

## THE RURAL-URBAN PARTNERSHIP IN EU REGIONAL POLICY – THE EVIDENCE FROM POLAND

**Joanna RAKOWSKA**, Faculty of Economics Science, Warsaw University of Life Sciences-SGGW, ul. Nowoursynowska 166, 02-787 Warszawa, Poland, [joanna\\_rakowska@sggw.pl](mailto:joanna_rakowska@sggw.pl)

Referring to research and a number of publications on rural-urban partnership, the paper discusses the evidence on such partnerships in Poland, provided by projects carried out under Operational Programmes 2007–2013(2015). The study was based on data from telephone interviews with representatives of 25 local self-governments and on data from the Information System for Monitoring and Control, which includes data sets on all projects carried out under national and regional Operational Programmes 2007–2013 and is disseminated by the Ministry of Infrastructure and Development. The verifying datasets were obtained from Poland's Central Statistical Office, the National Court Register, and the Ministry of Economy. The findings showed that the commune-unions and limited liability companies set up by the rural and urban local self-governments (LAU2) in Poland have had the characteristics of rural-urban partnerships. These entities were beneficiaries of Operational Programmes 2007–2013. This proves that in practise EU structural funds have been supporting rural-urban partnerships in Poland, although they have not been addressed specifically to them. Despite the on-going theoretical discussion on the definition of rural-urban partnership and the fact that it was purposely not explained to the interviewed the representatives of local self-governments, this form of collaboration was well-recognised by them.

*Keywords: rural-urban partnership, EU regional policy, Poland*

### INTRODUCTION

The rural-urban partnership is intended to promote an integrated approach to sustainable social and economic development through better co-ordination of rural-urban interactions (OECD 2013(b)) and linkages on a local level. Rural-urban partnerships are driven by functional linkages which take many different forms in economic, demographic and environmental terms (Funnell 1988, Tacoli 1998, Piacentini and Trapasso 2010, Esparcia and Buciega 2005, Copus 2010, Lucateli 2011, CEMR 2013), cross different administrative boundaries and policy domains (OECD 2013(a)), and generate diverse effects and challenges (McGranahan 2004, Ulied et al. 2010, Drejerska et al. 2014). Ignoring the linkages leads to inefficiencies and causes growth-inhibiting inequality (World Bank 2006). On one hand, establishing an effective and sustainable rural-urban partnership requires identification and analysis of these linkages (Bulderberga 2011). On the other hand, the rural-urban partnership is 'the mechanism of co-operation that manages these linkages to reach common goals and enhance urban-rural relationships' (OECD, 2013a, p. 34) and is based on 'a common set of objectives intended to be managed jointly, in a space where urban and rural dimensions are physically and/or functionally integrated' (OECD 2013a, p. 35). The rural-urban partnership can involve different actors and respond to different challenges and opportunities resulting from rural-urban relations.

In the European Union, the concept of the rural-urban partnership appeared in theoretical discussions at the end of the 1990s and continues to generate a good deal of interest today (e.g. Copus, 2010; Copus, 2012; Federal Ministry..., 2012; Jacuniak et al., 2014; Kawka, 2011; Kawka, 2013; Lucatelli and De Mateis, 2011; Mendez et al., 2011; Rakowska 2013(a)). The rural-urban partnership has also been studied in a good deal of empirical research, e.g. the European Spatial Development Perspective (European Commission, 1999), the Study Programme on European Spatial Planning (Nordregio, 2000), the European Spatial Planning Observation Network (ESPON, 2006), Caffyn and Dahlstrom (2005), the European Development Opportunities for Rural Areas (EDORA) project (Noguera-Tur and Lückenköter, 2009), and in recent studies by Eurocities (2011), Metrex (Metrex, 2011 and 2014; Kelling, 2011), and Artmann et al. (2012). Despite these achievements in the debate on rural-urban partnerships, there are those who believe that the partnership is still not a well-defined – and even rather unclear – conception in the context of EU policy.

