

# **PROBLEM AREAS IN POLAND IN TERMS OF THE OBJECTIVES OF THE EUROPEAN UNION'S REGIONAL POLICY**

Paweł Churski

*Institute of Socio-Economic Geography and Spatial Management, Adam Mickiewicz University,  
Fredry 10, 61-701 Poznań, Poland*

*e-mail: chur@amu.edu.pl*

**Abstract:** The present study focuses on problem areas in EU member states and Poland that are identified on the basis of criteria laid down in the assumptions of the EU regional policy. The analysis makes it possible to compare the spatial distributions of the problem areas and to assess the relevance of the statistical criteria employed to delineate them. Also presented is the new model of regional policy to be implemented in Poland in the period of its integration with the European Union.

## **1. Introduction**

Economic and social cohesion remains the basic target of the European Union (EU). Wide disparities in economic development, both at the level of states and regions, is one of the chief problems of the economies of the member states. This fact was noted as early as the First Cohesion Report prepared by the European Commission in 1996. To reduce the disparities, steps are taken under EU regional policy. One of them is concentrated support for the poorest developed areas which are termed problem areas under the regional policy objectives. These measures, however, fall short of the expected results (cf. J. Bachtler, I. Turok (eds), 1997; Ch.J. Paraskevopoulos, 2001; G. Tondl, 2001a, 2001b; A. Maura, 2002; N. Moussis, 2002; General Report..., 2002; L. Yin, G.K. Zestos, L. Michelis., 2003). In the Second Report on Economic and Social Cohesion published in 2001, the European Commission states that the economic disparities among the present member states still persist despite strong tendencies towards convergence. What has diminished are differences at the regional level, though the changes are far smaller than anticipated.

The decision made in Brussels in October 2002 to enlarge the European Union in May 2004 by ten new members, and the completion of accession talks with the applicant countries in

December 2002 in Copenhagen have radically changed the conditions of EU regional policy (cf. A. Amin, 1999; S. Manzocchi (ed.), 2002; I. Maile, 2002). The planned EU enlargement means the inclusion of much poorer states and regions than the present members. As a result, the number of inhabitants of problem areas under EU regional policy will more than double, and economic disparities will widen considerably both the national and regional levels. A significant "statistical effect of the enlargement will also be a decline in the mean EU per capita GDP by as much as 18%, and hence a relative improvement in the position of the present EU regions, which will become more wealthy" (J. Borkowski, 2003, p. 155). These facts lend weight to the popular opinion that the impending enlargement will pose the biggest challenge to EU regional policy so far. It will certainly lead to changes in its rules, including the criteria of problem area identification after 2006, that is, when a new EU budget is to be drawn up (cf. First Progress Report ..., 2002; Second Progress Report ..., 2003)<sup>1</sup>.

The process of change in the EU regional policy was paralleled by changes in the regional policies of the applicant countries. An example is Poland, where a new model of regional policy was implemented during the accession talks which conforms to the EU standards and creates organisational conditions allowing the country to absorb means from the Structural Funds.

The aim of the present study is to analyse and compare the spatial distribution of problem areas in the EU member states and Poland delimited on the basis of criteria laid down by the European Commission, and to assess the relevance of the statistical indices used to delimit them.

In the research procedure an attempt is made to answer the following cognitive questions:

1. What is the spatial distribution of problem areas under EU regional policy in member states, and to what extent does it coincide with that of the poorest developed European regions?
2. What is the spatial distribution of problem areas in Poland meeting the criteria of EU regional policy, and to what extent does it coincide with that of the poorest developed Polish regions?
3. What is the situation of Polish regions vis à vis the delineated problem areas?
4. To what extent can the statistical criteria employed in the delimitation of problem areas under EU regional policy be regarded as relevant to the identification of the poorest developed

---

<sup>1</sup> In recognition of the importance of future regional policy in the enlarged Union, the European Commission has started to hold consultations which are supposed to result in a project embracing objectives, tasks and rules of a new regional policy of the Community in the years 2007-2013. Its foundations are laid down in the First and Second Progress Reports on Economic and Social Cohesion (2002, 2003) and other studies, e.g., Weise et al. (2001), Jouen (2001), or The Financing of EU Structural Policy ... (2002).

regions which should be the first to receive assistance from the Structural Funds?

5. What is the regional policy model in force in Poland at present?

The article has been prepared under the Committee for Scientific Research grant no. 3 PO4E 018 23, entitled *Problem areas in Poland under objectives of the European Union's regional policy*.

## **2. Spatial distribution of problem areas in the EU member states**

The classification of problem areas under EU regional policy for the years 2000-2006 employing the criteria accepted by the European Commission in its decision of 1 July 1999 was published in the *Official Journal of the European Communities*.<sup>2</sup> The spatial distribution of the territorial units delineated in the EU member states is analysed by the policy objectives for the years 2000-2006 for which the spatial concentration of measures is intended and criteria for the identification of their respective problem areas have been established (cf. Council Regulation No. 1260/1999).

### *2.1. Objective 1 areas*

Support for Objective 1 areas is the main priority of the European Union's regional policy. Out of the total 2000-2006 Structural Funds budget of EUR 195 billion, more than 2/3 (i.e., more than EUR 135 billion) are allocated to projects implemented in those areas. The chief goal of those projects is to support economic growth building a region's competitive advantage through the financing of (cf. The results ..., 2001):

- infrastructural investment (28.0% of all Objective 1 means, about a half of which being earmarked for transport infrastructure);
- the development of human resources (30.0% of the total) by improving educational and training opportunities to help employees adapt to the requirements of the labour market;
- aid for the manufacturing sector (42.0% of the total).

Special attention is paid to investment in environmental protection and improving transport accessibility to peripheral regions. Substantial means are also allocated to projects contributing to

---

<sup>2</sup> See the website [http://europa.eu.int/comm/regional\\_policy/sources/docoffic/official/dec1\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/regional_policy/sources/docoffic/official/dec1_en.htm).

the building of a knowledge-based economy.

Problem areas "lagging behind in their socio-economic development", i.e., those where per capita GDP is below 75.0% of the Community average, are characterised in the opinion of the European Commission by the lowest level of investment, a high unemployment rate, lack of services for businesses and individuals, and poor basic infrastructure (cf. J. Beutel, 2002). The number of NUTS 2 units classified as belonging to this category is 56. They can be found in all the EU member states with the exception of Belgium, Denmark, Luxembourg, and The Netherlands, and include (cf. Commission Decision 1999/502/EC and Fig. 1):

- all regions of Greece,
- most regions of Spain and Portugal,
- southern Italy,
- north-western Ireland,
- eastern *lands* of Germany (except Berlin),
- individual regions of Great Britain and Austria,
- poorly populated areas in northern Sweden and Finland, and
- peripheral regions: French overseas departments, the Canary Islands, the Azores, and Madeira.

