



**Expert evaluation network  
delivering policy analysis on the  
performance of Cohesion policy 2007-2013  
Year 2 – 2012**

**Task 2: Country Report on Achievements of  
Cohesion policy**

**Poland**

**Version: Final**

**Grzegorz Gorzelak**

**Marek W. Kozak**

**EUROREG, University of Warsaw**

**A report to the European Commission  
Directorate-General Regional and Urban Policy**

## Contents

Executive summary .....	4
1. The socio-economic context .....	6
2. The regional development policy pursued, the EU contribution to this and policy achievements over the period .....	7
The regional development policy pursued .....	7
Policy implementation .....	8
Achievements of the programmes so far .....	16
3. Effects of intervention.....	22
4. Evaluations and good practice in evaluation.....	24
5. Further Remarks - New challenges for policy.....	36
References .....	40
Interviews.....	40
Annex 1 - Evaluation grid for examples of good practice in evaluation .....	41
Annex 2 - Tables.....	43
Annex 3 -Analysis of indicators used in the AIRs, 2011 .....	43

## List of abbreviations

- AIR Annual Implementation Report
- CAP Common Agriculture Policy
- CBC Cross-Border Cooperation
- DEP OP Operational Programme for Development of Eastern Poland
- ETC European Territorial Cooperation
- HC OP Operational Programme Human Capital
- IA Implementing Authority
- IE OP Operational Programme Innovative Economy
- I&E OP Operational Programme Infrastructure & Environment
- K-PV Kujawsko-Pomorskie
- KSRR National Regional Development Strategy
- KPZK National Spatial Development Concept
- MA Managing Authority
- MRD Ministry of Regional Development
- NEU National Evaluation Unit
- OP Operational Programme
- PV Podlaskie Voivodship
- ROP Regional Operational Programme
- SUE RMB Strategia Unii Europejskiej dla Regionu Morza Bałtyckiego (Strategy of the EU for the Baltic Sea Region)
- TA Technical Assistance

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The overall economic situation of Poland was favourable also in 2011. GDP grew by 4.3%. Domestic demand was the major driving force. However, predictions for 2012 are lower (2.5% - 3%) growth, mainly due to the negative impact of the European-wide recession. Public finance deficit has been lowered to 5.1% of GDP, and for 2012 it is expected to drop to 3%. There is an increase of the unemployment rate to almost 9.6% in mid-2011 (and growth to 10.1 in September 2012), affecting also university (and equivalent) graduates.

In comparison with the previous period for which the last report was prepared, the policy of regional development was implemented with no significant changes, except for greater intensity. The principles of Polish regional policy are shaped by the doctrine of “concentration and diffusion”. Intervention – financed mostly from the EU funds – is being concentrated (some say too much) on major infrastructure, of which the transport networks are of particular importance. Also support for enterprises is being delivered, as well as other priorities, according to the structure of the Operational Programmes (OPs). To some extent, the recent changes in the regional policy aiming at simplifying spending of the EU funds through more effective public procurement procedures stemmed from the assumption that the funding provided through the Cohesion policy would further reduce the scale of the slowdown of the Polish economy caused by financial and economic crisis (and mostly imported from the outside). In 2011, the economic crisis in the other Member States had no other influence than simplifying certain procedures. There is no doubt that the ERDF and Cohesion Fund contributions, as well as the payments within the Common Agriculture Policy (CAP), were among important factors helping to counteract the economic slowdown in Poland, at least through their demand-side effects.

Both commitments and disbursements were on the rise in 2011. On average, the commitments from the ERDF and Cohesion Fund allocations in 2011 reached the level of 69% (see Excel Table 4). Under this general figure, differences can be noted in the main policy areas (see Excel Table 3 and 4). In case of enterprise environment, the measure of RTDI and related services commitments has reached the level of 73% of the total ERDF and Cohesion Fund allocation, support for innovation in SMEs – 53%, road – 81%, rail 39%, tourism and culture 80%, planning and rehabilitation – 87% (ibidem). The progress in disbursement (measured by payment certification) has increased as compared to 2010, and reached the level of 21% in European Territorial Cooperation (ETC) programmes (the lowest), 24% in case of Infrastructure and Environment OP (I&E OP), and 57% in the Lubuskie Regional Operational Programme (ROP) and – best - 63% in the Opolskie (ROP).

The impact of the Cohesion policy on Poland’s development is analysed every year by three different macroeconomic models. The analyses presented in 2012 and relating also to 2011 suggest that according to all models, there is a positive impact on the country’s’ development (in 2011 the pace of GDP growth thanks to EU funds<sup>1</sup> was higher by 0.5-0.9 percentage points , (Ministry of Regional Development (MRD) 2012, Wpływ). Its high impact has also been noted in other categories, like investments, increased share of the GVA yield in industry (but decreased

---

<sup>1</sup> Except for the CAP.

in services and agriculture), employment, imports and exports, internal cohesion, public finances.

In 2011 there has been continuation of evaluations similar in character to those in 2010. Due to the fact that most large projects were in the phases of preparation or early implementation, most of the studies were oriented on problem solving (removing barriers) in programmes (priorities, measures), and not on results or impacts, as it was too early for this. Only 3 evaluations tried to assess the whole programmes' results.

Regrettably, the MRD web page containing the evaluation database was not updated till the beginning of 2013. In 2011 as many as 122 evaluations were carried out throughout the country. The majority, but not all of them, can be found on the web pages of Managing Authorities (MAs).

Since Poland has already achieved high methodological level in evaluations and several good and comprehensive evaluations have already been performed, no qualitative progress (with the exception of one meta-evaluation and one independent study) was noticed in 2011 (such a progress would require implementation of new theoretical approaches to evaluations, in directing them more to independent research projects form often formal studies required by regulations). During the Polish Presidency important international conferences on development and evaluation were organised in Poland. The preparation for the new programming period (including defining the strengthened role of evaluation during new period) has already started.

There is a growing concern if the EU funds are leading to a real and durable increase of the overall economic efficiency (i.e. if the supply effects are strong enough), or if they just have a short-term social significance (i.e. the demand effect). The use of the external funds coming to Poland in order to boost the innovativeness and competitiveness of the Polish economy seems to become the main challenge for the next programming period.

## 1. THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONTEXT

The overall economic situation of Poland was favourable also in 2011. GDP grew by 4.3% (higher than forecasts indicating in mid-2011 only 3.8%), and only the Baltic Republics noted higher rates (they were emerging out of the deepest recession within the EU). Domestic demand was the major driving force. However, predictions for 2012 are lower (2.5 - 3% growth) though relatively still high in comparison with the other EU Member States. Public finance deficit has been lowered to 5.1% of GDP, and for 2012 it is expected to drop to 3%. On the dark side, there is an increase of the unemployment rate (from 7% in mid-2008 to almost 10% in mid-2009, and stable since then), affecting also university (and equivalent) graduates. (More data on macro-economic developments can be found in Excel Table 2)

In recent months, a slowdown in the economy has been observed – GDP grew by only 2.5% in the first half of 2012. Preparations for the football championships EURO 2012 induced some boost to the economy due to accelerated infrastructure spending, however the short-term effects (increased consumption demand in hotels, restaurants, etc.) were not substantial and are now over. Housing is in a slump which affects both prices and the situation of developers. Several construction companies are in serious financial difficulties due to underestimation of costs (or being awarded the contracts with dumping prices) when bidding for construction of motorways, especially in a rush before EURO 2012. Industrial production is still growing, but at a slower pace than before. Importing the European stagnation may lead to a further deterioration of the general economic situation in 2013.

There were no major changes in the spatial and settlement structure in Poland during the recent years (the most recent picture is not possible since 2009 is the last year for which GDP in territorial breakdowns - NUTS3 - is available). The financial crisis (by which Poland has not yet been seriously affected) has not influenced the regional growth patterns. Main features are summarised below:

- Further growth of metropolitan regions, in several cases involving depopulation in the central city and a rapid growth of the number of population in its surrounding areas – mainly due to suburbanisation. In a few cases (Wrocław, Gdańsk, Łódź), this pattern was also repeated in the economic indicators. All the metropolitan cores noted lower rates of GDP growth than their surrounding areas;
- Growth of several industrial regions that were not burdened by heavy (Silesia) or light (Łódź) industries and which had undergone successful industrial restructuring, supported in most cases by foreign capital (like Kalisz-Ostrów and Rzeszów regions);
- Parallel processes of growth and decline in traditional industrial regions undergoing depopulation (Upper Silesia and Łódź), which on the one hand benefit from their metropolitan functions, but on the other hand are blocked by their industrial (economic, technical and social) heritage;
- Stagnation of most of the peripheral regions along the eastern and western borders – in the former case, the ones demonstrating obsolete socio-economic structures with high shares of agriculture, the latter still unable to overcome the heritage of collapse of state farms and a low level of industrialisation (more data on regional disparities and trends: see Excel Table 1).

## 2. THE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY PURSUED, THE EU CONTRIBUTION TO THIS AND POLICY ACHIEVEMENTS OVER THE PERIOD

### THE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY PURSUED

In comparison with the previous period for which the last report was prepared, the policy of regional development was implemented with no significant changes other than greater intensity. The principles of the Polish regional policy are shaped by the doctrine of “concentration and diffusion”. Intervention – financed mostly from the EU funds – is concentrated on major infrastructure, of which transport networks are of special importance. Support for enterprises is also emphasised, as well as other priorities, depending on the structure of the OPs. To some extent, the recent changes in regional policy aiming at simplifying spending of the EU funds through more effective public procurement procedures stemmed from the assumption that the funding provided through the Cohesion policy would further reduce the scale of slowdown of the Polish economy caused by the financial and economic crisis (mostly imported from the outside).

The strategic documents recently adopted – of which the *National Spatial Development Concept 2030*<sup>2</sup> and the *Long-term Country Development Strategy Poland 2030 and the Third Wave of Modernity*<sup>3</sup> – are the most important ones, however they have not as yet influenced the activities of the national and regional authorities.

In general, the last year of Polish regional development policy was characterised by the following major activities:

1. Further implementation of regional development programmes co-financed by the EU Cohesion policy, with a greater share of completed or largely advanced projects.
2. Attempts to simplify the procedures and ensure smooth absorption, however without major changes in this field as main improvements were done before 2011. Probably due to the piling up of well-advanced projects (presenting invoices paid for certification and refinancing), the time needed to process the paperwork and make the disbursements increased significantly (in the largest I&E OP, up to 3.6 months, in the Innovative Economy OP (IE OP) to about the same, that is 111 days from 70 in 2010). Despite the simplification, administration of procedures takes more time, which to some extent may be explained by an increase of the number of fairly advanced projects (increased workload).
3. Preparation of an integrated system of strategic development documents on national level.
4. However, problems with inter-programme and inter-project coordination remain largely unsolved.

---

<sup>2</sup> Not yet available in English, for the Polish version see:

[http://www.mrr.gov.pl/rozwoj\\_regionalny/Polityka\\_przestrzenna/KPZK/Aktualnosci/Documents/KPZK\\_2030.pdf](http://www.mrr.gov.pl/rozwoj_regionalny/Polityka_przestrzenna/KPZK/Aktualnosci/Documents/KPZK_2030.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> The Polish version: Długookresowa Strategia Rozwoju Kraju Polska 2030. Trzecia fala nowoczesności, [http://zds.kprm.gov.pl/sites/default/files/dsrk\\_1\\_tom\\_17\\_listopada\\_2011\\_0.pdf](http://zds.kprm.gov.pl/sites/default/files/dsrk_1_tom_17_listopada_2011_0.pdf)

5. At the end of 2011, there was an increasing concern among the beneficiaries about the maintenance cost of the implemented infrastructural projects: many municipalities' budgets got close to the prudence threshold of 55% of deficit related to their yearly incomes.

In Poland, the ERDF did not support directly in any specific way youth unemployment which – as part of overall unemployment - was the task to be addressed by the ESF. Also as a rule, ERDF measures were oriented on innovative, high-tech projects, and not on SMEs being unable to obtain finance, as in 2011 there was no crisis in Poland. (MRD, Raport Strategiczny 2012).

## **POLICY IMPLEMENTATION<sup>4</sup>**

Main points from previous country report:

- In 2010, a significant progress was recorded in the absorption of the EU funds (contracts signed) both at the national and regional levels, while real expenditure was increasing.
- At that time, relatively little information was available on the physical effects of intervention.
- The overall picture in policy implementation was positive, as it was in line with expectations and plans.
- Visible differences in the advancement of different programmes could be noticed (relatively least advanced European CBC). While CBC on the Polish western and southern borders developed dynamically, the CBC programmes financed under the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Scheme did not progress significantly, and implementation proceeded with no significant changes.
- There was a clear increase in terms of not only commitments made, but also of the expenditure made.

The year 2011 turned out to be different, due to the following features:

1. Functioning of the coordinating institution and MAs was to a large extent influenced by and subordinated to the Polish Presidency of the EU (July-December 2011) and to the preparation to the 2014-2020 programming period.
2. It was also a period of intensive work on the completion of a nationwide system of strategic development documents: the National Regional Development Strategy (KSRR) and the National Spatial Development Concept (KPZK) – the only ones adopted finally, with another 8 still in various stages of preparation (as of August 2012).
3. When compared to 2010, the year 2011 showed a piling up of payments, thus creating an additional pressure on accountancy, monitoring and evaluation.

In 2011, there was a continuous process of increasing commitments and payments. Comparing the levels of allocation contracted on 31 December, in 2009 the respective share was 26.9, in

---

<sup>4</sup> The indicators used in this section come from the AIR for 2011, which relate to the situation up to the end of 2011. A more up-to-date view of the aggregate position (though not of the situation in the different policy areas) is presented in the Synthesis Report for 2012 of the Expert evaluation network delivering policy analysis on the performance of Cohesion policy 2007-2013 which is based on data for payments from the ERDF and Cohesion Fund up to the end of 2012, i.e. after the present report was completed.



2010 - 58.1 and in 2011 – 72.6.<sup>5</sup> There are several measures where almost all the money was contracted; but there still remain some where the progress is lower than expected (e.g. railway projects).

