

**PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND FUNDING  
IN THE EUROREGIONS**

Abrahám J. \*

**Abstract:** The aim of this article is to evaluate the structure of financing as well as the project management of two selected Euroregions - Nisa and Šumava. The case studies of Euroregion Nisa and Euroregion Šumava were chosen because of their focus on triangular cooperation, which allows for more complex development of cross-border links than in the case of bilateral Euroregions. Within both Euroregions, cooperation between the border regions of the original and new EU Member States can be seen. Euroregion Nisa is located in the Czech-German-Polish border area, Euroregion Šumava nearby the Czech-German-Austrian borders. Both regions that are examined have a long tradition as they exist there more than two decades. The methodological approach is based on the quantitative analysis of budgets and realized projects. As the main database in the analytical part were used financial statements and statistics on projects from the sources of Euroregion Nisa and Euroregion Šumava were used. The examined case studies of Euroregions Nisa and Šumava give evidence of a traditional financing structure with a predominance of the contributions from EU funds and their members. However, both the income structure and the level of revenues are rather significantly different. Euroregion Nisa is among the regions with the largest population and the highest budget. Within the comparatively profile of the Czech parts of the Euroregions, also the per capita incomes are above average.

**Key words:** regional development, regional management, Euroregions, cross-border cooperation, structural funds, project management, European Union, Czech Republic

DOI: 10.17512/pjms.2017.16.1.01

*Article history:*

*Received* August 20, 2017; *Revised* September 6, 2017; *Accepted* October 10, 2017

**Introduction**

Euroregions represent a specific structure of cross-border cooperation structures. It is an association of regional actors that do specialize in mediation, coordination, information and project activities (Chamberlin, 2015; Smekalova et al., 2016). As classical network organizations, they receive funds in particular from the contributions of members and from the realization of project and economic activities (Janda et al., 2013; Zlyvko et al., 2014; Abrahám et al., 2015a; Abrahám et al., 2015b; Jankelová et al., 2017). For a majority of the Euroregions, involvement in the implementation of European Union grant programs is typical (Čábelková et al., 2015). Drawing contributions from European funds was one of the main reasons for the creation of euro regional structures in the Czech Republic. At present, thirteen Euroregions are operating in the Czech Republic, four of which

---

\* **Josef Abrahám, Associate Professor**, University of Economics, Prague, Prague, Czech Republic

✉ Corresponding author: abraham@vse.cz

are multilateral (trilateral) and the remaining nine are bilateral. All of them have an international dimension. Both the size and structure of the budgets of the individual Euroregions are not uniform. They reflect their size, geographic location, composition of the membership base and also the ability of the management structures to develop project and other complementary activities (Smekalova et al., 2015; Terem et al., 2015)

The aim of this article is to evaluate the structure of financing as well as the project activities of two selected Euroregions - Nisa and Šumava. The case studies of Euroregion Nisa and Euroregion Šumava were chosen because of their focus on triangular cooperation, which allows for more complex development of cross-border links than in the case of bilateral Euroregions. Within both Euroregions, cooperation between the border regions of the original and new EU Member States can be seen. Euroregion Nisa is located in the Czech-German-Polish border area, Euroregion Šumava nearby the Czech-German-Austrian borders. Both regions that are examined have a long tradition as they exist there more than two decades.

The methodological approach is based on the quantitative analysis of budgets and realized projects. As the main database in the analytical part were used financial statements and statistics on projects from the sources of Euroregion Nisa and Euroregion Šumava were used. The funding structure is examined for the current period of the year 2015. Both revenue and expenditure sides of the Euroregion budgets are monitored. The evaluation of the projects covers the period 2007-2015 in order to eliminate possible fluctuations in individual years. The project analysis was narrowed down only to cross-border cooperation programs funded by the European Union's Structural Funds.

Both streams are evaluated in two ways. The Euroregions are involved, on the one hand, in the implementation of small projects and also in the submission of large projects from cross-border cooperation operational programs. As for Euroregion Nisa, funds can be drawn from two different grant programs. The former program focuses on the cooperation in the Czech-Polish border area. The latter includes the Czech-Saxon region. Within Euroregion Šumava there are monitored the programs of cross-border cooperation between the Czech Republic and Bavaria and between the Czech Republic and Austria.

### **Theoretical Ackground**

Within the theoretical ground of the paper it is to clarify basic concepts and approaches to cross-border cooperation and to explain the development and principles of Euroregions in the Czech Republic in the context of the EU instruments. A border region can be defined as an area that is in the immediate vicinity of the border and which the border influences. An impact of the border on the region is called a border effect. The intensity of the influence of the border effect differs according to the openness (permeability) of the border and the type and compatibility of neighboring regions (Branda, 2008). In this paper, the term border region will be used as a synonym for the cross-border region.