The joint population of those areas amounts to almost 22.0% of the Community's total population. The largest appropriations of the Structural Funds under Objective 1 are allocated to the regions of Spain (30.0%), Italy (17.0%) and Greece (16.5%). In other words, support is given primarily to the less developed Southern Europe. A 'new' significant problem area is Germany's eastern *lands*, whose economic development, in spite of the huge support by the federal budget and the EU, is still closer to that of the regions of Central and Eastern, rather than Western, Europe.

In all, there are 113 projects drawn up by national and regional institutions that the European Commission has approved for implementation under Objective 1. Their database is available at [http://www.europa.int/comm/regional\\_policy/objective1](http://www.europa.int/comm/regional_policy/objective1), the website of the European Commission's Directorate General for Regional Policy.

## 2.2. Objective 2 areas

Under regional policy Objective 2, "support for socio-economic transformation in areas facing structural difficulties", the European Union aims to revitalise industrial, rural, urban, fisheries-dependent, and other areas whose economic development has been checked by poor adaptation to the changing economic situation. The areas eligible for support under Objective 2 include NUTS 3 units that meet the statistical criteria set by the European Commission<sup>3</sup> and are not part of NUTS 2 regions which are Objective 1 areas. Objective 2 problem areas are supplementary to those under Objective 1, which are the main priority of EU regional policy. That is why Objective 2 areas can chiefly be found in member states with a relatively higher level of economic development.

EUR 22.5 billion have been allocated to co-finance projects submitted by Objective 2 areas in the period 2000-2006, which amounts to 11.5% of the budget of the Structural Funds, mainly the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and the European Social Fund (ESF). The support embraced all member states except Greece, Ireland and Portugal, which receive full or transitional support under Objective 1. Objective 2 areas account for 18% of the Union's population. The most substantial aid has been apportioned among regions of France (27.0%), Great Britain (21.0%) and Germany (15.5%).

It should be emphasised that unlike Objective 1 areas, the eligibility of those under Objective 2 for aid from the Cohesion Fund is limited by their higher level of development. Only a few Spanish Objective 2 areas can apply for support from this source.

The spatial distribution of Objective 2 regions is analysed by the NUTS 3 units distinguished by the European Commission and those territorial units that meet the statistical criteria set for Objective 2 that are situated within NUTS 3 limits (cf. *Official Journal of the European Communities*, 1999; 2000).

#### Industrial areas:

They embrace 10 full NUTS 3 units and 65 NUTS 3 units within boundaries of which there are units of a lower territorial level that satisfy the criteria of industrial problem areas<sup>4</sup>. They are inhabited by 8.5% of the Union's total population. Objective 2 industrial areas coincide with

---

3 Cf. Council Regulation No. 1260/1999.

4 The criteria include: a mean unemployment rate from the last three years higher than the EU average, the proportion of industrial employment equal to or higher than the EU average in all the years since 1985, and a drop in industrial employment since 1985.

those traditional industrial districts of Europe that have not obtained support under Objective 1, e.g., in the Benelux, northern France, western Germany, and north-western Spain (see Fig. 2). They also include modern industrial districts, like Barcelona and Turin, in which high unemployment persists despite favourable changes in the structure of the economy.

#### Rural areas:

They embrace 7 full NUTS 3 units and 69 NUTS 3 units within boundaries of which there are units of a lower territorial level that satisfy the criteria of agricultural problem areas<sup>5</sup>. They are inhabited by 5.2% of the Union's total population. They are primarily the farming regions of France, north-eastern Spain, central Finland, and single territorial units of the remaining member states that have not obtained support under Objective 1 of the Structural Funds (cf. Fig. 3)<sup>6</sup>.

#### Urban areas:

In the present programming period 2000-2006, 83 urban problem areas are distinguished, i.e., urban places of relatively high population density and characterised additionally by at least one of the following criteria: a high rate of long-term unemployment, low standards of living, environmental pollution, a high crime rate, and a low education level of the population. They include both European capitals like London, Brussels, Rome, or Vienna, and smaller towns, chiefly in France, Great Britain, and Italy. No urban problem areas have been identified in Sweden, Denmark, The Netherlands, Spain, Portugal, Greece, and Ireland (see Fig. 4). It should be emphasised that a mere 1.9% of the Union's population inhabits the regions classed as this category of problem areas.

#### Areas dependent on fisheries:

These are 27 NUTS 3 units within boundaries of which there are coastal regions with a substantial proportion of fishing in their employment structure and additionally facing structural problems. This type of problem areas have been identified in France (both on the Atlantic and Mediterranean coasts), Great Britain (the North Sea coast), Denmark (the North Sea coast again),

---

5 These are two out of four criteria: a population density of under 100 persons per km<sup>2</sup> or the proportion of agricultural employment equal to or higher than double the EU average in each year since 1985; and a mean unemployment rate higher than the EU average during the last three years or a drop in the population since 1985.

6 An exception is low-density regions of Finland.

and Italy (the Adriatic coast) (see Fig. 5). The share of inhabitants of those areas in the Union's population is very low - a mere 0.3%.

Other areas:

They embrace 17 full NUTS 3 units and 274 NUTS 3 units within boundaries of which there are units of a lower territorial level that satisfy the criteria of other problem areas<sup>7</sup>. They are inhabited by 2.1% of the Union's total population. They have been identified in all the member states except Greece, Portugal and Ireland. In four states: France, Sweden, Great Britain, and Italy, some areas meet more than one criterion set for other problem areas under EU regional policy, which increases their eligibility for aid from the Structural Funds (see Fig. 6).

The European Commission has approved for implementation under Objective 2 a total of 96 projects drawn up by national and regional institutions in the 12 member states. Their database is available at [http://www.europa.int/comm/regional\\_policy/objective2](http://www.europa.int/comm/regional_policy/objective2), the website of the European Commission's Directorate General for Regional Policy.

### **3. Poland's new territorial division and its new model of regional policy**

#### *3.1. The new voivodeship system in Poland*

The territorial organisation of Poland that has been in force since 1999 is based on a new, three-tier model (commune, powiat, voivodeship) working on the principles of decentralisation and self-government. In the new administrative division poviats have been restored as local government units (besides communes operating since 1990). But especially important is the introduction of the voivodeship as an administrative region being the highest-level territorial unit of a mixed central government/self-government character, the basic one endowed with the task of implementing regional policy. It is the statutory duty of the voivodeship self-government authorities to draw up a strategy of all-round, sustainable development of their voivodeship and pursue a regional policy. The assumption is that this process is to be planned and implemented in co-operation with powiat and communal self-government and other institutions which, as Grosse (2002b) observes, emphasises the importance of social partnership in creating and pursuing regional policy. As a consequence, the voivodeship government prepares operations and puts

---

<sup>7</sup> For example, these are areas neighbouring on Objective 1 or Objective 2 industrial or agricultural areas.

them into practice under a new model of regional policy.