Another feature which gained some importance was the political and social pressure on finalising the projects considered important for the EURO 2012 football championship (though some undertakings were finalised after this event, like the Modlin airport in the vicinity of Warsaw, and some are still in progress, e.g. the motorway A2 west of Warsaw). Several infrastructural investments that in 2007 that were planned to be completed at the beginning of 2012 (before EURO 2012) were not fulfilled on time. Therefore the notion that EURO 2012 has helped complete large investments (mostly road, rail, rehabilitation and revitalisation) has little to do with reality. Most ambitious projects planned for EURO 2012 were not complete until today (motorways or expressways connecting the cities were football matches were being planned, A1 connecting Gdansk with Slovakia and the Czech Republic, A4 connecting with Ukraine, etc., the new passenger Warsaw-Modlin airport not ready until after EURO 2012. However, the renovation of several railway stations, improving public transport in cities was finalised.

In the previous country report (2011), we identified basic problems associated with large projects, such as:

- inefficient procedures (purchase of land and insufficient coverage of land-use plans on the local level),
- ineffective public procurement rules, in which the price too often is the main selection criterion,
- ineffective administration making mistakes in public procurement, which slows down the process due to opening the possibility of protests and claims,
- environmental protests possible because of too restrictive nature preservation laws,
- lack of clear targets and of complementarity between programmes and projects,
- intervention giving priority to “easy” and risk-avoiding proposals rather than to important and/or innovative projects.<sup>6</sup>

Some of the projects finalised in 2011 are presented in boxes throughout the text. The problem with large projects (of higher policy importance) is that in 2011 they were at an early stage of implementation. The largest ones (like railway modernisation or motorways construction) are not finished and their implementation has encountered several serious problems, explained further (see also note 5 below).

---

<sup>5</sup> MRD, Wykorzystanie środków z funduszy strukturalnych i funduszu spójności w ramach narodowego planu rozwoju 2004—2006 oraz narodowych strategicznych ram odniesienia 2007—2013. Informacja miesięczna za grudzień 2009, 2010, 2011. [29.09.2012]. See also Tables 1 and 2.

<sup>6</sup> Throughout this report, we give examples of projects undertaken in various programmes co-financed by the Cohesion policy. The projects were selected to some extent at random – these are typical projects implemented on the national and regional levels, sometimes involving large sums of money, in several cases rather small costs. These boxes should provide some “flavour” of the span of the Cohesion policy interventions in Poland. Their relevance is relative – in several cases small – in financial terms – projects may have significant meaning for local communities or organisations, and this was the reason to demonstrate also such examples.

### **Development of Innovative Systems through Knowledge Exchange**

Project aiming to improve competitiveness through developing cooperation among innovative SMEs and business support institutions, strengthening their potential through various forms of cooperation of science and technological parks, incubators, clusters, academia and local authorities. To create conditions for more intensive contacts and networking within the Baltic Sea Region Partners: municipality of Elbląg (lead partner) and technology institutions in Poland, Germany, Denmark and Sweden.

Co-financed by the ERDF, via the Southern Baltic CBC Programme; around EUR 0.25 million.

In 2011 (and in the first half of 2012), several constructing companies have gone bankrupt or found themselves in a difficult financial situation due to the very low price offered in the bids and later approved in the contracts signed and fast growing prices of raw materials, with the total risk left on the part of the contractor (most famous: the Chinese giant COVAC resigning from the construction of a part of the A2 motorway). It is estimated that as much as 6% to 7% of Poland's GDP is related to the construction complex in jeopardy now. Poor quality public procurement law and practices of the implementing authorities brought negative or at least unwanted results also in other types of projects, though not as spectacular.

#### **Support to research management system**

Project implemented by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education, dealing with the management of the research results and knowledge transfer from scientific institutions to the economy. It covers analyses and prognosis serving the development of science and innovation policy, evaluation studies, data bases. Four subprojects finalised, four in progress also in 2012. Among its products is the "Handbook of evaluation of foresight projects implemented in Poland".

Cost: EUR 21.8 million from the ERDF (IE OP).

Before we go into a more detailed analysis of the progress made in 2011, let us start with some general comments.

The first relates to changes in the financial allocations under the ERDF and Cohesion Fund (see Excel Table 3). The changes were minor. The largest consisted in reducing the allocation for "support for innovation in SMEs" by EUR 420.1 million (mostly due to relatively small demand), and "other transport" (that is mostly multimodal) by EUR 113.3 million due to little demand, and social infrastructure (by EUR 85.6 million) due to a diminishing demand from municipalities as main beneficiaries. For the same reason, the allocation for Technical Assistance (TA) was reduced by EUR 258.9 million. A significant part of this sums were allocated to the field of human resources (over EUR 300 million).

The second comment is about the dissemination of information on progress by the MAs. While general information on financial progress is easily available on a weekly, monthly, quarterly and yearly basis, the Annual Implementation Reports (AIRs) presented at programmes' websites in some case were not accessible to the public due to technical problems (for instance, in the case of Infrastructure and Environment OP, till August 2012). As a result, for an ordinary citizen it is

not easy to get access to information on physical progress and commentary<sup>7</sup>. For the purposes of this report, the AIRs provided directly by the MRD and by Evalnet were used.

The third comment (as in the previous period) is related to the low quality of progress indicators. In order to present a clear picture, a report on the indices used in AIRs 2011 was commissioned for the sake of this report (as presented in Annex 3).

The main findings are the following:

- only 34% of the output indicators used can be compared between (most, but not all of) different OPs,
- among the result indicators, only ONE was used in the corresponding sectoral OP and in all 16 ROPs (number of people connected to sewage systems),
- different wording of apparently similar indicators make it impossible to conduct any firm comparison of progress within different OPs (for instance: “Number of modernised culture objects” and “Number of supported cultural institutions”),
- relatively most typical (comparable) indicators were used by Małopolskie and Świętokrzyskie ROPs, while the least comparable - by Pomorskie. As a result, despite the fact that the ROPs have quite similar structures, the indicators used are not fully comparable.

Also, the AIRs report the projects that have been completed. As a result, several indicators show “0”, although a part of investment (for example a stretch of a motorway) has been finalised and made available to the users. One should therefore expect a sudden increase of outputs reported in future AIRs, as the projects are to be completed by the end of the programming period (plus two or three years)<sup>8</sup>.

A general comment is the following: there is virtually no possibility either to compare the achievements between the ROPs or to aggregate these achievements across the ROPs, as well as with the sectoral OPs. Moreover, the indicators most widely used are often completely meaningless. The best examples are: “Number of conferences, training sessions and seminars organised”, “Number of projects” - this information does not tell anything on either the content of activities undertaken or their results. Also, the real outputs displayed in the AIRs are deeply underestimated.

#### **„Via Fabrilis – handicraft tradition trail”**

Project implemented in the Dolnośląskie region jointly by the Karkonoske Museum (in Vrchlabi, Czech Republic) and the Ceramics Museum (in Bolesławiec, Poland), aiming to develop a new tourist product in the Czech-Polish border region. A trail links a number of Czech and Polish towns with long and well-established handicraft tradition. The project enhances the tourist attractiveness of the region, improves social awareness and cross-border exchange of tourists. Project co-financed by the OP within the CBC Czech Republic-Poland 2007-2013 (with around EUR 0.5 million).

<sup>7</sup> On top of that, the key information on progress is presented in the Excel format.

<sup>8</sup> There does exist information on projects completed which, however, is not displayed in the AIRs. This information is derived from a whole-national database on projects in which data on budgets, spending, outcomes is available. These can be easily summed up in any required form. However, it is not published since this is an internal database of the MRD.

To sum up, the problems with comparison and interpretation of indicators used in the 2011 AIRs stem from differences in the measurement units used, imprecise wording, differences in the numbers of indicators (unfortunately mostly product indicators), mistakes in the categorisation of indicators, and - finally - with one exception in the regional OPs - lack of impact indicators (see also Annex 3).

Having in mind all of these limitations, the data presented below should be treated with all carefulness due. To have a better picture of the financial allocation by policy areas, see Excel Table 3 and Excel Table 3cbc.

Table 1 offers some additional data from monthly implementation reports (31 December 2010 and 31 December 2011). Some of the data available in those reports have little value on progress, so only few of them are presented. Certified costs in relation to allocation may serve as an indicator of disbursement, as there is no better information in reports.

**Table 1 - Selected data on progress as of 31 December 2010 and 2011\*.**

OPs and Regional OPs **	Applications approved, no.		Commitments/allocation, in %		Certified costs/ allocation, in %	
	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011
Innovative Economy	6,562	9,917	64.5	73.8	13.0	26.6
Infrastr.&Environment	1,251	1,654	50.4	70.4	10.1	24.2
Eastern Poland Dev.	123	199	52.4	68.7	17.1	33.6
ETC	152	273	44.5	68.6	7.1	20.7
Dolnośląskie	1,335	1,612	65.0	74.0	25.5	41.0
Kujawsko-pomorskie	1,296	1,598	72.0	75.8	26.8	40.0
Lubelskie	1,688	2,128	58.7	74.1	22.0	38.9
Lubuskie	788	827	82.0	83.8	40.5	56.6
Łódzkie	928	2,221	65.0	89.4	24.4	41.5
Małopolskie	1,851	2,552	72.0	81.7	31.9	41.5
Mazowieckie	1,027	1,274	56.7	70.2	22.7	38.0
Opolskie	1,035	1,102	91.9	96.0	43.8	62.6
Podkarpackie	1,545	1,910	72.2	78.6	27.4	47.7
Podlaskie	859	954	75.5	67.7	28.1	41.5
Pomorskie	1,391	1,538	92.4	93.4	34.7	50.2
Śląskie	3,144	3,781	61.4	74.6	21.6	37.7
Świętokrzyskie	909	1,020	61.2	75.9	28.4	50.8
Warmińsko-mazurskie	1,566	1,939	68.2	74.8	21.5	35.2
Wielkopolskie	1,931	1,964	95.8	91.4	33.5	53.1
Zachodniopomorskie	1,089	1,392	67.9	75.2	22.6	38.4

*\*the data may differ from those in the AIRs. \*\*- except for TA OP and ESF funded OP (Human Capital). Source: MRD, 2011, Wykorzystanie...; MRD 2012, Wykorzystanie....*

Despite the fact that the indicator of disbursement (certified costs) is only an approximation, it gives insight into the progress in the implementation of, and differences between the different OPs.

The data on physical progress, for obvious reasons, will be mostly based on the most typical and comparable (main) indicators used in the AIRs 2011. According to all the AIRs, implementation of programmes is, in general, in line with what was planned. Visible progress in the financial and physical terms was observed in 2011 (see Table 2), helping to reach long-term objectives. This

was possible thanks to the finalisation of several projects initiated in the previous years. This, in turn, was due to increased implementation experience, certain procedural simplifications introduced on the EU level, triggered by the worsening financial situation and the economic crisis in most of the EU countries, and the influence of the evaluation reports, which in general helped to speed up the implementation process. One has to note in particular that measures under certain CBC programmes have gained some vigour (see Excel Table 4cbc). At the time of writing this report, no data were available for the eastern border CBC programmes where probably the advancement is far below the planned targets. It has to be stressed that many projects were in progress and due to this, the AIRs in many instances do not show the physical progress as the final figures will only be known after the projects are completed. It refers in particular to results indicators which often are shown as zero. Therefore commitment levels seem to be quite a useful indicator of achievements.

**Construction of the Research Centre for supercritical extraction of plant material with carbon dioxide (in the Fertilizer Research Institute in Puławy, Lubelskie region)**

The Project involves the construction of the Research Centre (furnished with all the necessary equipment) for supercritical extraction of plant material with carbon dioxide where the dry waste products from fruit juice production plants as well as herbs and dried yolks of hen eggs is generated.

The extraction process allows to obtain economically valuable polyunsaturated oils, flavonoids, anthocyanins, pigments for the needs of industry. The supercritical extraction technology with carbon dioxide is a "waste-less" technology, included in the group of "green chemistry" technologies, environmentally friendly, which allow for the manufacturing of ecological products from natural raw materials. The technology of supercritical extraction is an innovative technique used in a few countries only (Germany, United Kingdom, USA, Finland, China, India). It will serve cosmetic, food, pharmaceutical and feed industries. Its wider objective is to support the development of innovative research and technologies in Eastern Poland.

Co-financed by the ERDF within Development of Eastern Poland 2007-2013 OP (DEP OP) (co-financing around EUR 4.5 million).

In general, it is quite obvious that with time passing by, and advancement in implementation, relatively small progress was noted in the commitments (done to a high level already done in the past), the increasing dynamics can be noted on the side of completion and closing down the projects.

**Project "Aviation Culture Park in Kraków, including construction of main structure of Aviation Museum"**

Apart from the construction of a new building where a unique collection of old aircrafts is located, it helped renovate the area of an old military airport from 1912. The wider objective of the project is to contribute to the strengthening of the metropolitan functions of Kraków as a tourist centre.

Co-financing: around EUR 8 million from the Małopolskie ROP (ERDF).

In general, the progress achieved in 2011 in comparison with 2010 is quite significant, though not the same in various programmes (Table 2).

**Table 2 - Commitments in relation to ERDF and Cohesion Fund allocation 2010 and 2011 (%), selected programmes**

OP	Commitment/allocation(*) end-2010	Commitment/allocation end-2011
Sectoral OPs		
Innovative Economy	62.9	70.2
Infrastructure and Environment	50.7	69.2
Eastern Poland Development	50.3	64.7
Best performing regional OPs:		
Wielkopolskie	93.5	79.3
Opolskie	82.0	76.1
Pomorskie	88.9	80.0
Worst performing regional OPs:		
Śląskie	61.4	66.1
Świętokrzyskie	59.0	64.8
Lubelskie	58.0	65.4
ETC programmes:		
Poland - Slovakia	89.4	100.0
Poland-Brandenburg (GER)	51.4	89.0
Southern Baltic programme	63.1	95.6

Source: DG regio;. Note: allocation by end-2011.

The data provided in Table 2 show significant differences in the implementation progress measured by the ability to commit resources. In case of the nationally managed OPs, the two of them - Infrastructure and Environment and Eastern Poland Development - made the highest progress (by 14-18 percentage points in 2011). The IE OP represented a relative slowdown in implementation dynamics (progress by 7.3 percentage points only). The situation among the regional OPs is more differentiated, as some regions have already in 2010 committed almost 100% of resources, while there are also other which committed around 2/3 of allocation, with mostly moderate progress of less than 6 percentage points in 2011. ETC programmes for which we have information have reached a level of over 89% of funds committed thanks to a dynamic growth in 2011.

