peasants in the War for Independence. Participants of the War were given preference. The 23,023 tenants possessing their land before the reform maintained their possessions (Kasepalu, 1991). In mid-1920s the legal framework for land reform was developed. The number of persons applying for land increased constantly and by 1924 all the nationalised land was distributed. As the number of persons applying for land still kept increasing, a special Homestead Board was established in 1929. The main task of this body was to occupy unused mineral soil areas as well as wetlands. In the end of 1930s attempts to organise land exploitation were made. The aim of this was to get rid of farms consisting of separate pieces. Unfortunately, the process started too late and the following political changes changed its course.

Summing up the trends in land-use pattern it should be mentioned that altogether 33,180 new homesteads were established during the first (1918-1940) independence period. The total number of farms in 1939 has been estimated by different sources to be between 139,984 and 146,205 (Kasepalu, 1991). The average territory of a private farm was as

small as 22.4 ha. It is too difficult to even guess the number of acting farms during and after the war.

The first collective farms (kolkhozes) were formed in 1947. Beginning in 1949, collective and state farms (sovkhozes) became the most important agriculturally producing units. By the end of 1949 the number of collective farms reached 2898, together with fishery farms and state farms the total number of agricultural enterprises was 3122 (Kasepalu, 1991). In 1949 the average size of collective farms was 567 ha (Kasepalu, 1991). Later this number increased, reaching up to 8321 ha in 1980. In 1950, according to the CPSU CC directive, the process of merging smaller collective farms began. The number of collective farms was reduced to 1951 by the end of 1951. During the 1950s and 60s weaker collective farms were merged into state farms. The beginning of the 1970s marked a new wave of concentration in Estonian agriculture. The main characteristic feature of this wave was the merging of neighbouring smaller collective farms.

The aim of such unification was, according to A.Kasepalu, to obtain from the state better wages for the leaders of the collective farms and to subsidise the building of large cattle and pig farms.

The last considerable uniting of collective farms took place in 1976. From then until 1985 the number of agricultural enterprises remained stable at 302. Between 1985 and 1989, 22 enterprises were divided into smaller units. In the 1990s more than 200,000 heirs have submitted claims to have their property returned to them.

According to Ü. Mander et al. (1994) the main tendencies in land use dynamics in the 20^{th} century can be distinguished as follows:

Firstly, before World War II the share of agricultural land was larger in western counties and smaller in eastern counties (Figure 1). The year 1918 marked the time when greater percentage of agricultural land has reached. Even in Virumaa, the less agriculturally developed county in Estonia at that time, the share of agricultural land exceeded 50%, while in Saaremaa the number was as high as 88.05%.

Secondly, land-use patterns demonstrate a tendency towards polarisation. As a rule, the share of agricultural land has been continuously decreasing while the share of forests has been increasing (Figure 2). Increase of the forest area is generally achieved at the expense of semi-natural grasslands, while the areas of arable land and fields have remained almost constant since 1939. Increase of the forest area refers a higher share of natural areas within landscapes. The average area of a field has increased, due to land reclamation activities which often remove the natural elements (woods, grasslands, wetlands) and unite smaller fields into great massifs.

Thirdly, on the local level landscape patterns show a clear tendency towards simplification. Figure 3. shows the development of landscape structure in southern Hiiumaa. On the one hand, land-use units have become larger, on the other, about a half of former agriculturally used lands have turned into bushes and forest.

The main trends in land-use dynamics in Estonia have been decrease in the percentage of agricultural land, especially of semi-natural grasslands (from 65 % in 1918 to 30 % in 1994) and an increase in the share of forests (from 21 to 43 %, respectively). The most relevant driving factors of such a shift have been land reforms, collectivisation, formation of the Soviet border zone along the coasts, concentration of agricultural production, and urbanisation. The most significant reduction in the agriculturally used

area was recorded during the first ten years (1947-1957) of collectivisation (Mander et al., 1994).

OVERVIEW OF THE MAIN LEGISLATION CONCERNING PROPERTY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

The main goal of environmental policies is provision of preconditions for Estonia's long-term and sustainable development, safeguarding the state of the environment and natural resources necessary for this. The Estonian government considers the development of the appropriate legislative basis, setting of environmental quality standards, and application of efficient economic measures the priority objectives for achieving this.

