

PN  
15N

ABX 4-27  
97406

Lessons Learned from  
Small and Medium  
Size Enterprise-  
Related Regional  
Development  
Programs in Poland

*Technical Report No. 88*

# GEMINI

**GROWTH and EQUITY through MICROENTERPRISE INVESTMENTS and INSTITUTIONS  
7250 Woodmont Avenue, Suite 200, Bethesda, Maryland 20814**

**DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES, INC. • Michigan State University • ACCION International •  
Management Systems International, Inc. • Opportunity International • Technoserve • World Education**

# Lessons Learned from Small and Medium Size Enterprise-Related Regional Development Programs in Poland

by

Adam P. Saffer  
Malcolm Toland  
Daniel Wagner

September 1995

This work was supported by the U.S. Agency for International Development through a buy-in by the Poland Mission to the Growth and Equity through Microenterprise Investments and Institutions (GEMINI) Project, contract number DHR-5448-Q-62-9081-00.

## PREFACE

The GEMINI/Poland Small Business Project is a collaborative venture between the Ministry of Industry and Trade (MIT) of Poland and the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), implemented by a consortium led by Development Alternatives, Inc. (DAI). The objective of the project is to assist the Government of Poland (GOP) in creating and sustaining an environment conducive to the formation and successful operation of private sector small and medium size businesses in Poland. The primary areas of focus are as follows:

- Legal and Regulatory Policy Reform
- Financial Sector Reform
- GOP and Private Sector Advocacy

In Warsaw, GEMINI serves the Ministry in an advisory role to strengthen the capacity of the GOP to support SME development. This includes assistance to the MIT, the Foundation for the Promotion and Development of SMEs, and the G-24 Task Force, where GEMINI acts as the Secretariat. GEMINI also works with other ministries and Parliamentary bodies where applicable.

While the GOP and several non-government organizations promote SME interests at the central level, it is also necessary and logical that local governments, business chambers, SME associations, and other institutions at the local and regional level contribute to the creation of an enabling atmosphere for continued SME development. This contribution is difficult to achieve when public sector reform and the decentralization process have not moved as rapidly as anticipated.

Under these circumstances, in early 1994, GEMINI/Poland initiated, on a limited scale, various forms of regional initiatives. The objectives behind the regional work were to:

- solicit input from entrepreneurs throughout Poland on the then proposed national government SME policy,<sup>1</sup>
- discuss and develop the capabilities of local business and support organizations in the area of advocacy and lobbying, and
- provide assistance to regional authorities and business organizations in selected regions to develop a model regional SME policy and/or other supportive tools for the SME sector.

Whereas the first objective was achieved through a series of visits and discussions at Polish American Enterprise Clubs, Chambers of Commerce and other business organizations in 1994 and the second is now being addressed by the USAID-funded Polish Federation for Independent Entrepreneurs (PFIE) project, GEMINI work continues on the third.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Polish Council of Ministers adopted a national SME policy on June 6, 1995.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
<b>I. INTRODUCTION</b>	1
Purpose/Objectives	1
Rationale	1
Methodology	2
<b>II. SITUATIONAL OVERVIEW</b>	3
<b>III. KEY PARTICIPANTS IN THE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROCESS</b>	7
Regional and Local Government Organizations	7
Regional Business Support Organizations (BSOs)	8
Small and Medium Size Enterprises	9
Local Banking Institutions	10
Donors	11
<b>IV. KEY LESSONS LEARNED</b>	13
<b>V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE WORK</b>	19
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	21
<b>APPENDICES</b>	
<b>I. List of Cooperating Institutions, Seminars and Conferences on Regional SME Development</b>	23
<b>II. A Project Checklist for Designers and Implementors</b>	27
<b>III. "Rules for Regional Policy of the State"—Document Prepared by the Central Planning Bureau of the Government of Poland</b>	31

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

### **Purpose/Objectives**

The regional activities of GEMINI/Poland, although limited in time and scope, have nevertheless resulted in a number of interesting and valuable observations. In the course of GEMINI's work, we have had the occasion to speak with several regionally-based projects (mostly donor-funded) about their experience. The objective of this report is, by consolidating this information, to communicate these observations and lessons to regional project designers, implementors, and funding sources.

This report is not meant to be a comprehensive analysis of all the elements one must consider when implementing regional assistance programs. Nor is it intended to be a "How To..." manual in the area of project design. It focuses on the challenges of working regionally in Poland by summarizing some of the lessons GEMINI and other programs and organizations have learned in this area. Although some of the findings contained herein will be of value to providers of firm-level assistance, the majority of recommendations and conclusions in this paper relate to projects supporting and assisting development programs and institutions at the regional level in its broader context. The purpose is to raise pertinent questions and to hopefully add value to the regional development process. The authors of the report are fully aware of the fact that this paper is only an initial step. Further research and analysis, beyond the scope of this study, will be needed to develop a comprehensive handbook or guide which can be effectively used by practitioners and government counterparts.

### **Rationale**

A review of the last five years demonstrates that the benefits of economic transformation to a market based economy in Poland have not been equally disseminated throughout the country. In many areas which lack such elements as a diversified industrial base, qualified labor force, communications infrastructure, entrepreneurial tradition or a progressive business environment, the improvement of the overall economic situation in Poland has had little or marginal impact. In these regions, socio-economic problems (recession and unemployment) have become chronic. This as well as other factors, including desired membership in the European Union, have created a growing pressure to increase the GOP's activity in the area of regional development.

The donor community in Poland is responding to this need by redirecting more and more assistance funds toward regionally focused and based initiatives. This trend is augmented by the donor community's changing role. As part of the phasing out process that foreign assistance will face in the coming years and the growing emphasis on sustainability of the projects, the responsibility for management and implementation of regional projects is, to a greater and greater extent, being assumed by Polish nationals and organizations. Therefore, part of the rationale for this paper is the need for project designers and implementors alike to more effectively understand and incorporate the expectations and behaviors of all key parties involved.

There are many reasons why in Poland, as well as worldwide, the successful implementation of regional projects is particularly difficult. One such factor is the limited transferability of programs and models due to the uniqueness of socio-economic and other conditions of each region. Other differences include the available level of human and financial resources in local institutions, the strength and diversity of the business community, infrastructural capacity and so on. However, despite these factors, there are certain lessons which are common, an awareness and understanding of which can contribute to the more effective design and implementation of these programs. This report looks at some of these lessons through the experience of GEMINI and other assistance programs.

## **Methodology**

The methodology used to achieve the objectives of the report consisted of reexamining GEMINI's experience gathered over the past year and a half from direct contacts with entrepreneurs and from participation in a number of seminars devoted to various regionally-related SME issues. From our work in assisting the Ministry of Industry and Trade to develop a national policy for SMEs, we had occasion to share observations with a number of other organizations such as enterprise clubs, national and local chambers of commerce, small business support groups at the national and local level, local governments, self-governing organizations, and various international donor assistance programs involved in regional development. A listing of these sources is included in Appendix 1. The methodology did not include any systematic or focused research based on such tools as questionnaires, direct interviews or scientific sampling methods. In fact, neither the authors of this report nor any of the cooperating organizations were aware of any such broadly based, scientifically conducted research addressing regional development issues in Poland.

Although the report contains findings and observations related to regional development that can be applied to many sectors, the conclusions herein have been primarily derived from the experience of GEMINI and other organizations whose focus is on SME development. Moreover, the terms "private sector" and "SME sector" are used synonymously throughout this paper, as over 95% of the private businesses in Poland can be classified as small or medium size.

A further concept that needs to be defined is what is meant by "regional." In Poland, this term is often used in different ways for various purposes. In this study, however, a region is assumed to be identical with the administrative classification of a voivodship, as Voivods are the key implementors of regional policy in Poland. This approach seems to be predominant in Poland and is shared by the European Union. The term "regional development" therefore refers to the process of social, economic, cultural and human advancement which takes place within distinct parts, or regions, of the country. Extending this description one step further, the term "local development" is considered by the authors as development of a similar nature focused at the Gmina-level or sub-Voivod level. Note that while the scope of regional and local development in its broadest possible context is indeed wide, this study focuses on such development from the perspective of the private sector as an important contributor to and beneficiary of such initiatives.

## II. SITUATIONAL OVERVIEW

The process of transformation to a market economy initiated in Poland in 1989 has been universally recognized as very successful. The initial period of economic decline (1990-91) was quickly followed by dynamic growth. By 1992, Poland was the first of the East and Central European countries to show economic (GNP) growth.<sup>2</sup> In 1995, annual economic growth is estimated to be approximately 5% with industrial production growing by 7%.

Empirical evidence concludes that SMEs are a primary contributing factor in all free market and democratic economies. In Poland, the necessary adaptation process of the country's economy has required significant restructuring of industry which has had numerous consequences including an increase in unemployment (estimated by some Western analysts to reach a national average as high as 18% in 1995). It has been demonstrated that the emerging SME sector in Poland, similarly to that of many developed market economies, is absorbing much of this unemployment and is responsible for the vast majority of new jobs created in recent years.

The transformation process has involved significant changes in ownership structure. The private sector in Poland has gained considerable ground over the last five years, and is currently responsible for over 50% of GNP and over 60% of total employment. The number of private sector enterprises has grown rapidly, reaching an estimated 2 million entities. These numbers would probably be much higher if the "gray economy" of small, unregistered businesses was included.

In spite of these impressive figures, the activities of the Government of Poland (GOP) supporting the SME sector have not been regarded as overwhelmingly successful. "The Strategy for Poland" document introduced by the present government virtually ignores the role of SMEs. However, during recent months, the Ministry of Industry and Trade (MIT), the GOP unit responsible for the sector, has made highly visible and measurable progress in developing the institutional framework necessary to support the small business community. This includes the government's adoption of Poland's first national SME policy and the creation of the Foundation for the Promotion and Development of SMEs.

There is a growing consensus in Poland that managing the transformation process in greatly differentiated regions is an overly cumbersome and complex task when undertaken at the central level. Despite the continuing influence of central government and national institutions on economic and social development, there is a growing tendency for more economic activity and supporting laws and regulations to be decentralized. Consistent with the move toward instituting a competitive, decentralized market economy conducive to SME growth, the GOP is considering proposals for wide-ranging regional public administration reform. If adopted, local and regional self governments will be redefined and granted additional powers and responsibilities, including policy making and revenue authority. As these administration reforms are implemented, local officials will assume a greater role in shaping the "business climate" for SMEs.

---

<sup>2</sup> In 1992, the GNP of Poland increased by 2.6%.

A successful example of this transformation has been the reform of territorial self-government where considerable decision-making power and responsibility have been transferred from the central level to the gmina level. Although this process has not been completed with other levels of government, it will most likely result in delegating substantially more authority and responsibility to Voivods or future Poviats. The result of this transformation, therefore, has been and will continue to be a constantly changing framework in which to base and implement regional development initiatives.

One of the most restrictive aspects of the environment in which regional programs currently operate is the lack of consistent regional development policies at the national level. The Central Planning Office is the leading institution which formulates long term economic plans for the country and establishes the foundations for the State regional policy. The goals of this policy are translated into specific programs and implemented by various ministries and the Voivods. However, despite the involvement of a number of government institutions, there is a widely shared opinion that this process, beginning with long term planning and ending with specific program implementation, is not always coordinated or well understood.

The current GOP philosophy in the area of regional policy and the regional planning process is best expressed in the document entitled *Rules for Regional Policy of the State*, prepared by the Central Planning Office and approved by the Council of Ministers. The full text of this document (translated from Polish) is presented in Appendix 3. This document provides the rationale for developing regional policy, an analysis of the underlying processes, and suggests steps that would lead to greater effectiveness of regional development under currently prevailing conditions. While recognizing the need to increase the state's activities in the area of regional development, it stops short of suggesting the need for further decentralization and for changes in the State's budgeting and regional allocation system.

As previously stated, donor and domestic funding institutions are recognizing this trend and are therefore placing more emphasis on regional programs. This shift has largely been made possible as a result of legislative progress (laws on territorial self-government, public procurement, etc.) and the increasing human and financial capabilities of the regions which creates more and better opportunities to establish and implement effective regional assistance programs. Donors are also benefitting from the experience gained in the early years of Poland's transformation, when most regional programs were implemented in the major cities including Warsaw, Gdansk, Poznan and Krakow.

An early characteristic of regional programs initiated by the State, including those that were designed and implemented with the assistance of donors, was to focus on extremely disadvantaged areas. Examples include the special government plenipotentiaries which were appointed for the Walbrzych and Lodz regions, the British Know-How Fund's program for the Lublin and Bialystok regions (\$12 mln.), and the Ministry of Labor's TOR 10 Program.

More recently, in an effort to increase efficiency and impact, regional programs are attempting to introduce other elements into the process of regional selection, while maintaining their concentration on disadvantaged areas. In the case of the EC/PHARE Cooperation Fund's Program of Local Initiatives (ECU 7.3 mln.), the initial selection of eligible gminas carried out

by the Ministry of Labor was followed by a competition of projects based on demonstrated strengths and/or resources (human capital, institutional capability, industrial assets, etc.) of each region.