On average, the commitments level of EU funds (including ESF<sup>9</sup>) at the end of 2011 reached the level of 68.4% of the EU allocation, while the value of qualified (checked and approved) invoices issued by the beneficiaries reached the level of around 32%. (MRD, Poziom ..., 2012). The differences in progress depend mostly on the size and complexity of projects (large projects take more time in preparation and tendering procedures, managerial capability (railway modernisation projects) and, in case of some ETC programmes, time-consuming international agreements. The progress is on average higher in regional OPs, probably due to the fact that most of projects are modest in size.

When it comes to commitments (ERDF and Cohesion Fund) by main policy areas, the situation was improving fast. In 2011, the most advanced in terms of commitments were the policy areas of: planning and rehabilitation (87.4%), roads (80.5%) tourism and culture (80.2%), while the least advanced: rail (39.3%), transport other than roads and rail (51.7%) and support for SMEs (53.3%). In 2010, these figures were significantly lower. On average, that was 60.0%, while the highest percentage was similar for planning and rehabilitation (82.6%), ICT and related services

<sup>9</sup> As for the ESF: in 2010 commitments/allocation index in 2010 was 56.3%, while in 2011 65.9%, that is slightly below average.

(87.0%), tourism and culture (79.0%), and the lowest: rail 25.6%, other forms of transport than road and rail – 35.6%, support for innovation in SMEs – 37.1% (Excel Table 4).

Particularly large differences were between the year 2010 and 2011 in case of ETC programmes. Most successful recently in terms of commitments was Poland-Slovakia programme (100% committed in 2011), while in case of Brandenburg-Poland programme total figure was 89% in 2011 (compared to 51.4% in 2010). Main problem was no commitment in the field of energy infrastructure and 4.2% in other than road and rail transport in 2010. Southern Baltic programme has improved its commitment level from 63.1% in 2010 to 95.6% in 2011 (Excel Table 4cbc).

**Table 3 - Value of contracts signed, key support areas (EU funding in EUR million), end of 2010 and 2011**

Area	2010	2011
R&D, innovativeness, entrepreneurship	7,283	8,318
Information society	1,808	2,352
Transport	12,434	16,216
Energy	793	1,476
Environment	4,430	6,364
Tourism, culture, revitalisation	2,256	2,685
Human capital, labour market, social infrastructure (ESF)	7,292	8,840
Technical Assistance	824	1,086
TOTAL	31,123	47,337

Source: on the basis of MRD, Raport strategiczny 2012. Projekt, 2012, p. 41.

As it is shown in Table 3, there is a significant progress in 2011 in terms of the contracts signed. A major role – in case of ERDF spending - is played by transport projects and R&D, innovativeness and entrepreneurship projects.

**Second Metro (underground) line in Warsaw: preparatory works, technical project and construction of the central part plus purchase of the rolling stock**

A large, environmental-friendly transport investment project will help Warsaw to cope with congestion and facilitate transportation to and from the city centre. In a wider sense, it will help to create an integrated transportation system and thus develop metropolitan functions of the capital. Length 6.7 km, 7 stations, 35 modern trains plus other facilities. Works underway. Co-financed by the Cohesion Fund (via Infrastructure and Environment OP: contribution of EUR 658.4 million, that is around 47%)

Much wider differences can be observed within some ETC programmes, though allocations are much lower than in the sectoral OPs. For instance, in case of Poland-Brandenburg there are measures with over 90% commitments (ICT and related; tourism and culture; Education and training; Road; Tourism and culture; Social Infrastructure), but in one measure (energy infrastructure), the figure is 0%. However, due to a relatively limited size of the measures, in case of proper management the improvements can be very dynamic (see Table 3).

**Construction of new library, University of Zielona Góra**

A wholly new building is to satisfy all the needs of the University and the city of Zielona Góra. It brings a new multifunctional quality of access to books and information through open space and easy access to local, national and world databases. The Library constructed in 2011 now is being fitted with all the necessary equipment, technology and books. This project is just one of the projects to improve the human capital and increase the competitiveness of the Lubuskie region.

Project financed by the Lubuskie Regional OP (ERDF contribution around EUR 5.9 million)

The main reasons of delays noted refer mostly to the field of railway projects (infrastructural ones in particular), where a monopolistic group of companies Polskie Koleje Państwowe (Polish State Railways, PKP), and in particular PLK PKP (Polish Railway Tracks), a subsidiary of the PKP, national railway company, has displayed permanent problems with the preparation of efficient projects. The difficulties in changing the situation and a high demand represented by road construction and modernisation programmes have forced the government to seek the Commission's agreement to move around EUR 5,000 million of unutilised resources from railway to road projects. However, the Commission declined this request, which resulted in some improvement in project preparation by the authorities responsible for the Polish railways, and the situation in this sphere seems to be improved. In some cases, the reason lies in low demand, for instance for multimodal transport projects, TA or innovation in SMEs (see Excel Table 3). But in general, it is still the same problem as depicted in the 2011 report: "The potential recipients lack the capacity to use the funds available" (PBS, 2011).

As mentioned above, there are increasing worries whether the main beneficiaries (public authorities) will be able to commit resources to co-finance the projects. In 2011 that was only a fear, not a reality, but it may become a problem in the years to come, when after the successful completion of infrastructural projects, public administration will have to cover their maintenance costs.

All other problems can be attributed to normal management tasks that can be easily overcome.

**Borderless culture - construction of an amphitheatre in the city of Kostrzyn (on the Odra river, Lubuskie region)**

Project meant to develop infrastructure serving cultural tourism purposes and developing direct cross-border ties with communities on both sides of the border.

Co-financed by the ERDF within the CBC Poland-Brandenburg Programme scheme (EU contribution EUR 0.24 million).

## ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE PROGRAMMES SO FAR

Main points from previous country report:

- Regulatory Framework (public procurement) still hampers implementation.
- Concentration on disbursement instead of achieving results prevails.
- Generally positive impact of EU funds on development (though mostly on the demand side),
- Different indicators used make it very difficult to summarise the effects.
- In case of some OPs, there was little or no evidence of progress made in the physical terms, despite more visible disbursement.
- Achievements in the different fields of intervention and OPs (measures) differed significantly.

The results in various policy areas are more than difficult to describe due to the already mentioned reasons. Quite a number of measures still remain unfinished (or finished just in a few cases), since the projects are still in progress and their final reports have not been prepared.



For instance: the number of constructed kilometres of motorways and express ways reported is zero, as none of the projects is finished yet. Only the Eastern Poland Development OP reports 3.6 km of the newly constructed and 22.2 km of rebuilt roads. Similarly, the number of jobs created or research jobs is small (research jobs reported: 170), while the final figure is expected to be much higher. The same goes for jobs in general.

#### **Nanophotonics Centre.**

Complex project realised in Warsaw by a consortium of leading research centres (Institute of Electron Technology, Physics Faculty of University of Warsaw, Warsaw University of Technology, Łódź University of Technology, Military Technical Academy) and VIGO Systems SA. It is to modernise and fit with the necessary technology five specialist labs and thus allow for top quality research commercialisation of new products and services for industry, environment protection, health protection, safety and military technology. Its wider objective is to strengthen the research capacity of Poland's science and thus increase competitiveness.

Co-financed by the ERDF via IE OP (EUR 5.7 million)

The outcomes in most cases are in line with the plans, however one should notice that in some areas, like innovation or motorway construction, and especially the already mentioned rail tracks, the level of achievements is well below that expected in 2007 (but almost – with the exception of railways - as it was planned in 2010, in particular in case of projects that were linked to the EURO 2012 European Football Championship). This judgment depends to a large extent on the selection of the base year as the benchmark. When looking at baseline figures, it should be stressed again that due to most measures (and projects) being still in progress, the outcomes reported (often zero or next to zero) may be disappointing, but the final outcome will be known only after they are finished.

There were no special measures taken over the past two or three years to assist young people who are unemployed or SMEs which were hit by the credit crunch. The former target should have been undertaken due to the fact that, for the young people, it became more difficult than before to enter the labour market due to the slowdown of the economy and the structure of the higher education not properly adjusted to the demand of the labour market. Moreover, the share of temporary work contracts has increased, reducing employment security for the young. However, the policies undertaken have not as yet responded to these problems, which, in fact, still appear to be of much lesser importance than in many other EU Member States.

As yet – in general - Polish SMEs have not been negatively affected by the credit crunch.

#### **Modernisation of the Piast Dynasty Castle in Legnica, Plac Zamkowy 1.**

Project involves the modernisation of the historical Legnica Castle, now in the hands of the Foreign Languages College for Teachers. Project co-financed under the heading "Cultural tourism" in 60% (equivalent of EUR 1.0 million).

Co-financing: ERDF, Dolnośląskie ROP

**Construction of express road S7, between Elbląg and Miłomłyn (in Warmińsko-Mazurskie region)**

It is a part of an expressway to be built between Warsaw and Gdansk (part of the TEN-T corridors). Its general objective is to upgrade transportation standard and transport safety and improve the TEN-T network in Poland (and thus the basic transportation network). This particular part of the investment (dual carriageway of 50.3 km) will improve direct access to less developed Warmińsko-Mazurskie region (defined as Eastern Poland) and will reduce the travel from the coast to central regions of Poland.

Co-financed by the ERDF via Infrastructure and Environment OP (EUR 384.8 million)

**Construction of three stars Velvet Hotel with accompanying infrastructure in the city of Suwałki**

Town of Suwałki is located in the northern part of mostly rural Podlaskie region (north-eastern Poland), along the main transport corridor to the Baltic States (TEN-T). It is also a starting point to the surrounding tourist region abundant in Natura 2000 areas, national and landscape parks. The project – among others - is aimed to strengthen the capacity to serve tourists and develop a tourist hub in this part of Poland, thus creating new jobs and sources of income outside of agriculture.

Co-financed by the ERDF via Podlaskie ROP, contribution EUR 0.8 million

The intended objectives have not been achieved, in particular in the field of large infrastructural projects. Some reasons are similar, some sector specific. In case of road construction (motorways and expressways in particular), Poland suffered from poor quality regulations in the past and reforms were done only recently, to avoid even longer delays before the EURO 2012 championship<sup>10</sup>. In case of large and complex infrastructural investments, it took a long time to introduce new laws successfully. Despite the reforms, one unfortunate solution still remained: only the cheapest offer could win the tender, and all the risks were to be borne by the contractors. With the fast increase of the prices construction materials, quite a number of construction companies faced bankruptcy and some went bankrupt in 2011 (Chinese COVEC being the best known case). Environmental regulations and the NIMBY syndrome also contributed to some delays. Lengthy court proceedings contributed in some cases as well.

In case of the railway sector, where there is no problem with the acquisition of land, the main difficulties stem from very low efficiency and effectiveness of state-owned PKP group, in particular its member PKP PLK which is the owner of 99.9% of railway tracks in Poland (see MRD, Report 2011). Poor planning and poor implementation are the main problems.

Despite the efforts to improve the quality of indicators, due to both incompatibility of the indicators used (or different wording) and quite often the abundance of indicators and data (see Operational Programme Infrastructure & Environment (I&E OP)), it is not any easier to get information on the outcomes or to summarise them. Taking into account the fact that in many cases the Monitoring Committees approved the AIRs that did not give any substantial, clear information on the progress made in 2011, one may have serious doubts about the quality of the entire reporting system.

<sup>10</sup> Incidentally, through rather unfortunate special laws that give certain competences to the public authorities only for a limited time.

**Improvement of water floods protection of the Mielec municipality through levee construction and re-development along the River Wisłoka.**

Project aims to provide better protection to the Mielec municipality against water floods which endangered it several times recently. The aim will be achieved also by improvements in the water retention capabilities. Mielec is the heart of the Aviation Valley cluster, one of the most dynamic high technology development centres in south-eastern Poland.

Co-financed by the ERDF via Infrastructure and Environment OP (contribution: EUR 19.6 million)

**Table 4 - Main physical indicators and achievements in 2011**

Policy area	Main indicators	Outcomes
Enterprise support and RTDI including ICT	Households with broadband internet access: in general ( a); in the rural areas ( b) in the lowest income group (c)	From 56.8 (2010) to 61.1 (2011) From 46.9 (2010) to 53.4 (2011) From 23.6 (2010) to 26.9 (2011)
Increase access to finance by SMEs	(IE OP) No. of projects supported No. new R&D jobs created No. of new and modernised labs See also indicators Table 5	4,043 from 4 (2010) to 170 (2011) from 0 (2010) to 6 (2011)
Transport	(I&E OP) Position of Poland in IMD Business School, Switzerland ranking (field: infrastructure) See also indicators Table 5	From 36 (2010) to 34 (2011)
Environment and energy	I&E OP: Population with access to sewage treatment plant in towns (% of total population) See also indicators Table 5	Increase from 7.0 to 7.8%
Territorial development (urban areas, tourism, rural development, cultural heritage, health, public security, local development)	I&E OP: Payments (in comparison to 2004, in EUR million) (IEOP)No. of foreign tourists*, in million See also indicators Table 5	From 1,600 (2010) to 1,500 (2011) From 12.5 (2010) to 13.1 (2011)

*Note: comparisons made to 2010 data. \* - Foreign tourists: as defined by the Institute of Tourism (Warsaw). Source: own calculations on the basis of AIRs.*

**Construction of a ring road on S-6, in Nowogard (Zachodniopomorskie region)**

**The** project is a part of planned S-6 (internationally known as E-28) road linking northern Germany (Meklemburg-Vorpommern) with northern Poland (regions on the Baltic Sea), Kaliningrad Oblast and Lithuania. Ring road (length 9.4 km) has all the parameters of a future expressway and helps keep heavy traffic out of the city centre, reducing noise, fuel consumption and increasing level of safety. Project co-financed by the ERDF (EUR 38.5 million) as part of I&E OP.

Looking at the data presented in Table 4, it appears obvious that for most of the indicators values are not available due to the lack of finished projects which could report outcomes and results, which obviously does not mean that there is no progress.

Additionally, one of the reasons for the limited opportunities to offer a full and comprehensive picture of the key outcomes is the method of presenting progress in the monitoring indicators. For instance, in case of the largest OP (I&E OP), the list of indicators is 30 pages long (on average 32 indicators per page, what makes around 1,000 indicators for different objectives, priorities and measures). Interestingly, according to that source of data no project of motorway or expressway was executed in 2011, though obviously such roads were constructed. This is a good example that the lack of indicators may not be much worse than their abundance (hopefully not purposeful). It does not change the fact that most indicators in this programme are shown as “zero” or “not available”.

The data on ROPs (Table 5) are slightly more informative.

