Journal of Experimental Biology and Agricultural Sciences

<http://www.jebas.org>

ISSN No. 2320 – 8694

INVESTMENT POTENTIAL OF THE SOUTHERN TERRITORY OF RUSSIA (KRASNODAR KRAI) FOR DEVELOPING THE RURAL (AGRARIAN) TOURISM

Tatiana Aleksandrovna Volkova^{*1}, Vera Vladimirovna Minenkova¹, Alexandr Aleksandrovich Mishchenko¹, Julia Igorevna Karpova¹, Snezhana Vladimirovna Lazovskaya²

¹Kuban State University, 350040, Russian Federation, Krasnodar Krai, Krasnodar, Stavropolskaya St., 149

²Southern Institute of Management, 350040, Russian Federation, Krasnodar Krai, Krasnodar, Stavropolskaya St., 216

Received – August 08, 2017; Revision – October 06, 2017; Accepted – December 13, 2017

Available Online – December 27, 2017

DOI: [http://dx.doi.org/10.18006/2017.5\(6\).806.817](http://dx.doi.org/10.18006/2017.5(6).806.817)

KEYWORDS

Krasnodar Krai

Rural tourism (agrarian)

Investment potential

Tourism and recreational complex

ABSTRACT

In Russia, researches related to the rural (agrarian) tourism are in scarcity and most of the recent researches based on the agrarian are following model developed for European countries agrarian tourism development. Only after 2008, Russian researcher started working the developed a suitable model of the establishment of Russian agrarian tourism. Till today most of the researches were based on the territories such as Republic of Buryatia, and Volgograd Region but no research devoted to the investment attractiveness of the Krasnodar Krai for agricultural tourism have been made yet.

The goal of this study was to estimate the investment attractiveness of the rural (agrarian) tourism as one of the areas of the tourism industry in Krasnodar Krai. Study was conducted by comparative geographic method, statistical processing and analysis of indicators, factor-integral estimation of indicators of external and internal factors, which influence the development of rural (agrarian) tourism in terms of municipal structures of Krasnodar Krai. Result of study revealed that the territory of Krasnodar Krai can be estimated by a number of indicators such as potential agritourism attractiveness, agritourism supra-structure, number of investment agritourism projects, investment climate, and regional policy of the

* Corresponding author

E-mail: t.vlkv@mail.ru (Tatiana Aleksandrovna Volkova)

Peer review under responsibility of Journal of Experimental Biology and Agricultural Sciences.

Production and Hosting by Horizon Publisher India [HPI]
(<http://www.horizonpublisherindia.in/>).
All rights reserved.

All the article published by Journal of Experimental Biology and Agricultural Sciences is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License Based on a work at www.jebas.org.

power. Municipal regions of Krasnodar Krai were grouped according to the degree of investment attractiveness of agrarian (rural) tourism. Inter-regional differences in terms of the investment potential of municipal regions depending on a number of factors were specified.

The investment potential of Krasnodar Krai for developing the rural (agrarian) tourism increases in the regions where the tourism specialization is vividly expressed and in the regions specializing in agriculture. In Krasnodar Krai there are territories that need to take measures on improving the investment attractiveness of the territory for developing the rural (agrarian) tourism.

1 Introduction

In Russia researching of rural (agrarian) tourism as a separate tourism area has started recently. The first works which were published in the early 2000s analyzed the experience of European countries in the area of agrarian tourism development (Penkovskiy, 2002; Sharipov, 2002; Ardabatskaya, 2002; Soklova, 2002; Galkina, 2003; Penkovskiy, 2003). The first publications devoted to investments in agricultural tourism occurred in the Russian Federation in 2008 (Klikich & Kuktashev, 2008; Klikich & Kuktashev, 2010; Vinokurova & Ivanycheva, 2014). After this, work related to Russia agrarian tourism, first published in 2015. These were based on the agrarian tourism researches about territories of the Republic of Buryatia and Volgograd Region (Volkova, 2005; Shpyrnya & Yevtushenko 2005; Detochenko, 2006).