The new functional character of the voivodeship as a public administration unit is connected with the new territorial division of Poland. The voivodeship map has changed fundamentally: instead of the old 49 voivodeships, 16 large ones have been created which have the character of territorial regions (see Figure 7).

The creation of voivodeships with a new systemic regime and in new territorial shapes as well as entrusting them with tasks and powers connected with regional development have been a crucial step in Poland's adjustment to EU regulations.

A comparison of the new 16-voivodeship system with the old 49-unit one leads to the following conclusions (cf. Churski 2002):

1. Only one new voivodeship, Opole, corresponds to a single old one, although its boundaries have changed. The remaining new voivodeships comprise from 2 to 6 entire old voivodeships or their large fragments. Therefore, the boundaries of the new voivodeships do not coincide with those of the old ones that make them up. The old voivodeships constitute (1) the core or (2) a periphery of a new one.

2. The comparative analysis of the old and new voivodeship systems is based on the measurement of loss of particularity and increase in uniformity of the system (cf. Haggett 1964). The uniformity of the system is measured using the coefficients of variation of three characteristics of the system: its area, population, and per capita GDP (cf. Czyż 1999). The transition from the 49-unit to the 16-unit system means a 67% loss of particularity ( $((16:49) * 100\% = 32.65\%; 100\% - 32.65\% = 67.35\%)$ ). It is accompanied by a 33% increase in the system uniformity in terms of voivodeship population figures. The differences in area are almost the same as in the old system - the increase in uniformity is only 2%.

3. As to the mean area and population number, the new voivodeships are three times bigger than the old ones. There are significant differences among the new units in terms of area and population. The ratio of the biggest Mazovia voivodeship to the smallest Opole one is 4:1. Population contrasts are similar: the most populous unit (Mazovia again) has 5 times as many inhabitants as the least populous Lubuska Land. Even so, the contrasts are less striking than in the old territorial system, where the proportion of the area of the biggest voivodeship (Olsztyn) to the smallest one (Łódź) was 8:1, and where Katowice voivodeship had almost 16 times as many inhabitants as Chełm voivodeship.



4. In terms of per capita GDP, the transition has resulted in a 13% increase in uniformity. A characteristic feature of the 16-voivodeship system is big differences in the regional income as indicated by contrasts in per capita GDP, which varies between 66% (Świętokrzyska Land) and 143% (Mazovia) of the national average. However, in comparison with the old system the differences have narrowed: they used to range from 63% (Zamość) to 189% (Warsaw) of the average.

5. Another characteristic feature of the new, big voivodeships is a high degree of internal economic diversification of poviats which corresponds to the core-periphery pattern. The diversification is the highest in Mazovia and the lowest in Lubuska Land: by the measure of gross value added per capita, the rate of the strongest to the poorest poviat is equal to 4.

As follows from the above analysis, the transition from the 49-unit to the 16-unit system has reduced disparities at this level of territorial division, which had been growing since the start of the socio-economic transformation in Poland. As Gorzelak (2002) states, in the old system a steady and comparatively high growth rate was only recorded in regions with big metropolitan centres (Warsaw, Poznań). The remaining regions, including 'raw-material' areas (e.g., Płock, Tarnobrzeg, Wałbrzych), registered a deterioration in their position in the country to a greater or lesser degree, as did those with declining industries (Łódź, Katowice). The worst situation was in the traditionally poorly developed eastern regions, in which a heavily negative growth dynamics was recorded after 1992. It should be kept in mind, however, that the lessening of contrasts at the voivodeship level through the introduction of 16 big regions has naturally led to an increase in intra-voivodeship disparities, whose reduction has been one of the major goals of Polish regional policy (cf. Czyż 2002).

### 3.2. Regional policy in the period of integration with the European Union

Regional policy issues have also found a place in official documents prepared in connection with the advancing process of Poland's integration with the European Union. The two most important are *The National Integration Strategy*, adopted by the Council of Ministers on 28 January 1997, and *The National Programme for the Adoption of the Acquis*<sup>8</sup>, drawn up in 1998 on opening the accession negotiations. These documents list regional policy measures, among

---

<sup>8</sup> In accordance with the rules, *The National Programme for the Adoption of the Acquis* undergoes an annual evaluation and correction (cf. *National Programme ... 1998; Interim Report ... 2001*).

other things, which they describe as priorities in the adjustment process. Attention is also paid to the role that assistance funds, and later EU Structural Funds, can play in Poland's regional development. This is reflected in Poland's negotiating stand on *Regional Policy and Co-ordination of Structural Instruments*, which states: "... Poland takes the position that on achieving EU membership the entire country will fall under Objective 1 of the European Union's economic and social cohesion policy and will take full advantage of the Structural Funds and the Cohesion Fund according to the rules worked out for the Member States ..." (cf. *Negotiating position ...*, 2002). Following the timetable, negotiations on this subject opened on 6 April 2000 and closed with the European Union arriving at a definite common standpoint towards the end of 2002. The fact that the provisional conclusion of the negotiations in this field only took place on 1 October 2002, i.e., towards the end of the negotiation process, shows it to be one of the most problematic<sup>9</sup>. The extent to which the results of the negotiations are going to be put to use will largely depend on how well the Polish side has prepared the programme and institutional foundations of regional development policy that are to provide a basis for the expenditure of the structural means, including *The National Development Plan for the years 2004-2006*<sup>10</sup>.

The obligations that had arisen in the course of the negotiations provided a starting point for designing a new approach to regional policy in Poland. In the communist period, regional policy was of minor importance, but in the 1990s it constituted an increasingly serious challenge to the successive governments because of growing regional disparities (cf. Węclawowicz 2002, Grosse 2002a).

The first indispensable measure that helped to put Polish regional policy in order was the territorial-administrative reform introduced on 1 January 1999. It defined a clear-cut division of public tasks among the relevant structures, including local government authorities at the poviats and voivodship levels.

Another, and the most significant, step taken to systematise Polish regional policy and adjust it to EU standards was the Principles of Regional Development Support Act passed on 12 May 2000. It specifies the rules and forms of support for regional development, as well as standards of co-operation on this matter of the Council of Ministers and central government organs with local

---

<sup>9</sup> Poland closed the negotiations on 13 December 2002.