The former USSR legislative acts and standards which have been used up to now do not facilitate the achievement of the above objectives as they fail to meet the needs of the developed society, and differ from the ones used in the neighbouring and other European states.

The legislation currently in force in Estonia consists of a great variety of legislative acts of different origin and background. Part of these have been compiled and approved in recent years within the Republic of Estonia, after independence was regained. Some of these acts are based on legislation of the Republic of Estonia which were in force before 1940. Another part have been approved during the Soviet colonisation period (1944-1991) and are mostly based on corresponding USSR acts, regulations, etc.

The hierarchy of types of legislative acts is the following: the Constitution, acts, Government regulations, Ministerial regulations, state department regulations, and local government decisions. Until recently, precedents have not played a significant role in Estonian written environmental legislation, while custom-derived rules have played a limited role. International agreements, after they have been ratified by the Parliament, are an integrated part of national legislation and making of changes in national legislation is sometimes necessary in order to bring them into line with these agreements.

Significant changes in environmental legislation were initiated with the passing of the new Estonian SSR's Act on the Protection of Nature in Estonia on February 23, 1990. For the first time since 1940, all enterprises, organisations, including the army, and individuals are equally responsible for prevention of harm to nature. In particular, the role of regional and local authorities was increased, which under new act, gives them more rights and responsibilities concerning matters related to the environment. These changes were required because of over- centralization of decision-making, both in environmental protection and production activities (Kaasik, 1994). The above Act was a framework law, which was progressive and ahead of its time. The new Constitution of the Republic of Estonia, approved in 1992, contains a paragraph referring to environmental protection. In Article 53 it is stated: 'Everyone shall be obligated to preserve human and natural environment and to compensate for damages caused by him or her to the environment. The procedures for compensations shall be determined by law'.

Mostly two governmental institutions - Estonian Ministry of the Environment and Ministry of Agriculture - have got responsibility for development and implementation of

environmental policies in the Estonian land use system. Efforts to perform this task have unfortunately not been very successful. The environmental goal of land use policies through the Land Reform process in Estonia is maintenance of the present conservation status of the country.

The approval of the Act on Private Farming (1989) can be regarded as the starting point of land reform. It legalised private farming as an alternative to collective and state farms. However, this law only gave the right to use the land, not to own it. Under this arrangement, farmers were guaranteed economic support and credit by the State and the Estonian Central Farmers Union until 1993. Also, some activities (land reclamation, construction of road and electricity transmission lines, etc.) were carried out and financed by the national organisations for the new farmers. The Act also included some restrictions arising from environmental considerations and allowed for the possibility of terminating use of the land because of environmental violations as specified in Article 12. According to this Article, land must be used by the farmer rationally and considering agro-technical requirements in order to develop agricultural production and to create a healthy living environment for the people of Estonia. The farmer has got the right to use local natural resources (such as sand, gravel, limestone, peat etc.) for meeting the needs of the farm.

The Property Act (June 13, 1990) defined the owners' rights and confirmed the equality of owners before the law. Immediately after the passing of this Act, there was intensive public debate concerning the optimum method of privatisation. There have been essentially two opposing points of view. One view has it that the privatisation of state property, including land, should be conducted through large-scale selling off to private owners, both to legal and physical persons. The sale should take place primarily through auctions. The other view declared that first priority should be given to restoration of the ownership rights of the former owners whose property was nationalised during the Soviet period and, if restoration of property rights was not possible, then the value of the unlawfully seized property should be compensated. According to the latter point of view, this compensation would not be paid in money but in bonds and the recipient would have the right to use these during the process of privatisation of state property.

The basic principles of the Ownership Reform Act were established in June, 1991 and followed by the Land Reform Act which was approved in October, 1991, in 3 ways: returning of property, privatisation and munipalization. The aim of the land reform is to reform the relations based one state ownership of land into those based mainly on private ownership of land proceeding from the continuity of the rights of the former owners and the interests of the present users of the land as defined by law. The Land Reform Act determines procedures for the return, replacement, and compensation for land. It gives the former owners or their descendants first priority concerning land claims, with the exception of cases where land had already been allocated under the 1989 Act on Private Farming. It applies to physical persons whose land was nationalised on June 16, 1940 , and to a limited extent to legal bodies (including non-profit organisations and the church).