The border effect may be positive and negative for border areas. There are no cross-border contacts when the border is closed. The gradual opening of the border has a so-called coexistence effect. The development of economic contacts creates a cooperation effect. A complementarity as well as removal of borders can lead to an integrative effect (Martinez, 1990). Although the effects may be different, in economic practice those negative ones usually prevail. Border regions often have many disadvantages compared to central regions. Examples include less developed infrastructure, lower job opportunities, higher unemployment, lower economic levels, etc (Raisiene et al., 2014). Those problems require solutions not only at national level but also a kind of cooperation between actors on both sides of the common border. Cross-border cooperation can be defined in this sense as the cooperation between people, institutions, municipalities, cities and regions from different sides of the border (Branda, 2009).

Increased cross-border cooperation also requires adequate institutional structures. Those structures ensure both sustainability and stability of the cooperation (Zielińska, 2016). Cross-border cooperation is supported both by public institutions and by specially created entities such as Euroregions or co-working communities. The most widespread cross-border cooperation structures are, both within the Czech Republic and the European Union, Euroregions. They are stable with a fairly stable membership base and an internal decision-making system. They have a legal form different from their members and their own budget. Their territorial delineation is based on a combination of geographic factors, economic relationships and historical traditions. An administrative breakdown of the countries involved may not be decisive in this respect (Branda, 2008). Euroregions can be defined as associations of local entities and institutions on both sides of the border with a specialized personnel structure, a secretariat and, in some cases, a parliamentary assembly. A legal form of Euroregions can be based, according to public law, on interstate treaties. Alternatively, the Euroregion can be established in a more conventional way under a private law in the form of associations or national unions on either side of the border. In each state, the legal form is then adjusted according to the relevant legislation (Gabble et al., 2000). There is a substantial cross-border feature for the Euroregion. The cooperative area in the territory of one country cannot be considered as the Euroregion, but rather as a national border region. Within the Euroregion, a vertical cooperation of local actors from the given country (municipalities, regions, associations, firms, etc.) and a horizontal co-operation of partners across common borders (Gabble et al., 2000) take place.

Europe is, compared to other continents, characterized by a relatively large number of countries and borders in relation to the total area. The potential of border regions has not been used for centuries. Administrative and economic policies of individual states have been rather negative in this respect (Gabble, 2000). A key stimulus for the development of the cross-border cooperation was the European integration process after the Second World War. Western European countries were striving to

build common market and remove barriers to the free movement of production factors (Gualini, 2004). In line with the integration within the European Communities, the cooperation on border regions has also developed. The first Euroregion (Enschede-Gronau) was founded in 1958 on the border of Germany with the Netherlands. Based on this institutionalized form of the cross-border cooperation, the term Euroregion was subsequently generalized. Other Euroregions were created in the 1970s and 1980s in Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium, Denmark, France, Spain and other countries. However, the largest development of Euroregions dates back to the 1990s, when the Single Internal Market was launched and the association process of the Central and Eastern European countries started. In that decade, nearly 40 new Euroregions were established in the original and new Member States (Gabble et al., 2000).

The development of Euroregions as well as of the cross-border cooperation is closely linked to a modern policy of economic and social cohesion. The European Territorial Cooperation (often referred to as Interreg), in addition to cohesion and competitiveness, belongs among the basic objectives of economic and social cohesion policy. Programs within the framework of European Territorial Cooperation are geared to three main priorities: Cross-border Cooperation (Interreg A), Transnational Cooperation (Interreg B) and Interregional Cooperation (Interreg C). The cross-border cooperation can be characterized as a co-operation of entities along the common border (Jakubowski, 2017). The Interreg A Initiative is designed for the cooperation of regions that share a common border. The first cross-border cooperation programs were launched in 1990. They are designed in line with the programming cycles of the EU cohesion policy. This means that four periods have already been completed: Interreg I A (1990-1993), Interreg II A (1994-1999), Interreg III A (2000-2006), Interreg IV A (2007-2013). The Interreg V initiative (2014-2020) is currently under operation. In the Czech Republic and other countries that were preparing for their accession to the European Union in the 1990s, the Phare CBC (Cross-Border Cooperation) pre-accession assistance program could be used as an alternative to the Interreg initiative. This program had been implemented since 1994 in the regions of Central European countries that were bordering with the Member States of the European Communities (Gabble et al., 2000).