However, the significance of such partnerships has been recognised by both the European Commission (CEC, 2007; CEC, 2011) and the European Parliament, who agreed that 'a truly integrated approach to development must go beyond intra-city policy coordination and traditional rural issues. The integration with surrounding areas, both urban and rural, needs also to be considered. The benefits of stronger urban-rural cooperation include more efficient land use and planning, better

provision of services (e.g. public transport, health) and better management of natural resources' (EU regional policy website, 2013). As the rural-urban partnership is perceived as an important tool for bridging EU regional and rural development policies, the EU documents stress the need to strengthen the linkages between urban and rural areas and to abandon the division into separate funds for rural and urban areas (European Network for Rural Development 2010, p. 85). Still, the rural-urban partnership has thus far not been supported by any dedicated funding or operational programme.

As has been highlighted in the theoretical discussion, the rural-urban partnership is 'a topic mainly for the local level, because it is an action or project-oriented approach' (Kawka, 2013, p. 9). It remains in agreement with bottom-up territorial approaches, which stress that local self-governments play a crucial role in local development as they have the optimal potential to fully utilise human capital and social resources (Furmankiewicz et al., 2010) as well as economic ones. To enable them to play their role optimally, and to diminish the negative effects of administrative division, Polish law (Law of March 8, 1990) allows local self-governments to collaborate within different legal forms (Milewska and Czaban, 2014). Both the individual and collaborative applications of LAU2s<sup>1</sup> to obtain EU funding caused communes to become one of the two biggest groups of beneficiaries of Operational Programmes 2007-2013 in Poland. For all of these reasons, LAU2s are very important actors in rural-urban partnerships in terms of the absorption of EU funding, especially in the context of supporting local development (Żmija and Satoła 2009, Satoła 2009).

This study seeks to answer the following research questions: (i) Has there been any collaboration between different urban and rural local self-governments which can be considered rural-urban partnerships? (ii) Have these partnerships benefited from the EU structural funds under Operational Programmes 2007–2013? (iii) Is it necessary to strictly define the term rural-urban partnership? and (iv) Is it necessary to dedicate any special funds to rural-urban partnerships? The overall aim of the paper is to answer these research questions using the empirical evidence on rural-urban partnerships established by rural and urban communes in Poland.

## **RESEARCH METHOD**

The study was based on primary data obtained from telephone interviews with representatives of 25 local self-governments in Mazovian Voivodship and on secondary data from the Central Statistical Office of Poland, the National Court Register, the Ministry of Infrastructure and Development, and the Ministry of Economy.

To identify examples of rural-urban partnerships set up by local authorities that were beneficiaries of EU funding under Operational Programmes 2007–2013, the author carried out interviews with the representatives of 25 LAU 2 self-governments. The respondents indicated limited liability companies and unions formed by the communes as examples of rural-urban partnerships meeting the research criteria. The next stage of the study was different for each of these two types of entities.

Based on detailed data from the Ministry of Economy on the members of the commune-unions, the unions were divided into two groups: those of a rural-urban character and other. The urban, rural-urban or rural character of the LAU2s constituting the unions was defined according to the classification of urban and rural LAU2s developed by the Central Statistical Office of Poland (Rakowska, 2013(b)), and available from the Local Data Bank of the Central Statistical Office of Poland (as of December 31, 2014). Next, to select those who were beneficiaries of Operational Programmes 2007–2013 and to extract data on all projects carried out by this type of rural-urban partnerships, the identified unions of rural and urban communes were looked up in the Information System for Monitoring and Control database (as of June 30, 2015) maintained by the Ministry of Infrastructure and Development. In the process of extracting data on projects carried out by rural and urban communes, it appeared that the Information System for Monitoring and Control includes data for 18 cases, where two communes – a rural one and an urban one – have the same name and are located in the same local administrative units of higher level, i.e. LAU1 and regions. In such cases, to differentiate the rural commune from the urban and to assign the projects and data correctly, it was necessary to use the tax identification numbers of these units included in the Information System for Monitoring and Control and to verify them in the National Court Register database.