A steady tendency in the global economy can be observed, when service industries are on the rise and the tourism is the most dynamically developing one (Volkova et al., 2016a). The resort and tourism complex of Krasnodar Krai is one of the largest in the Russian Federation. The recreational complex of the Azov-Black Sea coast occupies the leading position in the regional tourism and recreational sector (Volkova et al., 2016b). Tourism is referred to one of the top priority and most socially significant investment purposes in Krasnodar Krai. Resulting from the geopolitical situation over the recent years, a certain increase in the number of tourists at the resorts of the Black Sea coast has been observed. The economic sanctions of Western countries affected the intent of Russian tourists to travel abroad. Fixation on Russian resorts was artificially supported by the growing rates of foreign currencies to RUB, which considerably reduced the purchasing power of the Russians in relation to the proposed foreign tourist products (Volkova et al., 2016c). As a consequence of such processes, a sharp growth of the load on relevant sea coastal zones took place and tourist infrastructure elements were overloaded. In this regard, there is a need to develop and popularize alternative types of tourism in the Krai, in particular, rural (agrarian) tourism. The development of agritourism makes it possible to increase the sales of agricultural products to travelers. Such development

should stimulate the local economy. It will also help to solve the problem of unemployment in rural settlements, reduce the escape of young generation to other places (Volkova & Ponomarenko, 2012).

There are few approaches to defining and understanding the nature of rural tourism. Obviously, the main reason for this is the diversity of types of recreational activities and occupations that can be conditionally classified as rural tourism. At the same time, tourist involvement in the rural life plays an important role because rural places are chosen for recreation by such travelers. In general, rural tourism is a complex of socio-economic activities focused at creating an additional source of income for countrymen and developing rural areas by providing tourist services (Minenkova et al., 2017).

To ensure the attractiveness and competitiveness of rural (agrarian) tourism entities, it is necessary to stimulate a flow of investments into this sector. However, firstly it is necessary to assess how much investments in this sector will be attractive and beneficial for potential investors.

2 Materials and Methods

At the moment there are several domestic methods available for assessing the investment attractiveness. Without challenging the provisions made by developers of the methodology of the tourism and recreational design, zoning and regionalization (Verkhoturov, 2011; Kaledin & Krapivina, 2007), we will note that the existing methodic developments and recommendations almost do not take into account specific types of tourism, for example, rural tourism as a type of tourism that has specific resources.

In present study, special attention paid to the approach developed by Omsk State Agrarian University named after P.A. Stolypin. The authors of this technique are Shumakova et al. (2015). It includes a set of five indicators viz., development of agriculture, natural specifics, cultural characteristics, uniqueness and identity of ethnic groups residing in relevant rural area and organizational and economic and legal conditions for establishing and development of agritourism in the relevant rural area. Based on

this method, the investment potential of the territory for developing the rural tourism was estimated.

Investments in travel business are mainly directed to the creation or reconstruction of tourist attractions. As a rule, investments in the touristic sector are higher, where tourism is the most significant and widespread type of business. Many regions of Russia have attractive tourist and recreational facilities. However, it is necessary to attract a considerable volume of investments for their full development and efficient operation.

According to the Minenkova et al. (2017) the factors determining the investment attractiveness of the territory can be divided into three groups i.e. (i) natural and geographical, (ii) historical and geographical, and (iii) socio-economic (Minenkova et al., 2017).

During the development of the territory capable of attracting and satisfying various needs and demands of numerous types of tourists, socio-economic factors prevail and can be divided into the external and internal ones (Figure 1) (Minenkova et al., 2017).

For Krasnodar Krai, the above-mentioned factors directly correlate with the tourist and recreational areas that are strategically important for potential investors to take a decision on investing funds. To obtain more details about investment attractiveness of rural agrarian tourism, the agriculture development factor should be added to this list, since it plays a fundamental role in developing this type of tourism in a certain

territory. The current attractiveness of the tourist and recreational complexes is presented as potential agritourism attraction calculated as the ratio of the number of tourists, who visited a municipal structure for the year, to the total number of tourists in Krasnodar Krai in the same year. For the rural areas, the agritourism potential integrated score will be used and calculated as the sum of the scores for relevant internal factors that determine the investment attractiveness of the tourist and recreational complex.

Firstly, it is important to determine the scores for external factors that define the investment attractiveness of rural (agrarian) tourism in Krasnodar Krai (geoeconomic, geopolitical and regulatory-legal). This study will be carried out for Krasnodar Krai as a whole (since the above external factors have almost equal impact on municipal structures of this subordinate entity of the federation). If the factor has a positive impact, the score is 1, if negative — 0.

The geo-economic factors include the presence or absence of an economic crisis, the inflationary developments, the profitability of exchange rates, etc. Only recently the situation has more or less stabilized, but still it is not in favor of ruble and because of this the geoeconomic score was consider as 0.