In the Czech Republic, 13 Euroregions were established: Nisa, Labe, Egrensis, Glacensis, Ore Mountains, and Šumava, Praděd, Těšínské Slezsko, Silesia, Pomoraví, Beskydy, White Carpathians and Silva Nortica. Their legal form is very similar. It is mostly an association of legal entities. The main activity is cross-border cooperation. All Euroregions use European Union programs and members' contributions to finance their activities (Habanik et al., 2016). Majority of them are also involved in the implementation of the Small Projects Fund. The differences can be found in the range of activities, share of own economic activity, size, population, and other indicators. According to the population among large regions belong Nisa, Pomoraví, Elbe, White Carpathians and Teschen Silesia. Among the

Euroregions with a low population are Šumava, Beskydy and Praděd. In terms of the area covered, the largest is Šumava, Nisa and White Carpathians, the smallest, on the other hand, are Beskydy and Teschen Silesia (Branda, 2009).

Looking closer to the selected case studies, it can be said that Euroregion Nisa (ERN) is an association located in the border area of three countries (the Czech Republic, Germany and Poland). That association is one of the oldest Euroregions in the Czech Republic as it was already established in 1991. The cross-border partners are: the Czech side of Euroregion Nisa, the German side of the Neisse Euroregion and the Polish Nysa Euroregion. The Czech part of the Euroregion was founded as an association of legal entities. At present, the association has more than one hundred members. Those are mainly municipalities from the former districts of Liberec, Česká Lípa, Semily and Děčín. Other members of the Czech part of Euroregion Nisa are the Liberec Region, the Regional Economic Chamber of Liberec and the Association of Bohemian Paradise. The involvement of the individual entities is regulated in all three countries autonomously without the need for the reconciliation by cross-border partners. The authorities of the Euroregion are the General Assembly, the Council and the Euroregion office. In terms of staff, meetings of bodies and working groups are staffed by an average of 1.5 people. A total of 5 persons were employed to administer the Small Projects Fund including people from both other partner countries. There was a head of Small Projects Fund and four project managers (Euroregion Nisa, 2016).

Euroregion Šumava has been operating since 1993. The cross-border cooperation is governed by a cooperation agreement between three entities: Euroregion Šumava from the Czech Republic, Euroregion Bayerischer Wald from Germany and Regionalmanagement Mühlviertel from Austria. The number of members is currently 94 (91 municipalities and 3 organizations). Like most other Czech parts of the Euroregions, Euroregion Šumava was founded as an interest association of legal entities. The bodies of the Association include the General Assembly, the Bureau, the Specialized Commissions, the Conciliation Commission and the Association's Office (Euroregion Šumava, 2017).

### **Financing of the Euroregions**

Financing of Euroregions reflects the purpose of their activities, their legal form, and the membership structure and last but not least, their possibilities of drawing subsidies from the European Union's Structural Funds (Hajek et al., 2016). The structure of budgets corresponds to that aims. Main revenue items in the Euroregion budgets are: contributions from their members (cities, regions, etc.); payments for the administration of the Small Projects Fund (Dispositional Fund); reimbursement of costs of their own cross-border cooperation projects, and income from economic activity and one-off events.

The Czech parts of the Euroregions function as interest groups of legal entities. Their goal is not to generate profits but to finance their own operations and activities supporting cross-border cooperation and the development of the border

region. The core of the membership is made up of municipalities and towns within the Euroregions. Other members are usually counties (regions) and chambers of commerce. In some cases, universities, corporate bodies, civic associations, etc. are also involved. Each member contributes to the Euroregion's activities according to the declared rules. Municipalities and cities pay annual rates per capita. For other members (e.g. districts, regions, associations, etc.), the payment is usually set as a lump sum per year. The largest contributors are mostly large (statutory) cities and regions.

Other key sources in the Euroregion's balance sheets are financial flows from the EU funds. The importance of European Union grant instruments is determined by the specificity of the border area, for which specific instruments of the European Union are always defined. It can be claimed that Euroregions were to a large extent created by the possibility to draw from the EU funds. These programs have been used in the Czech Republic for more than 20 years. Euroregions have functioned as secretariats for the selection and administration of the project already under the PHARE CBC pre-accession assistance program. Later, after joining the European Union, funds from INTERREG initiative were used by both the administrators of Small Projects Fund as well as other eligible applicants. Euroregion's own projects were presented mainly in the areas of support for member municipalities and for setting and building up the structures for the development of cross-border cooperation (Branda, 2009). This is also the case in the current financial period (2014-2020), when Euroregions allocate funds from the Small Projects Fund (Dispositional Fund) and implement separate larger projects.