ROPs, though similar, are not identical as far as their structure and the indicators used are concerned. The limited number of indicators used in Table 5 is due to the very simple fact that only few of them are used by all or most of the regional OPs or a given indicator in most cases shows “zero” results (see Annex 3). For instance, in 2011 none of the regional OP reported any person who would have access to broadband internet. Only a few reported the numbers of enterprises that produced new products or services (Mazowieckie: 682, Kujawsko-Pomorskie: 1159). For that reason, many indicators were not used in this table. As said before, ROPs' priority structures are similar but not identical and therefore some indicators are only programme specific.

The general conclusion from the analysis of progress as presented by the ROPs is that they in a few cases only use the same indicator for the same measure. Another important conclusion is that – again – results are less important than products (in this context, Małopolskie seems to be the most advanced in seeking both results and impacts). And there is a strong propensity to repeat the same data in presenting the outcomes of different measures, which makes any calculation of totals risky<sup>11</sup>. Finally, the fact that progress in infrastructural projects is presented almost everywhere in the same manner, may be a proof of larger experience or strongest interest shown by the MRD. In general, as is the case in sectoral (nationally managed) programmes, the clear impression is that in 2011 not many projects were finished, and therefore the results are difficult to describe.

---

<sup>11</sup> For instance, in the Zachodniopomorskie AIR the same numbers of students benefiting from programme projects are repeated at least twice in Annex IV (physical progress). Jobs created is another example of a problem concerning counting in the same AIRs.

**Table 5 - Selected indicators of achievements by selected regional OPs (outcome at the end of 2011)**

Regions	Length of			Population with accessed to sewage system (per cent)	Additional energy power from reusable energy sources (MW) (per cent)	No. of new jobs created			No. of health projects	No. of students benefiting from projects	No. of projects direct investment supp. to SMEs	No. of businesses supported
	roads newly constructed (km)	modernised (rebuilt) roads (km)	constructed or modernised sewage (km)			in tourist sector	total	research jobs <sup>A</sup>				
Dolnośląskie	7.9	42.9	67.2	4,239	0.0	26	579	0	51	79	151	0
Kuj-pomorskie	36.0	324.6	57.3	1,839	0.0	0	678	0	19	0	1	1,157
Lubuskie	6.2	83.1	83.2	8,834	0.0	78	667	0	12	0	225	225
Łódzkie	0.0	80.1	0.0	0	0.0	0	689	7	0	13,054	195	0
Małopolskie	5.0	245.0	138.1	9,146	0.0	76 <sup>B</sup>	1,028	16	5	1,982 <sup>C</sup>	612	0
Mazowieckie	26.3	336.0	277.0	3,626	0.0	0	40	0	9	3,628	265	0
Śląskie	0.7	0.0	0.0	450	0.0	147	-	0	29	40,972	346	310
Świętokrzyskie	48.2	309.7	0.0	8,114	0.1	102	-	0	0	17,693 <sup>C</sup>	257	0
War-mazurskie	7.5	347.8	58.3	689	117.6	173	2,308	0	0	1,953	0	0
Zach-pomorskie	4.4	78.2	0.0	69	0.0	20	596	0	9	3,641	297	271

Notes: <sup>A</sup>except for employment within TA priority (those employed by the programme and for its needs);

<sup>B</sup> tourism and culture sectors together; <sup>C</sup> university level students and other students and pupils.

Source: AIRs.

### 3. EFFECTS OF INTERVENTION

Main points from previous country report:

- Difficulties in obtaining information on the progress and impact of intervention,
- Considerable differences between OPs (national and regional),
- Prevalence of demand side effects over supply side ones.

The assessment of the level of achieving intended effects in different policy areas is difficult, as the process of implementation was under various pressures and games played by various actors. First of all, the planning period of 2007-2013 started with all efforts directed towards boosting disbursement and some traces of this approach seem to be visible still in 2011. And indeed, the disbursements level in 2011 increased significantly, which was due to the further progress of several projects. As for the effects, one may stress that there was a significant improvement in terms of roads built, water pipes constructed, sewage systems modernised or built, universities and R&D institutions supported, businesses and business environment supported, etc., even if this is not shown in the AIRs as projects finalised in 2011.

The impact of the Cohesion policy on Poland's development is analysed every year by three different macroeconomic models. The analyses presented in 2012 and relating also to 2011 suggest that according to all models there is a positive impact on the country's' development (in 2011 the pace of GDP growth thanks to EU funds<sup>12</sup> was higher by 0.5-0.9 percentage points, MRD 2012, Wpływ...). A substantial impact was also recorded in other categories, like investments, increased share of GVA yield in industry (but decreased in services and agriculture), employment, imports and exports, internal cohesion, public finances. In the latter case, the impact is differentiated, where the positive consequences (bigger GDP, larger public income) prevail over the negative ones (increasing public deficit due to the necessity to contribute to the EU funds). Interestingly, the report summarising the results admits that the supply side effects are still to be seen in the future (ibidem).

The question remains, however, as to the quality of the outcomes and whether the results offer at least some synergy. The macro-economic modelling mentioned above suggests that up to now (and also in 2011 alone) demand side effects have been larger than the supply side ones. There is no reason to doubt the quality of models, though one should remember that one in three is less pessimistic. In practice, it means that according to the best known studies, the beneficial effects of the Cohesion policy will cease to exist when the European resources are disbursed fully (which may happen after 2020). If so, one may expect limited innovativeness and/or lack of synergy due to the shortage of functional networks (interconnectivity) of the line projects.

The projects supported so far have had a varying impact on the development of regions (all the Polish regions received support as Convergence regions). There is absolutely no doubt that in all cases it contributed seriously to the quality of life. As macro-economic models show, it had, however, much less influence on economic development or competitiveness. Despite the fact that all the Polish regions had improved their position against the EU's GDP average, there is a growing disparity between the best and the least developed regions. In particular eastern Poland regions, which benefited from the dedicated Eastern Poland Development OP, still manifest a slow growth and suffer from potential marginalisation (MRD, 2011). To some extent, one may say that the influence confirms

---

<sup>12</sup> Except for CAP.

St Matthew principle: the better developed the area (region), the higher (in absolute terms) the absorption of funds, higher absorption of Lisbon earmarked funds (in particular TEN-T and ICT areas), and faster pace of development (see CSO data on GDP growth and MRD Raport Strategiczny 2012, p. 24, p. 7, p. 35)<sup>13</sup>. The situation is also better in those regions which are better accessible from the main Polish and European agglomerations, like the Dolnośląskie region, and in general those located in the triangle Katowice-Poznań-Łódź. Also the area around the capital city, Warsaw, is experiencing a robust growth (Mazowieckie region has reached almost 100% of EU GDP/inhabitant average, thanks to Warsaw's level of GDP – in this region, there are sub-regions achieving only some 20-25% of the Warsaw level of GDP per capita). It has to be stressed that it is not only location and accessibility that matter: also the absence of a strong agglomeration radically reduces the benefits of location (e.g. the Lubuskie region, although on the Polish western border and only 90 km from Berlin, still remains among the least developed Polish regions).

As mentioned before, for the society at large the improvement of living conditions seems to be among the most highly appreciated effects of intervention. Only recently, when preparation of the new planning period began and most if not all the regions started work on updating their development strategies, the debate about the drivers of growth and capacity of the regions to sustain economic development was initiated. Statistical data (MRD, 2011, Raport...) show clearly that there is a constant growth of inequalities between regions. As already indicated, the macroeconomic analyses suggest that the demand side effects prevail over the supply side ones, which makes the chances of the poorer regions catching up, due the support they receive from the EU, rather unrealistic. Moreover, it is envisaged that that the benefits from the EU funds will come to an end together with the decrease of their inflow (MRD, 2012).

Up till now, there has been little evidence that – with the exception of major transport and environmental infrastructure – the EU support under the Cohesion policy helps to deal with the cardinal long-term challenges (such as the increased competition resulting from globalisation, demographic change, climate change and energy security). There is a growing conviction that these questions are to be taken seriously into account in the next programming period. The long-term development strategy of Poland (project “Poland 2030” by a team of experts led by Minister Michał Boni) has put a strong emphasis on these issues, showing potential consequences for Poland and formulating challenges that need fast decisions. However, in practice, in line with the widely shared notion about the development paradigm deeply rooted in the industrial period of state intervention, there is more demand for infrastructural investments (considered often as the main driver of development) and quality of life. The belief that infrastructure – and not just in transport, but also in “softer” sectors, like research culture - will lead to immediate progress is still widely shared on all levels of the public authorities, although some doubts seem to emerge, since there is a growing number of regional politicians who begin to realise that old solutions do not necessarily fit contemporary and long-term challenges.

To sum up, Poland and its regions are facing the need to redirect efforts toward more long-term useful priorities and projects, better adjusted to the needs of global competitiveness, the new paradigm and new drivers of development. The current debate on Europe 2020 and regulations for

---

<sup>13</sup> Out of 16 Polish NUTS 2 regions, four best developed (Mazowieckie, Śląskie, Wielkopolskie and Dolnośląskie) generate over 50% of national GDP. The least developed regions represent the pace of development below the national average. (MRD, Raport strategiczny..., 2012, p.7.)

2014-2020 proposed by the European Commission may influence the pace and character of the discussions and their outcomes.

#### 4. EVALUATIONS AND GOOD PRACTICE IN EVALUATION

The official inventory of evaluation operated by the MRD<sup>14</sup> has been slowly updated and in December 2012 not all of them were published on the Ministry website devoted to evaluations. Head of Evaluation Unit explained that direct involvement in Polish Presidency activities, shortage of staff and technical reasons slowed down the process of publication which is about to be finished in January 2013. Therefore, there was a problem with systemic source of information on the evaluations carried out in 2012 which would relate to the activities performed up to 2012. Moreover, the evaluations carried out in 2011 were to a large extent covered in the previous report, so no new comprehensive analysis can be presented here.

Among 122 evaluation studies carried out in 2011 and provided by the MRD in the form of inventory on CD-ROM (however, not always accessible on the websites of the respective MAs which commissioned them) made available to the research team (not yet available on the Ministry webpage) there are 46 referring to ESF, and 77 to ERDF and Cohesion Fund (out of which two thirds refer to regional OPs) (see Table 6). They do not seem to form a comprehensive system. It is clear, that in line with already presented information, the 2011 (as was 2010) was characterised by early phases of implementation of numerous (particularly large) projects which are supposed to be completed in 2013 and after. To at least some extent it explains the technical character of most of evaluation studies and usually their relatively narrow scope (improvements in a given process, individual measures, single regions, quality of indicators etc.). They are devoted to many different topics, and relate to fragmented, mutually unrelated issues, and do not let formulate any wider picture of Cohesion policy progress made in 2011.

Some of them follow the formal requirements of the European Commission. For example, the study on the implementation of horizontal policies (equal rights, sustainable development, partnership principle, support for local development, etc.) within the IE OP provides a mixed picture - the least implemented principle appeared to be "partnership" and "international cooperation". However, there is no indication how a better implementation of these principle would help increase of the innovativeness of Polish economy.

Two evaluation studies relate to internal and external complementarity of the ROPs – the issue strongly highlighted in our previous report. However, these studies are limited to an analysis of documents and interviews with beneficiaries, therefore their results cannot be considered as objective. Usually, these studies are not conducted as independent research projects, and apply rather formal methods like checking if proper parts of applications related to "complementarity" have been filled in a proper and "convincing" way. However, some studies indicated deficiencies in definitions of "complementarity" on the regional and local levels, especially in projects implemented under the Human Capital OP (HC OP) (financed from the ESF) and the CAP (in this case, complementarity has not been used as a criterion in the application evaluation).

Two evaluations conducted in addition to the activities of the MRD (one prepared for the Lubelskie voivodship, and one commissioned for the needs of present report, see Annex 3) are of a more

---

<sup>14</sup> [http://www.ewaluacja.gov.pl/Wyniki/Strony/Wyniki\\_badan.aspx](http://www.ewaluacja.gov.pl/Wyniki/Strony/Wyniki_badan.aspx). On 3rd of January 2013 the list of evaluations on Ministry web page was presenting the entries as of 20.12.2011.



independent character and clearly focus on issues that should be considered as crucial for the future implementation of programmes and projects within the EU policies.

As already indicated, the reporting system is of a little use (see Annex 3). The indicators seem to be formulated accidentally, are not comparable between programmes and projects, do not create any opportunities for aggregation, some of them are meaningless. This seems to be a “traditional” practice. However, it is surprising that the respective authorities which should monitor this situation have not done anything in this respect, and no coordination efforts have ever been undertaken (or at least has not led to any satisfactory progress).

The second study presented here is related to the crucial issue of effects that the EU policies bring to the recipient country: are they temporary, driven just by an increase of demand – or can they be long-lasting, due to increase in overall socio-economic efficiency? The results of this study (corroborated by some other fragmentary pieces of research) demonstrate that the socially-oriented project bringing mostly demand-side effects dominate, at least in the relatively underdeveloped regions of Poland. Also the macroeconomic models (Hermin, MaMor3, EUImpactModIII) commissioned by the MRD and presented regularly suggest that most of the influence of the Cohesion policy funds on the Polish economy is still on the demand side<sup>15</sup>. Interestingly, the Strategic Report 2012 (draft), referring to those models, treats supply-side effects as phenomena expected only in the future.<sup>16</sup>

It should be advised that this type of modelling and evaluation research should be conducted on a wider scale, and that it should become a core of the nationwide discussions of the approaches to the next programming period. Also, the evaluation theory and practice should be moved more in the direction of comprehensive, independent research projects, involving deep and broad empirical field studies and involving more interventions of the EU in the country and its regions and localities that just those co-financed by the ERDF and Cohesion Fund.

It should be stressed, that the year 2011 was marked in the National Evaluation Unit (NEU) by consolidation of efforts on development of a modern evaluation system, adjusted to the needs of the new programming period (see: leaflet MRD 2012, Evaluation...). MRD has already undertaken preparation of series of training (for employees of central and regional public administration employees) and has published 5 handbooks on quality of public management strategy building, strategic management etc. which cover also question of the role monitoring and evaluation can play in management. Two handbooks were prepared by the NEU staff themselves.

More about the project: [http://www.strategiczniedlarozwoju.pl/s.strona\\_glowna,1.html](http://www.strategiczniedlarozwoju.pl/s.strona_glowna,1.html).

Among the 77 evaluation studies referring to the ERDF and Cohesion Fund, all are defined as “ongoing”. The majority of them refer to ROPs . The following types can be identified (Table 6).