The geopolitical factor includes a political situation in the country and in the world. As the above-mentioned negative impact is hardly appreciable in Krasnodar Krai, this may become the

Figure 1 Socio-economic Factors that Determine the Territory's Investment Attractiveness

decisive factor determining the choice of tourists in favor of the south of Russia, and alternative types of recreation, in particular rural (agrarian) tourism, can serve as additional motivators for the re-distribution of the tourist flow during the holidays. In this case, investments in the rural (agrarian) tourism industry can bring considerable benefits to investors. Based on the above, the geopolitical factor has a score of 1 point.

The regulatory factors currently contribute to the development of rural (agrarian) tourism in Krasnodar Krai. On the federal level the Government of the Russian Federation adopted Resolution No. 644 dated August 2, 2011 (amended on January 31, 2017) "On the Federal Target Program on Developing Domestic and Inbound Tourism in the Russian Federation (2011–2018)". On the regional level the Concept of Developing Rural (Agrarian) Tourism in Krasnodar Krai for 2017–2020 was adopted (Concept of Developing the Rural (Agrarian) Tourism in the Krasnodar Krai for 2017–2020 [available on Official website of the Ministry of Resorts, Tourism, and Olympic Heritage of the Krasnodar Krai – <https://min.kurortkuban.ru/de/search/item/kontseptsiya-razvitiya-selskogo-agrarnogo-turizma-v-krasnodarskom-krae-na-2017-2020-gody> retrieved on 12.09.2017). The Sochi Investment Forum plays an important role in stimulating tourism in Krasnodar Krai. Due to this, in 2017 more than 200 agreements and protocols of intent were signed for the total amount of about 140 billion rubles. In addition, in April 2016 the Krai adopted a set of legislative initiatives that provide a more perfect and flexible tax collection mechanism. All this stimulates business of small and medium-sized enterprises and entrepreneurs, creates a favorable climate for the development of tourism, including rural (agrarian) tourism in Krasnodar Krai and this was scored as 1 point.

Thus, the impact of the external factors on the investment attractiveness of rural (agrarian) tourism is assessed as good and they facilitate attraction of investments. Impact of the internal factors on the investment attractiveness of relevant areas for developing rural (agrarian) tourism should be analyzed in the context of municipal structures. It will allow seeing not only the general picture but also identifying areas that need additional stimulation or territories that have high agritourism potential. In order to calculate the investment attractiveness of the territory, the authors created the formula below. All indicators are considered as the ratio of the number of objects characterizing the indicator in the territory of the municipal region to the total number of objects in the territory of the region and are calculated by using the following formula:

$$K_{In} = InM / InKT,$$

Where,

K_{In} — is the studied indicator's coefficient,

InM — is the municipal structure's indicator, and

$InKT$ — is the subordinate entity's indicator (i.e. Krasnodar Krai).

The set of criteria for the subsequent factor-integral estimation is based on the following:

I_1 — is the tourist attractiveness of the territory. It is calculated as the ratio of the tourist's numbers who visited a municipal structure for the year to the total number of tourists in Krasnodar Krai in the same year; it has been calculated on the basis of the data presented by the Territorial Body of the Federal Service of State Statistics for Krasnodar Krai (Krasnodar stat).

I_2 — is the agritourism super-structure, which is defined as the availability of agritourism infrastructure objects in the territory; it has been calculated on the basis of the data presented by the Ministry of Resorts, Tourism and Olympic Heritage of Krasnodar Krai.

I_3 — is the number of investment agritourism projects; it has been calculated on the basis of the data presented at the Investment Portal of Krasnodar Krai.

I_4 — is the investment of climate, it is defined as the ratio of implemented and successfully implemented projects in the municipal structure; it has been calculated on the basis of the data presented by the Ministry of Resorts, Tourism and Olympic Heritage of Krasnodar Krai. In order to assess the overall investment situation in the tourist industry of Krasnodar Krai, not only the projects for developing rural (agrarian) tourism have been considered.

I_5 — is the regional policy, due to the fact that equally favorable environment for developing the tourism industry, in particular rural (agrarian) tourism, is supported in Krasnodar Krai, we will assign 1 point for this factor to each municipal structure. Further, relying on the availability of an additional, unique program for developing rural tourism in a particular municipality, we will add 1 point for such entity. The coefficient is calculated as the ratio of the number of points for each municipality to the total score of Krasnodar Krai.

I_6 — it characterizes the development of agriculture in the relevant municipality. The relevant information from the Guide on Agricultural Enterprises of the Southern Federal District has been used to calculate this score. It was calculated as the ratio of the number of agricultural enterprises in the municipal structure to the total number of agricultural enterprises in Krasnodar Krai.