A more integrated and systematic approach was taken by the PHARE-funded regional restructuring program STRUDER (ECU 76 mln.). Six voivodships with high unemployment were selected for the pilot program. While it was agreed that particular initiatives within the program must be implemented in a decentralized fashion, a central institutional framework (the Polish Agency for Regional Development) was created to perform a supervisory and coordinating function. This agency also plays a supportive role for regional implementors.

Despite these different approaches, there still appears to be a bi-polar approach to allocating resources for regional development in Poland. To a large extent, assistance tends to focus on either the most disadvantaged regions or the country's leading economic and industrial centers. This may be a reflection of a number of factors, including political visibility, the need to demonstrate results, and the uneven pace of regional development itself. Although beyond the scope of this study, the authors recommend that further research be undertaken with respect to the way in which development assistance has been allocated, as well as analyzing the similarities and differences in development among regions of different economic and social character.

In consideration of the above, it may not be surprising to note that one conclusion of this research was that the majority of regional programs which have been designed, funded and implemented by the donor community share a common constraint; namely, too little emphasis on or an ability to adapt to regional needs and conditions. While no one can dispute the fact that regional development is a difficult task, the authors feel that applying basic principles of planning and organizational strategy, as well as working to develop an effective relationship between donor and recipient(s), can make a measurable improvement. A recent conference organized by the USAID Mission in Poland<sup>3</sup> reinforced this desire to more efficiently allocate and utilize donor resources through the following:

- deepening inter-organizational and inter-donor cooperation among business advisory and educational institutions providing assistance to individual enterprises,
- improving the transfer of knowledge and experience among programs addressing policy, financial sector and advisory service issues,
- strengthening existing Polish institutions, including skill transfer and efforts aimed at capacity building, and
- better selection of projects and contractors, and new ways of facilitating the above goals without creating more bureaucracy or less accountability.

---

<sup>3</sup> USAID Assistance Implementors' Conference Workshop: Supporting Private Sector Development—April 28, 1995, Jablonna.

To conclude, Poland is in the midst of a dynamic economic transition where regional aspects of economic development are playing an increasingly important role. While a more systematic approach may be required for the allocation of resources, this regional trend is at least recognized both by the GOP and the donor community. It is hoped that this report will in some way positively contribute to the discussion and eventual impact of such initiatives.

### **III. KEY PARTICIPANTS IN THE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROCESS**

Designing and implementing regional development programs involves a unique set of counterparts. Donors, which initially concentrated their activity in the larger cities, are not always familiar with these players, their history, and the issues which surround and concern them. Similarly, many of the regional and local governments, business support groups, banks, and SMEs are equally inexperienced in working with donor organizations. Here, perception can often be stronger than reality, occasionally leaving local entities confused or suspicious of the true aims of the intervention.

#### **Regional and Local Government Organizations**

In Poland, the primary regional authorities are the Voivods and their administrative apparatus. They represent the regional arm, and voice, of the central government administration and as such, are limited in their authority to create policy. They are appointed and recalled by the Prime Minister and fall under the jurisdiction of the Minister-Chief of the Council of Ministers (URM). Although their term in office is not limited by law, their positions are sensitive to political winds and carry a high level of uncertainty.

The Voivods act mostly as facilitators in the economic development process of their regions, utilizing their share of budget funds from the central government. The constraints to this institutional structure are many. First, whether due to national fiscal and monetary pressures or disproportionately high local needs, it is safe to say that most of their activity is significantly under funded. Second, as the budget allocation is made on an annual basis with the potential for substantial fluctuation of funding levels from year to year, it is very difficult for the Voivod to realistically design and implement medium and long-term development programs. Third, their priorities predominantly and understandably focus on social issues including employment, education, housing and health care. Finally, one must note that the majority of Voivods and their staff have neither experience in nor the requisite skills to foster the growth and development of a market-led economy. Techniques in budgeting, planning and economic analysis are often new disciplines. More generally, there appears to be a lack of understanding of the linkages between economic growth, and in particular development of the private sector, and the social safety net.

One of the more recent and encouraging activities taking place in many Voivodships is the creation of Regional Development Agencies (RDAs) for which Voivods are typically an important supporter if not major shareholder. These have become a recognized force in regional development in Poland and are more fully described in the section on business support organizations. Another expanding role Voivods play is in mobilizing their communities to organize regional councils and foundations for economic restructuring. Further, many Voivods represent the State in select State-Owned Enterprises (SOEs) within their regions.

The second pillar of the public administration at the local level, commonly referred to as territorial self-government, are the Gminas or city governments. Each Gmina has a cadre of locally elected officials led by the city president or "mayor." Gminas are and will continue to be challenged by

the ongoing reform of public administration which is most likely to result in increasing responsibilities and budget allocations being transferred from the central to the local level. This transition carries with it considerable uncertainty due to the fact that the local budget and level of fiscal authority is often not commensurate with the range of allocated responsibilities. Additionally, there is the concern that the impact of this reallocation of responsibility and fiscal authority may not be uniform throughout the country, which could place certain regions at a disadvantage.

In the early 1990s, few appreciated how the growth of the private sector contributed to the local economy. Only recently have local authorities begun to realize the advantages of private sector development such as job creation, income from communal property, and additional tax revenues. However, they are also under increasing pressure from business groups demanding more assistance in the form of regional promotion, creation of local financial mechanisms, and the development of infrastructure.

Unfortunately, local governments seem to be ill-equipped to meet these demands, having to cope with such factors as insufficient and inexperienced staff in critical functional areas, and the daily budgetary pressures--all at the expense of long term, strategic planning. They are also under constant pressure to show measurable and immediate results despite the fact that economic development is a long term process.

Finally, regional and local government organizations often lack experience in working with the donor community. In many cases they have difficulty in expressing, let alone determining, their true needs, in identifying and committing resources which they could contribute to a regional project, and in understanding the donor's perspective. All of the above make it that much more difficult for a Voivod or Gmina president to understand how a project might be structured to emphasize local involvement and mutual partnership.

### **Regional Business Support Organizations (BSOs)**

There is a great variety of organizations supporting local business in Poland. Some of the more important are:

- regional development agencies (RDAs),
- agencies of local initiatives such as local FISE offices,
- economic development foundations,
- business support and advisory centers,
- incubators,
- enterprise clubs,
- chambers of commerce, and
- business and trade associations.

Although a detailed description of each is beyond the scope of this paper, a general observation is that local communities throughout Poland have witnessed the dynamic growth of these

organizations (if not in size, than at least in number). The spread of regional development agencies, for example, is unparalleled in Central and Eastern Europe.<sup>4</sup>

These organizations are gradually becoming more and more professional in their approach and in the services they provide. Their technical capabilities are improving as is their emphasis on personnel development. One of the key challenges facing such organizations today is retaining their more qualified personnel in a competitive labor market, with many successful private organizations able to offer higher compensation and better opportunities for career advancement.

The increasing level of professionalism in the operations of many BSOs notwithstanding, it is the character of these institutions which in many ways epitomizes the unique set of regional dynamics operating in Poland. BSOs are characterized by a historical and deeply-rooted independence which has led to a very segmented institutional structure and segregated group of players. These visible walls which may have been advantageous for institutions under the previous regime now threaten to isolate them in a market economy dependent on resource coordination and shared information. In addition, the set of informal relationships, hidden agendas and subtleties which tend to dominate the operating agendas of BSOs require time to understand and appreciate, and make regional project implementation an especially challenging task.

Financial considerations also greatly impact these organizations. Groups such as RDAs function as corporations, an approach which has a long-term positive effect by requiring BSOs to function as fully viable commercial organizations. In the short run, however, demands related to financial self-sufficiency often overburden weaker BSOs at the expense of the economic development needs of the region.

SME assistance foundations, on the other hand, are primarily funded from outside sources and conduct very limited commercial activity. Hence, these typically have difficulty in developing an independent and stable long-term funding base, particularly in an environment where the legal framework is not conducive to not-for-profit activity. So far, these organizations appear to lack the political strength to lobby successfully for such legislation, the passage of which is vital to their sustainability.

### **Small and Medium Size Enterprises**

The number of SMEs is not growing as rapidly as in the early phase of Poland's economic transformation. While at first, great numbers of people wanted to become entrepreneurs, prospective business people are now calculating the risk, appreciating the amount of work required and becoming more realistic.

---

<sup>4</sup> As of July 1995, there were approximately 65 RDAs in Poland. Of these, 57 are members of the National Association of Regional Development Agencies (NARDA).

The typical SME in Poland is owner-managed, structured in the form of either a natural person or civil partnership, and usually employs 5 people or less. Most business is conducted locally, either within the Voivod or Gmina. Start-up capital in almost all cases is derived from personal savings and other informal or private sources. Survival, as opposed to growth, market share, diversification or vertical integration, is the main objective and challenge. Most SMEs are unfamiliar with modern business principles and techniques such as strategic planning, cashflow projections, financial monitoring and control systems, human resource development and marketing.

The SME community is however maturing in many ways as entrepreneurs learn about business risk, failure, and the fact that success demands more than just good intentions. There is also a much better appreciation of the need for management skills and market analysis. A growing number of entrepreneurs who, in the early period had a tendency to drain their businesses by using the proceeds to acquire luxury consumer goods, are now increasingly reinvesting their profits. This is a reflection of growing business confidence.

Entrepreneurs are also beginning to form and/or participate in associations. A more recent phenomenon is the development of grass roots organizations alongside the initiatives established by local or central authorities, foundations, or other programs. These organizations are being created by business people who are learning to appreciate the value of information sharing, advocacy and lobbying.

Another noticeable development within the SME community is the growing number of business leaders who have successfully sought election to local governments. This is a further reflection of increased confidence and optimism by taking an active role in improving the business environment in which they live and work.

Lastly, on the whole, SMEs are still largely inexperienced in working with donor programs, and occasionally remain distrustful or at least skeptical of such assistance. Entrepreneurs typically tend to place too much emphasis on access to capital, although clearly one of the primary constraints, and not enough on the benefits of technical assistance and the need to develop management skills. They need to be coached as to their specific roles as beneficiaries of regional projects and as such, be more willing to cooperate and participate in the design and implementation of such initiatives.

### **Local Banking Institutions**

An important link at the local level in the design and implementation of many regional projects are local financial institutions. This can usually be interpreted as meaning local branches of commercial banks.

In Poland there are about 2,000 bank branches (not including cooperative banks) scattered around the country, providing basic banking services to local citizens and businesses. In most cases, the bank branch is led by a branch manager with a small staff. Decision-making authority can be limited as head office approval is typically required for transactions and operations of a specified

magnitude, as well as for the commitment to participate in a particular development program. While several Polish banks have become participating banks for various donor-funded programs, many of which involve local branches, these branches tend to be less familiar than the head office in working with both donors and the program. However, in a similar fashion to the leadership of other local institutions, the branch bank manager, by virtue of his or her personal stature and reputation in the community, can play a powerful role in committing bank time and resources to a particular development program, and in attracting local support for the initiative.

## **Donors**

There is a fairly large group of foreign and domestic organizations providing regional economic development assistance to Poland. Many of the interventions are fully funded by one or a consortium of donors, some are supported by foreign loans (i.e. the World Bank's TOR 10 Program), while others include significant Polish financial participation from the State budget, such as the environmental programs Ecofund I and II and the Ministry of Finance-funded loan guarantee fund being administered by Banku Gospodarstwa Krajowego (BGK).

The general trend in donor assistance, consistent with the needs in Poland, appears to be a gradual move away from sectoral programs organized in Warsaw (mass privatization, agricultural reform, etc.) to more integrated cross-sectoral programs managed at the regional or local level. In the future, the regional approach is expected to be the rule, with centrally based sectoral and policy reform initiatives being maintained as exceptions.

Donor programs are increasingly stressing the concept of sustainability in an attempt to create programs that will continue to operate once donor assistance has ended. Many initiatives initially funded by donors are making good progress in developing as commercially viable programs. While this objective involves generating domestic sources of support for the programs, it also makes the programs rely more heavily on Polish personnel, local expertise, and Polish support organizations. It should be kept in mind, however, that self-sustainability has inherent limitations. Very few regional development projects or institutions, even in Western countries, are able to achieve full operating and financial independence without external support. Therefore, in striving to achieve the objective of self-sustainability in the provision of either financial or non-financial support, one must be careful to look at the ideal, not the idealized, version of an initiative's future.

#### **IV. KEY LESSONS LEARNED**

This section addresses key success factors and lessons which have emerged from an analysis of the experience of GEMINI and of several other assistance programs involved in regionally-based development. Their substance and significance should be viewed in the context of the specific regional project under consideration. We have tried to group the key factors and the lessons learned identified in this paper according to the subject areas of widest and most general significance for regional work.