---

<sup>15</sup> MRD, Wpływ polityki spójności na sytuację społeczno-ekonomiczną kraju i regionów, [http://www.mrr.gov.pl/rozwoj\\_regionalny/ewaluacja\\_i\\_analazy/oddziaływanie\\_makroekonomiczne/strony/oddziaływanie\\_makroekonomiczne\\_funduszy\\_unijnych.aspx](http://www.mrr.gov.pl/rozwoj_regionalny/ewaluacja_i_analazy/oddziaływanie_makroekonomiczne/strony/oddziaływanie_makroekonomiczne_funduszy_unijnych.aspx) [August 2012]

<sup>16</sup> MRD, Raport strategiczny 2012. Strat2012.pl, [http://www.mrr.gov.pl/rozwoj\\_regionalny/ewaluacja\\_i\\_analazy/oddziaływanie\\_makroekonomiczne/strony/oddziaływanie\\_makroekonomiczne\\_funduszy\\_unijnych.aspx](http://www.mrr.gov.pl/rozwoj_regionalny/ewaluacja_i_analazy/oddziaływanie_makroekonomiczne/strony/oddziaływanie_makroekonomiczne_funduszy_unijnych.aspx), [10.09.2012]

**Table 6 - Evaluation studies**

Policy area	No. of studies
1. RTDI	0
2. Enterprise support and ICT	4
3. Human Resources (ERDF only)	1
4. Transport	4
5. Environment	4
6. Energy	0
7. Territorial development (urban areas, tourism, rural development, cultural heritage, health, public security, local development)	13
8. Capacity and institution building	3
9. Multi-area (e.g. evaluations of programmes, mid-term evaluations)	4
10. Transversal aspects (e.g. gender or equal opportunities, sustainable development, employment)	44
<b>Total</b>	<b>77</b>

The remaining 44 studies (type 10) are difficult to attribute to any of the aforementioned types. In most cases they refer to implementation problems met, such as irregularities found, assessment of indicators used, complementarity with other programmes (mostly on local level), assessment of communication (promotion, information, awareness change) effects; assessment of monitoring questionnaires; conformity of programmes with European (supranational) strategies; activity of beneficiaries in support seeking; assessment of achievements in terms of conformity with the assumptions of Baltic Sea Region strategy and similar (most often of Infrastructure and Environment OP). Among those difficult to categorize is the one titled: "Percentage of respondents expressing positive opinions on structural intervention" (No 3.192, commissioned by Warminko-Mazurskie ROP). Most, if not all of them, are either very technical or limited to single measure.

It should be stressed that for obvious reasons most data analysed and/or presented in evaluations referred to 2010, therefore they rather present activities in evaluation, than results (or progress) in implementation of Cohesion policy in 2011.

Evaluation reports are sometimes not available (link broken etc.), and generally widely dispersed (not always available on MAs websites; quite often on the websites of other institutions not necessarily involved in Cohesion policy implementation).

**Table 7 - Examples of studies in various policy areas**

Due to very high number of evaluation studies realised in 2011, in most policy areas only randomly selected studies will be presented (excluding cases where there is no access to the report).

Policy area	Title and date of completion	Policy area and scope (*)	Main objective and focus (*)	Method used (*)	Main findings	Full reference or link to publication
1.RTDI: zero evaluations in 2011	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.Enterprise support and ICT: 4 studies in 2011	Analysis of directions of support provided to entrepreneurs in Kujawsko-Pomorskie ROP, March 2011	2, region, priority	1	3,4	Support went mostly to industry and construction sectors, to functional areas of biggest towns; most projects below EUR 200 thousands; cost of job est. at ca EUR 45 thousands; mostly low readiness of projects at the time of applying for support.	<a href="http://www.mojregion.eu/tl_files/mojregion/dokumenty-rpo/Ewaluacja/Badania%20ewaluacyjne/Analiza%20kierunkow%20wsparcia%20mikroprzedsiębiorców%20w%20ramach%20RPO%20WK-P%20na%20lata%202007-2013.pdf">http://www.mojregion.eu/tl_files/mojregion/dokumenty-rpo/Ewaluacja/Badania%20ewaluacyjne/Analiza%20kierunkow%20wsparcia%20mikroprzedsiębiorców%20w%20ramach%20RPO%20WK-P%20na%20lata%202007-2013.pdf</a>
	Evaluation of support to entrepreneurs in Śląskie ROP; November 2011	2, region, selected priorities	3	1,4	78% of projects supported would be implemented regardless of support. Grants below needs expressed by businesses. Debt-leading instruments should be used widely.	<a href="http://rpo.slaskie.pl/zalaczniki/2012/01/03/1325587140.pdf">http://rpo.slaskie.pl/zalaczniki/2012/01/03/1325587140.pdf</a>
3.Human Resources (ERDF only): one study in 2011	Shaping up and implementation of informational and promotional activities under measure 13.1 Infrastructure of Higher Education; I&E OP	3, measure within the priority	1	4	Full report not available.	<a href="http://www.evaluation.pl/projekty.php?pid=66">http://www.evaluation.pl/projekty.php?pid=66</a>
4.Transport (altogether 4 studies in 2011)	Complementarity of projects under Measure 1.1 of the Lubuskie ROP "Improvement of regional transport infrastructure with regional, national and international communication network"	4	N.a.(File not available )	N.a.	N.a.	<a href="http://www.lrpo.lubuskie.pl/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=article&amp;id=874:raport-z-badania-ewaluacyjnego-lrpo-komplementarno-projektow-realizowanych-w-ramach-dziaania-11-lrpo-na-lata-2007-2013-poprawa-stanu-infrastruktury-transportowej-w-regionie-z-regionalnym-krajowym-i-midzynarodowym-ukadem-komunikacyjnymq&amp;catid=142:wyniki-ewaluacji&amp;Itemid=166">http://www.lrpo.lubuskie.pl/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=article&amp;id=874:raport-z-badania-ewaluacyjnego-lrpo-komplementarno-projektow-realizowanych-w-ramach-dziaania-11-lrpo-na-lata-2007-2013-poprawa-stanu-infrastruktury-transportowej-w-regionie-z-regionalnym-krajowym-i-midzynarodowym-ukadem-komunikacyjnymq&amp;catid=142:wyniki-ewaluacji&amp;Itemid=166</a>
	Analysis of the main problems acquainted in projects relating to maritime transport and	4, selected priority	1,3	4,3	Only few projects in danger of not meeting the deadlines. Shortage of human resources may be a problem.	<a href="http://www.pois.transport.gov.pl/re/s/dokumenty/wydawnictwa/raporty/rk_7_2i7_5_122011.pdf">http://www.pois.transport.gov.pl/re/s/dokumenty/wydawnictwa/raporty/rk_7_2i7_5_122011.pdf</a>

Policy area	Title and date of completion	Policy area and scope (*)	Main objective and focus (*)	Method used (*)	Main findings	Full reference or link to publication
	inland waterways; December 2011					
5.Environment: 4 studies in 2011	Verification of assumptions of the environmental impact prognosis of the Infrastructure and Environment OP, March 2011	5, whole programme	1	4	Assumptions found correct. In general cost-benefit analysis brings positive results. However, expected increasing number of large projects which may have a negative impact on environment in different aspects.	<a href="http://www.pois.gov.pl/AnalizyRaportyPodsumowania/Documents/Raport_koncowy_ostateczny_1.04.11%20POIS.pdf">http://www.pois.gov.pl/AnalizyRaportyPodsumowania/Documents/Raport_koncowy_ostateczny_1.04.11%20POIS.pdf</a>
	Significance of Podkarpackie ROP interventions in the field of environment protection infrastructure; November 2011	5	3	4,3	Problems with quality of selected indicators; in some cases too high costs; visibly coherent approach to counter-flood investment.	<a href="http://www.rpo.podkarpackie.pl/pliki/file/Ewaluacja/Badania%20ewaluacyjne/2011_badanie_IV/FUNDEKO_raport_koncowy_jednolity.pdf">http://www.rpo.podkarpackie.pl/pliki/file/Ewaluacja/Badania%20ewaluacyjne/2011_badanie_IV/FUNDEKO_raport_koncowy_jednolity.pdf</a>
	Verification of assumptions of Environmental Impact Assessment of the IE OP, March 2011	5	1	4,3	Overall balance of benefits and losses from the implementation of projects co-financed within the I&E OP should be positive. Implementation of most of the projects for which grant agreements were signed by December 2010 may have a positive impact on individual components of the environment. About 3% of the supported projects can affect the environment in a solely negative way. Case studies confirm the negative/inhibitory environmental impact of road construction and airport infrastructure construction and modernisation projects. The scope of compensation and mitigation measures taken under the projects is in line with the Forecast assumptions.	<a href="http://www.ewaluacja.gov.pl/Wyniki/Documents/3_183.pdf">http://www.ewaluacja.gov.pl/Wyniki/Documents/3_183.pdf</a>
6.Energy: zero studies in 2011	-	-	-	-	-	-
7.Territorial development: 13 studies in 2011	Evaluation of impact of projects in the framework of Priority V of the Lubuskie ROP "Development and modernization of tourist and cultural infrastructure" on socio-economic development and	7, region, measure 5.1	3	4,3	Projects implemented take into account mostly local needs; lack of synergy; positive socio-economic effects; tourist attractiveness contributes to increased investment attractiveness but is not among key investment criteria.	<a href="http://www.lrpo.lubuskie.pl/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=article&amp;id=799:raport-z-badania-ewaluacyjnego-lrpo-ocena-wpywu-projektow-realizowanych-w-ramach-v-priorytetu-lubuskiego-regionalnego-programu-operacyjnego-na-lata-2007-2013-">http://www.lrpo.lubuskie.pl/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=article&amp;id=799:raport-z-badania-ewaluacyjnego-lrpo-ocena-wpywu-projektow-realizowanych-w-ramach-v-priorytetu-lubuskiego-regionalnego-programu-operacyjnego-na-lata-2007-2013-</a>

Policy area	Title and date of completion	Policy area and scope (*)	Main objective and focus (*)	Method used (*)	Main findings	Full reference or link to publication
	improvement of regional tourist competitiveness and on increase of the regional investment attractiveness, October 2011					<a href="#">rozwoj-i-modernizacja-infrastruktury-turystycznej-i-kulturowej-na-rozwoj-spoeczno-gospodarc&amp;catid=142:wyniki-ewaluacji&amp;Itemid=166</a>
	Analysis of the effects of support under the XII Priority of the I&E OP and diagnosis of the investment needs in the health sector; December 2011	7	2 (Covers both projects completed and underway)	3,4	Generally positive impact in particular due to innovative, proecological and inclusive effects. Difficult to assess efficiency as most projects were not completed yet.	<a href="http://zdrowie.gov.pl/aktualnosc-23-1763-Raport-z-badania-ewaluacyjnego-%E2%80%9EAnaliza-efektow-wsparcia-w-Priorytecie-XII-PO-lis-oraz-diagnoza-potrzeb-inwestycyjnych-w-sektorze-ochrony-zdrowia.html">http://zdrowie.gov.pl/aktualnosc-23-1763-Raport-z-badania-ewaluacyjnego-%E2%80%9EAnaliza-efektow-wsparcia-w-Priorytecie-XII-PO-lis-oraz-diagnoza-potrzeb-inwestycyjnych-w-sektorze-ochrony-zdrowia.html</a>
	Impact assessment of the Kujawsko-pomorskie ROP on increase of the potential of the region' capitals, including development of the metropolitan functions; 2012	7, region, selected areas	3	4	Attractiveness of capitals (Bydgoszcz and Toruń) decreases. Attractive location on transport corridors. Average level of metropolitan features. Improved connectivity.	<a href="http://www.mojregion.eu/tl_files/mojregion/dokumenty-rpo/Ewaluacja/Badania%20ewaluacyjne/Funkcje%20metropolitane/Raport%20Koncowy-Ocena%20wplywu%20RPO%20na%20funkcje%20metropolitane.20.08.2012.pdf">http://www.mojregion.eu/tl_files/mojregion/dokumenty-rpo/Ewaluacja/Badania%20ewaluacyjne/Funkcje%20metropolitane/Raport%20Koncowy-Ocena%20wplywu%20RPO%20na%20funkcje%20metropolitane.20.08.2012.pdf</a>
	Impact evaluation of the selected projects implemented under selected programmes on the transformation of rural areas in Kujawsko-pomorskie region; November 2011	7, rural areas, region	3	4	Rural areas: limited development levels and growth (in relative terms). Main problem is underdeveloped technical infrastructure. Various assessment of the effectiveness of the development measures employed. Projects co-financed by the rural areas development programme (CAP) are much smaller than theses co-financed by the ROP. Effects visible in quality of life, but insignificant in terms of socio-economic development.	<a href="http://mojregion.eu/tl_files/mojregion/dokumenty-rpo/Ewaluacja/Badania%20ewaluacyjne/Obszary%20wiejskie/Rapor%201%20-%20Obszary%20wiejskie%20K-P.pdf">http://mojregion.eu/tl_files/mojregion/dokumenty-rpo/Ewaluacja/Badania%20ewaluacyjne/Obszary%20wiejskie/Rapor%201%20-%20Obszary%20wiejskie%20K-P.pdf</a>
	Internal and External complementarity of the Project in the ROPs of Podlaskie Voivodship (PV) 2007-2013 with other Projects implemented within the 2007-2013 perspective, June 2011	7	Mostly 3	3,4	Only partial results provided, no overall conclusion. Out of 181 beneficiaries, 27 answered that their projects were complementary internally. Beneficiaries indicated a large number of projects tied together in 5.1, 1.2 and 3.1 Measures. No project of this type appeared in 1.1, 1.3, 2.2, 3.2 and 5.2 Measures. Over half of the respondents answered that the complementary project had been carried out as part of the same action. 31.6% respondents carried out complementary	<a href="http://www.ewaluacja.gov.pl/Wyniki/Documents/1_114.pdf">http://www.ewaluacja.gov.pl/Wyniki/Documents/1_114.pdf</a>

Policy area	Title and date of completion	Policy area and scope (*)	Main objective and focus (*)	Method used (*)	Main findings	Full reference or link to publication
					projects with the plan from the same ROP PV priority. Only 15.8% showed that these undertakings had been financed from other priority. 174 beneficiaries had shown outside complementary (mostly in 2.1, 6.1, 3.1 and 5.2 Measures). Recommendations have been formulated.	
	Analysis of complementarity effects between Project co-financed within the 2007-2013 Perspective in Kujawsko-Pomorskie (K-PV) region, March 2011	7	3	3,4	Definitions of complementarity are not unified. The fullest description of such criteria can be found in the ROP K-PV, and the opposite at HC OP and RADP. The instruments of complementarity planning are scarce. The procedures of monitoring the complementarity of projects during the application stage are not sufficient.	<a href="http://www.ewaluacja.gov.pl/Wyniki/Documents/3_179.pdf">http://www.ewaluacja.gov.pl/Wyniki/Documents/3_179.pdf</a>
	Assessment of the use of EU funds regional development 2004-2013, August 2012	Regional development, regional strategy			The largest funds regionally were allocated to the development of transport infrastructure and integrated rural areas development, the least volume to financial capital, social capital and quality of the administration. More funds to rural than to urban areas. Small funds to innovativeness and R&D. No correlation found between the value of projects and changes in the condition of the local economy. The local governments make decisions on embarking upon new projects depending on the possibilities for obtaining external co-financing (EU and other sources). Direct payments and structural pensions coming from CAP are treated as social purpose funds. Local authorities are pursuing EU-supported projects, convinced about the need to improve the living standards of the local residents. The projects being implemented in the surveyed municipalities fail to produce supply effects. Supply effects are also expected to be brought about as a result of projects carried out by private	Na.