For the rural areas, the agritourism potential integrated score is calculated as the sum I_I by the following scores:

$$I_I = I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4 + I_5 + I_6$$

3 Results

The resort cities i.e. Sochi, Anapa and Gelendzhik, as well as the city of Krasnodar and the Tuapse district have the highest tourist attractiveness (I_1). Other municipal structures need additional attention, especially the Uspenskiy, Tbiliskiy, Starominskiy, Severskiy, Novopokrovskiy, Novokubanskiy, Kushchevskiy, Krasnoarmeyskiy, Korenovskiy, Kalininskiy, Dinskoy, Gulkevichskiy, Vyselkovskiy, Bryukhovetskiy and Beloglinskiy districts. They have the smallest shares of tourists served by collective accommodation facilities in Krasnodar Krai.

Further, results of study revealed that following municipalities have a well-developed agritourist supra-structure (I_2): the resort cities of GoryachiyKlyuch, Sochi and Anapa, as well as the Dinskoy, Krivskiy, Severskiy and Temryuk districts. The greatest concentration of rural (agrarian) tourism facilities is in these municipal structures. The Apsheron, Belorechenskiy, Vyselkovskiy, Gulkevichskiy, Caucasian, Korenovskiy, Krasnoarmeyskiy, Krylovskiy, Kurganinskiy, Kushchevskiy, Novopokrovskiy, Pavlovskiy, Primorsko-Akhtarskiy, Starominskiy, Tbiliskiy, Tikhoretskiy, Uspenskiy and Scherbinovskiy districts have the least scores. However, in most areas with the low score there is a decent share of investment projects for developing rural (agrarian) tourism, which allows seeing positive dynamics in this sector.

Overall, the highest number of investment projects in agritourism (I_3) was reported from the resort cities of Gelendzhik, Sochi, Anapa and GoryachiyKlyuch, as well as in the Severskiy, Temryuk, Tuapse and Scherbinovskiy districts. At the same time, the most favorable investment climate (I_4) was observed in such municipal structures as the resort cities of GoryachiyKlyuch, Sochi and Anapa, as well as in the Severskiy, Temryuk, Tuapse and Scherbinovskiy districts.

The above-mentioned integrated program of support and promotion of agritourism is being implemented in Krasnodar Krai. However, comparison of all the municipal structures of the Krai suggested that the resort city of Sochi and the Krivskiy, Severskiy and Mostovskiy districts have the highest scores for I_5 (Regional Policy). They are wonderful examples for other regions, because it is not necessary to wait for a call from the high quarters, but create and implement own programs to develop the municipal structure.

The highest scores for I_6 (development of agriculture in certain areas) are given to the city of Krasnodar, and the Beloglinskiy, Gulkevichskiy, Dinskoy, Yeisk, Kanevskoy, Korenovskiy, Krasnoarmeyskiy, Leningradskiy, Novokubanskiy, Pavlovskiy, Slavyanskiy, Temryuk and Shcherbinovskiy districts.

The minimum level of agricultural development is found at such municipal structures as the cities of Novorossiysk and Armavir, the resort cities of Gelendzhik and GoryachiyKlyuch, as well as in the Apsheron, Belorechenskiy, Krylovskiy, Mostovskiy and Tuapse districts. Such variation was reported because of the difference in the specialization of these districts. Most of the territories with a very low level of agricultural development specialize in other industries, mainly transport, tourism or mining. In addition, many of them are located under such geographical conditions that due to their landscape features do not allow developing their agricultural sector as successfully as areas with a high level of development of this activity do it.

The resort city of Sochi is the most attractive municipal structure for investments in the area of tourism under consideration. Sochi has such high score mainly due to a large number of tourists per year, as well as its favorable investment climate. The resort city of Anapa and the Severskiy and Temryuk districts are also referred to the group with high investment attractiveness.

To sum it up, based on the agritourism potential integral score for Krasnodar Krai, the municipal structures have high, medium, low or very low investment attractiveness for developing rural (agrarian) tourism (Table 1, Figures 2, 3).