Based on the points below, the authors have also attempted to develop a checklist for project designers and implementors. This checklist, which is included as Appendix 2, consists of a list of questions to be considered by organizations involved in the regional development process.

##### **The Uniqueness of a Region**

- **Maximize flexibility in project design.** This is particularly important if the program is to serve as a model or pilot which is intended at some point to be replicated. Model programs may still be a valid concept in regional work, but adequate flexibility is required in order to accommodate regional differences and the constantly changing environment in which the individual programs are to be implemented.
- **Transferability of programs between regions is limited.** Project designers need to take into account a particular region's strengths, resources, industry/economic structure, and socio-economic limitations, as well as the level of development of existing institutions and the region's capacity for change. A SWOT-type analysis (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) is one of many possible frameworks to incorporate into the design process. Designers need to be realistic about what will work and what will not work in a particular region, and be sure that the mix of assistance being offered fully meets the characteristics and needs of its target group.
- **Understand what is within and beyond the control of local authorities.** This includes specific legal, financial and other issues which may need to be resolved or clarified as part of either designing the project or allowing the initiative to move forward. It is inadvisable to establish objectives for a regional project which requires significant action at the national level.

##### **Key Local Decision-Makers**

- **Key local individuals play a powerful role in regional development.** Project designers and implementors need to be aware of the local decision-makers and their influence in the region. The interest and commitment of a relatively small group of key players (Voivod, City President, elected City Council members, business leaders, directors of local financial institutions, and the local Sejmik leader) and their

**Previous Page Blank**

willingness to actively support the project needs to be gauged. Not only can a different level of commitment to the project from each of these important local institutions be expected, but situations may arise in which the leaders of some organizations are strong but the organization as a whole is weak, and vice versa. Project management should develop methods of dealing with situations where such imbalances occur.

- Cooperation within and amongst local institutions is often ineffective. Despite evidence that this level of cooperation is increasing, donors should be wary of committing resources to regions in which local authorities demonstrate limited ability to resolve political differences and where quarrels over institutional competencies are frequent. Personal ambitions can often hinder efforts to develop a coordinated local development strategy.

### **The Host Organization and Local Personnel**

- **The choice of a local partner or host organization is vital to project success.** Care should be exercised when selecting local partner institutions. They should be positioned as the initiator of the effort and play an increasingly dominant role throughout the life of a project. Therefore, donors and host organizations should become familiar with each other before making a mutual commitment. Donors must demonstrate that their program is sound and workable. At the same time, donors need to investigate the host organization's history, presence and credibility in the region, objectives and priorities, technical capabilities, and the issues, problems and opportunities confronting them.
- **Institution building efforts should be emphasized initially in regions lacking strong partner institutions.** To create a stable base for program implementation, it is sometimes necessary to focus first on strengthening a local organization so it can become an effective partner or host for the program. Institution building for many projects, however, is seen only as a bi-product. Although difficult to quantitatively measure, capacity building should always be maintained as a project priority.
- **Competent Polish staff should be involved from the beginning of the project's design.** Local knowledge is an essential component of regional development. The involvement of Polish expertise can compensate for a donor's limited understanding of the local and regional realities.
- **A specific individual(s) should be assigned as the local counterpart(s).** An individual(s) from the host organization needs to be identified as the contact point for the project. This should be a person who is committed to the project, has ideally been involved from the beginning, and can devote an adequate amount of time to its design and implementation. Although developing this relationship at the highest level of authority and responsibility within the host organization can assist in garnishing needed local support, it may also result in a disappointing day-to-day working relationship.

In cases where the primary counterpart is clearly overwhelmed with current duties, he or she should be encouraged to assign specific staff to the initiative.

- **Dynamics within the host organization can vary considerably and must be monitored.** On the one hand, there can be a tendency for individuals designated as local counterparts to "carve their own stamp" on a project. In such situations, ongoing support for the project and an awareness of decisions taken, progress made and problems which arise, is needed at the senior management level of the host organization. On the other hand, the designated counterpart may have little or no influence in his or her organization and may be reluctant to act without the direct participation of senior management. This may slow down decision-making and impede project implementation. Another common variant is when the designated counterpart organization and the umbrella or supervisory entity share the same physical premises and perform related functions, such as a chamber of commerce and a business support center, but do not have a transparent nor effective reporting relationship between them.
- **Regional programs are often supported or implemented by poorly compensated staff of public institutions.** This makes it easy for the private sector to lure away more qualified public sector professionals and adversely affects the project's continuity. When working directly with a public institution, all of the constraints relating to civil service regulations should be carefully considered.

### **The Donor-Host Relationship**

- **Develop a shared vision between donor and recipient.** This process takes time and should not be underestimated or rushed. Failure to develop a joint vision of the project's various components, objectives and likely outputs and outcomes will adversely affect its impact. This exercise should begin during the design phase and be completed prior to implementation. If the project has gone off track, a restructuring exercise, with this goal in mind, should take place.
- **Ensure that each component of a multi-dimensional project is fully understood by both sides.** This applies equally to project designers, implementors and recipients. It is easy for misunderstandings to arise as to the purpose and relevant importance of each component. Ideally, each element should be viewed not in isolation but in the context of the project as a whole.
- **Avoid false expectations: clarify the parameters of the cooperation at the outset.** Delegation of authority and the tasks which each side will perform must be clearly and precisely spelled out, formally agreed to, and put in writing.
- **The working language of the cooperation should be the recipients' native language.** Overcoming language barriers is a fundamental yet easily overlooked initial step in developing the donor/host relationship. This greatly helps to minimize possible negative perceptions and/or misunderstandings of the host organization or within the

local community about the project. Working in the native language will facilitate clearer communication between the two sides, result in more effective and efficient project design and implementation, and help narrow the inevitable gaps arising out of a partnership based on individuals and institutions with different backgrounds, cultures, and experiences.

- **A participative approach throughout the process is essential.** The roles that donors and recipients play need to be mutually agreed upon and fully understood. While the role of the donor can have many dimensions, they should not carry the project nor take on line job responsibilities. Rather, they should play a supporting role with diminishing involvement over time.
- **A constant and consistent donor presence in the region is critical.** This is the proven way to build donor credibility and send a very positive signal to the host organization that the donor is serious about the project. A strategy of periodic site visits, with great expectations of activity having taken place between each trip, more often than not results in disappointment.
- **Projects should rely, to as great an extent as possible, on Polish personnel.** The availability of local people with the skills needed for regional projects is gradually increasing as more and more qualified individuals are seeking opportunities outside the main agglomerations. As projects become autonomous and/or reach the latter stages of their funding cycle, local management and staff should be in control. The recurring question for designers and implementors should be what will remain once the "project" is completed.
- **Always work towards local "ownership" of the project.** This will provide the greatest chance for the project to achieve long term impact and sustainability. The project should be structured in a manner which allows the host organization to lead and be perceived by the community as its leader. The likelihood of generating local support and mobilizing local resources for a project may be enhanced if it is perceived less as an international assistance effort and more as a truly local or grass roots development initiative.

### **The Project: Design and Implementation**

- **Ensure that the project is well structured.** This includes developing a mission statement, clearly defining the project's objectives, establishing specific benchmarks, and formulating clear exit parameters which, if not met, would enable the parties to terminate the relationship. A step-by-step approach to achieving objectives is more effective than trying to accomplish too much too quickly.
- **Minimize the time delay between project design and project implementation.** Poland is in the process of rapid transition which adds another level of complexity to assistance efforts. While project planning and developing the necessary administrative

systems and procedures can be very time-consuming, proper systems must be in place to ensure accountability at all times. Still, it has often been the case in Poland that projects involving significant amounts of foreign assistance have encountered exceedingly long delays in implementation, frustrating local counterparts and reducing their enthusiasm to participate. An extensive time gap between project design and implementation may also result in a situation where the project no longer accommodates or adequately meets current local needs. At the very least, a reassessment provision should be included as one of the first implementation steps to verify the accuracy of the initial assumptions and end objectives.

- **Cooperation and coordination between relevant assistance programs should be emphasized whenever possible.** While this aspect is increasingly being stressed by donors, the level of coordination among existing programs remains inadequate, sometimes resulting in the implementation of competing and/or redundant initiatives. The range of direct and indirect assistance to SMEs, for example, is quite broad, including efforts aimed at policy reform, improving SME access to loan capital, and providing business advisory services to individual enterprises and institutions. The scope for and resulting benefits of coordinating regional project work, given the depth and breadth of donor assistance in Poland, are numerous.
- **Develop and utilize tools for project monitoring and evaluation.** In the case of a financial program, for example, evaluation should include both an analysis of "output" and "outcome." By "output" we mean data such as the number of companies assisted, the value of grants awarded, etc. By "outcome" we mean the extent to which the project has achieved its original objectives. Strengthening the capabilities of local financial and other institutions is often an outcome of a regional program which, while difficult to measure, has an important long term impact on regional development.

It is also important to re-evaluate the needs of the project throughout its life and to be able to react quickly by introducing necessary adjustments to the project such as reallocating resources as necessary. Given the fact that the requirements of recipients may change over time, program designers need to focus on meeting the actual needs of the target group rather than rigidly trying to meet the needs perceived at the outset.

- **A plan is needed for project close out.** This should include: (i) measuring and demonstrating the economic and other impacts of the project; (ii) communicating these results to all players involved; and (iii) establishing the next steps, which will depend in part on the degree to which skills and knowledge transfer has taken place. When the project has been designed to serve as a model or a pilot project, the final report should be prepared in a form which is easy to use by subsequent implementors and effectively shared with all relevant institutions and programs. Given the fact that regional projects are usually complex and their outcome is rarely a full and unequivocal success, an effective method of presentation could be in the form of a well-documented case study presenting, in a detailed and objective manner, the project's objectives, opportunities and constraints, unsuccessful elements and sustainable achievements.

## **V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE WORK**

Throughout the decade of the 1980s and during the 1990s Poland has been developing without a clearly articulated regional policy. In addition, in the period immediately following 1989, regional development was left primarily to market forces. Changes which occurred at the regional level, therefore, were the outcome of changes occurring in several sectors of the national economy. Government agencies responsible for formulating and implementing regional policies were not able to move much beyond the proposal stage, and then only focusing on the special needs of problem regions. Both the regional and the central government recognize that this approach must change. Today, the State's greater emphasis on regional activities is being perceived as a necessary element in Poland's rapid economic transformation. The on-going reform of public administration is also expected to bring about a further transfer of authority and responsibility from the central to regional levels.

This trend is paralleled by the greater number of foreign funded or joint assistance programs focusing on a regional level. While donors in Poland are shifting their emphasis to the regions, such organizations have limited experience in developing local initiatives, which involve an entirely new set of players and issues.

Regional project design and implementation is a complex and long term process taking place in a dynamic environment wrought with historical and cultural obstacles. It requires patience, persistence, sensitivity, and flexibility. To our knowledge there have been limited efforts to identify and collate the lessons applicable to these projects in Poland. While this paper is intended to initiate a discussion and share various lessons and observations, considerable follow-up work is needed to better understand and incorporate into regional work specific aspects such as: (i) methods to more accurately assess technical assistance needs; (ii) more effective use of project milestones; (iii) development of project evaluation tools and criteria; and (iv) the critical role of skills and knowledge transfer.

The authors have, on the one hand, attempted to dispel the notion that there is one correct formula for designing and implementing a regional project. In each case, a unique set of regional factors must be accounted for which directly impact the projects's planning, operational structure, implementation and eventual outcome. This uniqueness notwithstanding, we have also concluded that on the basis of empirical evidence, observations and interviews with a number of experienced practitioners, there are lessons to be learned that are to a large extent universally applicable, and which can and should be brought to the attention of other regional project designers and implementors.

**Previous Page Blank**

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

*Small and Medium-sized Enterprises: Progress and Strategy Paper*, EC PHARE, Pierre Mirel and Stuart Thompson, Lead Authors, 1994.

*The Local Initiatives Programme—We Keep Learning*, by Grazyna Gesicka, EC PHARE Cooperation Fund Local Initiatives Programme. Presentation for the Conference "Local Initiatives—The Polish Experience", organized by EC PHARE Cooperation Fund, Warsaw, November 24-25, 1994.

*Partnership and Integration in Local Development*, by Grazyna Gesicka, EC PHARE Cooperation Fund Local Initiatives Programme. Presentation for the Conference "Local Initiatives—The Polish Experience", organized by EC PHARE Cooperation Fund, Warsaw, November 24-25, 1994.

*Country—Region—Locality: External Factors of Local Development in a Situation of Rapid Change*, by Grzegorz Gorzelak, European Institute for Regional and Local Development, University of Warsaw. Presentation for the Conference "Regional Development in Poland", organized by Friedrich Ebert Stiftung and FISE, Warsaw, Sept. 30-October 1, 1993.

*The Region vs. Local Scale*, by Krzysztof Herbst. Presentation for the Conference "Regional Development in Poland", organized by Friedrich Ebert Stiftung and FISE, Warsaw, Sept. 30-October 1, 1993.