Policy area	Title and date of completion	Policy area and scope (*)	Main objective and focus (*)	Method used (*)	Main findings	Full reference or link to publication
					investors. The degree of the complementarity of the projects implemented as part of the ROP LV seems insufficient.	
8.Capacity and institution building: 3 studies in 2011	Beneficiaries' activity in applying for co-financing within the ROPs of Podkarpackie voivodship 2007-2013, September 2011	8	1	3	Applicants display relatively high level of fund-raising activity, submitting applications corresponding to the priorities of their activity. Local government units and entrepreneurs have had the highest activity and also applied for the highest refinancing from the ERDF. The effectiveness of fund-raising from the ROP ranks at 50%. Objectives of applications of local governments correspond to the needs of communities: transport and education, environmental protection, including flood control infrastructure.	<a href="http://www.ewaluacja.gov.pl/Wyniki/Documents/1_111.pdf">http://www.ewaluacja.gov.pl/Wyniki/Documents/1_111.pdf</a>
	Evaluation study of the monitoring questionnaires of DEP OP, April 2011	8	1	4	Technical recommendations related to reporting forms and time schedule of their preparation have been provided.	<a href="http://www.ewaluacja.gov.pl/Wyniki/Documents/3_181.pdf">http://www.ewaluacja.gov.pl/Wyniki/Documents/3_181.pdf</a>
	Analysis of a system of indicators for monitoring the Świętokrzyskie ROP 2007-2013, May 2011	8	1	4 (and 3)	There is a partial only coverage by indicators of the fields of intervention. Current list of indicators is coherent with regional, national and European Union strategic documents. Sometimes there is discrepancy between target values and values which are declared by beneficiaries.	<a href="http://www.ewaluacja.gov.pl/Wyniki/Documents/3_190.pdf">http://www.ewaluacja.gov.pl/Wyniki/Documents/3_190.pdf</a>
9.Multi-area (evaluation of programmes, mid-term evaluations: 4 studies in 2011	Mid-term evaluation of the Świętokrzyskie ROP, 2011	9	3	4,3	Indicators not always linked to the programme objectives. Decreasing absorptive capacity of municipalities. ERDF funds will be underutilized or utilized or even exceeded. Selection system is suboptimal. Procedures seen as too complex. MA structure appropriate.	<a href="http://www.rpo-swietokrzyskie.pl/userfiles/Ewaluacja/Raport_koncowy_mid_term_rpows.pdf">http://www.rpo-swietokrzyskie.pl/userfiles/Ewaluacja/Raport_koncowy_mid_term_rpows.pdf</a>
	Evaluation of the impact of the Łódzkie ROP on regional development; December 2011	9	3	4	Implementation of individual ROP priorities is highly differentiated (most advanced in the field of Innovative economy). No relationship between projects realized and entrepreneurship	<a href="http://www.rpo.lodzkie.pl/wps/wcm/connect/e137b780497d3043ac7fad/a86083fa86/Raport_Koncowy_Wplyw_RPO_WL_Agrotec_20122011.pdf?MOD=AJPERES">http://www.rpo.lodzkie.pl/wps/wcm/connect/e137b780497d3043ac7fad/a86083fa86/Raport_Koncowy_Wplyw_RPO_WL_Agrotec_20122011.pdf?MOD=AJPERES</a>

Policy area	Title and date of completion	Policy area and scope (*)	Main objective and focus (*)	Method used (*)	Main findings	Full reference or link to publication
					development. Limited influence on innovativeness. Small influence on intraregional differences in development levels.	
	Mid-term Evaluation of the implementation stage of priorities 3,4,5 and 6 of the IE OP , September 2011	9	2	3,4	Support provided in analysed Priority Axes of the Programme improves innovativeness of Polish companies. There are no proofs of real and serious risk of failure to achieve the general objective related to increase of innovativeness. Particular attention should be paid to improvement of general economic standing of the key group of the Programme's beneficiaries i.e. entrepreneurs. Results and financial implementation of the four Priority Axes is satisfactory. Many of the indicators set in Programme should achieve the 100% level or even exceed it. Innovativeness system in Poland ought to be developed in line with the Nordic model. The most important obstacles in process of project implementation are of administrative nature. Burdens and information obligations. Recommendations for future activities have been formulated.	<a href="http://www.ewaluacja.gov.pl/Wyniki/Documents/2_073.pdf">http://www.ewaluacja.gov.pl/Wyniki/Documents/2_073.pdf</a>
	Meta evaluation of studies on assessment criteria for selection of projects in the OPs co-financed from EU funds in Poland in the 2007-2013, April 2011	9	1	4 (and 3)	Problems related to project selection and evaluation criteria are generated mostly at the systemic (institutional) level. The decisions concerning changes in project selection criteria are actually made by institutions which play an operational role rather than a strategic one. The principle of formal correctness in spending such resources has completely dominated the principle of evaluation of effective spending of the resources (control over evaluation). The strategy of choosing formally safe activities will continue to dominate over the vital focus on key strategic activities.	<a href="http://www.ewaluacja.gov.pl/Wyniki/Documents/3_186.rar">www.ewaluacja.gov.pl/Wyniki/Documents/3_186.rar</a>
10.Transversal aspects (gender, equal	Evaluation of the implementation of	10, 9	3,2	4	In general positive picture, though often projects fail to give appropriate attention	



Policy area	Title and date of completion	Policy area and scope (*)	Main objective and focus (*)	Method used (*)	Main findings	Full reference or link to publication
opportunities, sustainable dev., employment): 4 studies in 2011	horizontal policies in the Innovative Economy OP; November 2011				to gender issues, to local development support policy. Programme in general does not comprehensively implement partnership principle. Monitoring and control system relating to horizontal policies implementation is not developed satisfactorily.	
	Identification of barriers in project implementation in measures 1.6, 1.8, 4.2 of the ROPs of Mazowieckie voivodship 2007-2013, March 2011	9	1	4	No summary. No general conclusions, fragmented results and recommendations.	<a href="http://www.ewaluacja.gov.pl/Wyniki/Documents/1_110.pdf">http://www.ewaluacja.gov.pl/Wyniki/Documents/1_110.pdf</a>
	Study of effects of informational and promotional activities about the European Funds and analysis of Social effect of these activities, January 2011	9	3	3	88% of respondents met with the definition "European Funds" or "EU Funds", while 57% understood their meaning. Vast majority of respondents identified European Funds with grants, money from the EU (68%), subsidies for farmers (37%) and financial support for investment (32%). European Funds have a role in the country development (85%) Key benefits from the presence of European Funds are investments related to building roads, highways, bridges, bicycle paths (47%), subsidies for farmers (35%), the overall development of the country (33%) and the overall development of the economy (32%). 78% are most interested in the subject of investments, which are carried out with European Funds.	<a href="http://www.ewaluacja.gov.pl/Wyniki/Documents/3_174.pdf">http://www.ewaluacja.gov.pl/Wyniki/Documents/3_174.pdf</a>
	Analysis of indicators used in AIRs (regional and sectoral OPs) in 2011, August 2012	9	1	4	Differences in measurement units used, imprecise wording, differences in numbers of indicators (unfortunately mostly product), mistakes in categorisation of indicators. No possibility neither to compare the achievements between the ROPs nor to aggregate these achievements across ROPs, as well as with the sectoral OPs. Moreover, the indicators most widely used are often completely meaningless.	Na.

Policy area	Title and date of completion	Policy area and scope (*)	Main objective and focus (*)	Method used (*)	Main findings	Full reference or link to publication
11.Non categorized studies: selected examples (44 studies in 2011)	Evaluation/analysis of the performance of the financial services under the XIII priority of the I&E OP on the level of beneficiaries and implementing institutions of 1 and 2 level; November 2011	7	1	4	Opinions on payments service varies. The system for expenses and transfer of funds is functioning efficiently and does not require major changes. Simplification expected for the future.	<a href="http://www.ncbir.pl/gfx/ncbir/userfiles/public/fundusze_europejskie/in_frastruktura_i_srodowisko/pliki_pois/1_rap_fin_xiii_pois_fin_poprawiony_wersja_ost_24xi2011.pdf">http://www.ncbir.pl/gfx/ncbir/userfiles/public/fundusze_europejskie/in_frastruktura_i_srodowisko/pliki_pois/1_rap_fin_xiii_pois_fin_poprawiony_wersja_ost_24xi2011.pdf</a>
	Assessment of the implementation system of Podkarpackie ROP in relation to projects with "financing gap"; June 2011	2	1	4,3	Texts of contracts are not in full compliance with the guidelines. Not all beneficiaries understood well the guidelines. Funding gap turned out to be on average 36% higher than presented in the application for support.	<a href="http://www.rpo.podkarpackie.pl/pliki/file/Ewaluacja/Badania%20ewaluacyjne/2012%20badanie%20I/RK%20Podkarpackie%20Luka%202012-06-28.pdf">http://www.rpo.podkarpackie.pl/pliki/file/Ewaluacja/Badania%20ewaluacyjne/2012%20badanie%20I/RK%20Podkarpackie%20Luka%202012-06-28.pdf</a>
	Analysis of barriers to implementation of the Eastern Poland Development OP; October 2011	7	1	4,3	Projects not always 100% ready when applying for support (delays in preparation, fulfilling all legal requirements). Delays noted on every critical step of project preparation for implementation. Four types of barriers found: legal, human, organizational, financial.	<a href="http://www.ewaluacja.gov.pl/Wyniki/Documents/ggov_204.pdf">http://www.ewaluacja.gov.pl/Wyniki/Documents/ggov_204.pdf</a>
	Analysis of effectiveness, quality and utility of selected instruments of information and promotion of the Pomorskie ROP; 2011	?	1	4	Instruments adequate to the objectives of the communication system. Quality of training assessed as good. Forms and content of promotional materials (events) not always of highest quality. Advanced progress in objectives attainment. Some groups of stakeholders not covered (NGOs etc.).	<a href="http://www.ewaluacja.gov.pl/Wyniki/Documents/ggov_202.pdf">http://www.ewaluacja.gov.pl/Wyniki/Documents/ggov_202.pdf</a>
	Final Report: Evaluation of the Implementation of the assumptions of the "Strategy of the EU for the Baltic Sea Region" in the framework of I&E OP: fields of I&E OP achievements	7	3	4	Activities by I&E OP in general in line with the Strategia Unii Europejskiej dla Regionu Morza Bałtyckiego (Strategy of the EU for the Baltic Sea Region - SUE RMB). More activities oriented on climate change adaptation and on attractiveness of the RMB than to anything else.	<a href="http://www.pois.gov.pl/AnalizyRaportyPodsumowania/Documents/RAPORT_KONCOWY_22_12_11.pdf">http://www.pois.gov.pl/AnalizyRaportyPodsumowania/Documents/RAPORT_KONCOWY_22_12_11.pdf</a>
	Evaluation of horizontal policies in IE OP, November 2011	10	3	4 (and 3)	67% of analysed projects display a positive impact on the sustainable development principle in its social aspect; 56% of analysed applications	<a href="http://www.ewaluacja.gov.pl/Wyniki/Documents/2_074.pdf">http://www.ewaluacja.gov.pl/Wyniki/Documents/2_074.pdf</a>

Policy area	Title and date of completion	Policy area and scope (*)	Main objective and focus (*)	Method used (*)	Main findings	Full reference or link to publication
					relate to equal opportunities principle; 90% of the projects to horizontal employment policy; 26% of the analysed projects display a positive impact on the implementation of the local development support policy; 38% of applications for project co-financing declare conformity with the policy for international cooperation; partnership principle is not being comprehensively implemented by the OP I&E. 40 best practices have been selected.	

Note: (\*) Legend:

**Policy area and scope:** 1. RTDI; 2. Enterprise support and ICT; 3. Human Resources (ERDF only); 4. Transport; 5. Environment; 6. Energy; 7. Territorial development (urban areas, tourism, rural development, cultural heritage, health, public security, local development); 8. Capacity and institution building; 9. Multi-area (e.g. evaluations of programmes, mid-term evaluations); 10. Transversal aspects (e.g. gender or equal opportunities, sustainable development, employment)

**Main objective and focus:** 1. assess the arrangements and procedures for managing or administering programmes; 2. support monitoring, or check the progress made in implementing programmes, such as many mid-term evaluations; 3. assess the outcome or effects of programmes in terms of the results achieved and their contribution to attaining socio-economic policy objectives

**Method used:** 1. Counterfactual; 2. Cost-benefit analysis; 3. Other quantitative; 4. Qualitative

## 5. FURTHER REMARKS - NEW CHALLENGES FOR POLICY

Main points from previous country report:

- Despite a relatively good economic situation, there was a worry that low propensity to innovate may jeopardise development in the long-run;
- EU accession (market opening) and financial support increasing internal demand have been beneficial to Poland;
- More formal and financial data were available than information on the physical progress;
- Better standardised indicators would help assess the progress in the future.