Its implementation is shared between the central authorities and the Euroregions, which are entrusted with considerable authority in drafting the drawing rules. Euroregions participate in the collection, control, registration, evaluation and selection of grant applications under the Small Project Fund. They also oversee the implementation and completion of projects. For the administration of the Small Projects Fund, Euroregions receive contributions from both the structural funds of the European Union and from the state budget.

In addition to small projects financed from the Small Projects Fund, Euroregions also present large projects, always in cooperation with partners from the other side of the border. The leading partner of these projects may be the Czech side of the Euroregion or the entity on the other side of the border.

Most Euroregions try to obtain additional funding from economic (complementary) activity in addition to membership contributions and subsidies from European Union funds. The volume of own income differs according to individual Euroregions. However, the structure of these revenues is similar. Most often they are generated from consulting, information and representation services. Euroregions provide advice to their members when preparing project applications for cross-border cooperation. As another frequent source of income is declared a levy for providing information services and representation of the institutions (regions) abroad. This revenue can be realized thanks to the developed links of

Euroregions to foreign partners. Euroregion Nisa is among the regions with the largest population and the highest budget. As illustrated in Table 1, total revenues amounted to nearly EUR 500 thousand in 2015. Within the comparatively profile of the Czech parts of the Euroregions, also the per capita incomes are above average. This is mainly due to extensive project activity and own economic activity. In the Czech Republic, the comparable income from supplementary activities achieves only the Teschen Silesia Euroregion. The economic activities include, in particular, assistance in preparing project applications as well as feasibility studies for members from towns and municipalities. Euroregion Nisa is also involved in carrying out further professional activities in relation to the European Union. It runs an information center called Europe Direct in Liberec and the representation of the Liberec region in the EU bodies. The share of the complementary activities accounts for less than twenty percent of the budget. The revenues from the administration of the Small Projects Fund and from the implementation of own projects amount to more than double the contributions from their members.

On the contrary, Euroregion Šumava belongs to the group of regions with the lowest total revenues and with a low additional and project activity. Euroregion Šumava shows low income level both in the absolute amount (475 thousand in 2015) as well as in relative terms (see Table 1). A key source of funding represents the contributions from members and a payment for the administration of the Dispositional Fund. Both sources were almost the same in 2015. The membership contributions make up about half of the budget. Unlike in the case of the Euroregion Nisa where those contributions are make only a quarter of the budget. Moreover, when we take into account a fact that the contributions per capita in Euroregion Nisa are slightly higher.

**Table 1. Revenues in Euroregion budgets in 2015 (in EUR)**

*(Euroregion Šumava, 2016; Euroregion Nisa, 2016a)*

Euro-region	Total revenues	Revenues per capita	Membership contribution	Membership contribution per capita	Refunding of the EU projects	Revenues from complementary services
Nisa	475 037	1,10	94 259	0,22	203 000	76 296
Šumava	64 518	0,36	31 223	0,17	33 296	0

### **Project Management of Euroregions Nisa and Šumava**

As noted above, Euroregions in general do involve in drawing up funds via two channels. They administrate the drawing of small projects and also participate in the submission of large projects from cross-border cooperation operational programs. Both regions are tripartite, so they can use resources from two operational programs. In the case of Euroregion Nisa, funds can be drawn from two different grant programs. The first program focuses on cooperation in the Czech-Polish border area. The second includes the Czech-Saxon region. Programs are

always set for the given programming period. The evaluation of the projects includes the already closed programming period 2007-2013, when it was possible to draw funds from the Czech Republic-Poland Operational Program and from the Program Goal 3 as to support cross-border cooperation between the Free State of Saxony and the Czech Republic. The projects from the period of 2014-2015 were, under the  $n + 2$  rule, also financed from the financial perspective 2007-2013. Regarding small projects, the data used represent the Czech-Polish microprojects and Czech-Saxon small projects. In the following text, the structure of the projects in the period 2007-2013 will be evaluated in terms of thematic focus while those in the period 2007-2015 according to the type of beneficiaries. Small and large projects will be examined separately.

It can be seen from Table 2 that the structure of supported projects according to the thematic focus differs both between large and small projects, as well as between the Czech-Polish and Czech-Saxon border areas. As far as large projects are concerned, 25 projects were implemented within the framework of the Czech-Polish cross-border cooperation, in which the main partner was from the Czech Republic. Nearly half of them aimed to support tourism. A fifth of the projects were implemented in the area of social and cultural activities. It is followed by the development of the business environment and infrastructure (Euroregion Nisa (2016b)).