*Regionally Oriented Financial Instruments*, by Marek Kozak, Polish Agency for Regional Development. Presentation for the Conference "Innovative Approaches to Financial and Technical Services for Small Business—What Works in Central and Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union? Budapest, June 6-8, 1995.

*"Small and Medium Enterprises in the National Economy", A Policy Towards Small and Medium Size Enterprises*, drafted by the Polish Ministry of Industry and Trade, adopted by the Polish Government, June 1995.

*Stimulating the Growth and Development of Small and Medium Size Enterprises Through Financial Sector Policy Reform in Poland*, by Malcolm Toland, Adam P. Saffer, and Bruce Heatly, GEMINI Technical Report No. 82, Development Alternatives, Inc., March 1995.

*Summary Report on the Polish Delegation's Tour of Small Business Assistance Organizations in the United States*, by Adam P. Saffer, GEMINI Technical Report No. 78, Development Alternatives, Inc., September 1994.

*Experiences with Foreign Assistance in Poland—The Regional Aspect*, by Witold Sartorius. Presentation for the Conference "Regional Development in Poland", organized by Friedrich Ebert Stiftung and FISE, Warsaw, Sept. 30—October 1, 1993.

*Regional Development in Poland—Five Years of Transformation*, by Witold Sartorius, February 1995.

**Previous Page Blank**

**APPENDIX I. List of Cooperating Institutions, Seminars and Conferences on Regional SME Development**

**GEMINI REGIONAL MEETINGS:**

Regional meetings were held in Polish American Enterprise Clubs (run by the Foundation in Support of Local Democracy and sponsored by the Polish American Enterprise Fund), Regional Development Agencies, Regional Chambers of Commerce, Business Support Centers, Centers for Entrepreneurship Promotion, and Business Incubators. In many locations GEMINI also met with representatives of local administration and government.

**Polish-American Enterprise Clubs:**

1. Olsztyn Management Club
2. Wroclaw Entrepreneurship Club
3. Lubelski Entrepreneurship Club
4. Entrepreneurship Club of the Malopolski Institute of Territorial Self-Government and Administration in Krakow
5. Kielce Entrepreneurship Club
6. Entrepreneurship Club in the Opole Region (meetings in Opole and Kedzierzyn-Kozle)
7. Czestochowa Entrepreneurship Club
8. Szczecin Entrepreneurship Club
9. Bialystok Entrepreneurship Club

**Regional Development Agencies:**

1. Lodz Regional Development Agency
2. Swietokrzyska Agency for Regional Promotion and Development
3. Konin Regional Development Agency
4. Opole Regional Development Agency
5. Tarnobrzeg Regional Development Agency
6. Bialystok Regional Development Agency

**Regional Chambers of Commerce:**

1. Zachodniopomorska Industrial Chamber of Commerce (Szczecin)
2. Sadecko-Podhalanska Chamber of Commerce (Nowy Sacz)
3. Torun Industrial Chamber of Commerce
4. Tatrzenska Chamber of Commerce (Tatra)

**Previous Page Blank**

**Business Incubators:**

1. Szczecin Entrepreneurship Center
2. Lodz Incubator Foundation
3. Krakow Center for Innovation and Technology

**Business Support Centers**

1. Konin Business Support Center and branch in Klodawa
2. Nowy Sacz Business Support Center
3. Opole Business Support Center
4. Lodz Foundation for the Development of Entrepreneurship
5. Polish-American Advisory Center for Small Business in Warsaw
6. Polish-American Advisory Center for Small Business in Gdynia
7. Polish-American Advisory Center for Small Business in Lodz

**Local Government and Administration**

1. City President and Gmina Council in Opole
2. Voivod Office in Opole (Voivod and departments heads)
3. Voivod of Tarnobrzeg
4. Voivod of Nowy Sacz
5. Voivod of Konin
6. City Vice-Presidents of Nowy Sacz
7. Voivodship Office in Szczecin, Center for International Cooperation
8. Mayor of Bialystok
9. Mayor of Klodawa
10. Mayor of Sandomierz
11. Mayor of Konin

**COOPERATING INSTITUTIONS:**

1. Ministry of Industry and Trade (MIT)
2. EC PHARE and Cooperation Fund
3. Foundation for Social and Economic Initiatives (FISE)
4. Polish Agency for Regional Development (PARD)
5. National Association of Regional Development Agencies (NARDA)
6. Micro-Enterprise Development Project
7. CARESBAC-Polska
8. Opportunities Industrialization Centers (OIC) Polish Foundation
9. US Peace Corps—Poland
10. Business Center Club (BCC)
11. Foundation in Support of Local Democracy (FSLD)

12. Economic Innovation International (EII)
13. Citizen's Democracy Corps (CDC)
14. National Chamber of Commerce
15. British Know-How Fund (BKHF)
16. Foundation for the Promotion of Polish Cities
17. Polish Business Advisory Service (PBAS)
18. Polish-American Advisory Foundation for Small Business

**PARTICIPATION IN SEMINARS AND CONFERENCES ON REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT:**

1. The Third National Entrepreneurship Forum, organized by the Gdansk Private Entrepreneurs Club and the Solidarity Economic Foundation NSZZ, Gdansk (May 15-17, 1994).
2. "Business Incubators as an Element of Regional Development", conference organized by the Lodz Incubator Foundation, Lodz (June 15-16, 1994).
3. Annual Conference of the Association of Polish Business and Innovation Centers, Blazajewko (September 21-24, 1994).
4. "Local Initiatives—Polish Experience", conference organized by the EC/PHARE and the Cooperation Fund's Local Initiatives Program, Warsaw (November 24-25, 1994).
5. General Assembly of Union of Polish Small Cities: "Role of Self-Government in Regional Development", Janki (November 8, 1994).
6. Seminar on "Defining Strategy of Development for Southern Poland Through Collaboration of Public Administrators and Economic Entities", Nowy Sacz (December 16-18, 1994).

## **APPENDIX II. A Project Checklist for Designers and Implementors**

### **I. THE REGION**

- What are the region's unique strengths and resources? How can they best be integrated into the project?
- What are the region's major limitations? Can a project be designed in such a way as to mitigate the impact of these barriers?
- Does the mix of assistance which can be offered fully meet the characteristics and needs of its target group(s)?
- Is there a model program that your project can be based on? Does the model have enough built-in flexibility to accommodate these unique regional factors or do these unique factors make the model inapplicable?

### **II. KEY DECISION-MAKERS**

- Who are the key individuals (decision-makers) in the region?
- How are they perceived in the community/region, especially in the sectors relevant to your project?
- Do these key decision-makers have a personal and/or political agenda that may positively or negatively affect their level of cooperation with you?
- Are they willing to actively support the project? To what extent? Are they willing (or able) to move beyond declarations and commit specific resources to the project?
- Do regional/local governments have enough authority and competence to achieve the project's objectives?

### **III. HOST ORGANIZATION & PERSONNEL**

- Can you identify a local host/partner organization which has the potential to develop and implement the project?
- What is the role of this organization in the community/region?

**Previous Page Blank**

- What is this organization's history, past performance, achievements, resources, level of commitment, objectives, capacity, and technical capability—"beyond good intentions"?
- How is this organization perceived in the community/region?
- Do you need to include institution-building elements in your program? If the proposed host organization shows deficiencies, can they be remedied within the time frame of your project?
- Has the proposed host organization had any experience working with foreign donors? Is there evidence of successful regional projects and/or lessons learned at the local level which can be applied to the current project?
- Is your hosting/partner institution ready to cooperate with other organizations including the local authorities? Are there examples in which cooperation has been effective in the past?
- Can you identify one or more people from this organization who are willing, able and capable to be assigned to your initiative?
- Are the individuals specifically identified for the project able to work effectively with the leadership of their organization?
- Do these people have the needed skills? If not, do you need to include professional development elements in your project? If so, in what areas?
- Have you researched the compensation levels of the people you will employ?

#### **IV. DONOR-HOST RELATIONSHIP**

- Have you clarified all parameters of your relationship with the host organization (preferably in writing) before starting the project?
- Have you developed the final version of the project together with the future implementors?
- Is the functional structure of the project and its specific individual components clear to all involved parties?
- Is there a clear delegation of authority and tasks?
- Are there any significant language barriers between the host organization and the donor? If so, how will they be resolved?

- Has the project been structured in a manner which allows the host organization to be positioned as the initiator of the effort? Is this organization prepared to play an increasingly dominant role throughout the life of the project?

#### **V. LINKAGES WITH OTHER ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS**

- Are there any linkages between this and other regional assistance programs that could be established? Are there any synergies between programs that could be developed?
- Have you verified that your program does not overlap or compete with other programs?
- Have you researched if there are programs which could share their experience with you?

#### **VI. THE PROJECT**

- Are the objectives of the project achievable given the length of the project and the allocated human and financial resources?
- Have you identified all possible areas in the project where local or Polish expertise could be used, is necessary, and is available?

#### **VII. PROJECT TIMING / IMPLEMENTATION**

- Can the program be implemented quickly so that the impact of changing local circumstances is minimized?
- Have you looked at the progress of similar programs implemented in Poland, if any, in order to establish a realistic time table?
- Is your budget based on recent research?
- Is the budget flexible enough to re-allocate resources when necessary? Does it have built-in reserves and/or contingencies?

#### **VIII. PROJECT MONITORING / MEASUREMENT**

- Have you developed tools to monitor the project's progress?

- Do you have a way of measuring and evaluating the cooperation with your partners on an ongoing basis? Does this include an element to monitor and evaluate the transfer of skills and knowledge to the host organization?
- Is there a mechanism to periodically re-evaluate the needs of the project and to introduce adjustments if necessary? Do you have a strategy in case the actual pace of the project diverges from the original plan?
- Who is responsible for monitoring and evaluation? What is the role of the host organization in this process?

## **IX. PROJECT CLOSE-OUT**

- Have you developed a plan for the close-out phase of your project?
- Have you established with your partner the "next step" agenda? Does this envision continuing the project? If so, in what form?
- If the project is to continue as a local initiative, have you developed a strategy to encourage the local community to "buy in" to the project by committing local resources?
- Have you communicated the economic and other impacts of the project, and project outcomes, to all players involved?
- Have you shared your experience with all potential parties that could benefit from the lessons you have learned?

**APPENDIX III. "Rules for Regional Policy of the State"—Document prepared by the Central Planning Bureau of the Government of Poland (original in Polish, author of translation unknown).**

**Introduction**

The transformation process of Polish economy so far proves that for the programming of further changes it is necessary to take into consideration the spatial differences between various conditions and development factors, also—to a wider extent than currently—the aspirations, priorities and interests of regional communities. There is a visible need to increase the importance of the regional policy as a crucial element of the policy of socioeconomic development of Poland. In recognition of this need, work was intensified in two areas.

The first of them is the medium- and long-term socioeconomic and spatial programs, primarily the development program for the years 1994-1997 and the strategy for a 10-year period, with an integral concept of spatial development of the country. The work on these programs must include the varied economic, environmental, historical and culture factors for defining the goals of regional development. The second area includes the definition and application of the rules for achieving goals of the state's regional policy—which means the ways of activity of the government administration in this area. This project is a summary of work done so far. The project has been designed with the use of foreign experience and ideas, as well—and first—of factors resulting from the diagnosis of regional policy in Poland, in the years 1990-1993. It was assumed that conclusions and proposals will be designed according to the current territorial status of the country, and first of all to its administrative division and the division of competencies and responsibilities between the government administration and self-government bodies. Many conclusions were formulated, with the purpose of strengthening the government administration of general competencies and the Voivods, by giving them the leading role in the implementation of the government's regional policy (interregional policy) and in the inspiring of voivodship regional policy (intra-regional policy). Those conclusions—similarly as the proposals to make the functioning of the central and local state administration bodies more effective in the area of regional policy—do not breach the competencies of the government administration as a whole, and entail only some switches of competencies and responsibilities between the individual bodies. It is obvious that the proposed solutions should be verified after work on the new constitution and administrative reform of the state is completed.