Limited liability companies set up by local self-governments are the other example of rural-urban partnership identified in the interviews. However, all limited liability companies are shown in the Information System for Monitoring and Control database as one category of beneficiaries, without specifying those set up by local self-governments. That is why only the limited liability companies indicated by the respondents were used as examples of rural-urban partnership and looked up in the Information System for Monitoring and Control database to identify their projects and extract data.

## **FINDINGS**

The representatives of local self-governments in Poland indicated the unions of communes and limited liability companies set up by the communes as the main forms of rural-urban partnerships established by LAU2s and resulting in projects carried out with the support of EU funding under Operational Programmes 2007–2013. Both these types of partnership can be established based on the Law of March 8, 1990 on LAU2, which allows self-governments to set up different legal entities to jointly achieve social and economic development goals which require collaboration going beyond administrative borders.

---

<sup>1</sup> LAU – classification of Local Administrative Units developed by EUROSTAT and including two categories of units: higher level ones called LAU1s and lower level ones called LAU2s [EUROSTAT 2007, EUROSTAT 2010, Rakowska 2013]. The latter ones refer to municipalities or communes.

The commune-unions operate as separate legal entities, whose aims can supplement and/or extend the task that communes have to accomplish by law. Based on the register of the Ministry of Economy, as of June 30, 2015 there were 217 functioning entities of this kind. The Information System for Monitoring and Control registered 41 commune-unions as Operational Programmes 2007–2013 beneficiaries, or 19 % of all existing unions. In the group of beneficiaries, one union included only urban LAU2s and four unions included only rural LAU2s, thus excluding them from the research. The remaining 36 commune-unions benefitting from Operational Programmes 2007–2013 consisted of both rural and urban LAU2s, which makes them rural-urban partnerships as defined by the OECD. They carried out 82 projects of total value of 2 422,4 million PLN, 66 % of which was co-funded from EU structural funds (1 459.6 million PLN ). Thematically these projects concentrated mostly on environmental issues such as sewage treatment (26 % of projects) and on municipal and industrial waste management (21% of projects). The remaining 44 projects addressed a wider range of issues connected with environmental protection, the labour market, leisure and sports, transportation, SMEs and culture, to name a few.

The limited liability companies set up by LAU2s were the other form of collaboration between LAU2s indicated by the respondents as a form of rural-urban partnership. The respondents pointed out that limited liability companies have been set up by the communes mainly to deal with the construction and/or maintenance of water supply or sewage systems. Thus when applying for EU funding under Operational Programmes 2007–2013, they were beneficiaries of mainly the Operational Programme Infrastructure and Environment and the Regional Operational Programmes, which provided funds for these aims. However, the limited liability companies are usually set up by one individual LAU2, and thus they themselves are not examples of partnerships. They also apply for EU funding individually. But, as the respondents indicated, the limited liability companies set up by LAU2s often collaborate with each other on. One example of how would be infrastructure projects for water supply and sewage treatment systems crossing the administrative borders of the involved LAU2s. So, although they carry out their projects individually, they plan and design them in such a way, after completing the projects, that their effects are fully synergic and constitute one system e.g. a pipeline collecting sewage from an adjacent LAU2 and delivering it to a treatment plant located in one of them. If such collaboration involves rural and urban LAU2s, it meets the criteria of a rural-urban partnership. But, in the Information System for Monitoring and Control database involving 314 projects (of 13 652 mln PLN total value including 52 % PLN of EU co-financing) carried out by limited liability companies set up by LAU2s, there is no information on which of them are individual projects and which are synergic with projects of other entities of this kind. Consequently, only field research enables such identification and that is why only findings of the interviews with representatives of 25 LAU2s are discussed in this paper. The interviews enabled the identification of 6 rural-urban partnerships, five of which had been set up to develop the sewage treatment infrastructure and one to develop constructing dumps. The character of these projects indicates that mostly environmental issues were the reason this form of collaboration between rural and urban LAU2s.