<sup>10</sup> After Poland has joined the European Union, this document will provide a basis for negotiating a Community Support Framework (CSF) for our country. Poland completed negotiating its *National Development Plan for the years 2004-2006* on 31 July 2003, which opened the formal way for the negotiation of the CSF.

government authorities and social partners. Under the provisions of Article 3 of the Act, regional development is to be supported under the *National Strategy for Regional Development* (NSRD) and initiatives of a voivodeship's local government, in accordance with the principles of sustainable development. The Act defines basic organisational principles of Poland's regional policy (see Fig. 8):

- The government's basic document for the planning of its regional policy is the National Strategy for Regional Development (NSRD), which defines: the directions and priorities of State's regional development policy; the period for which the Strategy is to be effective; anticipated expenditure from public funds; principles and criteria of financial support for *Voivodeship Programmes* from the State budget; and estimates of the minimum extent to which individual tasks or *Voivodeship Programmes* have to be co-financed from budgets of local government units and by private entities. It is devised by the minister responsible for regional development (at present, it is the Minister of Economy, Labour and Social Policy) in co-operation with voivodeship governments taking into account strategies of voivodeship development worked out by voivodeship diets. *The National Strategy for Regional Development, 2001-2006* was approved by the Council of Ministers and came into force on 28 December 2000.

- The government document defining a concrete dimension of regional policy, especially the scope and form of State support for local governments, is the *Assistance Programme*, which provides details of the priorities defined in the NSRD. This document is the government's response to *Voivodeship Programmes* drawn up by the regions.

- The next stage in the designing of regional policy is direct negotiations between the minister responsible for regional development and a voivodeship government represented by the voivodeship's marshal. The result is a *Voivodeship Contract*<sup>11</sup>, a legal document determining concrete terms of the State's financial support for the given voivodeship.

The Principles of Regional Development Support Act also defines the rules and procedure of regional policy financing, but it fails to stipulate any increase in the level of income of voivodeship governments, which should be considered a basic barrier to its correct implementation. Another weak point is the low level of co-ordination of the policies of government agencies and goal-oriented funds (22 mentioned in the Act) with development plans

---

11

The government and voivodeship governments concluded *Voivodeship Contracts* on 19 and 22 June 2001.

devised by the governments (cf. Pyszkowski 2000)<sup>12</sup>.

The Principles of Regional Development Support Act in its present form is, on the one hand, a legal document long awaited by local governments which defines the principles and forms of support by the State budget of multi-year investments and actions taken in the voivodeships. On the other hand, however, Gorzelak (2000) claims that it has created a model of a centralised State where regions are endowed with limited powers and relatively scarce means of their own, and the central government is busy with a host of small problems and tasks that would be part of the remit of strong regional governments in a decentralised system. The Act has also drawn much criticism for its focus on the detailed procedures of a voivodeship government 'petitioning', to use Gilowska's (2001) term, for financial means at the disposal of the central administration, rather than on what should be the substance of regional policy. One might even go so far as to claim that in accordance with the provisions of the Act, it is the central administration that is to conduct regional policy, while voivodeship governments, deprived of sufficient financial means of their own, are only there to implement it. This has nothing to do with creating voivodeships as entities responsible for their regional policy, and it is certainly a far cry from the standards obtaining in Europe. In the opinion of Hausner (2001), the biggest threat resulting from the Act is drawing up separate plans for EU assistance and domestic means earmarked for regional development when voivodeship governments lack their own adequate funds. As a result, as Węclawowicz (2002) observes, the objectives of a voivodeship's regional development are in fact imposed 'from above', as evidenced by the *Voivodeship Contract*, in which the so-called government-indicated means make up more than 80% of the total and whose payment and settlement follow the same rules as target-oriented subsidies. The proportion of free means left in the contracts for the voivodeship governments to finance their own regional policy is only 10% (cf. Grosse 2002a). What strikes one when analysing the legal side of the *Voivodeship Contract* is the fact that the central government-voivodeship government relations are not balanced. While both sides are assumed to be formally equal in negotiations, it is the Minister that has the right to terminate the contract. In the light of the above remarks, the *Voivodeship Contract* can be regarded as a form of regulation of central/local government relations which reinforces the centralised mode of management in which voivodeship local government is the party applying for means and the government, one that has those means at its disposal. This can hardly be considered a proper

---

<sup>12</sup> A detailed analysis of the provisions of the Act can be found, e.g. in Rudnicki (2000) and Grosse (2000).

solution, especially considering the fact that, in the legislator's intention, the *Contract* was to perform the role of an instrument preparing the Polish regions for the use of EU structural funds. This situation confirms the necessity to amend the *Principles of Regional Development Support Act* in such a way as to give local government greater financial freedom, and hence to allow it to pursue real intra-regional policy. The amendments should also concern such issues as (cf. Grosse 2002a):

- increasing the clarity of the government's *Assistance Programme* in such a way as to make its provisions consistent with other acts in force;
- simplifying the rules that have to be followed when preparing contract documentation;
- abandoning the requirement of *Voivodeship Contracts* containing a clause of consistency with many strategic government documents, which now only leads to 'pro forma' rather than 'de facto' consistency. There is a need for contract negotiations to include talks on how to reconcile the government's strategic proposals with development priorities set by the self-governing regions;
- making it possible for budgetary means earmarked for the financing of the *Contracts* to pass to the next budgetary year; and
- making uniform the rules of monitoring the implementation of *Voivodeship Contracts* so as to improve the present system's efficiency.

Unfortunately, the difficult situation of the State budget has made it even harder to execute the contracts concluded. As 2001 drew to a close with a mounting crisis in public finance, more and more contracted State-financed expenditures were being blocked at the instance of the Ministry of Finance<sup>13</sup>. As a consequence of those decisions and difficulties with getting the majority of EU programmes off the ground, the 2001 *Voivodeship Contracts* were only carried out in 73%<sup>14</sup>. The year 2002 brought a high State-budget deficit of nearly 10 billion euros<sup>15</sup>, which made it necessary to introduce corrections into the solutions adopted. Initially, the new government of Leszek Miller declared complete withdrawal from the *Contracts* concluded, but in March 2002 it announced that the 0.5 billion euros allocated by the previous government of

---

13 The Council of Ministers Ordinance of 23 October 2001 on the Blocking of Some Expenses in the 2001 State Budget (Law Gazette no. 125/2001, position 1373) and the Council of Ministers Ordinance of 29 December 2001 changing the former ordinance (Law Gazette no. 154/2001, position 1807).