**1. Conclusions from the analysis of the progress and results of economic transformations, in a spatial perspective.**

The fundamental elements to create the rules of regional policy of the state are the conclusions from the analysis of the process and outcome of economic transformations. The four-year period of such occurrences and processes as: level of wealth in the regions; unemployment; income situation of the population; changes in the structure of ownership and within the branches; influx of foreign capital; growth of the private sector; development of institutions of market economy (business environment) and other factor confirms that the differences in the situation of particular

regions are, to a larger degree, the result of the varied features of their social and economic structures, regardless of the general factors. The improvement of the overall economic situation has positive results in only some regions, with multi-functional, rich economic structures; good communication (especially with other countries); environment favorable to entrepreneurship and highly qualified work force. The opposite position is occupied by regions which do not have those features. The improvement of the overall situation does not give positive results in those areas, on the contrary—recession and unemployment become chronic, and the chances of overcoming the depression based on inter-regional factors become very slim, due to the huge infrastructure gap. It is estimated that similar polarization tendencies will appear also in the coming years. We also expect further changes in the hierarchy of the economic attractiveness of voivodship regions. The forces which shaped the spatial model of economy—defined as polycentric—stopped working. This model of economy was characterized by moderate concentration and slight differences, usually for the benefit of regions which had a high concentration of heavy industry. The current development of market economy, and especially—the new quality of relations among Poland, Europe and the rest of the world—breeds other impulses and tendencies, whose spatial expression will be found probably in the change of criteria, and—following it—change of the hierarchy of the voivodship regions from the standpoint of attractiveness to investors and to inhabitants; larger concentration of economic potential in the attractive regions and the increase of interregional differences of the level of living conditions. In such a situation, the regional policy of the state faces the following challenges:

- a) as a preliminary condition: accurate identification of causes and results, also further processes that cause the differences in the social and economic areas, also the possibility and feasibility of influencing those processes;
- b) (based on the above activities)—formulation of appropriate goals of the regional policy and their presentation in government documents, which define the short- medium- and long-term policy for the social and economic development of Poland; and
- c) skillful design of the tools of regional policy, adequate for the selected goals and suited to specific features of the regions, whose development they would influence. Specifically, it is necessary to work out a set of tools for a long-term strategy of empowering the rural regions, which usually have low level of development.

The results of the diagnostic and prognostic work performed so far allow only a partial answer to such challenges. The geographical differences in the economy, society and the environment should be and will be the subject of ongoing and constantly perfected monitoring. The regional policy of the state, its goals, instruments, institutions, and—first and foremost—effectiveness, will be analyzed and perfected with equal care. The current diagnosis allows for the definition of preliminary framework of regional policy, which can be a kind of "opening balance" for the government.

## **2. Conclusions from the evaluation of regional policy of the state in the years 1990 -1993.**

The diagnostic studies of the Central Planning Bureau point out the most important features, conditions and mistakes of the regional policy, which are important for plans and actions in this area.

First, regional policy in the years 1990-93 was formed under the influence of the priorities of macro-economic policy. It is understandable in relation to the regional policy of the government—the "center." Due to the status of the territorial organization of the state, there was no counterbalance in "regional policy for regions," which could be carried out under the responsibility of the regional authorities, based on their own resources. The real regional policy, which in most countries is the result of balancing interests and of the exchange between the center and the regions, was shaped in Poland mostly based on central decisions.

Second, in the analyzed period the macro-economic policy of the state was consciously concentrated on the monetary issues, and the social policy—on the alleviation of the particularly drastic results of the economic transformations, reflected on the job markets. The regional policy, dominated by those priorities, was in practice reduced to the attempts of alleviating the results of the geographical concentration of unemployment in those regions, where its rate exceeded two (or sometimes even seventy-five) times the average national level. Such level of unemployment was the basic criterion to classify individual gminas as "areas threatened with exceptionally high structural unemployment."

Third, the "areas threatened with exceptionally high structural unemployment" became almost the sole object of interventions of the center in the area of regional development. The direct and indirect tools for these interventions have been unified, without efforts to allow for the specifics of individual regions, especially of agrarian regions dominated by the collapsing state farms. All such regions were treated with the same variety of instruments stimulating, directly and indirectly, the economic development, and the instruments of intensive social protection (such as extending the period in which the unemployed may collect benefits).

Fourth, the resources from central budget, designated directly for regional policy, were scarce; and the money of target funds (besides the Job Fund), and foreign assistance resources, were used separately from the goals of the regional policy, which were defined in government documents.

Fifth, the central level lacked a government body that would be responsible for the carrying out of regional policy. This policy, stated in the socioeconomic Policy Paper, was designed by the Central Planning Bureau, adopted by the Council of Ministers, approved (or not) by the Parliament, and was carried out by different ministries—each of them acting within its competencies and resources. However, first they acted according to their whims, as no government body has been formally authorized to coordinate those actions. With the most difficult regions, which also exert the strongest pressure (Katowice, Lodz and Walbrzych, recently also Rzeszow), substitute solutions were used—the establishment of inter-ministerial working groups, or granting the voivods the function of plenipotentiaries of the government (a very vague function). The objective evaluation of the result of those methods is impossible, The very fact that they were used confirms the existence of a gap in the structure of regional policy.

**Sixth**, the voivodship regions have lost their legal and material status. The reform of the territorial organization of the state has been stopped in a situation where the voivod is only a state official with limited authority, and the voivodship convention of self-government—an opinion-making and advisory body, without its own power. There is no full-fledged body which would be the subject of the so-called intra-regional policy, and capable of effective actions.

**Seventh**, this situation supported the strengthening of the vertical relations in government administration, at the cost of the horizontal relations. The negative result of this situation was the weakening of the coordination function of the voivods, and territorial disintegration of the spending of budget money and state resources from target funds.

In summary we can say that the regional policy of the state in the years 1990-93 was characterized by: excessive centralism, uniform solutions, insufficient material resources, lack of instruments and institutions that would allow for effective use of the existing resources, Those features drastically reduced the effectiveness of regional policy.

The above described limitations and faults of the regional policy so far cannot be totally removed, if the aspects of regional development are not considered during the work on new constitution and administrative reform of the country. Evidently both the future political system and the administrative division of the country will have a strong influence on the opportunity to use regional policy as the tool for social and economic development of the country. The proposed solutions display the necessary directions of changes within the current system of the state.

### **3. International impulses for the development of regional policy.**

Among those impulses, we can name the following:

- (1) consequences of cooperation and Poland's participation in international organizations (the European Community, Council of Europe, OECD).
- (2) consequences of the fundamental changes in the geo-political position of Poland in Europe.

In the first group, the most important are:

- the possibilities of using technical assistance of the European Community and, starting in 1994, investment resources designated for regional development (STRUDER, Cross-Border Cooperation). The use of those opportunities depends on the adaptation of the institutions and instruments of Polish regional policy to standards used in the EC.
- obligations stemming from Poland's participation in the so-called Madrid Convention, which defines the rules for the local and regional cross-border cooperation for its signatories,

- inspiration and technical assistance from such organizations as OECD, UNIDO and many others; And also participation in their work, related to the policy of regional development. This may have positive influence on Poland's international image.

In the second group, the most important are the chances for development and breaking the syndrome of provinciality in Polish border regions, including the particularly retarded regions along the eastern border. The use of those chances requires, first of all, the removal of legal obstacles to cross-border cooperation; but also capital involvement of the "center," as well as assistance resources into the modernization and construction of new border crossings, transportation infrastructure and institutions which support the economic development and could engage in effective international cooperation.

The outside impulses so far were not, for different reasons, used in Polish regional policy. The cross-border and regional cooperation is best developed with Germany, although even here there are significant difficulties, resulting mostly from the difference in the economic potential of the partners. The perspective of cross-border cooperation, and its influence on the stimulation of Polish border regions, depend to a large extent on the participation and activity of Poland in such projects as joint preparation of long term plans and programs for development of such regions; creation of joint institutions; finally—joint involvement in investment projects. It is necessary to provide finances for those purposes, as well as a clear definition of the Polish side's goals regarding the directions of development and plans available to the border regions.

#### **4. Creation of the institutional structure of regional policy.**

The main, parallel and co-dependent tasks of the government administration in this area should be: coordination of the activities of ministries and central offices in the support of regional development; design and creation of effective, decentralized institutional structure for regional policy on the voivodship level.

The coordination of the actions of ministries and central offices in the area of regional policy can be undertaken already in 1994 in a manner not breaching the existing organizational structures and distribution of functions. The following rules should be protected:

- regional policy of the state is designed by the Central Planning Bureau, during work on the long- medium and short-term programs and theses of the social and economic policy of the government;
- the theses and programs are approved by the Council of Ministers;
- the implementation of the goals and tasks of the regional policy of the state is performed by all interested ministries and central offices, and the voivods, within the legal and material action resources.

A supplement to those rules shall be as follows:

- the Minister—Director of the Central Planning Bureau will be obliged to submit annually to the COM of a report on the regional policy of the state. At the same time ministries and central offices shall be authorized to coordinate work in this area;
- all ministers and directors of central offices, as well as the voivods, will be obliged to provide the necessary data and studies to the Minister—Director of the CPB;
- gradual extension of the scope of support of regional development by the foundation of the State Treasury "The Polish Agency for Regional Development," which so far dealt only with the administration of part of the foreign assistance resources, designated for this purpose. At the same time, the possibility of transforming PARD into the State Regional Fund will be considered.

The proposed innovations will improve the monitoring of the processes of regional development and will enable the increased effectiveness of the spending of central resources for this purpose.

The construction of effective, decentralized institutional structure of regional policy should be commenced with the shift of authority and material resources for actions within the government administration, such as:

- limiting the scope of authority of the special administration (sectors) for the benefit of the general administration (voivods)<sup>5</sup> and appropriate shifts of budget funds;
- gradual increase of the scope of coordination by the voivods of the activity of local offices of ministries and central offices.

The strengthening of the functions and increase of the authority of the voivods in the area of regional development will allow them for effective representation of government administration and the State Treasury in the institutions of regional policy, created in voivodships (but also with inter-voivodship reach), such as: funds, foundations, consortiums and other. The voivods, implementing the regional policy of the state, will be obliged to invest and promote institutions of this type, and also to participate in them whenever State Treasury resources are involved (subsidies, shares).

The creation, in the regions, of institutions of regional policy which are capable of capital operations (accumulation and distribution of resources supporting development and restructuring processes) will fill—to a large extent—the gap in the system of territorial organization of the state. The resources, accumulated by those institutions, could play the substitute role of quasi-budget resources for development purposes. The authorities managing those resources will have the function of the subject of the voivodship regional policy. The participation of the voivod in decision-making bodies would have the form of representing the State Treasury and the rules of regional policy, defined in state documents.

---

<sup>5</sup> With the reservation of the exclusive rights of the ministers or central administration bodies in the area of international regional cooperation, resulting from international agreements.

The obligation of the voivods is to initiate the creation of and promote the activity of institutions of regional policy. They should be established, first of all, in those voivodships which apply for central resources to support their programs of development and restructuring. The voivods should also organize systematic monitoring of the process and outcome of economic transformations, and—diagnostic and study work to diagnose the conditions, possibilities and capacities of the socioeconomic structures of the region. Using the apparatus of the Voivodship Offices (such as the departments of regional policy, voivodship zoning offices), the voivods should create the foundations for work on the voivodship (regional) restructuring and development programs and attract such partners as local self-governments, business self-government, trade unions, scientific and professional communities, and others. The voivods should also create conditions for the effective implementation of solutions provided for in the government draft of the act on spatial planning; and first—initiate and carry out government tasks financed with budget and foreign assistance resources.

##### **5. Central resources designated for regional support. Rules for their use.**

The source of support for the regional development and restructuring by the government, its bodies and agencies shall be:

- budget resources, designated for the support of regional restructuring programs and other tasks related to regional policy. The 1994 Budget Act allocates 297.2 billion zloty for regional restructuring programs and 573.5 billion for infrastructure investments in high unemployment areas.
- budget resources designated for the support of sectoral programs, tied to regional restructuring. The 1994 Budget Act allocates: 7712.6 billion for industrial restructuring (together with subject subsidies). Of this sum, 3455 billion for mining industry.
- the money of state target funds, the most important being the Job Fund. For 1994, 7400 billion is allocated for active unemployment prevention (Job Fund)
- foreign assistance resources administered by government bodies and by the PARD. In 1994 the STRUDER program will become effective (60 million ECU, which is about 1500 billion zloty) and the PHARE Cross Border Cooperation program (55 million ECU—1375 billion zloty).

The scope and geographical reach of the support and restructuring of regions by indirect instruments (tax deductions and reliefs, credit guaranties and other) will be defined annually in the Theses for Socioeconomic Development, and confirmed in the budget act and decrees of appropriate ministers. The newly introduced instruments will have to be used in a given area for at least three consecutive years.

During the start-up of central resources and of mechanisms which support the development and restructuring of the regions, the following priorities must be respected:

- a) the object of the support will be, first of all, the development of business environment and infrastructure investments, which increase the region's attractiveness to investors;
- b) in areas with persistent structural unemployment, encouragements for domestic and foreign investors will be used;
- c) the central resources will be used, first, for partial subsidizing of projects related to the creation of institutional infrastructure for market economy in the regions, and for support of projects for development of small and medium enterprises. Those resources should not be used for subsidizing ongoing production or services.
- d) simple and suggestive solutions, easily adapted by the investors, will be preferred among the ways of using central resources to support new projects, especially in the SME sector;
- e) in the case of regions threatened with structural unemployment, the central resources can be used for capital support of regional policy institutions (funds, foundations, consortiums, agencies) in the form of grants, subsidies or shares.

The common feature of the above rules is making the start-up of central resources dependent on the fulfillment of a number of conditions by the prospective beneficiaries. Such conditions will increase the chances for effective use of those resources. The real geographical structure of spending budget money for regional development support will depend not only on the above listed priorities, but also on the fact whether the beneficiaries can document their ability to use those resources effectively.