The following are referred to the municipal structures which have very low investment attractiveness (it requires increasing and relevant incentives): the Dinskoy, Bryukhovetskiy, Novokubanskiy, Yeisk, Leningradskiy, Kanevskoy, Krasnoarmeyskiy, Kalininskiy, Gulkevichskiy, Pavlovskiy, Korenovskiy, Tikhoretskiy, Vyselkovskiy, Kurganinskiy, Apsheron, Starominskiy, Novopokrovskiy, Kushchevskiy, Caucasian, Belorechenskiy, Uspenskiy and Krylovskoy districts (listed in descending order of points of the above integral score). These areas are characterized by the weak investment activity, small number of agritourism facilities and tourists visiting such municipal structures. This situation is mainly due to the fact that tourism in these districts, as a rule, is not a top priority sector of the economy. To improve this situation, it is necessary to improve the investment climate in these districts, create new investment projects that will be attractive for potential investors. Moreover, certain federal highways pass through the majority of the listed municipal structures. This gives them the opportunity to attract transit tourists.

The areas with low investment attractiveness (it should be increased) include the Abinskiy, Beloglinskiy, Mostovskiy, Labinsky, Otradnenskiy, Primorsko-Akhtarskiy, Timashevskiy, Ust-Labinskiy and Tbiliskiy districts and the city of Armavir. These municipal structures are characterized by a small number of collective accommodation facilities and weak involvement of places of interest, which results in their low attendance. These

Figure 2 Agritourism Potential Integral Score for Krasnodar Krai, Investment Attractiveness for Developing Rural (Agrarian) Tourism By Municipal Structures (I_1) (Compiled by the Authors)

Table 1 Factor-Integral Assessment of the Investment Attractiveness For Developing Rural (Agrarian) Tourism in Krasnodar Krai, various Municipal Structures

No.	City or District	I_1	I_2	I_3	I_4	I_5	I_6	I_i
1	Krasnodar	0.080	0.017	0.036	0.047	0.013	0.034	0.227
2	Novorossiysk	0.021	0.034	0.036	0.047	0.027	0.010	0.175
3	Gelendzhik	0.111	0.017	0.071	0.047	0.027	0.001	0.274
4	GoryachiyKlyuch	0.012	0.052	0.071	0.095	0.013	0.005	0.248
5	Sochi	0.490	0.138	0.071	0.462	0.081	0.034	1.276
6	Armavir	0.009	0.017	0.036	0.047	0.013	0.010	0.132
7	Anapa	0.118	0.103	0.071	0.190	0.027	0.001	0.51
8	Abinskiy	0.002	0.017	0.036	0.047	0.013	0.016	0.131
9	Apsheron	0.007	0	0	0	0.027	0.008	0.042
10	Beloglinsky	0.001	0.017	0.036	0.047	0.013	0.034	0.148
11	Belorechenskiy	0.005	0	0	0	0.013	0.010	0.028
12	Bryukhovetskiy	0.001	0.034	0	0	0.027	0.029	0.091
13	Vyselkovsky	0.001	0	0	0	0.027	0.018	0.046
14	Gulkevichskiy	0.001	0	0	0	0.013	0.037	0.051
15	Dinskoy	0.001	0.052	0	0	0.013	0.032	0.098
16	Yeisk	0.014	0.017	0	0	0.013	0.036	0.08
17	Caucasian	0.002	0	0	0	0.013	0.021	0.036
18	Kalininskiy	0.001	0.017	0	0	0.013	0.021	0.052
19	Kanevskoy	0.002	0.017	0	0	0.013	0.037	0.069
20	Korenovskiy	0.001	0	0	0	0.013	0.034	0.048
21	Krasnoarmeyskiy	0.001	0	0	0	0.013	0.039	0.053
22	Krylovskoy	0.002	0	0	0	0.013	0.008	0.023
23	Krimsky	0.004	0.086	0	0	0.095	0.024	0.209
24	Kurganinskiy	0.002	0	0	0	0.013	0.029	0.044
25	Kushchevskiy	0.001	0	0	0	0.013	0.024	0.038
26	Labinskiy	0.004	0.017	0.036	0.047	0.013	0.021	0.138
27	Leningradskiy	0.002	0.017	0	0	0.013	0.037	0.069
28	Mostovskiy	0.005	0.034	0	0	0.054	0.008	0.101
29	Novokubanskiy	0.001	0.034	0	0	0.013	0.034	0.082
30	Novopokrovskiy	0.001	0	0	0	0.013	0.024	0.038
31	Otradnenskiy	0.002	0.017	0.036	0.047	0.013	0.016	0.131
32	Pavlovskiy	0.002	0	0	0	0.013	0.034	0.049
33	Primorsko-Akhtarskiy	0.002	0	0.036	0.047	0.013	0.016	0.114
34	Seversky	0.001	0.103	0.071	0.095	0.108	0.013	0.391
35	Slavyanskiy	0.003	0.017	0.036	0.047	0.040	0.037	0.18
36	Starominskiy	0.001	0	0	0	0.013	0.026	0.04
37	Tbiliskiy	0.001	0	0.036	0.047	0.013	0.024	0.121
38	Temryuk	0.008	0.070	0.071	0.095	0.027	0.032	0.303
39	Tomashevskiy	0.003	0.017	0.036	0.047	0.013	0.021	0.137
40	Tikhoretskiy	0.004	0	0	0	0.013	0.029	0.046
41	Tuapse	0.069	0.034	0.071	0.095	0.013	0.008	0.29
42	Uspenskiy	0.001	0	0	0	0.013	0.013	0.027
43	Ust-Labinskiy	0.002	0	0.036	0.047	0.013	0.016	0.114
44	Shcherbinovskiy	0.005	0	0.071	0.095	0.013	0.034	0.218