14 *Report on the implementation of Voivodeship Contracts in the year 2001*. The Ministry of the Economy, April 2002.

15 The exchange rate on 3 January 2004 was 4.70 zlotys to the euro.

Prime Minister Jerzy Buzek for the implementation of the *Contracts* in 2002 were to be distributed half and half over the years 2002 and 2003. This meant that, first, the means earmarked for the 2002 tasks stipulated in the *Contracts* were cut down to about 50% of the initial budget. Secondly, the *Contracts* were prolonged until the end of 2003. In this situation the government suggested that local authorities should themselves select *Contract* tasks they wanted to continue in that year. As was announced, the government amended its *Assistance Programme* by defining its validity for the years 2001-2003, and renegotiated all the *Voivodeship Contracts* concluded in 2001. Unfortunately, the whole procedure was carried out again initially in a state of uncertainty and then at a breakneck pace, which increased the possibility of mistakes. The amendment of the *Assistance Programme* was primarily intended to restrict the 2002 State expenditure resulting from the implementation of the *Contracts*<sup>16</sup>. However, it has also had serious political consequences. Regional self-government authorities can no longer trust the stability of agreements signed with the government. Multi-year planning involved in the contracting procedure has practically become groundless. As it turned out, agreements financed from the State budget should extend to a maximum of one year's horizon. Longer-lasting obligations of the budget, including those resulting from the *Contracts*, can only be treated as declarative and conditional, since the government can change, or even annul, a *Contract* at any time.

This situation certainly hinders the introduction of the new system of planning and implementing regional policy in Poland. One can only hope that budgetary problems will not result in giving up measures taken already, as this could make the Polish voivodeships inadequately prepared to absorb structural means after Poland has joined the European Union.

#### **4. Problem areas under EU regional policy in Poland**

Poland's entry into the European Union scheduled to take place in May 2004 will close the pre-accession period. Our membership of the European Community will mean, among other things, support for our country financed by the Structural Funds and the Cohesion Fund under the rules of EU regional policy. Since as early as mid-2003 the Polish government has been

---

<sup>16</sup> Among the things struck from the *Assistance Programme* were investments carried out by individual Ministries as well as means at the disposal of the voivodes designed to help finance the investments and investment purchases of local government units.

conducting negotiations with the European Commission for the approval of drafts of *Operational Programmes* whose implementation is going to be supported by the European Union. Poland will be able to draw upon all the Structural Funds and the Cohesion Fund, ensuring co-financing of the planned tasks from its own means<sup>17</sup> (see Table 1). The EU support will be granted on the basis of *The National Development Plan for the years 2004-2006*, which is a strategic document at the national level adopted by the Polish government on 15 January 2003. It was presented to the European Commission to start negotiations that are to end with the drawing up of a *Community Support Framework*, a document defining the future structural policy in Poland which is to be part-financed by the Structural Funds and the Cohesion Fund. *The National Development Plan* and *The Community Support Framework* will be implemented with the help of executive documents in the form of *Operational Programmes* following from the development directives set in *The National Development Plan*<sup>18</sup> (cf. J. Ku\_niewicz, 2002).

The identification of problem areas under EU regional policy in Poland is carried out in accordance with EU regulations in terms of NTS units<sup>19</sup> that meet the statistical criteria set in the objectives of the policy for the years 2000-2006 (cf. Council Regulation No. 1260/1999).

**Objective 1 areas (support for development and restructuring of the economy)** are identified in terms of NTS 2 units (voivodeships) on the basis of per capita GDP (at PPS) expressed as a percentage of the EU average (as of 31 December 1998). All regions with the index below 75.0% of the EU average (i.e., US\$ 15,159.8 per head) are treated as Objective 1 areas.

By this criterion, at present all the Polish voivodeships are eligible, on Poland's joining the Union, for financial assistance from the Structural Funds under Objective 1 of EU regional policy (see Table 2).

The inclusion of all the voivodeships in support under Objective 1 pre-empts the possibility

---

17 Even today it is estimated that the Polish budget is going to be about EUR 1 billion short to make full use of means from the Structural Funds granted Poland until the end of 2006 (cf. EUROPAP, 18 July 2003, <http://www.europap.pl>).

18 For example, an Increase in Economic Competitiveness Sectoral Operational Programme, a Human Resources Development Sectoral Operational Programme, or a Regional Development Integrated Operational Programme.

19 The Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics, introduced in Poland in 2000, embraces five levels: NTS 1 - the entire country, NTS 2 - 16 voivodeships, NTS 3 - 44 subregions, NTS 4 - 373 poviats, and NTS 5 - 2,489 communes (cf. Law Gazette no. 58/2000, position 685).

of their applying for support under the other objectives<sup>20</sup>. It should be kept in mind, however, that the process of EU enlargement by ten new members will produce a decline in the average per capita GDP throughout the Union from the present EUR 22,603 to EUR 19,661 (according to 2000 data). As a result, the number of regions in the present European Union with per capita GDP under 75.0% will drop from 56 to 30, but the number of the least-favoured regions in the new enlarged Union will mount to 67, while the population living in those areas will double from 68 million to 137 million (cf. Second Progress Report ..., 2003). This will necessitate a change in the rules of EU regional policy in the next programming period, viz. 2007-2013, in order to reduce the number of regions eligible for support from the Structural Funds. It may lead to limiting assistance at the level of NUTS 2 units and concentrating it in NUTS 3 units. Hence, it is relevant to investigate to what extent Polish subregions (NTS 3 units) satisfy the criteria set for Objective 2 areas in the period 2000-2006 (cf. Council Regulation No. 1260/1999).

**Objective 2 areas (support for socio-economic transformation in areas afflicted by structural problems)** are identified with reference to NTS 3 units on the basis of selected socio-economic indices defined by the European Commission and available in the data resources of the Central Statistical Office in Warsaw (see Table 3). Owing to lack of statistical data and an ambiguity of EU criteria, the delimitation of Objective 2 areas in Poland is restricted to two types of problem areas: industrial and rural.

*Industrial areas* have to satisfy three criteria at once:

- a mean unemployment rate higher than the EU average as of June 2000 (i.e., 8.2%);
- the proportion of industrial employment equal to or higher than the EU average as of September 1999 (i.e., 28.3%); and
- a drop in industrial employment in the years 1997-1999.