Many of the aforementioned conclusions could be repeated also this year, as several (many!) indicators in the AIRs do not provide any relevant information, partly due to the fact that the projects are for the most part not finished and their results cannot be presented, and partly because the indicators are meaningless, not complete and vary across regions and programmes. Unfortunately, the attempts to standardise the indicators did not help, even when the programmes (including the relatively similar in structure of priorities regional OPs) tend to use the same measure-specific indicators, but quite often differently worded - which makes it impossible to sum up the final figures. One may only hope that in the last years of implementation of the programmes more realistic data will be available. Evaluations carried out, with a few exceptions concentrating on technicalities, give only a limited insight into the overall progress. The I&D OP is the best example of almost 1,000 indicators which bring little or no information. Therefore - unwillingly - we have to accept that data on the financial progress in 2011 again tell more about the progress than (unavailable) physical indicators. It is a weak source of information but it seems (in particular commitments level) to promise a serious outcome soon.

It is disappointing that still the demand side effects strongly dominate over the supply side ones. It seems that last year did not bring any significant changes in this respect: the projects approved and in progress (in particular the large ones) are difficult to change. Moreover, we cannot produce any sound proof that serious attempts to change this have been undertaken. However, this question is at long last being discussed. More stress put on complex or large coordinated projects remains an unfulfilled and important recommendation, as the need for a better checked and evidenced relationship between outputs and results and policy objectives.

There is a growing concern - until now mostly of intellectual character and not yet translated into actions and policies - if the EU funds lead to a real and durable increase of the economic efficiency (i.e. if the supply effects are strong enough), or if they just have a short-term social significance (i.e. the demand effect). An important report was published at the beginning of 2012 by a group of independent scholars<sup>17</sup> arguing, that the traditional sources of Polish competitiveness - mostly the relatively low cost of production as a result of relatively cheap labour - are becoming depleted. If so, the new sources - namely innovativeness and

---

<sup>17</sup> J. Hausner, T. Geodecki, G. Gorzelak, S. Mazur, J. Szlachta, J. Zaleski, Direction: Innovations. How to get Poland out of the development drift? (in Polish, [http://www.fundacja.e-gap.pl/doki/kurs\\_na\\_innowacje.pdf](http://www.fundacja.e-gap.pl/doki/kurs_na_innowacje.pdf)).

technological advancement – should replace them, but – contrary to expectations – the large inflow of EU funds does not trigger this change to a sufficient degree. It is also indicated that in the new financial perspective different mechanisms should be introduced which would allow for an increase of the overall economic efficiency which after 2020 would save the country from an inability to maintain and develop the assets that will have been created with the assistance of the EU funds during the generous financial perspectives of 2007-2013 and 2014-2020.

This concern becomes even more serious since these issues are not discussed in AIRs, but are sometimes undertaken in more general reports published by the MRD and based on various sources (including reporting, monitoring, research, etc). Most of the AIRs (if at all) presented very formal approach to the Lisbon strategy (or Europe 2020) or other strategic documents, limiting its conclusions to the formal check whether the name and description of a given priority (or its measure) relates to objectives of that documents is provided. But only an in-depth analysis of the results can offer an assessment of the real effects. One of the reasons why formal checking is not enough lies in the phenomenon called “objective replacement”. It is when instead of achieving a given objective, we redefine it for operational reasons and make the work easier or closer to the requirements of reporting. For instance, instead of achieving strategic objectives, we concentrate on spending money. Instead of implementing very difficult and complex urban revitalisation projects (which should involve not only material refurbishing, but also include social and economic changes), we renovate a few buildings and call it “revitalisation”. Or renovate an old building (be it town-hall, burgher house or a palace) and call it a “tourist product”, though – by chance – these are still performing functions that make them useless for tourists (state archives, offices, etc).

In case of innovation, which in the 2004-2006 period was rather unsuccessful due to the demanding requirements set by the MAs and low demand (money was transferred soon to business modernisation objective), high demand for direct innovation support presented by business sector could easily be explained through an operational definition of “innovation” adopted by the implementing authorities: innovation became to be understood as almost any change in design, organisation, technology or product.

One may have similar doubts in every field of intervention. Is it really good that large number of universities received support for laboratories construction or modernisation when they do not have high quality researchers ready to perform significant scientific experiments? The quality criterion is not taken into account when selecting projects, and highest-ranking state officials show great satisfaction with the amount of funds spent on “laboratories”, even though this is not reflected in the scientific product obtained in them<sup>18</sup>. Is there any link between roads constructed or modernised and increase of economic performance? Do these roads form a network, offer any synergy? One look at the map is enough to say: no<sup>19</sup>. As stated in last year’s

---

<sup>18</sup> When investment in research or academic establishments is focused on research equipment, there might be some improvement of the scientific product. However, in the IE OP, and in the Eastern Poland Development OP, funds are also spent on new offices of higher education establishments, new sport arenas, dormitories for students, etc. – which have a simple demand side effect but can by no means be translated into any scientific results nor can improve the innovativeness of the national economy.

<sup>19</sup> Poland is a strange country in this respect: motorways are usually being first built in “the middle of nowhere” while the big cities are still waiting for circular by-passes or proper exit/entry roads (where the traffic is the heaviest). As a result, time saved on faster travel between the main nodes is wasted in traffic

report, one of the main problems is that large infrastructural projects are constructed not where they are badly needed, but where they are easier to build. The MRD report "Raport Polska 2011" not only confirms this finding, but formulates a number of conclusions and recommendations for the development policy.

In case of environmental projects, it is stressed that too many projects are dispersed, not connected and as such do not bring any visible results. It suggests also that there should be more functional delimitation of areas covered by certain projects (like in sewage treatment, solid waste management, natural disasters prevention, etc.). Better coordination of sectoral policies and spatial planning is also recommended (MRD, Raport, p.125).

As for the transport area, particular attention is given to the need for more complex and coordinated projects<sup>20</sup>, coherent system of road networks, better balance between investments into individual transport infrastructure and public transport, "demonopolisation" of public transport or better spatial planning as the foundation of any infrastructural investments (ibidem, p. 101). Low efficiency of project preparation in the rail sector (mostly state owned) and further execution of the projects adopted was particularly stressed.

In relation to health, education and tourism, most of the recommendations are oriented to further improvement of the structure and quality of services offered (better adjustment to the needs, with demographic changes in mind), promotion of healthy lifestyle and promotion of tourist assets and products.<sup>21</sup> (ibidem, p. 79).

Labour market is one of the most sensitive topics. General recommendations which have been made above all cover the need of taking into account the current demographic changes (growing shares of elderly people, decreasing numbers of the youngest generations) in the process of strategic planning, promotion of flexible employment schemes, and adjustments of the structure of vocational education to the needs of economy (encouragement to study maths, technical and natural sciences), and promotion of life-long learning (ibidem, p. 68).

In case of entrepreneurship, competitiveness, R&D and innovation, the Report concludes that most problems in this field relate to low, and even recently diminishing, innovativeness of Polish enterprises. Therefore the main recommendation is to support innovativeness (directly and through support to innovative milieu), regulatory framework (science, education included) and development of modern infrastructure (also broadband Internet). Specifically, the structural funds should concentrate their support to the economy more on knowledge intensive sectors (ibidem, p. 51). The Report is based on a number of research studies, evaluations and

---

jams when entering or leaving the city. For example, the motorway connecting Warsaw with the west (A2) is almost completed (with delay, obviously), but there are no plans whatsoever of constructing a bridge on the River Vistula and connecting this motorway with its eastern 'leg' towards the border with Belarus. This motorway will end in the city, and the expected congestion will further paralyse the connection of Warsaw with its southern suburbs.

<sup>20</sup> A negative example of the lack of coordination (or imagination) can be given here: in 2011, the railway track Warszawa-Krakow was modernised for fast(er) trains. New trains were used to test it and it turned out that everything was new except for the energy supply system which was not modernised and not meant to provide large amounts of electricity to high speed trains. It will take long time to modernise it to fit the needs. Results of the project are far below expectations.

<sup>21</sup> For some reasons the assets (rather traditional, as *de facto* disputable quality of environment and Polish cuisine) are seen as key attractions to be promoted abroad.

monitoring data. Though not always, it usually refers directly to the Cohesion policy in Poland, and there is no doubt that this policy - as a major instrument of Poland's development - is one of the key, if not the main addressee, of these recommendations.

## REFERENCES

MRD, *Poziom realizacji programów - stan na 1 stycznia 2012 r.*

[http://www.funduszeuropejskie.gov.pl/AnalizyRaportyPodsumowania/Documents/KSInfo\\_01012012.pdf](http://www.funduszeuropejskie.gov.pl/AnalizyRaportyPodsumowania/Documents/KSInfo_01012012.pdf) [15.07.2012]

MRD, 2012, *Raport strategiczny 2012. Strat2012.pl,*

[http://www.mrr.gov.pl/rozwoj\\_regionalny/ewaluacja\\_i\\_analizy/oddziaływanie\\_makroekonomiczne/strony/oddziaływanie\\_makroekonomiczne\\_funduszy\\_unijnych.aspx](http://www.mrr.gov.pl/rozwoj_regionalny/ewaluacja_i_analizy/oddziaływanie_makroekonomiczne/strony/oddziaływanie_makroekonomiczne_funduszy_unijnych.aspx), [10.09.2012]

MRD, 2012, *Wpływ polityki spójności na rozwój społeczno-gospodarczy Polski w latach 2004-2015 w świetle wyników badań makroekonomicznych,*

[http://www.mrr.gov.pl/rozwoj\\_regionalny/Ewaluacja\\_i\\_analizy/Oddziaływanie\\_makroekonomiczne/Documents/material\\_informacyjny\\_wplyw\\_funduszy\\_2004\\_15\\_aktualizacja\\_lipiec2012\\_24072012.pdf](http://www.mrr.gov.pl/rozwoj_regionalny/Ewaluacja_i_analizy/Oddziaływanie_makroekonomiczne/Documents/material_informacyjny_wplyw_funduszy_2004_15_aktualizacja_lipiec2012_24072012.pdf) [24.07.2012]

MRD, 2012, *Wpływ polityki spójności na sytuację społeczno-ekonomiczną kraju i regionów,*

[http://www.mrr.gov.pl/rozwoj\\_regionalny/ewaluacja\\_i\\_analizy/oddziaływanie\\_makroekonomiczne/strony/oddziaływanie\\_makroekonomiczne\\_funduszy\\_unijnych.aspx](http://www.mrr.gov.pl/rozwoj_regionalny/ewaluacja_i_analizy/oddziaływanie_makroekonomiczne/strony/oddziaływanie_makroekonomiczne_funduszy_unijnych.aspx), [August 20, 2012]

MRD, 2012, *Process of evaluation of the cohesion Policy in Poland -2012,* leaflet

MRD, 2011, *Wykorzystanie środków UE w ramach strategii wykorzystania funduszu spójności na lata 2004—2006 oraz narodowych strategicznych Ram odniesienia 2007—2013. Informacja miesięczna za grudzień 2010 r.,*

[http://www.mrr.gov.pl/aktualnosci/fundusze\\_europejskie\\_2004\\_2006/Documents/2010\\_12\\_31\\_miesieczna\\_grudzien.pdf](http://www.mrr.gov.pl/aktualnosci/fundusze_europejskie_2004_2006/Documents/2010_12_31_miesieczna_grudzien.pdf) [10.07.2012]

MRD, 2012, *Wykorzystanie środków UE w ramach strategii wykorzystania funduszu spójności na lata 2004—2006 oraz narodowych strategicznych Ram odniesienia 2007—2013. Informacja miesięczna za grudzień 2011 r.,* [10.07.2012]

*National Spatial Development Concept 2030 (available in Polish only), 2010*

[http://www.mrr.gov.pl/rozwoj\\_regionalny/Polityka\\_przestrzenna/KPZK/Aktualnosci/Documents/KPZK2030.pdf](http://www.mrr.gov.pl/rozwoj_regionalny/Polityka_przestrzenna/KPZK/Aktualnosci/Documents/KPZK2030.pdf) [20.01.2011]

*Long-term Country Development Strategy "Poland 2030. The Third Wave of Modernity", 2011 (project)*

## INTERVIEWS

Mr. Stanisław Bienias, head of NEU, MRD

Dr Piotr Żuber, Director, MRD

Mr. Krzysztof Hetman, Marshall, Lubelskie voivodship

Dr Bogdan Kawałko, Director, Lubelskie voivodship marshal office

Mr. Andrzej Brzozowy, MRD

Mr. Radosław Górecki, MRD



**ANNEX 1 - EVALUATION GRID FOR EXAMPLES OF GOOD PRACTICE IN EVALUATION****Evaluation Grid A - Metaewaluacja badań dotyczących oceny kryteriów wyboru projektów w programach operacyjnych współfinansowanych z funduszy europejskich w Polsce w perspektywie 2007-2013**

<b>BASIC INFORMATION</b>	
Country: Poland	
Policy area: governance	
Title of evaluation and full reference: Metaewaluacja badań dotyczących oceny kryteriów wyboru projektów w programach operacyjnych współfinansowanych z funduszy europejskich w Polsce w perspektywie 2007-2013 Centrum Ewaluacji i Analiz Polityk Publicznych Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego	
Intervention period covered: 2007-2013	
Timing of the evaluation: 2011	
Budget : Not known	
Evaluator: external	
Method: document analysis, interviews, questionnaire	
Main objectives and main findings: To develop a set of guidelines for creating project selection criteria in the next programming period. the problems related to project selection and evaluation criteria are generated mostly at the systemic (institutional) level.	
Appraisal:	
<b>CHECK LIST</b>	
Score each item listed below from 0 to 2 as follows: 0: No; 1: Yes, but not fully; 2: Yes	
Report	
Are the objectives, methods and findings of the evaluation clearly set out?	2
Are the findings and recommendations clearly supported by the analysis?	2
Are the methods used suitable given the objectives of the valuation and have they been well applied?	2
Are the quantitative and qualitative data used reliable and suitable for the purpose of the evaluation?	2
Are the potential effects of other factors (e.g. the economic situation) on the outcome fully taken into account?	1
Is a serious attempt made to distinguish the effects of the intervention from these other factors?	2

**Evaluation Grid B - Ocena wykorzystania środków UE w rozwoju regionu, 2004-2013,**

<b>BASIC INFORMATION</b>	
Country: Poland	
Policy area: Regional development	
Title of evaluation and full reference: Ocena wykorzystania środków UE w rozwoju regionu, 2004-2013, Dominika Wojtowicz, Tomasz Kupiec August 2012	
Intervention period covered: 2004-2006, 2007-2013	
Timing of the evaluation: 2012	
Budget: EUR 2 500	
Evaluator: external	
Method: document analysis, interviews, case studies	
Main objectives and main findings: To assess the implementation and effects of the externally co-financed projects in one of the less developed regions in Poland.	
Appraisal: The study is an excellent example of INDEPENDENT piece of research conducted by experienced scholars, relates to most important issues of external assistance to regional development of less developed regions, and shows priorities of local authorities – not always congruent with the needs of long-lasting, durable development.	
<b>CHECK LIST</b>	
Score each item listed below from 0 to 2 as follows: 0: No; 1: Yes, but not fully; 2: Yes	
Report	
Are the objectives, methods and findings of the evaluation clearly set out?	2
Are the findings and recommendations clearly supported by the analysis?	2
Are the methods used suitable given the objectives of the evaluation and have they been well applied?	1
Are the quantitative and qualitative data used reliable and suitable for the purpose of the evaluation?	1
Are the potential effects of other factors (e.g. the economic situation) on the outcome fully taken into account?	1
Is a serious attempt made to distinguish the effects of the intervention from these other factors?	1
Comment: This is a narrow, low-budget research which should be considered as an example to follow on a wider scale with more comprehensive and more expensive evaluation studies.	