Figure 3 Investment Attractiveness of KrasnodarKrai for Rural (Agrarian) Tourism, by Municipal Structures

areas, except for the city of Armavir, have exclusively agro-industrial specialization, therefore, in the long term the progressive development of rural (agrarian) tourism is possible therein.

The areas with medium investment attractiveness include the Slavyanskiy, Krimsky, Tuapse and Scherbinovskiy districts, as well as the cities of Novorossiysk and Gelendzhik. The following areas have already developed subsectors of rural (agrarian)

tourism, e.g., wineries (the cities of Novorossiysk and Gelendzhik, the Krimsky district), recreation and fishing (the Slavyanskiy district), and steady tourist flow (the resort cities of GoryachiyKlyuch and Gelendzhik and the Tuapse district).

High investment attractiveness is characteristic for the Seversky and Temryuk districts and the resort cities of Sochi and Anapa. Most of these areas belong to the coastal territories of subtropical and temperate latitudes that have high investment attractiveness, a

large number of collective accommodation facilities, developed transport infrastructure, and accordingly, are leaders in attracting tourists.

4 Discussion

Tools of the tourism zoning are based on singling out territories with the similar resource potential. Most works solve conceptual tasks related to characterizing the territorial tourism and recreational system (Los', 2012; Sarancha, 2010; Sarancha & Kuskov, 2011), and singling out tourism regions (Bessonova, 2006). Researchers strive for taking into account various natural, geographic, social and economic peculiarities of territories development (Bogdanova & Tihonova, 2011; Verkhoturov, 2011;

Dunets, 2011; Raskovalov, 2012.). As a result, a number of applied aspects (Gapanovich, 2014; Danilov et al., 2012) remained unrevealed. The existing methodic developments and recommendations do not take into account certain types of tourism, for example, agricultural tourism as a type of tourism with special resources (Trukhachev, 2016).

The Concept of Developing the Rural (Agrarian) Tourism in Krasnodar Krai for 2017–2020 provides a more active “inclusion” of the foothill zone in the tourist-recreational activity, while the steppe territories of the Krai still remain relatively unused (Figure 4). However, if the general trend continues, the authors can assume that the next step will be the activation of tourist and recreational development in the steppe territories of Krai.

Figure 4 Top Priority Directions for Developing the Tourism and Recreational Complex of Krasnodar Krai according to the Draft Concept of Developing the Resort and Tourism Complex of Krasnodar Krai till 2030, by Municipal Structures

The need of using the offered method occurs when taking the strategic decision that defines rural tourism as one of the top priority types in the tourism development, and it is necessary to define the main geographical territories for its development. That's why it is reasonable to use the suitable method when developing a projects for strategic documents in the area of developing tourism in terms of defining top priority and promising areas of the tourism development on various levels; tourism and recreational zones/clusters in terms of developing strategies of specializing/diversifying the activity. It can also be useful as a tool of the comparative analysis of competing regions and when developing marketing strategies of developing tourist regions (Krivosheeva, 2014; Platonova & Krivosheeva, 2015).

Conclusion

The above-mentioned external factors have a positive impact on the investment attractiveness of rural (agrarian) tourism in Krasnodar Krai, and promote investing in it. In the context of developing rural (agrarian) tourism, the investment attractiveness of Krasnodar Krai has been assessed in its municipal structures by such selected internal criteria: potential agritourism attractiveness, agritourism super-structure, number of agritourism investment projects, investment climate, regional policy and development of agriculture. This makes it possible to identify the most and least promising municipal structures for investment in rural (agrarian) tourism.