The accumulation and spending of central resources for the support of regional development will in 1994 be subordinated to the rules defined in the Budget Act and related documents. The main efforts will be directed towards better coordination and effectiveness of spending budget resources. They will be targeted at coordinating the spending of central resources (budget money, state target funds, foreign assistance funds) which are designated for the support of regional development. The following issues will be considered:

- The concept of establishing a Regional Fund as a state target fund (possibly as a government and self-government joint fund). This fund would administer all resources designated for regional development, which are currently scattered in different sections of the budget and managed by various entities. It would also use this money for the support of regional programs according to the current programs and procedures. A similar solution is employed in the EC and in Hungary.
- The concept of a fundamental increase of the functions and scope of activity of the State Treasury foundation, the Polish Agency for Regional Development (PARD) which currently administers only the funds of the PHARE STRUDER fund. If this agency received budget funds and money from state target funds, designated for the support of regional development, this would mean that the procedures of spending this money would be not only done according to the model of the STRUDER program (which is based on long experiences of the EC countries), and would also promote the

more effective use of this money due to coordination in time and space. These concepts and their comparative analysis would be prepared in a manner and time which would allow their use in the work on state budget for 1995.

In the course of work on the theses of socioeconomic policy and state budget for 1995 and the following years, the government will aim to significantly increase amounts spent for regional development. This purpose will be served by relating the money designated for sectoral programs (industry, agriculture, infrastructure, improvement of natural environment, forestry) with regional programs. To this end, the rule of participation of the voivods and their officials in work on sectoral programs will be adhered to.

It is also assumed, that the budget resources designated for regional policy will be gradually increased, so that Poland comes closer to the proportions of the EC countries. It is a condition for obtaining support from the Regional Fund of the EC, as this Fund spends its resources usually for co-financing, instead of exclusive financing, of regional programs.

The manner in which central budget money is spent for the support of regional development will vary according to the particulars of individual voivodships. Proposals to this end will be formulated in restructuring programs and in the proposals for concrete projects, prepared in the interested voivodships.

## **6. Regional (voivodship) programs of restructuring and development.**

The time, place and scope of preparing regional (voivodship) programs of restructuring and development will be decided by the authentic needs, expressed in initiatives undertaken by local and regional communities. The voivods are obliged to the creation of analytical, research and prognostic base, all over the country, which would enable and inspire the undertaking of such work. After the Zoning Act comes into force (its proposal is currently discussed by Sejm committees), the voivods will have to prepare and update a voivodship register of the approved program of government tasks, which serve the accomplishment of over-regional public programs and voivodship programs containing government tasks. The updated register will be a valuable source of credible information for all interested parties, especially for the investors. Based on these studies and diagnostic and study work which considers the specific features of regions, the voivods should initiate and promote (and also prepare, in cooperation with the interested groups), information and offers for potential investors. The shape of such studies will depend primarily on the needs and specific of regions and on the inventiveness of their authors.

The regional (voivodship) programs for restructuring and development should be prepared with own resources and powers, supported in exceptional cases with foreign assistance resources and budget money. The task of the government and its agencies will be the improvement of information delivered to regional communities. The central ministries and bureaus will give the voivods all analytic, diagnostic, prognostic and program materials which can be useful for the work on regional programs of restructuring and development. In the case of undertaking the so-called sectoral programs, the leading ministries will also be obliged to consult them with the interested voivods.

The regional programs for restructuring and development can be also prepared for two or more voivodships, if they have similar development programs and are closely related in space and functions. In such cases the voivods, after consultation with the regional self-government conventions, will sign appropriate agreements. Such initiatives can be undertaken only with clear support of local self-government and the communities and institutions of the voivodships in question.

The regional programs of R&D should have an information and offer character, to be used by the domestic and foreign capital. They should inform of the local possibilities, resources and development capacities; clearly state the forms of support for the economic initiatives (such as the creation of special economic zones, offers of capital participation, land development and infrastructure, covering the costs of professional education, deductions in communal fees) by the authorities, regional and local institutions. Those obligations must be covered by formal and material action resources of the entity which makes the declaration of intent.

The primary function of the regional restructuring programs is to design and create institutions which will be capable (legally and financially) of managing the policy of development and restructuring the region on their own responsibility and funds. Such institutions must have legal authorization for capital trade (accumulating resources and disposing of them). The composition of bodies which manage those institution should be consistent with the structure of the start-up capital and should represent the structure of the main social forces in the region.

For regions with specific needs, solutions should vary. However, an organizational model was elaborated in the course of actions taken so far, which can be used in most regions. It includes:

- an entity representing the most important actors of the regional scene: government administration, bodies of local self-government, employers and employees, and also local scientific community. This body can have the form of regional council (which is an advisor to the voivod), or a regional council/committee, which at the same would be the board of a capital institution, established at the same time;
- a capital institution (fund, foundation, consortium or agency) with legal capacity to accumulate and distribute resources designated for the support of the development and restructuring of economy in the region. Such institutions can partly fill the system gap, created by the lack of a full-fledged and public institution of regional policy on the voivodship level.

Central resources, which support regional restructuring and development programs will be directed first to those voivodships which are considered priority regions in the program documents of the government (medium-term and annual plans). The preparation of voivodship (regional) restructuring and development programs and the establishment of regional policy institutions, capable of capital trade, will be considered a condition to support the voivodship (region) with central resources in a manner which would enable disposing of the received funds on the basis of decisions of the appropriate institutions.

\* \* \*

In view of the presented diagnostic materials, the increase of state's activity in the area of regional development appears to be no more the alternative, but a fully justified necessity. Especially that regional development contributes to the harmonization of transformation activities in the Polish economy and makes it possible to alleviate social results of this transformation. Creating conditions for effective activity in local environment, in voivodships and among voivodships may become an important factor which would change currently dominating claim-biased approach to partnership.

The assumption made in this paper is that such conditions may and should be created within the existing constitutional framework, principles of territorial organization of the country and that they should take into consideration the existing financial resources allocated to regional development.

The proposed solutions comply with (and even underline) a general principle of effective spending of public resources. An approval of "Rules for regional policy of the state" will not infringe constitutional order, distribution of authority between the state administration and self-government entities or budgetary discipline. The "Rules" can be thus implemented still in 1994. Meanwhile, simultaneous works should be assumed to develop and specify these elements of the "Rules" which are recommended for the following years.

## GEMINI PUBLICATION SERIES

### GEMINI Working Papers:

1. "Growth and Equity through Microenterprise Investments and Institutions Project (GEMINI): Overview of the Project and Implementation Plan, October 1, 1989-September 30, 1990." GEMINI Working Paper No. 1. December 1989. [not for general circulation]
- \*2. "The Dynamics of Small-Scale Industry in Africa and the Role of Policy." Carl Liedholm. GEMINI Working Paper No. 2. January 1990. \$5.50
3. "Prospects for Enhancing the Performance of Micro- and Small-Scale Nonfarm Enterprises in Niger." Donald C. Mead, Thomas Dichter, Yacob Fisseha, and Steven Haggblade. GEMINI Working Paper No. 3. February 1990. \$6.00
4. "Agenda Paper: Seminar on the Private Sector in the Sahel, Abidjan, July 1990." William Grant. GEMINI Working Paper No. 4. August 1990. \$3.00
- \*5. "Gender and the Growth and Dynamics of Microenterprises." Jeanne Downing. GEMINI Working Paper No. 5. October 1990. \$10.50
6. "Banking on the Rural Poor in Malaysia: Project Ikhtiar." David Lucock. GEMINI Working Paper No. 6. October 1990. \$3.30
7. "Options for Updating AskARIES." Larry Reed. GEMINI Working Paper No. 7. October 1990. \$3.50
- \*8. "Technology — The Key to Increasing the Productivity of Microenterprises." Andy Jeans, Eric Hyman, and Mike O'Donnell. GEMINI Working Paper No. 8. November 1990. \$3.60
9. "Lesotho Small and Microenterprise Strategy — Phase II: Subsector Analysis." Bill Grant. GEMINI Working Paper No. 9. November 1990. \$15.50
- \*10. "A Subsector Approach to Small Enterprise Promotion and Research." James J. Boomgard, Stephen P. Davies, Steven J. Haggblade, and Donald C. Mead. GEMINI Working Paper No. 10. January 1991. \$3.10
11. "Data Collection Strategies for Small-Scale Industry Surveys." Carl Liedholm. GEMINI Working Paper No. 11. January 1991. \$1.30

---

\*Publications of general interest

112

12. "Dynamics of Microenterprises: Research Issues and Approaches." Carl Liedholm and Donald C. Mead. GEMINI Working Paper No. 12. January 1991. \$6.50
13. "Dynamics of Microenterprises: Research Priorities and Research Plan." Carl Liedholm and Donald C. Mead. GEMINI Working Paper No. 13. August 1990. [not for general circulation]
14. "Review of Year One Activities (October 1, 1989 to September 30, 1990) and Year Two Work Plan (October 1 to November 30, 1990)." GEMINI Working Paper No. 14. January 1991. [not for general circulation]
- \*15. "The Process of Institutional Development: Assisting Small Enterprise Institutions to Become More Effective." Elaine Edgcomb and James Cawley. GEMINI Working Paper No. 15. February 1991. \$9.70
16. "Baseline Surveys of Micro and Small Enterprises: An Overview." Donald C. Mead, Yacob Fisseha, and Michael McPherson. GEMINI Working Paper No. 16. March 1991. \$2.60
17. "Kenya: Kibera's Small Enterprise Sector — Baseline Survey Report." Joan Parker and C. Aleke Dondo. GEMINI Working Paper No. 17. April 1991. \$6.40
- \*18. "A Financial Systems Approach to Microenterprises." Elisabeth Rhyne and Maria Otero. GEMINI Working Paper No. 18. April 1991. \$3.00
- \*19. "Agriculture, Rural Labor Markets, and the Evolution of the Rural Nonfarm Economy." Steve Haggblade and Carl Liedholm. GEMINI Working Paper No. 19. May 1991. \$2.50
- \*20. "The Microenterprise Finance Institutions of Indonesia and Their Implications for Donors." Elisabeth Rhyne. GEMINI Working Paper No. 20. June 1991. \$3.40
21. "Microenterprise Growth Dynamics in the Dominican Republic: The ADEMI Case." Frank F. Rubio. GEMINI Working Paper No. 21. June 1991. \$3.10
- \*22. "Credit Unions: A Formal Sector Alternative for Financing Microenterprise Development." John H. Magill. GEMINI Working Paper No. 22. September 1991. \$3.80
23. "A Proposed Subsector-Based Monitoring and Evaluation System for CARE/Thailand's Silk Promotion Efforts." Steven Haggblade. GEMINI Working Paper No. 23. September 1991. \$3.60
24. "Steps to the Creation of a Viable Financial Institution for Microenterprise Development in the Philippines: Notes on a Process for the Staff and Board of Tulay sa Pag-Unlad, Inc." Doug Salloum and Nan Borton. GEMINI Working Paper No. 24. November 1991. \$2.00
- \*25. "Village Banking: A Cross-Country Study of a Community-Based Lending Methodology." Sharon L. Holt. GEMINI Working Paper No. 25. December 1991. \$12.60
26. "Dynamics of Small- and Micro-scale Enterprises and the Evolving Role of Finance." Carl Liedholm. GEMINI Working Paper No. 26. December 1991. \$3.00
- \*27. "Opportunities for Intervention in Thailand's Silk Subsector." Steven Haggblade and Nick Ritchie. GEMINI Working Paper No. 27. January 1992. \$3.20