The findings of the interviews proved that although the term rural-urban partnerships has no legal or administrative definition in Poland and is not in common use, the interviewees intuitively and correctly used this term and indicated examples of such partnership.

The findings of the SIMIK database search prove that EU funding allocated under Operational Programmes 2007–2013 was also absorbed by entities whose characteristics classify them as rural-urban partnerships. Thus despite the lack of funding dedicated to such partnerships, they benefited from this source of funding.

## **DISCUSSION**

The findings prove that rural-urban partnerships established by LAU2s functioned in Poland over 2007–2013 budget perspective and benefitted from Operational Programmes 2007–2013, although there were no special financial instruments addressed to rural-urban partnerships as a particular group of beneficiaries. As the identified rural-urban partnerships were beneficiaries of EU structural funds under Operational Programmes 2007–2013 we can conclude that the fact that this EU funding was not formally addressed to them was not an obstacle in obtaining these funds. This can be an argument in the discussion on the future instruments of regional and cohesion policy, proving that there is perhaps no need to address structural funds particularly to rural-urban partnerships, as they benefit from this source even without such dedicated instruments.

Another issue concerning urban-rural partnerships is that they are quite often identifiable only in the process of field research as public statistics and other sources of data do not identify them. Findings of the research done for this paper provided two examples of such partnerships, which differed in many aspects, including these: they were different legal entities, they were subject to different laws and regulations, and they were established to complete different tasks. The unions of communes require collaboration of different involved units from the very beginning, i.e. there must be partners to establish such a union. However, the analysed limited liability companies are set up by individual LAU2s and in the discussed cases had been functioning individually to achieve different aims. They entered into collaboration with each other at some stage in order to combine some of their projects. These differences explain why some partnerships can be identified on the basis of public registers and public statistics while other, probably much more numerous ones, can be identified only in the course of field research.

The findings also show that despite the on-going theoretical discussion on the definition of rural-urban partnership, this form of collaboration was well-recognised by the interviewed practitioners and stakeholders of local development. That suggests that such definition is needed more by researchers and policy-makers than by practitioners of local development. However, if the European Commission and Parliament decide to support rural-urban partnerships by e.g.

financial instruments, it will be necessary to precisely address them to a well-defined group of beneficiaries, thus the definition will be required.

It should be stressed that although Polish law does not refer to urban-rural partnerships, the fact that it allows local self-governments to enter into collaboration by establishing different legal entities does create a legal basis for these partnerships.

Based on the collected empirical evidence, it can be concluded that already functioning rural-urban partnerships are a response of local self-governments to these social and economic needs and challenges, whose character requires collaboration going beyond administrative borders and beyond the division of policies into urban versus rural. So these kind of collaboration proves that rural-urban partnerships do bridge the regional and rural development policies.