**Table 2. Euroregion Nisa: focus of the projects (2007-2013) (Euroregion Nisa, 2016b)**

Large projects under the Operational Program Czech Republic-Poland		Czech-Polish microprojects	
Focus	Share	Focus	Share
Tourism	44.0 %	Regional development	29.6 %
Culture and leisure activities	20.0 %	Tourism	18.8 %
Enhancement of accessibility	12.0 %	Sport	16.6 %
Development of business environment	12.0 %	Education	15.7 %
Territorial cooperation of public institutions	8.0 %	Culture	13.5 %
Risk prevention	4.0 %	Flood relief	5.8 %

The volume of subsidies from the Micro-Projects Fund within the framework of the Czech-Polish cooperation in the period 2007-2013 was about EUR 2.5 million. More than 200 smaller projects (up to 30,000 EUR) were supported from the Fund. The vast majority of them were aimed at promoting cross-border relations and the territorial development. The largest share was among the projects in the areas of regional development (almost 30%) and tourism (almost 20%). Almost (approximately 15%) of funds were used to support sport, education and culture (Euroregion Nisa, 2016b). Under the Program Goal 3 to promote cross-border cooperation between the Free State of Saxony and the Czech Republic, 35 projects were funded in Euroregion Nisa (only the projects with the main partner from the Czech Republic are included here).



**Table 3. Euroregion Nisa: focus of the projects (2007-2013)** (*Euroregion Nisa, 2016b*)

Large projects under The Program Goal 3 to support cross-border cooperation between the Free State of Saxony and the Czech Republic		Czech-Saxon small projects	
Focus	Share	Focus	Share
Environmental Protection	31.4 %	Education	25.8 %
Human Resources	17.1 %	Culture	23.9 %
Tourism	14.2 %	Regional development	22.7 %
Recovery of flood damage	14.2 %	Tourism	19.0 %
Regional development and planning	8.5 %	Sport	6.1 %
Economic cooperation	5.7 %	Euroregion activities	2.1 %
Secure	2.8 %		
Infrastructure	2.8 %		
Flood protection	2.8 %		

The total value of the large projects was comparable to the Operational Program Cross-border Co-operation between the Czech Republic and Poland (EUR 500 million) in the reviewed period. Table 3 illustrates that most projects (31%) were implemented in the environmental field. Then followed support for the development of human resources (17%), tourism (14%) and the elimination of flood damage (14%). The financial allocation to the Small Projects Fund under the Czech-Saxon cooperation was lower than under the Micro-Projects Fund in the Czech-Polish region. In terms of the structure, more than 90% of the projects were implemented in four areas: education (26%), culture (24%), regional development (23%) and tourism (19%).

**Table 4. Euroregion Nisa: drawing by beneficiaries (2007-2015)**

(*Euroregion Nisa, 2016a*)

The Small Projects Fund of the Czech Republic-Saxony		The Micro-projects Fund of the Czech Republic-Poland	
Beneficiaries	Share	Beneficiaries	Share
Cities and municipalities	31.6 %	Cities and municipalities	50.0 %
Schools, kindergartens and facilities for children and youth	20.9 %	Sport, tourist and interest associations	19.2 %
Sport, tourist and interest associations	18.3 %	Euroregion Nisa	10.7 %
Cultural organizations and associations	10.3 %	Schools, kindergartens and facilities for children and youth	9.1 %
Euroregion Nisa	8.5 %	Association of Municipalities	7.7 %
Liberec Region	5.8 %	Cultural organizations and associations	2.8 %
Association of Municipalities	4.6 %	Liberec Region	0.5 %

Based on the sources of Euroregion Nisa it is possible to find out the structure of drawing subsidies from the Czech-Saxony Small Projects Fund and the Czech Republic-Poland Micro-Projects Fund according to the beneficiaries. This statistic is clearly illustrated in Table 4, from which it can be ascertained that the main beneficiaries from both programs are cities and municipalities. In the case of the