Eighteen problem areas were distinguished that meet all the above criteria set for industrial areas (see Fig. 9). They form a compact belt stretching from the south of Poland along its western part to the northern subregions. The belt includes three enclaves: the city of Wrocław and the Wrocław subregion, the city of Poznań, and the Tri-City subregion of Gdańsk-Sopot-Gdynia. Outside this compact belt lies only the subregion of the city of Łódź. These problem areas comprise most of Poland's biggest industrial districts, including the extractive, heavy and textile industries, which are undergoing intensive restructuring and in which detrimental social effects

---

<sup>20</sup> In accordance with the rules of EU regional policy, areas receiving support under one objective are not eligible for support under any other objective.



of the transformation have accumulated, e.g., the Upper Silesian Industrial District, the Wałbrzych district, and the Łódź district (see T. Strykiewicz, 1999).

Rural areas. Their identification should be carried out in terms of two different sets of statistical criteria laid down by the EU. Hence two types of rural problem areas were distinguished:

#### TYPE ONE:

- a population density of under 100 persons per km<sup>2</sup> as of 31 December 1999; and
- a drop in the population in the years 1997-1999.

The above criteria were only satisfied by seven subregions of eastern and central Poland. They form a compact area embracing the central and northern parts of the so-called 'eastern wall' as well as the farmlands of northern Mazovia and the eastern part of Łódź Land. The spatial distribution of these units, corresponding largely to the rural problem areas (lagging in their development) delimited by J. Bański (2001), is presented in Fig. 10.

#### TYPE TWO:

- the proportion of agricultural employment equal to or higher than double the EU average as of September 1999 (i.e., 9.6%); and
- a mean unemployment rate higher than the EU average as of June 2000 (i.e., 8.2%).

This set of criteria allowed the identification of 37 NTS 3 units as problem areas (see Fig. 11). It makes the entire territory of Poland, with the exception of the major metropolitan areas, fulfil the criteria for rural problem areas set under Objective 2. As a result, the areas distinguished coincide fully with those delineated by R. Kulikowski (1987, 1992) and Z. Bański (1999, 2001) as rural problem areas.

When comparing the two types of rural problem areas, one can state that type two with its related set of statistical criteria is the one more favourable to Poland in terms of the number of units eligible for financial support by the Structural Funds.

## 5. Conclusions

The results of the analysis of the spatial distribution of problem areas under EU regional

policy allow one to state that a considerable number of the Community's regions, inhabited by almost 50% of its population, are eligible for support by the Structural Funds. Objective 1 areas, which are the main priority of EU regional policy, include the less-favoured southern Europe, Ireland, eastern *lands* of Germany, and thinly populated regions of Scandinavia. Objective 2 problem areas are supplementary to those under Objective 1, can be found in all the member states except Greece, Ireland and Portugal, which fall as wholes under Objective 1.

By the criteria of identification of problem areas under the EU regional policy currently in force, all Polish regions are eligible for support under Objective 1 owing to differences in the level of socio-economic development between Poland and the member states. Similarly, all subregions except the cities of Warsaw, Cracow, Wrocław, and Poznań qualify as industrial or agricultural problem areas under Objective 2. Hence, if the entire country does not fall under Objective 1 (e.g., due to a change in the Union's average per capita GDP as a result of its enlargement and/or a change in the criterion of delimiting Objective 1 areas, for instance from 75.0% to 50.0% of the EU average), the Polish regions with the highest level of socio-economic development will be eligible for support at the subregional level under Objective 2.

Against the backcloth of the EU member states, the Polish voivodeships and subregions belong to the poorest developed parts of Europe. At the level of regions, their situation corresponds to that of the poorest developed areas of Portugal, Spain, Greece, and southern Italy. The difference is that the Polish voivodeships have a better demographic structure, which is favourable for their further development. The disparities are greater at the level of NUTS 3/NTS 3 units. The Polish subregions lag behind their NUTS 3 counterparts with their per capita GDP of under 30.0% of the EU average (with the exception of Warsaw, Cracow, Wrocław, and Poznań). Such a low level of socio-economic development is only displayed by single NUTS 3 units in Portugal, Greece and Spain.

The new model of regional policy in Poland certainly makes the country closer to the EU standards. However, the proper functioning of this model requires both, an increase in the financial means earmarked in the State budget for regional development and, urgently, an increase in the financial independence of voivodeship self-governments through an increase in their own income. These changes are indispensable if Poland is to be able to make efficient use of the Structural Funds and the Cohesion Fund after it has joined the European Union.

It should be emphasised that the EU regional policy which is Poland's target is now

undergoing a reform. It is to be expected that the increase in budgetary expenditure following the Union's enlargement by ten new members will result in more stringent criteria defining problem areas. Even today, it is believed that the priorities for the next programming period, 2007-2013, should include (cf. Second Progress Report ..., 2003):

- the concentration of support in the Community's least-favoured regions, especially those in the new members,

- the choice of appropriate statistical criteria for the identification of problem areas (leaving the per capita GDP index as basic). The new system of indicators should allow a better identification of intraregional socio-economic differences given the current changes in the European economy (cf. Roger Tym & Partners, 1998): (1) demographic conditions, (2) changes in the economic structure and the role of the high-tech sector and R&D activity in it, (3) labour market segmentation determining the unemployment structure, and (4) differences in the standards and conditions of living,

- distinguishing the following types of regions of the future enlarged European Union in which various kinds of activity can be planned under regional policy:

- regions satisfying the criteria of the current Objective 1,
- regions that will have lost support under the current Objective 1 as a result of the enlargement,
- regions obtaining support under additional regulations, e.g. French overseas departments or sparsely populated areas of Austria, Finland and Sweden, and
- other regions not meeting the criteria of problem areas.

- establishing the limits of EU means transferred to the budgets of the member states (at present 4.0% of the GDP, with a planned increase to 4.5%).

The magnitude of support that Polish problem areas can obtain from the Structural Funds depends on the final results of the discussion being now held and the implementation of the new rules of the European Union's regional policy after 2007.