## REFERENCES

1. Artmann, J., Huttenloher, Ch., Kawka, R., Scholze, J., 2012. Partnership for sustainable rural-urban development: existing evidence. Federal Institute for research in Building, Urban Affairs and Spatial Development, Deutscher Verband für Wohnungswesen, Städtebau und Raumordnung e.v.
2. Bulderberga, Z., 2011. Rural-Urban Partnership for Regional Development. *Social Research*, Vol. 22, No. 1, pp. 14–24.
3. Caffyn, A., Dahlstrom, M., 2005. Urban-rural interdependencies: Joining up policy in practice. *Regional Studies*, Vol. 39, Iss. 3, pp. 283–296. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0034340050086580>
4. CEC, Commission of the European Communities, 2007. Territorial Agenda of the European Union Towards a More Competitive and Sustainable Europe of Diverse Regions Agreed on the occasion of the Informal Ministerial Meeting on Urban Development and Territorial Cohesion in Leipzig on 24/25 May 2007. Available at: <http://www.eu-territorial-agenda.eu/Reference%20Documents/Territorial-Agenda-of-the-European-Union-Agreed-on-25-May-2007.pdf> (accessed on 15/08/2014).
5. CEC, Commission of the European Communities, 2011. Territorial Agenda of the European Union. A Strategy for Smart, Sustainable and Inclusive Growth. Agreed at the Informal Ministerial Meeting of Ministers responsible for Spatial Planning and Territorial Development in Gödöllő on 19 May 2011. Available at: <http://www.eu-territorialagenda.eu/Reference%20Documents/Final%20TA2020.pdf> (accessed on 15/08/2014).
6. CEMR, Council of European Municipalities and Regions, 2013. *Urban-rural partnership CEMR survey on integrated territorial development*. Available at: [http://www.ccre.org/docs/cemr\\_survey\\_urban\\_rural\\_relationship\\_en.pdf](http://www.ccre.org/docs/cemr_survey_urban_rural_relationship_en.pdf) (accessed on 15/08/2015).
7. Copus, A., 2012. Urban-Rural Relationship in the New Century: Clarifying and Updating the Intervention Logic. Available at: [http://www.mrr.gov.pl/english/Regional\\_Development/Regional\\_Policy/NSRD/doc\\_str/Documents/Copus\\_Urban\\_Rural\\_Linkages.pdf](http://www.mrr.gov.pl/english/Regional_Development/Regional_Policy/NSRD/doc_str/Documents/Copus_Urban_Rural_Linkages.pdf) (accessed on 15/08/2014).
8. Copus, A. (2010). New relationships between rural and urban areas in EU countries. Paper presented at the conference “*The Territorial Approach in Agricultural and Rural Policies: An International Review*”, Rome, Italy, 4–5 November.
9. Drejerska, N., Chrzanowska, M., Pomianek, I., 2014. *Strefa podmiejska Warszawy. Wybrane zagadnienia*. Wydawnictwo SGGW, Warszawa.
10. Esparcia, J., Buciega, A., 2005. New rural–urban relationships in Europe: a comparative analysis. Experiences from the Netherlands, Spain, Hungary, Finland and France. Local Development Research Institute, University of Valencia, Spain, p. 1–12.
11. ESPON (2006). *Urban-Rural Relations in Europe*, ESPON 1.1.2, final report, Luxembourg.
12. Eurocities, 2011. *Cities cooperating beyond their boundaries: Evidence through experience in European cities*. Accessed on 31.07.2014 at <http://www.eurometrex.org/Docs/METRO-D/Eurocities-Background-paper.pdf>
13. European Communities, 1999. *European Spatial Development Perspective: Towards Balanced and Sustainable Development of the Territory of the European Union*.
14. European Network for Rural Development, 2010. *Targeting territorial specificities and needs in Rural Development Programmes*. Thematic Working Group 1. Final Report. Available at: [http://enrd.ec.europa.eu/app\\_templates/filedownload.cfm?id=24D006FD-C169-200D-F420-1E539F269C79](http://enrd.ec.europa.eu/app_templates/filedownload.cfm?id=24D006FD-C169-200D-F420-1E539F269C79) (accessed on 02/02/2012).
15. EUROSTAT, 2007. *Regions in the European Union. Nomenclature of territorial units for statistics. NUTS 2006/EU27. Methodologies and working papers*. Luxembourg.
16. EUROSTAT, 2010. *EUROSTAT regional yearbook 2010*. Luxembourg, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
17. Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Development, 2012. *Urban-Rural Partnerships. Growth and innovation through cooperation*. Germany.
18. Funnell, D.C., 1988. Urban-rural linkages: Research themes and directions. *Geografiska Annaler*, Vol. 70B, No. 2, pp. 267–274. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/490953>
19. Furmankiewicz, M., Thompson, N., Zielińska, M., 2010. Area-based partnership in rural Poland: The post accession experience. *Journal of Rural Studies*, Vol. 26, Iss. 1, pp. 52–62. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2009.05.001>
20. Institute of Urban Development, 2014., *Towards Urban-Rural Partnerships in Poland. Preconditions and Potential*. Kraków. Available at [http://www.urma-project.eu/upload/files/downloads/Towards\\_urban-rural\\_partnerships\\_in\\_Poland\\_2014.pdf](http://www.urma-project.eu/upload/files/downloads/Towards_urban-rural_partnerships_in_Poland_2014.pdf) (accessed on 01/09/2015)
21. Jacuniak-Suda, M., Knieling, J., Obersteg, A. 2014. Urban-rural partnerships as a tool of territorial cohesion. A conceptual approach derived from INTERREG IV C URMA “Urban-Rural Partnerships in Metropolitan Areas, p. 15-32 (in:) Institute of Urban Development, 2014, *Towards Urban-Rural Partnerships in Poland. Preconditions and Potential*. Kraków. Available at [http://www.urma-project.eu/upload/files/downloads/Towards\\_urban-rural\\_partnerships\\_in\\_Poland\\_2014.pdf](http://www.urma-project.eu/upload/files/downloads/Towards_urban-rural_partnerships_in_Poland_2014.pdf) (accessed on 01/09/2015).