Part of the land will remain in state ownership. Land may be left in the ownership of the state in the following cases:

- land under buildings and constructions in state ownership and land catering to them;
- land under state protection and belonging to the objects under state protection, in cases when the established protection regime makes it impossible to exploit the

land by another person or in case the owner does not accept the protection requirements;

- land under water resources in state ownership;
- land meant for social, cultural and recreational purposes; agricultural land of the municipal enterprises and institutions;
- reserve land of the local municipalities necessary for the development purposes.

Land lots which are not subject to return or substitution, nor in state or municipal ownership owned by the state or municipalities, may be privatised.

The purpose of the Agricultural Reform Act of March, 1992, is liquidation of collective and state farms (kolkozes and sovkhozes) and transition to agriculture based on private ownership. This Act does not deal with land ownership. Ownership of former collectively owned property (production, tools, basic capital) will be determined according to the following principles:

1. Under the Land Reform Act, property collectivised compulsorily in the 1940s and 1950s will be returned to former owners and their descendants;
2. Part of collective property will be transferred to municipal ownership;
3. Property given to the collective or financed by the state will be taken (returned) into state ownership and then either privatised, transferred to municipal ownership or leased;
4. The most important principle of the agricultural reform is that the remainder will be divided among present and past members of the collective on the basis of their 'labour contribution' - the number of years they have worked.

In Articles 18 and 25 of this Act it is stipulated that during the transition of ownership, environmental protection requirements must be considered.

One of the main instruments in the implementation of land use policies is the Land Valuation Act of July, 1993, and the Land Tax Act of May, 1993. Land users might get tax abatement privileges if their property is situated within an environmentally protected area where, for instance, use of mineral fertilisers is restricted or prohibited. These laws are in some aspects in conflict with the interests of local governments. According to law, half of the land tax is considered revenue to budget.

The forestry reform, focusing on partial privatisation and reorganisation of the management of state-owned forests, has been in the centre of discussion for some years. The Forestry Act of October 20, 1993, defines the principles of forest management based on the role of forest as one of the main natural resources of Estonia and takes into account its impact to the environment.

The Act on Protected Natural Objects (May, 1994) determines the nature of protection and the procedure of taking into protection of territories, single natural objects, plant, fungi and animal species (hereunder also referred to as objects of nature), and determines the rights and responsibilities of land-owners, land-users, and other persons concerning protected natural objects. Protected object of nature may be owned by the state, the local government, physical or legal person.

The Act on Protected Natural Objects, the Land Reform Act, and the National Heritage Protection Act foresee the possibility of changing ownership rights in cases where legal

protection requirements are not implemented by the land-owner. However, the procedure for this is still under development.

Currently many legislative acts created in the post-World-War-II- period no longer apply since ownership, entrepreneurship, social and other relations in society have changed. At the moment the following acts concerning the environment are in force in Estonia: the Act of Protection of Bogs (1970); the Water Code (1972); the Act on Air Protection (1981); the Act on Using Natural Resources (1989); the Fisheries Act (1991); the Waste Act (1992); the Act on Animal Protection (1992); the Forests Act (1993); the Act on the Borders of Territorial Waters (1993), the Environmental Fund Act (1994), the Act on Protected Natural Objects (1994), the Hunting Act (1994), the Water Act (1994), the Mineral Resources Act (1994), Land Arrangement Law (1995), Act on the Protection of Marine and Freshwater Coasts, Shores and Banks (1995), Act on Planning and Building (1995), Act on the Amendment of Land Tax (1995), Fisheries Act (1995). An act on Environmental Impact Assessment is also being developed, based on the experience obtained through implementation of a governmental regulation on EIA of 1992.

At the beginning of 1994 the real estate register was established. An important prerequisite for taking into consideration environmental requirements is provided by Land Reform Act, Articles 6, 18 and 31, which define conditions for management of lands within currently protected areas, and determine under which conditions it is permitted to maintain land in state ownership.

The rate of the land tax depends on restrictions to land use. The more restrictions, the more difficult it is to use land profitably. Depending on the range of restrictions, the areas are either abated or exempted from the land tax. To compensate for the economic loss caused by environmental restrictions, the Land Tax Act foresees exemption of lands where all or some economic activities are prohibited from state or local tax. Between July and October, 1993, district environmental departments and the staff of the Ministry performed inventory of nature conservation objects. A regulation of the government (October 20, 1993, No. 323) provides exemption of 204,771 hectares from state and local tax and exemption of 23,146.9 hectares from state land tax (Environment, 1994). The methodology for accounting the economic consequences of restrictions is being developed.