Czech Republic-Poland Micro-project Fund, even half of the projects were awarded to the municipalities. As for the Czech-German cooperation it is more than 30%. The most successful city in terms of project acquisition is Liberec, followed by Hrádek nad Nisou, Jablonec nad Nisou and Trutnov. A large proportion of projects are also reported by the associations and educational establishments. In both programs, sport, tourism, and interest associations made a fifth of the projects. A rate of success of schools differs according to the programs. In the framework of Czech-Saxon cooperation, the share of schools, nurseries and school facilities was 20%, in the case of Czech-Polish cooperation less than 10%. A relatively high proportion of projects (around 10%) were also implemented by Euroregion Nisa itself. The analysis of Euroregion Šumava projects is limited to the Dispositional Fund in the Czech-Bavarian region due to the availability of data. The Dispositional Fund, with its focus, corresponds to the Small Projects Fund, just the name is different. Euroregion Šumava delegated the administration of the Dispositional Fund to the Regional Development Agency of Šumava. The allocation and financing of subsidies from the Dispositional Fund of the Czech-Bavarian Cross-border Cooperation Program has been carried out since 2008. In the years 2008-2015, projects from the 2007-2013 programming period were implemented. The last call was announced in the second half of 2014, the approved projects were completed by the end of January 2015. In 2016, the Dispositional Fund was launched for the period 2014-2020. The volume of subsidies allocated amounted to EUR 2.8 million in the Czech part of the Euroregion Šumava in the period 2008-2015. In total, 645 projects were supported. The main beneficiaries were towns and municipalities. A large number of projects have been recorded in sports, tourism, leisure and cultural associations. More than 10% of the projects were awarded to school facilities. The share of other entities was not significant. From the point of view of the thematic structure, the bulk of projects focused on cross-border relations and regional development. The largest share was spent in projects in the areas of urban, municipal and tourism development (totaling around 60%). A smaller proportion of funds (around 40%) were used to support sport, education and culture.

### **Managerial Implications of the Research**

Based on the analysis, the following implications regarding the development of management at the level of a) Euroregional structures, b) cities and municipalities, c) regions, d) national and European structures can be drawn. During their existence, Euroregions have significantly improved the quality of governance systems and intensified the use of resources provided by structural funds of the European Union. The extent of project participation, additional economic activities and the ability to draw on financial resources differ across regions. In this respect, sharing best practices across Euroregions and stronger diversification of activities in underperforming areas can be recommended. Focusing activities solely on those areas where subsidies are provided may limit the quality of cross-border

cooperation. In the management of projects, it is necessary to pay attention to the overall concept of border regions and long-term sustainability of cross-border cooperation. At the local level, more promotion towards the mayors of cities and municipalities, along with participation of municipal-level politicians in the functioning and management of Euroregions would be beneficial. In the preparation and management of projects supported by the EU funds, municipalities can use Euroregions as service organizations. Regarding the management of regions, it would be beneficial to tie the regional development concepts more closely with the concept of development of Euroregions and also increase the share of regional-level agents in the financing of cross-regional cooperation (Muller, 2014; Novotny, 2016). In their strategies and decision-making processes, central governments should more strongly reflect the interests and position of Euroregions. It would also be beneficial to provide more support to the cooperation of Euroregions within the framework of national associations. Furthermore, it would be useful to create platform for communication, coordination and cooperation of Euroregions and ministries. Euroregions could also be used as the platform for transfer of information. This information could be further used in the process of creation of regional development strategies, decision-making and consulting during legislation preparation. In relationship to Euroregions, the European Union mainly takes the role of the provider of subsidies.. The efficiency of the set-up and use of cross-border cooperation programmes could be improved by stronger decentralization of programmes and more intense participation of Euroregions in the preparation and implementation of operational programmes. It would be worthwhile if future studies focus on the comparison of Euroregions within the EU space and more detailed analysis of the effects of public support in border zones (Novotny, 2013).

### **Conclusions**

The undertaken analysis proved that funding of Czech of Euroregions reflects the purpose of their activities, their legal form, and the membership structure and last but not least, their possibilities of drawing subsidies from the European Union's Structural Funds. The structure of budgets corresponds to that aims. Main revenue items in the Euroregion budgets are: contributions from their members, payments for the administration of the Small Projects Fund, reimbursement of costs of their own cross-border cooperation projects and income from economic activity and one-off events. The expenditure side of the Euroregion budget, as a rule includes: administrative costs, financing own projects, the cost of administering the Small Projects Fund and membership contributions and the representation in professional organizations. The examined case studies of Euroregions Nisa and Šumava give evidence of a traditional financing structure with a predominance of the contributions from EU funds and their members. However, both the income structure and the level of revenues are rather significantly different. Euroregion Nisa is among the regions with the largest population and the highest budget.