43

- \*28. "Apex Study of the Asociación de Grupos Solidarios de Colombia." Arelis Gomez Alfonso, with Nan Borton and Carlos Castello. GEMINI Working Paper No. 28. April 1992. \$4.60. [See Technical Reports No. 36 and No. 39 for apex studies in Senegal and Thailand.]
29. "The Subsector Methodology, A Field Orientation for CARE/Egypt, January 20-February 7, 1992." William Grant. GEMINI Working Paper No. 29. April 1992. \$9.50
30. "Poverty Lending and Microenterprise Development: A Clarification of the Issues." Mohini Malhotra. GEMINI Working Paper No. 30. May 1992. \$3.60
31. "The Solidarity Group Experience." Shari Berenbach and Diego Guzman. GEMINI Working Paper No. 31. June 1992. \$5.80
32. "A New View of Finance Program Evaluation." Elisabeth Rhyne. GEMINI Working Paper No. 32. November 1992. \$1.50
33. "The Role of Savings in Local Financial Markets: The Indonesian Experience." Marguerite S. Robinson. GEMINI Working Paper No. 33. November 1992. \$3.50
34. "Assessment of Policy Issues and Constraints in the Construction Sector in Poland." Adam Saffer, Mirosław Zielinski, Jerzy Zielinski, Tadeusz Marek, and Matthew Gamser. GEMINI Working Paper No. 34. February 1993. \$5.20
35. "BancoSol: A Private Commercial Bank. A Case Study in Profitable Microenterprise Development in Bolivia." Amy J. Glosser. GEMINI Working Paper No. 35. February 1993. \$8.60
36. "The Structure and Growth of Microenterprise in Southern and Eastern Africa: Evidence from Recent Surveys." Carl Liedholm and Donald Mead. GEMINI Working Paper No. 36. March 1993. \$5.60
37. "Transformation Lending: Helping Microenterprises Become Small Businesses." Larry Reed and David Befus. GEMINI Working Paper No. 37. April 1993. \$4.80
38. "Should Principles of Regulation and Prudential Supervision be Different for Microenterprise Finance Organizations?" Rodrigo A. Chaves and Claudio Gonzalez-Vega. GEMINI Working Paper No. 38. April 1993. \$3.40
39. "Application of the GEMINI Methodology for Subsector Analysis to MSE Export Activities: A Case Study in Ecuador." Gary D. Kilmer. GEMINI Working Paper No. 39. June 1993. \$2.80
40. "Private Business Organizations and the Legislative Process." Tom Gray. GEMINI Working Paper No. 40. July 1993. \$4.20
41. "Financial Institutions Development Project in Indonesia: Developing Financial Institutions to Serve Small Enterprises." Roland Pearson and Dallas Garland. GEMINI Working Paper No. 41. July 1993. \$13.90
42. "Review of Years 1-3 Activities and Workplan for Years 4 and 5 (December 1, 1991 to November 30, 1992)." GEMINI Working Paper No. 42. June 1993. [not for general circulation]
- \*43. "CARE and Subsector Analysis: A Report on CARE's Formative Experience." Marshall Bear. GEMINI Working Paper No. 43. October 1993. \$2.00

44. "Small and Medium Enterprise Development: A National Assessment of the Agroindustry Sector of Poland." GEMINI Working Paper No. 44. Volume One, technical report; Volume Two, annexes. George L. Metcalfe and Debra Wahlberg. January 1993. \$37.80
45. "FondoMicro: Lessons on the Role of Second-Tier Financial Institutions in MSE Development." Mohini Malhotra. GEMINI Working Paper No. 45. February 1994. \$1.40
46. "Methodology for Microenterprise Strategy Design in the Sahel." William Grant and Matthew Gamser. GEMINI Working Paper No. 46. February 1994. \$3.00
47. "Bridging the Gap between Equity and Impact: A Subsector Approach to Export Promotion in Ecuador." John Magill. GEMINI Working Paper No. 47. April 1994. \$3.00
48. "Structure and Growth of Small Enterprises in the Forest-Products Sector in Southern and Eastern Africa." J.E.M. Arnold and I.M. Townson (Oxford Forestry Institute), and C. Liedholm and D. Mead (Michigan State University). GEMINI Working Paper No. 48. September 1994. \$6.20
- \*49. "Toward More Cost-effective Nonfinancial Assistance: Case Studies in Subsector-based MSE Development." Mohini Malhotra and Jennifer Santer. GEMINI Working Paper No. 49. October 1994. \$3.60
- \*50. "Business Linkages in Zimbabwe: Concept, Practice, and Strategies." John P. Grierson and Donald C. Mead. GEMINI Working Paper No. 50. May 1995. \$2.00
51. "Review of Year Five Activities (December 1, 1993-September 30, 1994) and Year Six Workplan (October 1, 1994-September 30, 1995)." GEMINI Working Paper No. 51. December 1994. [not for general circulation]

#### **GEMINI Technical Reports:**

1. "Jamaica Microenterprise Development Project: Technical, Administrative, Economic, and Financial Analyses." Paul Guenette, Surendra K. Gupta, Katherine Stearns, and James Boomgard. GEMINI Technical Report No. 1. June 1990. [not for general circulation]
2. "Bangladesh Women's Enterprise Development Project: PID Excerpts and Background Papers." Shari Berenbach, Katherine Stearns, and Syed M. Hashemi. GEMINI Technical Report No. 2. October 1990. [not for general circulation]
3. "Maroc: Conception d'une Enquête pour une Etude du Secteur Informel." Eric R. Nelson and Housni El Ghazi. GEMINI Technical Report No. 3. November 1990. \$12.50
4. "Small Enterprise Assistance Project II in the Eastern Caribbean: Project Paper." James Cotter, Bruce Tippet, and Danielle Heinen. GEMINI Technical Report No. 4. October 1990. [not for general circulation]
5. "Technical Assessment: Rural Small-Scale Enterprise Pilot Credit Activity in Egypt." John W. Gardner and Jack E. Proctor. GEMINI Technical Report No. 5. October 1990. \$4.00
- \*6. "Developing Financial Services for Microenterprises: An Evaluation of USAID Assistance to the BRI Unit Desa System in Indonesia." James J. Boomgard and Kenneth J. Angell. GEMINI Technical Report No. 6. October 1990. \$9.00

7. "A Review of the Indigenous Small Scale Enterprises Sector in Swaziland." David A. Schrier. GEMINI Technical Report No. 7. October 1990. [not for general circulation]
8. "Ecuador Micro-Enterprise Sector Assessment: Summary Report." John H. Magill and Donald A. Swanson. GEMINI Technical Report No. 8. April 1991. \$10.20
9. "Ecuador Micro-Enterprise Sector Assessment: Financial Markets and the Micro- and Small-scale Enterprise Sector." Richard Meyer, John Porges, Martha Rose, and Jean Gilson. GEMINI Technical Report No. 9. March 1991. \$16.00
10. "Ecuador Micro-Enterprise Sector Assessment: Policy Framework." Bruce H. Herrick, Gustavo A. Marquez, and Joseph F. Burke. GEMINI Technical Report No. 10. March 1991. \$11.30
11. "Ecuador Micro-Enterprise Sector Assessment: Institutional Analysis." Peter H. Fraser, Arelis Gomez Alfonso, Miguel A. Rivarola, Donald A. Swanson, and Fernando Cruz-Villalba. GEMINI Technical Report No. 11. March 1991. \$25.00
12. "Ecuador Micro-Enterprise Sector Assessment: Key Characteristics of the Micro-Enterprise Sector." John H. Magill, Robert Blaney, Joseph F. Burke, Rae Blumberg, and Jennifer Santer. GEMINI Technical Report No. 12. March 1991. \$19.60
13. "A Monitoring and Evaluation System for Peace Corps' Small Business Development Program." David M. Callihan. GEMINI Technical Report No. 13. [not available for general circulation]
14. "Small-Scale Enterprises in Lesotho: Summary of a Country-Wide Survey." Yacob Fisseha. GEMINI Technical Report No. 14. February 1991. \$6.40
- \*15. "An Evaluation of the Institutional Aspects of Financial Institutions Development Project, Phase I in Indonesia." John F. Gadway, Tantri M. H. Gadway, and Jacob Sardi. GEMINI Technical Report No. 15. March 1991. \$8.80
- \*16. "Small-Scale Enterprises in Mamelodi and Kwazakhele Townships, South Africa: Survey Findings." Carl Liedholm and Michael A. McPherson. GEMINI Technical Report No. 16. March 1991. \$4.60
17. "Growth and Change in Malawi's Small and Medium Enterprise Sector." Michael A. McPherson. GEMINI Technical Report No. 17. June 1991. \$2.20
18. "Burkina Faso Microenterprise Sector Assessment and Strategy." William Grant, Matthew Gamser, Jim Herne, Karen McKay, Abdoulaye Sow, and Sibry Jean-Marie Tapsoba. GEMINI Technical Report No. 18. August 1991. Volume One, Main Report, \$7.60; Volume Two, Annexes, \$14.20
- \*19. "Women in the BPD and Unit Desa Financial Services Programs: Lessons from Two Impact Studies in Indonesia." Sharon L. Holt. GEMINI Technical Report No. 19. September 1991. \$3.80
20. "Mali Microenterprise Sector Assessment and Strategy." William Grant, Kim Aldridge, James Bell, Ann Duval, Maria Keita, and Steve Haggblade. GEMINI Technical Report No. 20. October 1991. Volume One, Main Report, \$6.70; Volume Two, Annexes, \$13.00
21. "A Microenterprise Sector Assessment and Development Strategy for A.I.D. in Zambia." Eric L. Hyman, Robert Strauss, and Richard Crayne. GEMINI Technical Report No. 21. November 1991. \$10.00

46

22. "Bangladesh: Women's Enterprise Development Project Paper." GEMINI Technical Report No. 22. August 1991. [not for general circulation]
23. "Peru: Small Business and Employment Expansion Project Paper." GEMINI Technical Report No. 23. November 1991. [not for general circulation]
24. "A Country-wide Study of Small-Scale Enterprises in Swaziland." Yacob Fisseha and Michael A. McPherson. GEMINI Technical Report No. 24. December 1991. \$5.40
- \*25. "Micro and Small-Scale Enterprises in Zimbabwe: Results of a Country-wide Survey." Michael A. McPherson. GEMINI Technical Report No. 25. December 1991. \$5.00
26. "The Development Impact of Financing the Smallest Enterprises in Indonesia." GEMINI Technical Report No. 26. January 1992. [not for general circulation]
27. "Midterm Evaluation of the ASEPDE Component of the Small Business II Project, Honduras." Arelis Gomez Alfonso, Wesley Boles, and Donald L. Richardson. GEMINI Technical Report No. 27. February 1992. \$5.80. Also available in Spanish.
28. "Midterm Evaluation of the ANDI/PYME Component of the Small Business II Project, Honduras." Arelis Gomez Alfonso, Wesley Boles, and Donald L. Richardson. GEMINI Technical Report No. 28. February 1992. \$6.60. Also available in Spanish.
29. "The Role of Financial Institutions in the Promotion of Micro and Small Enterprises in Burkina Faso." John McKenzie. GEMINI Technical Report No. 29. February 1992. \$10.40
30. "Small and Micro Enterprise Development Project No. 262-0212, Egypt. Midterm Evaluation." Katherine Stearns. GEMINI Technical Report No. 30. March 1992. \$7.60
31. "A Review of the Prospects for Rural Financial Development in Bolivia." James J. Boomgard, James Kern, Calvin Miller, and Richard H. Patten. GEMINI Technical Report No. 31. March 1992. \$4.60
32. "The Role of Private Sector Advocacy Groups in the Sahel." William Grant. GEMINI Technical Report No. 32. March 1992. \$2.40
- \*33. "Access to Credit for Poor Women: A Scale-up Study of Projects Carried Out by Freedom from Hunger in Mali and Ghana." Jeffrey Ashe, Madeline Hirschland, Jill Burnett, Kathleen Stack, Marcy Eiland, and Mark Gizzi. GEMINI Technical Report No. 33. March 1992. \$11.80
- \*34. "Egyptian Women and Microenterprise: the Invisible Entrepreneurs." C. Jean Weidemann. GEMINI Technical Report No. 34. March 1992. \$11.20
- \*35. "A Pre-Project Identification Document Analysis of the Lesotho Agricultural Enterprise Initiatives Project." Mike Bess, Don Henry, Donald Mead, and Eugene Miller. GEMINI Technical Report No. 35. April 1992. \$20.00
36. "Apex Study of the Small Enterprise Development Program of Catholic Relief Services, Senegal." Arelis Gomez Alfonso. GEMINI Technical Report No. 36. May 1992. \$3.00
37. "The Private Operators' Perspective on an Agenda for Action," Dakar, Senegal, November 22-25, 1991. A Seminar on the Private Sector in West Africa. Organized by the Senegalese National Employers'

Union (CNP), the Club du Sahel, CILSS and USAID. GEMINI Technical Report No. 37. May 1992. \$7.00

38. "Background Documents to the Seminar on the Private Sector in West Africa," Dakar, Senegal. November 22-25, 1991. GEMINI Technical Report No. 38. May 1992. \$5.00

39. "Apex Study of the Small Enterprise Development Program of Catholic Relief Services, Thailand." Arelis Gomez Alfonso. GEMINI Technical Report No. 39. May 1992. \$3.20

40. "Study of Informal Cross-border Trade, Poland." SMG-KRC/Poland. GEMINI Technical Report No. 40. May 1992. \$3.20

41. "Study of the Informal Commercial Sector, Poland." SMG/KRC Poland. GEMINI Technical Report No. 41. May 1992. \$4.20

42. "Evaluation of the Micro and Small Enterprise Development Project (MSED) in Bolivia." William Fisher, Jeffrey Poyo, and Ann Beasley. GEMINI Technical Report No. 42. June 1992. \$10.60. Also available in Spanish.