Estimation of the investment attractiveness for certain municipal structures in Krasnodar Krai for developing rural (agrarian) tourism makes it possible to identify areas that are most suitable and have the greatest investment attractiveness for such development, and also helps to identify factors that will contribute to the balanced development of those municipalities.

Acknowledgements

The research was financially supported by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research and Administration of Krasnodar Krai, project "Investment Policy in the Tourism and Recreational Complex of Krasnodar Region: System of Indicators and Factors of Territorial Differentiation" No. 16-12-23006 a(p).

Conflict of Interest

Authors would hereby like to declare that there is no conflict of interests that could possibly arise.

References

Ardabatskaya YL (2002) Factors of Agricultural Tourism Efficiency (In Russian). *Agricultural Economy* 1: 672.

Bessonova VB (2006) Tourism Region: Essence and Boundaries of the Notion (Through the Analysis of Manuals on Tourism) (In Russian). *Tourism and Cultural heritage, International Collection of Works* 3: 287–295.

Bogdanova LP, Tikhonova AN (2011) Zoning Lower Territories for Developing Tourism (In Russian). *Bulletin of the Tver State University. "Geography and Geo-ecology* 1 : 90–95.

Danilov AA, Bondarenko MV, Danilova VA (2012) Tourism and Recreational Systems and Their Role in the Regional Social and Economic Development. *Service in Russia and Abroad* (electronic journal) 11. Available on http://old.rguts.ru/electronic_journal/number38/contents access on 12.12.2015.

Detochenko LV (2006) Agroutourms as a Catalyzer of Economic Development of Agricultural Settlements (Through the Example of the Volgograd Region of the Russian Federation) (In Russian). In: *Regional Geographical Researches of Ukraine and Neighboring Territories*, Pp. 108–110.

Dunets AN (2011) Tourism and Recreational Space of the Mountain Trans-boundary Region: Theory of Organizing and Developing (In Russian). PhD Thesis submitted to Geographical Sciences, Saint-Petersburg, 2011.

Galkina GI (2003) Developing the Industry of Agrotourism in France in the 1990a (In Russian). *Agricultural Economy* 3 : 652.

Gapanovich AV (2014) Recreational Zoning of the Territory of the Krasnodar Krai (In Russian). *Bulletin of the Kant Baltic Federal University* 1: 148–158.

Kaledin MV, Krapivina GA (2007) Implementing Provisions of the Theory on Management and Taking Decisions in the Regional Decisions on Developing the Tourism and Recreational Territory (In Russian). *PPMBPFVS* 11: 45–49.

Klikich LM, Kuktashev II (2010) Methods of Attracting Investments in Agritourism and Creating Special Economic Zones (In Russian). In the collection of works: *Research provision of Innovation Development of the AIC. Materials of the All-Russian Research and Practice Conference within the XX Anniversary Specialized Exhibition "AgroComplex-2010"*, Pp. 65–69.

Klikich LM, Kuktashev II (2008) Attracting Foreign Investments in Developing Agritourism in Bashkortostan (In Russian). In the collection of works: *Integration of Agrarian Science and Production: State, Problems, and Ways of Solving. Materials of the All-Russian Research and Practice Conference with International Participation within the 18th International Specialized Exhibition "AgroComplex 2008"*. Ministry of

Agriculture, of the Russian Federation, Ministry of Agriculture of the Republic of Bashkortostan, Federal State Educational Institution of Higher Professional Education Bashkirskiy State Agrarian University, "Bashkortostan" JSC Exhibition Complex Bashkir Exhibition Company. 2008. p. 104-108.

Concept of Developing Rural (Agrarian) Tourism in the Krasnodar Krai for 2017-2020] (2017): Official website of the Ministry of Resorts, Tourism, and Olympic Heritage of the Krasnodar Krai. – <https://min.kurortkuban.ru/de/search/item/kontseptsiya-razvitiya-selskogo-agrarnogo-turizma-v-krasnodarskom-krae-na-2017-2020-gody>. – Data obrashcheniya 12.09.2017 (In Russian).

Krivosheyeva TM (2014) Tourism Destinations: Issues of Forming Marketing Strategies (In Russian). Service in Russia and Abroad (electronic journal) 6 (53). Available on URL: http://old.rguts.ru/electronic_journal/number53/contents access on 12.12.2015.

Los' MA (2012) Conceptual Basics of the Tourism and Recreational Design (In Russian). Bulletin of the Tyumen State University 7: 174–177.