Within the comparatively profile of the Czech parts of the Euroregions, also the per capita incomes are above average. This is mainly due to extensive project activity and own economic activity. The economic activities include, in particular, assistance in preparing project applications as well as feasibility studies for members from towns and municipalities. Euroregion Nisa is also involved in carrying out further professional activities in relation to the European Union. The share of the complementary activities accounts for less than twenty percent of the budget. The revenues from the administration of the Small Projects Fund and from the implementation of own projects amount to more than double the contributions from their members. On the contrary, Euroregion Šumava belongs to the group of regions with the lowest total revenues and with a low additional and project activity. Euroregion Šumava shows low income level both in the absolute amount as well as in relative terms. A key source of funding represents the contributions from members and a payment for the administration of the Dispositional Fund.

The structure of the supported projects in Euroregions Nisa and Šumava differs both interms of large and small projects, as well as of the Czech-Polish, Czech-Saxon and Czech-Bavarian border areas. Most of the funds from the Micro-Projects Fund in the framework of Czech-Polish cooperation aimed to aid regional development and tourism. The financial allocation to the Small Projects Fund under the Czech-Saxon cooperation was lower than under the Micro-Projects Fund in the Czech-Polish region. In terms of the structure, most projects were implemented in four areas: education, culture, regional development and tourism. The largest part of funding from the Dispositional Fund of Euroregion Šumava was directed towards the development of cities and tourism. In the case of large projects, the fields of the environmental protection and human resources dominated within the Czech-Saxon border area. In contrast, in the Czech-Polish area, the largest number of projects was implemented in tourism and regional development. The main beneficiaries of the projects were all in all examined cases the cross-border programs of the city and municipalities. These were followed by sports, tourism and interest associations, schools, cultural organizations, regions, associations of municipalities and others.

*The article was written with the support of the grant from the The Czech Science Foundation (GAČR) : Active borders as a source of Europeanization? The Case of the Triangle Euroregions Nisse/ Nisa/ Nysa and Šumava/Bayerischer Wald/Mühlviertel.*

## References

- Abrahám J., Bilan Y., Krauchenia A., Strielkowski W., 2015a, *Planning horizon in labour supply of Belarusian small entrepreneurs*, "Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja", 28(1).
- Abraham J., Strielkowski W., Vošta M., Šlajs J., 2015b, *Factors that influence the competitiveness of Czech rural small and medium enterprises*, "Agricultural Economics", 61(10).
- Branda P., 2009, *Euroregiony v České republice komparativní analýza*, "Současná Evropa", 14(1).

- Branda P., 2008, *Regionální politika EU a podpora přeshraniční spolupráce*, Liberec: Euroregion Nisa.
- Chamberlin G., 2015, *Coordinating Monetary and Fiscal Policies in the Open Economy*, "International Economics Letters", 4(1).
- Čábelková I., Abrahám J., Strielkowski W., 2015, *Factors influencing job satisfaction in post-transition economies: the case of the Czech Republic*, "International Journal of Occupational Safety and Ergonomics", 21(4).
- Euroregion Nisa, 2016a, *Zpráva o hospodaření ERN v roce 2015*, Liberec: Euroregion Nisa.
- Euroregion Nisa, 2016b, *Kompendium přeshraničních projektů 2007-2013*, Liberec: Euroregion Nisa.
- Euroregion Šumava, 2017, *Výroční zpráva 2016*, Klatovy: Euroregion Šumava.
- Euroregion Šumava, 2016, *Výroční zpráva 2015*, Klatovy: Euroregion Šumava.
- Gabble J. Malchus V., Martinos H. 2000. *Praktický průvodce pro přeshraniční spolupráci*, Gronau: Asociace evropských hraničních regionů.
- Gualini E., 2009, *Integration, Diversity, Plurality: Territorial Governance and the Reconstruction of Legitimacy in a European "Postnational" State*, "Geopolitics", 9(3).
- Habáň J., Kordoš M., Hošťák P., 2016, *Competitiveness of Slovak economy and regional development policies*, "Journal of International Studies", 9(1).
- Hájek O., Novosák J., Nekolová J., Smékalová L., 2016, *Distribution of structural funds: equity, efficiency and public procurement (Czech Republic)*, "Journal of International Studies", 9(1).
- Jakubowski A., Miszczuk A., 2017, *The EU's New Borderland: Cross-border Relations and Regional Development*, New York: Routledge.
- Janda K., Rausser G., Strielkowski W., 2013, *Determinants of Profitability of Polish Rural Micro-Enterprises at the Time of EU Accession*, "Eastern European Countryside", 19.
- Jankelová N., Jankurová A., Masár D., 2017, *Effective management and self-government: current trends*, "Czech Journal of Social Sciences, Business and Economics", 6(2).
- Martinez O.J., 1990, *Transnational frontiers: Cross-border linkages in Mexican border societies*, "Journal of Borderland Studies", 5(1).
- Müller K.B., 2014, *Aktivní hranice a evropeizace veřejné sféry. Jak „stejný“ může být i „jiný“ a naopak*, "Sociológia", 46(4).
- Novotný L., 2016, *Sociologická reflexe*, "Sociológia", 48(2).
- Novotný L., 2013, *Die deutsch-tschechischen Beziehungen und die Präsidentschaftswahl*, "Austrian Journal of Political Science", 44(4).
- Raišienė A.G., Bagdonienė J., Bilan Y., 2014, *Inter-Institutional Interaction Results: The Effect of EU Programs on the Reduction of Long-Term Unemployment*, "Procedia Economics and Finance", 16.
- Smékalová L., Hájek O., Kubík J., Škarka M., 2016, *Management of European Projects by Czech and Slovak Entrepreneurs in Bile-Biele Karpaty Euroregion*, "Economics and Sociology", 9(1).
- Smékalová L., Janiček P., Škarka M., Kozák V., 2015, *Spatial Concentration of the Cohesion Policy Projects in Nationally Delimited Intervention Areas: The Case of the Czech Republic and Poland*, "Economics and Sociology", 8(2).
- Terem P., Čajka P., Rýsová L., 2015, *Europe 2020 Strategy: Evaluation, Implementation, and Prognoses for the Slovak Republic*, "Economics and Sociology", 8(2).
- Zielińska A., 2016, *Information is a market products and information markets*, "Czech Journal of Social Sciences, Business and Economics", 5(4).