22. Kawka, R., 2011. Rural-urban partnerships and rural development. Available at [http://www.mrr.gov.pl/english/Regional\\_Development/Regional\\_Policy/NSRD/doc\\_str/Documents/Kawka\\_Rural\\_urban\\_partnerships\\_and\\_rural\\_development.pdf](http://www.mrr.gov.pl/english/Regional_Development/Regional_Policy/NSRD/doc_str/Documents/Kawka_Rural_urban_partnerships_and_rural_development.pdf). (accessed on 15/09/2014).
23. Kawka R., 2013, Rural-urban Partnerships and Rural Development. Available at: [https://www.mrr.gov.pl/english/Regional\\_Development/Regional\\_Policy/NSRD/doc\\_str/Documents/Kawka\\_Rural\\_urban\\_partnerships\\_and\\_rural\\_development.pdf](https://www.mrr.gov.pl/english/Regional_Development/Regional_Policy/NSRD/doc_str/Documents/Kawka_Rural_urban_partnerships_and_rural_development.pdf) (accessed 29.04.2014).
24. Kelling, J. 2011. Urban-rural relationships in metropolitan areas of influence: Best practice examples of metropolitan-rural cooperation. Hamburg, Germany. Available at: [www.eurometrex.org/Docs/Expert\\_Groups/URMA/Urban-rural-relationships-in-metropolitan-areas-of-influence.pdf](http://www.eurometrex.org/Docs/Expert_Groups/URMA/Urban-rural-relationships-in-metropolitan-areas-of-influence.pdf) (accessed 09/2014).
25. Law of March 8, 1990 on LAU2 Self-government. Journal of Law of 2001, No 142/1591.
26. Lucatelli, S., 2011. Rurban: Rural-Urban Partnership for Sustainable Development. Presentation at the conference "Effective Instruments of Territorial development", Warszawa, October 24-25, 2011.
27. Lucatelli, S., De Mateis P., 2011. Rural-urban partnership for sustainable development. (in:) New paradigm in action: successful partnerships, edited by Kolczyński, M., Warsaw, Polish Ministry of Regional Development.
28. McGranahan, G., Satterthwaite, D., Tacoli, C., 2004. Rural-urban change, boundary problems and environmental burdens. International Institute for Environment and Development
29. Mendez, C., Bachtler, J., Wishlade, F., 2011. *Comparative study on the visions and options for Cohesion Policy after 2013*, European Parliament, Brussels.
30. METREX, 2014. URMA-Expert Group. Available at: [http://www.eurometrex.org/ENT1/EN/Activities/activities.php?Cat=Expert\\_Groups&SubCat1=URMA](http://www.eurometrex.org/ENT1/EN/Activities/activities.php?Cat=Expert_Groups&SubCat1=URMA) (accessed on 30/04/2014).
31. METREX, 2011. Urban-rural relationships in Metropolitan Areas of Influence. Best practice example of metropolitan-rural cooperation. Hamburg.
32. Milewska, A., Czaban, T., 2014. Formalnoprawne aspekty funkcjonowania związków międzygminnych. *Zeszyty Naukowe SGGW w Warszawie. Ekonomika i Organizacja Gospodarki Żywnościowej*, No 106/2014, pp. 121–134. Available at: [http://www.wne.sggw.pl/czasopisma/pdf/EIOGZ\\_2014\\_nr106.pdf](http://www.wne.sggw.pl/czasopisma/pdf/EIOGZ_2014_nr106.pdf) (accessed on 01.09.2015). (In Polish)