Minenkova VV, Sidorova DV, Filobok AA (2017) Factors of Territorial Differentiation of Investment Activity in the Tourist and Recreational Complex of the Krasnodar Region (In Russian). Resort and Recreational Complex in the System of regional Development: Innovation Approaches: Materials of the V International Research and Practice Conference. Kabardinka, 30: Pp. 333–337.

Pan'kovskiy GA (2002) Some Problems of Prolonging the Agrotourism Season and Ways of Solving Them (In Russian). Agricultural Economy 1: 167.

Pan'kovskiy GA (2003) Opportunities of Developing Agricultural Tourism in Bulgaria (In Russian). Agricultural Economy 2: 417.

Platonova NA, Krivosheyeva TM (2015) Defining and Analyzing Competitors When Developing the Strategy of Developing the Region's Tourism (In Russian). Regional Economy: Theory and Practice 25 : 2–12.

Raskovalov VP (2012) Estimation and Geographical Analysis of the Resourceful Potential of the Nature-Focused Tourism (Through the Example of the Perm Krai (In Russian). PhD thesis submitted to Geographic Sciences. Perm, 2012.

Sarancha MA (2010) Territorial Tourism and Recreational System as a Complex Social and Natural Formation (In Russian). Bulletin of the Udmurt University 3: 58–67.

Sarancha MA, Kuskov AS (2011) Evolution of Approaches to Researching Territorial Tourism and Recreational Systems (In Russian). Bulletin of the Udmurt University. 3 : 101–113.

Sharipov IN (2002) Strategy of Managing Agricultural Enterprises in the Context of Political and Economic Changes (Switzerland) (In Russian). Agricultural Economy 3: 554.

Shpyrnya OV, Yevtushenko SF (2005) Prospects of Developing Agrotourism in the Krasnodar Krai (In Russian). Actual Issues of Physical Culture and Sports 5: 135-137.

Shumakova OV, Kosenchuk OV, Novikov YI, Nardin DS (2015) Methodology for Assessing the Agro-Tourism Potential of Rural Areas (In Russian). Economic Sciences, Fundamental Research 2: 5478–5481

Sokolova ZY (2002) Comparative Estimation of Conditions and Level of Developing Agrotourism in the Area of Greyhawk, Hiroshima Prefecture, Japan, and in the Area of Umbria, Italy, as well as Farmers' Attitude to This Type of Entrepreneurship (In Russian). Agricultural Economy 3: 669.

Trukhachev AV (2016) Methodic Issues on Estimating and Rating Territories for Developing Agricultural Tourism (In Russian). Service Plus 10 : 30-37.

Verkhotursov DA (2011) Economic Estimation of the Efficiency of Using the Recreational and Tourism Potential of the Territory and Opportunities of Its Economic Reclamation (In Russian). Problems of the Modern Economy 2 : 290–293.

Vinokurova MV, Ivanycheva TA (2014) Implementation of Investment Projects as an Element of Forming the Unified Economic and Social Space (Through the Example of the Nizhnetavdinskiy Region) (In Russian). In: Barbakov OM, Zobnin YA (Eds.) the collection of works: Problems of Forming the Unified Space of Economic and Social development of CIS Countries. Materials of the Annual International Research and Practice Conference, Pp. 432-438.).

Volkova OG (2005) Prospects of Developing Agriculture in the Republic of Buryatia (In Russian). Agricultural Economy 4: 914;

Volkova TA, Maksimov DV, Minenkova VV, Filobok AA, Khodykina MF (2016a) Tourist and Recreational Complex of Krasnodar Krai: Main Characteristics and Development Forecast (In Russian). Bulletin of NAT 3: 48–56.

Volkova TA., Minenkova VV, Mishchenko AA, Razumov VV, Belikov MY (2016b) Tourist Complex of South of Russia in the Current Conditions: The Krasnodar Region and the Republic of

Crimea. *International Review of Management and Marketing* 6: 30–35.

Volkova TA, Minenkova VV, Filobok AA, Maximov DV, Belikov MY (2016c) Methodology of Individual Accommodation Facilities Research and Estimate of Non-Organized Tourists. *Journal of Environmental Management and Tourism* 7: 672–678.

Volkova TA, Ponomarenko AA (2012) Evaluation of the Agro-Tourism Potential of Krasnodar Krai (In Russian). Actual Problems of Developing Rural (Agrarian) Tourism in the Context of Modern Geopolitical and Socio-Economic Challenges: Materials of the All-Russian Research and Practice Conference. Krasnodar. Kuban State University, pp. 101–107.