Zlyvko O., Lisin E., Rogalev N., Kurdiukova G., 2014, *Analysis of the concept of industrial technology platform development in Russia and in the EU*, "International Economics Letters", 3(4).

### ZARZĄDZANIE PROJEKTAMI I FINANSOWANIE W EUROREGIONACH

**Streszczenie:** Celem niniejszego artykułu jest ocena struktury finansowania oraz zarządzania projektami dwóch wybranych euroregionów – Nysa i Sumava. Studia przypadków Euroregionów Nysa i Sumava zostały wybrane ze względu na charakteryzujących na współpracy trójstronnej, co pozwala na zwiększenie powiązań transgranicznych, niż w przypadku dwustronnych Euroregionów. Euroregion Nysa znajduje się na pograniczu czesko-niemiecko-polskim, Euroregion Sumava przy granicy czesko-niemiecko-austriackiej. Oba badane regiony, mają długą tradycję współpracy, ponieważ trwa ona od ponad dwudziestu lat. Podejście metodologiczne opiera się na analizie ilościowej budżetów i zrealizowanych projektów. Jako główną bazę danych, w części analitycznej, wykorzystano sprawozdania finansowe i statystyki dotyczące Euroregionu Nysa i Euroregionu Sumava. Analizowane studia przypadków obu Euroregionów świadczą o tradycyjnym finansowaniu z przewagą funduszy UE i ich państw członkowskich. Euroregion Nysa należy do regionów o największej liczbie ludności i najwyższym budżecie.

**Słowa kluczowe:** rozwój regionalny, zarządzanie regionalne, euroregiony, współpraca transgraniczna, fundusze strukturalne, zarządzanie projektami, Unia Europejska, Czechy

### 欧元区项目管理和筹资

**摘要:** 本文的目的是评估两个选定的欧元区-Nisa和Šumava 的融资结构和项目管理。选择欧元区Nisa和欧元区Šumava的个案研究是因为它们侧重于三角合作, 因此与双边欧盟区域相比, 可以更为复杂地发展跨境联系。在两个欧盟区域内, 都可以看到原欧盟和新成员国边界地区的合作。欧元区 Nisa位于捷克 - 德国 - 波兰边境地区, 捷克 - 德国奥地利边界附近的欧元区Šumava。这两个被审查的地区都有着二十多年的悠久传统。方法论是基于预算和实现项目的定量分析。由于在分析部分的主要数据库中使用了欧元区 Nisa 和欧元区 Šumava来源项目的财务报表和统计数据。对欧元区 Nisa 和 Šumava的案例研究提供了一个传统的融资结构的证据, 主要来自欧盟基金及其成员的贡献。然而, 收入结构和收入水平却有较大差异。欧元区Nisa是人口最多, 预算最高的地区之一。在欧洲地区捷克部分的相对简介中, 人均收入也高于平均水平。

**关键词:** 区域发展, 区域管理, 欧盟区域, 跨境合作, 结构基金, 项目管理, 欧盟, 捷克共和国