33. Noguera-Tur J., Lückenköter J., 2009. European Development Opportunities for Rural Areas (EDORA). Review of current situation and trends: access to services of general interest. Espo Publishing, Luxembourg.
34. Nordregio, 2002. *Final Report on the SPESP*.
35. OECD, 2013(a). *Rural-Urban Partnerships: An Integrated Approach to Economic Development*. OECD Publishing. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264204812-en> (accessed on 01/09/2015).
36. OECD, 2013(b). *Better Policies for Better Lives*. OECD Publishing.
37. Piacentini, M., Trapasso, R., 2010. Urban-Rural Linkages: Issues, Measurement and Policies in OECD Countries. Paper presented to the joint meeting of the Working Party on Territorial Development in Urban Areas and the Working Party on Territorial Development in Rural Areas of the OECD's Territorial Development Policy Committee, Paris, 30 November 2010.
38. Rakowska, J., 2013(a). Partnerstwo miasto-wieś jako kierunek polityki zrównoważonego rozwoju. (Rural-urban partnership as a concept of policy of sustainable development). *Wies Jutra*, 2013/4, pp. 1–3. (In Polish)
39. Rakowska, J., 2013(b). Klasyfikacje obszarów – kryteria, definicje, metody delimitacji. Studium metodyczno-statystyczne. (Classifications of areas – criteria, definitions, methods of delimitation. Methodology and statistics. *Wies Jutra*, Warszawa. (In Polish)
40. Satoła, Ł., 2009: Znaczenie funduszy Unii Europejskiej we wspieraniu rozwoju lokalnego, *Acta Scientiarum Polonorum, Series Oeconomia*, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 77–87.
41. Tacoli, C., 1998. Rural-urban interactions: A guide to the literature. *Environment and Urbanization*, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 147–66.
42. Uljed, A., Biosca, O., Rodrigo, R., 2010. Urban-rural narratives and spatial trends in Europe: the state of the question. Final project report. Barcelona.
43. Urban-rural linkages fostering sustainable development in Europe. First statements and conclusions. Available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/archive/conferences/urban\\_rural/doc/caseconclusions.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/archive/conferences/urban_rural/doc/caseconclusions.pdf) (accessed on 15/09/2013)
44. EU Regional Policy website, 2013. Available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/regional\\_policy/archive/conferences/urban\\_rural/doc/caseconclusions.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/archive/conferences/urban_rural/doc/caseconclusions.pdf) (accessed on 15/09/2013)
45. World Bank, 2006. World development report: Equity and development. New York: Oxford University Press.
46. Żmija, J., Satoła, Ł., 2009: Wykorzystanie instrumentów polityki regionalnej Unii Europejskiej w jednostkach samorządu terytorialnego, *Zeszyty Naukowe Polityki Europejskiej, Finanse i Marketing*, vol. 50, Warszawa, p. 91–101. (In Polish)