## References

- Amin A. (1999) *An institutionalist perspective on regional economic development. International Journal of Urban & Regional Research*. vol. 23 (2). s. 365-378.
- Bachtler J., Turok I. (Ed.) (1997) *The coherence of EU regional policy: contrasting perspectives on the structural funds*. Jessica Kingsley. Londyn.
- Bański J. (1999) *Teoria i kierunki badań obszarów problemowych w Polsce. (Theory and research directions of problem areas in Poland). Przegląd Geograficzny*. t. LXXI, z. 4. Polskie Towarzystwo Geograficzne. Warszawa. s. 401-416.
- Bański J. (2001). *Problems areas in Poland's agriculture. Geographia Polonica*. vol. 74. no. 1. Spring 2001. Warszawa. s. 47-64.
- Beutel J. (2002) *The economic impact of objective 1 interventions for the period 2000 – 2006. Final Report to the Directorate-General for Regional Policies*. European Commission. May 2002. Konstanz, Germany.
- Borkowski J. (2002) *Perspektywa członkostwa Polski w unii Europejskiej. Regiony polskie i innych państw kandydujących a spójność ekonomiczna i społeczna Unii Europejskiej. (The EU membership – a perspective for Poland. Polish regions and of other candidate countries and the economic and social unity in the EU). Studia Europejskie*. Centrum Europejskie Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego. Numer 3 (23) 2002. Warszawa. s. 155-162.
- Commission Decision of 1 July 1999 drawing up the list of regions covered by Objective 1 of the Structural Funds for the period 2000 to 2006*. 1999/502/EC. (notified under document number C(1999) 1770). Official Journal of the European Communities. 27.07.1999. Luxembourg.
- Council Regulation (EC) No 1260/1999 of 21 June 1999 laying down General Provisions of the Structural Funds*. Official Journal of the European Communities. 26.06.1999. Luxembourg.
- Documentation NUTS 3 areas, EU, EFTA & CEC*. Version 01.01.2002. GEODAN IT BV. Amsterdam. 2002.
- The Financing of EU Structural Policy in the Context of Enlargement of the EU*. Interdepartmental Policy Study (IBO). Brussels.2002.
- First Cohesion Report*. European Commission. Brussels. 1996.
- First Progress Report on Economic and Social Cohesion. Unity, Solidarity, Diversity for Europe, its People and its Territory*. Commission Communication. Commission of the European Communities. COM (2002) 46 final. Brussels. 30.01.2002.
- General Report on the Activities of the European Union 2001*. European Commission. Brussels-Luxembourg. 2002.
- Jouen M. (2001) *How to enhance economic and social cohesion in Europe after 2006 ?* Groupement D'Etudes et de Recherches. Notre Europe. Brussels.
- Kulikowski R. (1987) *Geografia rolnictwa w pracach nad planem przestrzennego zagospodarowania kraju do 2000r. (Geography of agriculture in the works on the spatial plan of the country's management until 2000)*. *Przegląd Geograficzny*. t. LIX, z. 4. Polskie Towarzystwo Geograficzne. Warszawa. s. 603-609.
- Kulikowski R. (1992) *Obszary problemowe rolnictwa w Polsce. (Agricultural problem areas in Poland)*. (W:) *Wybrane zagadnienia obszarów wiejskich*. Biuletyn KPZK PAN. z. 158. Warszawa. s. 23-40.
- Kuźniewicz J. (2002) *Wsparcie inwestycji lokalnych z funduszy Unii Europejskiej. (The support*

- for local investments from the EU funds). *Zapiski Kujawsko-Dobrzyńskie* t. 17. Gospodarka (XX-Początek XXI wieku). Włocławskie Towarzystwo Naukowe. Włocławek. s. 71-85.
- Maile I. (2002) *The design of EU after enlargement: customs union or common market with new members*. *Journal of Economic Integration*. 17 (2). June 2002. Center for International Economics. Sejong Institution. s. 243-261.
- Manzocchi S. (Ed.) (2002) *The economics of enlargement*. *Rivista di politica economia*. Seria III. Numer I – II. Rzym.
- Maura A. (2002) *Developing European regions ? : comparative governance, policy networks and European integration*. Ashgate. Burlington.
- Moussis N. (2002) *Guide to European policies*. European Study Service. Rixensart.
- NUTS – Statistical Regions of Europe*. [http://europa.eu.int/comm/eurostat/ramon/nuts/home\\_regions\\_en.html](http://europa.eu.int/comm/eurostat/ramon/nuts/home_regions_en.html). 2002.
- Official Journal of the European Communities*. 1999. Luxembourg.
- Official Journal of the European Communities*. 2000. Luxembourg.
- Paraskevopoulos Ch.J. (2001) *Interpreting convergence in the European Union: patterns of collective action, social learning and europeanization*. Basingstoke. Palgrave.
- The Results of the Programming of the Structural Funds for 2000-2006 (Objective 1)*. Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. Commission of the European Communities. SEC (2001) 1140. COM (2001) 378 Final. 05.07.2001. Brussels.
- Roger Tym & Partners (1998) *EU structural policy indicators for the identification of problem regions*. European Parliament. Directorate General for Research. Working Paper. Regional Policy Series. REGI 104 EN. Luxembourg.
- Rozporządzenie Rady Ministrów z dnia 13 lipca 2000r. w sprawie wprowadzenia Nomenklatury Jednostek Terytorialnych do Celów Statystycznych (NTS)*. Dz.U. nr 58/2000, poz. 685.
- Second Report on Economic and Social Cohesion*. European Commission. Brussels. 2001.
- Second Progress Report on Economic and Social Cohesion. Unity, Solidarity, Diversity for Europe, its People and its Territory*. Communication from the Commission. Commission of the European Communities. COM (2003) 34 final. Brussels. 30.01.2003.
- Strykiewicz T. (1999) *Adaptacja przestrzenna przemysłu w Polsce w warunkach transformacji*. (Spatial adaptation of industry in Poland at the time of transformation). Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM. Poznań.
- Tondl G. (2001a) *Regional policy*. W: (red.) M.Artis, F.Nixson. *The economics of European Union. Policy and analysis*. Oxford University Press. Oxford.
- Tondl G. (2001b) *Convergence after divergence ? : regional growth in Europe*. VERLAG. Wien- New York.
- Weise Ch., Bachtler J., Downes R., McMaster I., Toepel K. (2001) *The impact of EU enlargement on cohesion. Final report*. German Institute for Economic Research. European Policies Research Centre. European Commission Tender No. PO/00-1/RegioA4. Berlin – Glasgow.
- Yin L., Zestos G.K., Michelis L. (2003) *Economic convergence in the European Union*. *Journal of Economic Integration*. 18 (1). March 2003. Center for International Economics. Sejong Institution. s. 188-213.

Table 1

**European Union's aid for Poland in the years 2004-2006 (in EUR billion)**

<b>FUNDS</b>	<b>EU means</b>	<b>Co-financing by Poland</b>
<b>STRUCTURAL FUNDS</b>	<b>7.320</b>	<b>2.760</b>
<b>COMMUNITY INITIATIVES</b>	<b>0.320</b>	<b>0.110</b>
of which:		
European Regional Development Fund	4.650	
European Social Fund	1.750	
European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund, the Guidance Section	1.060	
Financial Instrument for Fisheries Guidance	0.180	
<b>COHESION FUND</b>	<b>3.730</b>	<b>0.660</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>11.370</b>	<b>3.530</b>

**Sources:** Second Progress Report on Economic and Social Cohesion. Unity, Solidarity, Diversity for Europe, its People and its Territory. Communication from the Commission. Commission of the European Communities. COM (2003) 34 final. Brussels. 30.01.2003. Own compilation.