The existence of land returned to the rightful owner constitutes a problem both for the owner and for the environmental staff. In theory, the owner may agree to restrict economic activities within his/her land, or he/she may accept compensation paid by the state. In reality, the owner would probably want to substitute the area subject to economic restrictions for another land lot in an area without restrictions. Substitution of one piece of land for another can be difficult if there is no free (ownerless) land in the commune in question. Getting the substitution piece of land in another commune is not

considered practical. In cases like this, the state has to find the finances to purchase the environmentally valuable land lot from the owner of land. Such practice is common in Finland and Sweden. Due to lack of funding, such practice cannot currently become common in Estonia. In a society focusing on the implementation of reforms it is extremely complicated to apply legislation oriented at stable societies with established relations based on private ownership.

As the Act of Estate recently came into force, all procedures concerning property have proved extremely complicated. The list of state lands has not been submitted to the government yet. The areas where all economic activities are prohibited due to environmental considerations are strict nature reserves and special protection areas, the total area of which is 1-2 % of the territory of all protected areas.

The most optimistic prognosis has it that registering of all owners in the real estate register will take 10 years at least. The number of notaries and land licensed surveyors is insufficient. Besides, many contradictions between former and 'new' owners, between renters and owners, between inheritors of land themselves, need solution through the court system. For improving the legal framework, it is necessary to pass the Act on Land Surveying and the Act on Building and Planning. The Act on Protected Natural Objects generally including legal instruments for maintaining the present conservation status of areas, but effectiveness of implementation of the Act depends highly on the staff of local and regional governments. A good example can be given from the Lahemaa National Park, where in one district involved (Lääne-Virumaa) local government staff works in close cooperation with the staff of the National Park while in other parts of the National Park (e.g. the Harjumaa district), cooperation is insufficient.

The environmental goal, like nature conservation goals in land use policy in the land reform process in Estonia, is maintaining of the present conservation status of the country. The following factors should be considered:

The Act on Land Reform includes legal instruments to keep the most important sites under state ownership and to maintain protection regimes in the already protected areas, to the extent which is financially possible and considered necessary.

New authorities, such as institutions which are dealing with land (forestry, agriculture) who have got responsibility for land management and policies, should hire more nature conservation specialists.

PROPERTY QUESTIONS WHICH NEED BETTER REGULATION

Privatisation has been one of the main priorities in restructuring the Estonian economy. The government of the Republic of Estonia has consistently been striving toward the following goals:

- Stability of privatisation (this has been carried out on the basis of the Privatisation Law, passed in 1993, to which no substantial changes have been made);
- Carrying out privatisation on the model of the German Treuhand, in which the Estonian Privatisation Agency has had vast authority to operate independently.

Important changes have taken place in the Estonian economy as a result of privatisation. While in 1994 only 67.5% of all business revenues came from the private sector, in 1997 this figure was 86.2%. (Estonia, Candidate for membership in the EU, International Business Handbook 1998-1999, pp 74)

The speed of **land reform** has substantially slowed down during last 1-2 years.
The National Land Board has established 15 regional cadastres in which land registered as cadastre units. The first cadastre units were registered in December 1992.
As of 31 May 2000, the land registered in the cadastre totalled 2 432 972 hectares (54% of Estonian's territory).
Of the total arable land stock have registered in the cadastre 47% (536 thousand hectares) and from total woodland 69 % (1 385 thousand hectares) (Regional Statistics of Estonia 1999, pp 137).

The main keyword of land reform in 1999 was the identification of vacant lands.
The main question for the future is: when will land reform be completed?
There are basically two alternative answers to this question.
First one, when all return and privatisation applications are solved (this is the position of the Land Board). And in this case land reform was expected to be concluded by the year 2002, by which time the land cadastre would contain up to 3.8 million hectares of registered land.
Second answer will be that when the entire land stock has been entered in cadastre, which will take much more time and can be completed not earlier than in 2006.