## ANNEX 2 - TABLES

See Excel Tables 1 -4:

Excel Table 1 – Regional disparities and trends

Excel Table 2 – Macro-economic developments

Excel Table 3 - Financial allocation by main policy area

Excel Table 3cbc - Financial allocation by main policy area – Cross border cooperation

Excel Table 4 - Commitments by main policy area (by end-2011)

Excel Table 4cbc - Commitments by main policy area (by end-2011) - Cross border cooperation

## ANNEX 3 -ANALYSIS OF INDICATORS USED IN THE AIRS, 2011

*Alicja Silska*

The analysis has been prepared on the basis of the data provided in the AIRs, which were updated following the meetings of the respective Monitoring Committees. It aimed to find how the indicators used in specific programmes could be compared. It also tentatively evaluated those indicators in such terms as precision, degree of detail and relevance.

Thanks to the diversified structure of data, we were able to adopt a research method which only comprised the ROPs. We selected so-called typical indicators which could be found in most ROPs and therefore allowed for comparisons. We then decided that for an indicator to be included in this group it had to be present in no fewer than half of all ROPs (i.e. 8 of 16). In this way, 25 output indicators and 14 result indicators were identified. As the next step, the overall comparability level of the indicators used in ROPs was calculated, as the actual percentage of typical indicators in the sum of all the indicators. In case of output indicators, 25 typical indicators were found to occur with a varying frequency, altogether 307 times out of a total of 673 indicators generated from all of the 16 ROPs. A similar method was used to identify the voivodships (regions) with the highest comparability, i.e. those where the actual share of typical indicators was the highest in relation to the sum of indicators used in specific voivodships. For instance, the sum of output indicators in the Świętokrzyskie region is 29, and 17 of them can be classified as typical indicators, which means that the comparability rate for this voivodship is 58.6%. However, these methods could not be used for the national programmes owing to substantial differences between the supported areas to which they refer.

### Indicators in ROPs

Both the output and result indicators used in the ROPs are characterised by a much greater degree of detail, as in the following examples:

- gross jobs or FTE broken down by sex;
- modernised/reconstructed roads broken down by category;
- supported enterprises broken down by size, and also spatial differentiation – rural areas.

The indicators used in the ROPs can be regarded as relatively easy to compare since the analysis at the level of priorities found that 45.6% of them could be classified in the category of comparable output indicators.

When we look at all the ROPs we will see that there are only five indicators which always have the same form, i.e. they are 100% comparable: *number of information society projects; number of projects offering direct supports to SMEs; number of health care projects; number of renewable energy projects, and number of waste management projects* (cf. Annex Table A).

**Annex Table A - Output indicators with the highest frequency of occurrence in ROP AIRs – typical indicators**

Name of indicator	Frequency (max. = 16)	Frequency in %	Related sectoral programme	Occurrence (+/-)
No. of transport projects	14	88	I&E OP	+
Length of new local/municipal and district roads	13	81	I&E OP	-
Length of reconstructed local and regional roads (municipal, district and voivodship)	11	69	I&E OP	-
Length of reconstructed railway lines	8	50	I&E OP	+/- (modernised railways)
No. of purchased/modernised public transport vehicles	11	69	I&E OP	+
Capacity of purchased public transport vehicles - seats	10	63	I&E OP	-
No. of information society projects	16	100	IE OP	+
Length of built/extended/ modernised broadband Internet network	9	56	IE OP	-
No. of projects offering direct investment supports to SMEs	16	100	IE OP	+
No. of R&D projects	8	50	IE OP	+
No. of cooperation projects between businesses and research institutions	13	81	IE OP	+
No. of tourism projects	15	94	IE OP	+/- (No. of supported )projects, incl. tourism)
No. of new/modernised culture institutions	9	56	I&E OP	+
No. of projects promoting sustainable development & improving attractiveness of cities	14	88	-	-
No. of projects in education/education & training infrastructure	15	94	I&E OP	+/- (No. of HE projects)
No. of health care projects	16	100	I&E OP	+
No. of renewable energy projects	16	100	I&E OP	+/- (No. of environment-friendly energy infrastructure projects)
No of projects to improve air quality	13	81	I&E OP	+
No of water & waste management projects	8	50	I&E OP	+
No. of waste management projects	16	100	I&E OP	+

Name of indicator	Frequency (max. = 16)	Frequency in %	Related sectoral programme	Occurrence (+/-)
No. of risk prevention projects	10	63	I&E OP	+
Length of built/modernised sewage network	9	56	I&E OP	+
No. of training programmes, workshops, study visits organised	11	69	TA OP	+/ (with trainees from institutions covered by TA OP 2007-2013)
No. of computers purchased	12	75	TA OP	+
No. of appraisals, expert's studies, analyses, studies and concepts by external evaluators	10	63	TA OP	+

A similar analysis in the category of result indicators showed that slightly over 33% of all indicators can be compared with a fairly satisfactory result. Only one result indicator is 100% comparable: *Number of people connected to the sewage network as a result of project implementation* (cf. Annex Table B).

**Annex Table B - Result indicators with the highest frequency of occurrence in ROPs – typical indicators**

Name of indicator	Frequency of occurrence (max. = 16)	Frequency of occurrence in %	Related sectoral programme	Occurrence (+/-)
Time savings on new and reconstructed roads in passenger and cargo transport, in EUR/year	8	50	I&E OP	+
No. of people who acquired Internet access (or possibility of access), in people / thousands of people	14	88	IE OP	-
No. of people using on-line services	9	56	IE OP	-
No. of new jobs (gross employment full-time) - <i>usually broken down by sex</i>	11	69	IE OP	+
Additional investment projects generated by supports, in MEUR or EUR	14	88	IE OP	-
No. of created research jobs, in R&D or R&TD	13	81	IE OP	+
No. of people connected to new or modernised water network	14	88	I&E OP	+
No. of people connected to sewage network	16	100	I&E OP	+
No. of people covered by segregated waste collection	12	75	I&E OP	- (only: no. of people covered by municipal waste management system)
No. of people secured against floods as a result of projects	12	75	I&E OP	+
Installed power from renewable sources, in	8	50	I&E OP	+

MW or MWh or MWh/year				
No. of students and university students using project results, in people or people/year	11	69	I&E OP	+
Potential no. of specialised medical tests done using equipment bought as a result of projects	13	81	I&E OP	+
No. of participants in training programmes, conferences, information meetings, seminars, etc., on project preparation and implementation	8	50	TA OP	+/- (No. of people trained)

Not all of the above-listed typical 25 output indicators and 14 result indicators can be found in respective national programmes. The proportion in the former case is 15 of 25, and 9 of 14 in the latter; this means that result indicators offer a relatively better picture in that respect.

The priorities set in the ROPs come from nearly identical areas, and invariably include categories related to transport, enterprise development, natural environment or social infrastructure. At the level of indicators, however, the situation becomes more complicated: even though the indicators used are related to similar issues such as roads, supported enterprises or length of sewage networks built, in many cases they are worded differently. In effect, such differences, though insignificant at first sight, at the end of the day make it impossible to reliably compare the data provided for specific indicators. Some of the examples are provided below:

- Number of new/modernised culture facilities vs. Number of supported culture institutions;
- Number of conferences, meetings, seminars organised vs. Number of training programmes and conferences for the Programme beneficiaries;
- Number of schools which obtained Internet access vs. Share of schools potentially able to use broadband Internet to total number of schools – in %;
- Number of enterprises supported by micro-loan and loan funds vs. Number of enterprises supported by loan and guarantee funds.

There is a difference between new or modernised culture institutions and institutions which “only” received support. In case of the indicator: *Number of organised conferences, meetings, seminars*, the authors did not specify who the participants of such events were, and therefore they cannot be identified with the Programme beneficiaries. Many similar examples could be found. It is possible, however, that, after checking what individual projects were behind a given indicator and what the authors meant by them, such a comparison of the indicators would prove possible after all. With the current body of knowledge, this is not possible.

An analysis of individual ROPs shows that some of them use a number of typical indicators, thus allowing for comparisons showing the impact of these programmes in various voivodships. This group primarily includes the voivodships of Małopolskie and Świętokrzyskie.

Implementation effects will be the easiest to compare for the Małopolskie and Świętokrzyskie ROPs, and the most difficult – for Pomorskie. However, the quality of the indicators used can differ from programme to programme and is not directly correlated with the frequency of their

occurrence. Some examples of well-defined indicators, which provide solid, reliable information, include:

1. Number of facilities which acquired new functions following revitalisation (Łódzkie);
2. Length of flood prevention facilities, in km (Kujawsko-Pomorskie);
3. Increased expenditure on innovative activities, in EUR million (Łódzkie);
4. Reduced commuting time when using public city transport to the centre of the metropolitan area, in minutes (Pomorskie);
5. Change in the emission of major air pollutants: sulphur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, dust, carbon dioxide, in tonnes/year (Mazowieckie);
6. Recycled waste, in % (Warmińsko-Mazurskie);
7. Number of schools equipped with computer labs (Lubelskie).

Currently, these can be found in only one of the 16 ROPs, but should be used on a broader scale owing to their considerable cognitive value.

On the other hand, some indicators raise doubts rather than provide information. This group includes inter alia:

1. Number of applications installed (Świętokrzyskie) – what applications are they?
2. Number of biodiversity projects (Kujawsko-Pomorskie) – what does it mean? Is it about the introduction of new species? Protection of existing ones? Or something totally different?
3. Number of institutions collaborating in an innovation centre (Małopolskie) – what centre is this?
4. Areas developed as part of a given priority in ha (Dolnośląskie) – developed in what way? Built up/afforested?
5. Number of branches/units/divisions of health care centres which were adapted to the legislative requirements (Dolnośląskie) – what requirements are they? What are they supposed to achieve?
6. Number of participants of events/developments/campaigns promoting the region or participants of opinion polls (Małopolskie) – these should be two separate indicators, since as one they do not provide any specific information.
7. Number of jobs created in problem areas (Wielkopolskie) – problem areas are defined in a number of ways – it is difficult to say if the authors meant areas in need of revitalisation/redevelopment, or e.g. peripheral areas.
8. Number of projects involving direct investment supports to enterprises, including environment-related enterprises (Opolskie) – what does it mean? Nearly every single project can be somehow linked to the environment.

There are many such indicators, which makes it impossible to draw any conclusions owing to their excessive degree of generality. In their present form, such indicators are utterly redundant.

#### Indicators in the sectoral (national) programmes

Comparing the indicators used in the OPs: Infrastructure and Environment, Innovative Economy, Development of Eastern Poland and Technical Assistance is in itself a considerable challenge because each of these programmes has its own unique set of priorities. The attempts

to find universal indicators have proved that there is no indicator which would be present in all of the aforementioned programmes (cf. Annex Table C).

**Annex Table C - Occurrence of selected indicators (prepared by the author).**

Name of indicator	I&E OP	IE OP	DEP OP	TA OP	ROP
No. of students using supported infrastructure (no. of persons)					
No. of collaboration projects between R&D institutions and enterprises	-	+	+	-	+
No. of purchased public transport vehicles	+	-	+	-	+
No. of purchased computers (laptops, servers, desktop computers)	-	+	-	+	+

On the other hand, we can find similar indicators, referring to similar issues. Indicators showing the number of new jobs can serve as a very good example: they are used in all of the programmes, although take dissimilar forms (cf. Annex Table D).



**Annex Table D - Indicators of new jobs in various OPs (prepared by the author).**

I&E OP	IE OP	DEP OP	TA OP	ROP
No. of created new jobs funded from the programme (only employment contracts – full positions/month – output indicator  No. of created new jobs result indicator	No. of new R&D jobs created in the project – output indicator  No. of created new jobs result indicator	No. of R&TD jobs created – only research positions – result indicator	No. of jobs funded from TA OP 2007-2013 (full positions/month) – output indicator	No. of created new jobs (gross full-time employment).  No. of created new jobs  No. of directly created new jobs (FTE)

As a result, it is not possible to reliably compare the effects achieved through the implementation of specific programmes. In their current form, each of the national OPs represents a set of either distinctive, or merely similar, indicators.

To sum up, the attempts to interpret and compare the indicators found in various ROPs have identified a number of problems, such as:

1. Lack of uniform units – the indicators can be similar or even identical but are expressed using different units, e.g. ha or km.
2. Lack of precision – such as for example shown in the indicator: *Capacity of public transport vehicles purchased* – in some cases capacity was specified as the number of passenger seats; it can only be surmised that this was also the case in other programmes.
3. Varying number of indicators in different ROPs, resulting in a dissimilar degree of detail – the indicators are quoted either at the level of priorities or at the level of measures, or even sub-measures.
4. Application of different categories – for example, in the case of roads, some indicators use the categories of regional and local roads, and others – those of voivodship, district and municipal roads.
5. Using the same indicator in different priorities of the same programme.
6. Lack of clarity, too little accuracy – it is not clear what a given indicator specifically denotes, for example: *Number of people protected against floods* – in what way? Or *Increase of population using modernised public transport (%)* – how is the percentage arrived at? Is it the share of the total number of the population or the population already using public transport? In some cases, the unit used in such indicators is the number of people – in such a situation, it is difficult to compare the obtained results, referred to in item (1) above.
7. The selection of indicators can be really amazing – for example: *Length of new railway lines* in the measure relating to air transport (ROP for Lubelskie Voivodship, Measure 5.5 - Air Transport).
8. In some cases result indicators have not been included at all.
9. Impact indicators are practically absent – they have been used only in the ROP for the Małopolskie Voivodship.