Table 2

**Per capita Gross Domestic Product by voivodeship (NTS2 unit)**

<b>Voivodeship</b>	<b>Per capita GDP (at PPS) as of 31 Dec. 1998 in US\$</b>
Kujawy-Pomerania	6,715
Lower Silesia	7,274
Lublin	5,285
Lubuska Land	6,648
Łódź	6,455
Małopolska	6,631
Mazovia	10,648
Opole	6,431
Podkarpacie	5,530
Podlasie	5,561
Pomerania	7,192
Silesia	8,151
Świętokrzyska Land	5,628
Warmia-Mazuria	5,591
West Pomerania	7,116
Wielkopolska	7,707
<b>POLAND</b>	<b>7,287</b>
<b>EUROPEAN UNION</b>	<b>20,213</b>
<i>Criterion - 75% of EU mean</i>	<i>15,159.8</i>

**Source:** Statistics in Focus. General Statistics. Theme 1-4/2001. Eurostat. Luxembourg.





Table 3

## Selected socio-economic indices by subregion (NTS3 unit).

<b>Voivodeship</b>	<b>Subregion</b>	<b>Population density, 31 Dec. 1999</b>	<b>Change in population number, 1997-1999</b>	<b>% industrial employment, 30 Sept. 1999</b>	<b>Change in number of industrial employment, 1997-1999</b>	<b>% agricultural employment, 30 Sept. 1999</b>	<b>Unemployment rate, 30 June 2000</b>
Kujawy-Pomerania	Bydgoszcz	116	2208	33.8	-8399	24.8	16.5
	Toruń-Włocławek	118	545	27.5	-7355	37.0	18.6
Lower Silesia	Jelenia Góra-Wałbrzych	134	-7864	35.7	-20453	22.6	20.8
	Legnica	124	54	36.5	-7591	21.0	17.2
	Wrocław	85	2674	27.7	-2896	42.1	16.8
	Wrocław city	2174	-2634	32.5	-5073	1.5	5.9
Lublin	Biała Podlaska	54	-889	12.4	-891	61.0	13.4
	Chelm-Zamość	73	-3897	11.5	-3865	66.0	13.7
	Lublin	125	-2679	18.8	-13455	50.3	12.1
Lubuska Land	Gorzów	63	1504	33.3	-3761	21.5	16.3
	Zielona Góra	81	1634	32.0	-6205	21.6	19.8
Łódź	Łódź	110	-4342	24.1	-10692	49.2	15.2
	Piotrków-Skierniewice	97	-3275	24.6	-9162	52.0	15.0
	Łódź city	2718	-12207	36.3	-19560	1.8	14.3
Małopolska	Cracow-Tarnów	190	6498	23.3	-15584	51.7	11.8
	Nowy Sącz	146	11784	16.0	-6811	57.7	13.0
	Cracow city	2258	-2387	35.6	-13908	1.5	5.7

<b>Voivodeship</b>	<b>Subregion</b>	<b>Population density, 31 Dec. 1999</b>	<b>Change in population number, 1997-1999</b>	<b>% industrial employment, 30 Sept. 1999</b>	<b>Change in number of industrial employment, 1997-1999</b>	<b>% agricultural employment, 30 Sept. 1999</b>	<b>Unemployment rate, 30 June 2000</b>
Mazovia	Ciechanów-Płock	83	-115	22.3	-4716	50.8	17.2
	Ostrołęka-Siedlce	64	-23	14.1	-4670	62.4	14.4
	Warsaw	157	16364	27.7	-14906	38.1	9.6
	Radom	106	-1725	18.3	-9773	56.1	18.4
	Warsaw city	3268	-9474	26.4	-27624	0.5	3.0
Opole	Opole	116	-2805	31.0	-12286	32.8	13.6
Podkarpacie	Rzeszów-Tarnobrzeg	155	6895	25.0	-6397	47.7	13.7
	Krosno-Przemyśl	92	1765	18.1	-3995	56.6	15.6
Podlasie	Białystok-Suwałki	61	-482	18.3	-6184	47.6	11.6
	Łomża	60	-753	13.5	-1497	63.6	14.5
Pomerania	Słupsk	60	1999	32.5	-1957	25.8	23.1
	Gdańsk	98	11846	30.1	-5471	33.7	18.3
	Gdańsk-Sopot-Gdynia Tri-city	1821	-681	33.1	-8460	2.2	5.8
Silesia	North Silesia	180	14118	33.3	-13696	30.9	12.6
	South Silesia	324	1863	41.9	-69796	21.4	9.7
	Central Silesia	1742	-44699	48.3	-72558	1.5	11.0
Świętokrzyska Land	Świętokrzyska Land	113	-5112	20.0	-12029	54.3	15.3
Warmia-Mazuria	Elbląg	72	2057	30.1	-4284	31.8	24.2
	Olsztyn	61	2914	27.6	-1603	25.7	19.9
	Elk	46	174	22.9	193	39.6	27.4
West Pomerania	Szczecin	89	879	31.7	-8855	17.3	14.7
	Koszalin	59	2111	29.5	-4785	24.1	22.1

<b>Voivodeship</b>	<b>Subregion</b>	<b>Population density, 31 Dec. 1999</b>	<b>Change in population number, 1997-1999</b>	<b>% industrial employment, 30 Sept. 1999</b>	<b>Change in number of industrial employment, 1997-1999</b>	<b>% agricultural employment, 30 Sept. 1999</b>	<b>Unemployment rate, 30 June 2000</b>
Wielkopolska	Piła	64	807	32.3	-362	33.1	16.8
	Poznań	97	9824	35.3	-6281	33.8	9.1
	Kalisz	113	1143	28.5	-7647	43.1	13.7
	Konin	99	660	26.0	-3926	49.1	17.2
	Poznań city	2208	-3147	32.7	-8677	0.9	3.0
<b>POLAND</b>		124	-6,870	27.8	-477,901	33.7	13.5
<b>EUROPEAN UNION - criterion</b>		100	drop in population	28.3	drop in employment	9.6	8.2

**Source:** Unpublished GUS data, 1997 and 1999 GUS local data banks, own calculations.

**Ryciny zamieszczone są w publikacji P.Churski, 2004. Obszary problemowe w Polsce z perspektywy celów polityki regionalnej Unii Europejskiej.  
Wyższa Szkoła Humanistyczno-Ekonomiczna we Włocławku. Włocławek**