The incomplete data of forest management reveal that on average the farms have got 10-12 ha of forest land.
A new **forest policy** promoting contemporary and effective forestry was approved by the parliament on June 11, 1997.
According to Estonian's Forest Policy, the state's role in forestry is to a counterbalance in questions of production and protection of forests and to support private forestry.
Two goals for Estonian forestry are set forth in the policy:

- economical forestry, meaning a system of carrying for and using the forests in a manner and at a tempo that will guarantee their biological diversity, productivity, renewal capability and vitality;
- effective forestry, meaning ecological use of the forest that takes into account both long- and short-term goals. (Estonia, Candidate for membership in the EU, International Business Handbook 1998-1999, pp 108)

The forest ownership part provided for no extensive privatisation of forestlands, which belonged to the state before 23 July 1940, which means that up to 1 million ha of Estonian's present forest area was decided to be left in state ownership. The Forest Act (9 December 1998) prescribed that the area of state owned forest is at least 20% is equal to 875 thousand hectares, which according to the land cadastre data was already entered in state ownership as of 31 March 1999.
The forests growing in former farmlands are to be returned and privatised in accordance with the Land Reform Act. As of 31 May 2000, the total area of private forest entered in the land cadastre was 510 thousand hectares.(Agriculture and Rural Development, Overview 1999, pp 138)

Complexity of the procedure

The crucial point in land reform and property rights in Estonia was a restitution. Estonian Government decided to restitute agricultural land to the former owners (were owners of land before the year 1940). In the 1990s more than 200,000 heirs have submitted claims to have their property returned to them. At same time, last fifty years has passed tremendous changes in land use pattern. Investigations shows that only small amount of land has remained same borders as before the World War II. With restitution to the former owners, most affected were people who owned the land now, and who had to leave their houses and land, if there was no other solutions. Those conflicts, in between former and present owners has generated many never ending court cases

In many cases, former owners or their heirs were living in abroad, and it was very long and time consuming procedure to make clear the relations and fulfill all requirements, that was needed. Quite often there was a luck of documents, that has been lost during the WW II or during the reorganisations afterwards.

Poor cooperation between different authorities - land cadastres next to the local municipalities, Land Board and property register offices.

Especially in the first years of the re-independency, the poor cooperation between those institutions has made the process very long and complicated

Former military areas

Environmental problems emanating from defence activities of the former Soviet Army in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, are similar to these in the former socialistic Eastern and Central European countries - huge areas with polluted surface- and groundwater, mechanical and chemical damages to soils etc. (See also Vaiciunaite, 1994)

According to official data, troops of the former Soviet Army occupied over 500 land lots. During the Soviet occupation period these covered the area of 83,000 ha, which is 2% of Estonia territory. There were 12 military airfields (including reserve airstrips), 29 missile bases and 4 large areas for military training in Estonia. Among them the largest were the military training area at Aegviidu (over 33,000 ha), airfields at Tapa, Ämari and Tartu (900-1,000 ha) and notable amount of special fuel storage in different places in Estonia (Otsa, 1993).

In 1992-1994 systematic inventories of the damages caused by military units were studied. The Ministry of the Environment formed a Working Group which analysed 85 per cent of the territory formerly held by the Soviet militaries. The Working Group estimates the costs of repairing the damage to the Estonian Environment at over 4 billion USD (which exceeds the national budget of Estonia for 1995 by over 5 times).

According to law, former military property will be given to the state (Ministry of Defence mostly), municipalities or into private hands. Nobody of the above has got money to perform clean-up activities. In a number of cases the former military objects cause real danger to the environment (underground oil terminals, pipelines, contaminated areas etc.). In some cases it is logical and even better to give some areas to commercial use (oil terminals) than to conserve these sites. According to law, after privatisation the new owners bear responsibility for determination of the scope of pollution. Due the high price of clean-up activities, the former military areas will maintain their military look for decades. Problems related to the former military properties need more attention from the government.

Property of former state and collective farms.

According to the Agricultural Reform Act of March, 1992, liquidation of the collective and state farms (kolkozes and sovkhozes) and transition to agriculture based on private ownership is under way. In many regions, agricultural reform was carried out successfully, but in some areas of Estonia violation of law occurred, and the 'second round' via court will follow. While questions of land ownership are specified in legislative acts, questions related to responsibility for huge unused facilities, such as use of reclaimed areas, are not resolved in practice. There were 289 large cattle farms (more than 400 cows) in Estonia. Of these, 261 had got between 400 and 799 animal places, and 28 over 800 places (Kaasik, 1994) (Figure 5). Even if a larger cattle farm had got normal storage facilities, then without a real owner these facilities do cause considerable danger to the environment. If we add that in many cases the farms were built without any manure storage and quite often former control wells in the vicinity of farms are unclosed (which is especially dangerous in the Northern and Western part of Estonia), the seriousness of the problem is understandable. The former property of collective and state farms should receive more attention from the regional and local authorities.

CONCLUSIONS

The main trends in land-use dynamics of Estonia have been decrease in the percentage of agricultural land (from 65 % in 1918 to 30 % in 1994) and increase in the share of forests (from 21 to 44 %, respectively).

Environmental legislative instruments are not effective, largely due to problems with lower regulative acts, insufficient or poorly defined instruments and problems of implementation (institutional framework, financing).

Due to radical changes in land ownership and economy, completely new nature conservation problems have arisen. Land and forest privatisation mean that measures should urgently be taken to set aside the most valuable territories and objects for remaining in state ownership. It is necessary to adapt effective legal, administrative, and economic measures to protect the existing network of natural areas.

The estimated time necessary for registering all owners in the real estate register is 10 years at least. The number of notaries and licensed land surveyors is insufficient to increase the speed of this process. Contradictions between the 'former' and 'new' owners, between land-users and owners, between the applicants themselves, take time to be solved through the court system. Changing of legislation is a dynamic process with new passed acts leading to need for yet new acts.

In the present circumstances, compensation for direct governmental restrictions to landowners' activities and interests should be provided via the taxation system, not through direct subsidies or grants. This should encourage landowners to move towards more conservation-oriented forms of land use.

A number of questions concerning property rights are not clearly regulated, for example: How to clean up former military territories, who is responsible from pollution at or from former military areas or from manure storage and farms. This might cause risk to the environment. Clean-up and remediation of former military sites is expensive, questions concerning legal liability for this have not been solved in an acceptable way.

Problems related to management of waste (water) treatment facilities should be dealt with, giving high consideration to public health requirements and seeking for possibilities to combine the interests of private owners and municipalities, (settlements).

References

Act of 11.3.92 on Agricultural Reform in the Republic of Estonia, in force 12.3.92: *Riigi Teataja* (hereunder: *RT*) (State Herald) 1992, No.10.

Act of 17.10.91 on Land Reform in the Republic of Estonia, in force 1.11.91*: RT* (State Herald) 1991, No 34.

Estonian Environment 1993. Ministry of the Environment of Estonia, Environmental Information Centre. Tallinn, 1994, 94 p.

Kaasik, T. 1994. Environmental policy instruments in Estonian agriculture. In: *Comparing Nordic and Baltic Countries - environmental problems and policies in agriculture and forestry*. TemaNord 1994:572. pp.123-139.

Kasepalu, A. 1991. *That Which the Master Leaves, the Woods Will Take. Land Use in the Estonian Village*. Tallinn, Valgus, 75 pp. (In Estonian with summery in English).

Kuresoo, R. (1994). A NGO perspective by the Estonian Fund for Nature. In: *Workshop on the Practical Implementation of The Convention on Biological Diversity in the Baltic Countries*, 16-18 October, 1994, edited by Külvik, M. pp.88-90.

Külvik, M., Veinla, H. Land reform and nature conservation: status review. In*: IUCN European Program. Land (Re)privatisation in Central and Eastern Europe*. National Reports. 1993.

Mander, Ü. and Palang, H. 1994: Changes of landscape structure in Estonia during the Soviet period. *GeoJournal.,* 33, 1, pp. 45-54.

Otsa, E. 1993. Military Environment in Estonia. In: *Estonian Environment 1993.* Ministry of the Environment of Estonia, Environmental Information Centre. Tallinn, pp. 68-70.

Sillaots, T (1994). Land reform and nature conservation. In: *Estonian Environment 1993*. Ministry of the Environment of Estonia, Environmental Information Centre. Tallinn, pp. 61-64.

Vaiciunaite, R. 1994. When armies give way to life. WWF Baltic Bulletin, 5, 15-17