43. "Analysis of Funding Mechanisms for the Small and Micro Enterprise Development Project, Egypt." Kenneth J. Angell and John M. Porges. GEMINI Technical Report No. 43. June 1992. \$3.80

44. "Get Ahead Foundation Credit Programs in South Africa: The Effects of Loans on Client Enterprises." Jennefer Sebstad. GEMINI Technical Report No. 44. June 1992. \$3.00

45. "Get Ahead Foundation in South Africa: Final Evaluation." Robert Christen, Elisabeth Rhyne, Doug Salloum, and Jennefer Sebstad. GEMINI Technical Report No. 45. June 1992. [not for general circulation]

46. "Micro- and Small-Scale Enterprises in Botswana: Results of a Nationwide Survey." Lisa Daniels and Yacob Fisseha. GEMINI Technical Report No. 46. August 1992. \$9.40

\*47. "The Growth and Dynamics of Women Entrepreneurs in Southern Africa." Jeanne Downing and Lisa Daniels. GEMINI Technical Report No. 47. August 1992. \$3.10

48. "Small Business Development Programming Trip: Peace Corps/Albania and the Office of Training and Program Support, Small Business Development Sector." Lauren Spurrier and Wesley Weidemann. GEMINI Technical Report No. 48. October 1992. \$6.00

49a. "Small Enterprise Development in the Russian Far East." Martha Blaxall, Yasuo Konishi, Virginia Lambert, Jennifer Santer, and Timothy Smith. GEMINI Technical Report No. 49a. October 1992. \$12.00

49b. "Supporting Private Enterprises in Uzbekistan: Challenges and Opportunities." Nan Borton, John Magill, Neal Nathanson, and Jim Packard Winkler. GEMINI Technical Report No. 49b. November 1992. \$5.60

49c. "Assessing the Prospects for Small Enterprise Development in Kazakhstan." Kenneth Angell, James J. Boomgard, Mohini Malhotra, and Robert A. Rodriguez. GEMINI Technical Report No. 49c. December 1992. \$3.90

48

- 49d. "Small Enterprise Development in Ukraine." Dennis De Santis, Jean Gilson, Max Goldensohn, Jennifer Santer, and Timothy Smith. GEMINI Technical Report No. 49d. December 1992. \$8.10
- \*50. "Skins and Hides in Four Countries in Africa: The Potential Role for Micro- and Small-Scale Enterprise Development." William Grant. GEMINI Technical Report No. 50. November 1992. \$3.00. Also available in French.
- 51a. "Morocco: Assessment of Programming Options for Microenterprise Development." Housni El Ghazi, Sheila Reines, Steve Silcox, Katherine Stearns, and Matthew Gamser. GEMINI Technical Report No. 51a. November 1992. [not for general circulation]
- 51b. "USAID/Morocco: Assessment of Programming Options for Microenterprise Development. Report on Workshop and Field Investigations." Matt Gamser, Housni El Ghazi, Sheila Reines, Steve Silcox, and Katherine Stearns. GEMINI Technical Report No. 51b. December 1992. Also in French. [not for general circulation]
52. "Small Enterprise Development in Armenia: Programming Recommendations for Peace Corps Volunteers." Timothy J. Smith. GEMINI Technical Report No. 52. July 1992. \$2.20
53. "Results of a Nationwide Survey on Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises in Malawi." Lisa Daniels and Austin Ngwira. GEMINI Technical Report No. 53. January 1993. \$11.80
- \*54a. "A Review of Donor-Funded Projects in Support of Micro- and Small-Scale Enterprises in West Africa." William Grant. GEMINI Technical Report No. 54a. February 1993. \$18.80
- \*54b. "A Review of Donor-Funded Projects in Support of Micro- and Small-Scale Enterprises in West Africa: Case Studies." William Grant. GEMINI Technical Report No. 54b. March 1993. \$15.60
55. "Business Linkages and Enterprise Development in Zimbabwe." Donald C. Mead and Peter Kunjeku. GEMINI Technical Report No. 55. April 1993. \$3.40
56. "End of Project Evaluation, Enterprise Development Project, Bangladesh." Mohini Malhotra, John Magill, and James Packard-Winkler, with the assistance of M.M. Nurul Haque. GEMINI Technical Report No. 56. April 1993. \$19.20
57. "Small Business Development Support Project in South Africa: Concept Paper." Richard Betz, Ian Clark, Matthew Gamser, Juneas Lekgetha, Jacob Levitsky, Neal Nathanson, Sango Ntsaluba, and Barney Tsita. GEMINI Technical Report No. 57. June 1993. [not for general circulation]
58. "Attitudes and Practices of Credit Union Members and Non-Members in Malawi and Grenada: Synthesis Report." John Magill. GEMINI Technical Report No. 58. November 1993. \$5.00
59. "Midterm Evaluation of the Microenterprise Development Project in Jamaica." Surendra K. Gupta and Mario D. Davalos, with assistance from Marcia Hextall. GEMINI Technical Report No. 59. September 1993. \$13.80
60. "Investing in the Future: Report of the Task Force for Small and Medium Enterprise in Poland." GEMINI Technical Report No. 60. May 1993. \$13.00

61. "New Competitiveness and New Enterprises in Peru: Small Businesses in an Internationalized Economy." Fidel Castro Zambrano and Ernesto Kritz. GEMINI Technical Report No. 61. August 1993. \$11.80. Also available in Spanish (\$13.20).
62. "Principles for Effective Design and Management of Small Business Development Centers." Jennifer Santer, Neal Nathanson, Steve Thalheimer, and Anita Campion. GEMINI Technical Report No. 62. October 1993. \$13.60
63. "Mongolia: Options and Strategies for Small- and Medium-Scale Enterprise Development." John Magill, Clara Lipson, and Michael McKone. GEMINI Technical Report No. 63. November 1993. [not for general circulation]
64. "Credit Unions and Microenterprises: The WOCCU Perspective." World Council of Credit Unions. GEMINI Technical Report No. 64. December 1993. \$4.00
65. "Strategic Option Paper for Malawi Small Enterprise Support Institutions." Stephen C. Silcox, Anicca Jansen, and Mark Baughan. GEMINI Technical Report No. 65. January 1994. \$9.20
66. "Integration of Gender into GEMINI." Catherine R. Neill and Olaf Kula. GEMINI Technical Report No. 66. January 1994. \$9.80
67. "A Training Program for Microenterprise Lending Agencies in Jamaica." Mohini Malhotra, with assistance from David Logan and Valerie Tate. GEMINI Technical Report No. 67. January 1994. \$3.60
68. "Study of the Financial Sector and SME Development in Poland." Bruce Heatly, Cynthia Lynn Chrzan-Lanigan, and Cathy Silverstein. GEMINI Technical Report No. 68. February 1994. Volume One: Main Report \$5.00; Volume Two: Appendices \$25.20
69. "Private Sector Business Associations in South Africa and Zambia: Advocacy for SMEs." Kenneth Angell. GEMINI Technical Report No. 69. March 1994. \$4.80
70. "A Dynamic Study of Jamaican Micro- and Small-Scale Enterprises." Yacob Fisseha. GEMINI Technical Report No. 70. March 1994. \$3.40
71. "Changes in the Small-scale Enterprise Sector from 1991 to 1993: Results of a Second Nationwide Survey in Zimbabwe." Lisa Daniels. GEMINI Technical Report No. 71. March 1994. \$11.80
72. "The Contribution of Small Enterprises to Employment Growth in Southern Africa." Donald C. Mead. GEMINI Technical Report No. 72. March 1994. \$2.80
73. "Small Enterprise Development in Poland: Does Gender Matter?" C. Jean Weidemann and Carol Finnegan. GEMINI Technical Report No. 73. March 1994. \$6.80
74. "Slovakia Small Business Assessment." Tony Barclay and Bruce Heatly. GEMINI Technical Report No. 74. March 1994. \$6.60
75. "Micro- and Small-Scale Enterprises in Kenya: Results of the 1993 National Baseline Survey." Joan C. Parker with Tanya R. Torres. GEMINI Technical Report No. 75. March 1994. \$12.00
76. "Measuring Socioeconomic Impact of Credit on SMI: Assessment of the Monitoring System Used by the Alexandria Businessmen's Association, Egypt." Linda Oldham and others. GEMINI Technical Report No. 76. May 1994. \$12.20

77. "The Kenya Rural Enterprise Programme under Cooperative Agreement No. AID-615-0238-A-00-7026-00: A Final Evaluation." Catherine Neill, Mario Davalos, Washington Kiiru, M. Manundu, and Jennefer Sebstad. GEMINI Technical Report No. 77. September 1994. \$17.60
78. "Summary Report on the Polish Delegation's Tour of Small Business Assistance Organizations in the United States." Adam P. Saffer. GEMINI Technical Report No. 78. September 1994. \$5.00
79. "Mongolian Chamber of Commerce and Industry Study Tour: U.S. Business Associations and Services." Tom Gray. GEMINI Technical Report No. 79. September 1994. \$4.60
80. "Morocco Microenterprise Finance Concept Paper." Jim Kern, Emile Salou, Housni El Ghazi, and Matthew Gamsler. GEMINI Technical Report No. 80. March 1995. \$8.00. [not for general distribution]
- \*81. "The USAID Microenterprise Initiative in Sri Lanka." David A. Lucock, Wesley J. Weidemann, J. Charitha Ratwatte, and Mahinda Gunasekera. GEMINI Technical Report No. 81. April 1995. \$9.60
- \*82. "Stimulating the Growth and Development of Small and Medium Size Enterprises through Financial Sector Policy Reform." Malcolm Toland, Adam P. Saffer, and Bruce Heatly. GEMINI Technical Report No. 82. March 1995. \$10.20
83. "Review of the Covelo Foundation in Honduras and the Organizations it Supports." Robin Bell and Bruce Heatly. GEMINI Technical Report No. 83. March 1995. \$7.60
84. "Proposed Small and Microenterprise Program Activities for USAID in Hungary: the GEORGETTE Project." Neal Nathanson. GEMINI Technical Report No. 84. August 1995. \$7.60
85. "Zimbabwe: Financial Sector Assessment." Robin R. Bell, Team Leader, Geoffrey Peters, and Mehlo Ndiweni. GEMINI Technical Report No. 85. August 1995. \$5.30
86. "Membership Survey of Dominica Cooperative Credit Union League." Olaf Kula and Melissa Punch. GEMINI Technical Report No. 86. August 1995. \$6.20
87. "The Art of Lobbying in Poland." Daniel R. Mastromarco, Adam P. Saffer, and Miroslaw Zielinski. GEMINI Technical Report No. 87. September 1995. \$10.80
88. "Lessons Learned from Small and Medium Size Enterprise-Related Regional Development Programs in Poland". Adam P. Saffer, Malcolm Toland, and Daniel Wagner. GEMINI Technical Report No. 88. September 1995. \$4.40

**Technical Notes:**

**Financial Assistance to Microenterprise Section:**

- \*1. Series Notebook: "Tools for Microenterprise Programs" (a three-ring binder, 1 and 1/2 inches in diameter, for organizing technical notes and training materials) and "Methods for Managing Delinquency" by Katherine Stearns. April 1991. \$7.50. Also available in Spanish and in French.
- \*2. "Interest Rates and Self-Sufficiency." Katherine Stearns. December 1991. \$6.50. Also available in Spanish and in French.

\*3. "Financial Services for Women." C. Jean Weidemann. March 1992. \$5.00. Also available in Spanish and in French.

\*4. "Designing for Financial Viability of Microenterprise Programs." Charles Waterfield. March 1993. \$10.00 with diskette. Also available in Spanish and in French.

\*5. "Monetary Incentive Schemes for Staff." Katherine Stearns, ACCION International. April 1993. \$3.80. Also available in Spanish and in French.

\*6. "Fundamentals of Accounting for Microcredit Programs." Margaret Bartel, Michael J. McCord, and Robin R. Bell. December 1994. \$6.30

\*7. "Financial Management Ratios I: Analyzing Profitability in Microcredit Programs." Margaret Bartel, Michael J. McCord, and Robin R. Bell. February 1995. \$5.90

\*8. "Financial Management Ratios II: Analyzing for Quality and Soundness in Microcredit Programs." Margaret Bartel, Michael J. McCord, and Robin R. Bell. February 1995. \$6.30

#### **Nonfinancial Assistance to Microenterprise Section:**

\*1. "A Field Manual for Subsector Practitioners." Steven J. Haggblade and Matthew Gamser. November 1991. \$4.65. Also available in Spanish and in French.

\*2. "Facilitator's Guide for Training in Subsector Analysis." Marshall A. Bear, Cathy Gibbons, Steven J. Haggblade, and Nick Ritchie. December 1992. \$35.00. Also available in Spanish and in French.

\*3. "Management Information Systems for Microenterprise Development Programs." Mark King and Charles Waterfield. January 1995. \$6.50.

#### **Field Research Section:**

\*1. "A Manual for Conducting Baseline Surveys of Micro- and Small-scale Enterprises." Michael A. McPherson and Joan C. Parker. February 1993. \$13.60. Also available in Spanish and in French.

#### **Special Publications:**

\*1. "GEMINI in a Nutshell: Abstracts of Selected Publications." Compiled by Eugenia Carey and Michael McCord. Special Publication No. 1. 1993. \$10.00

\*2. "GEMINI in a Nutshell II: Abstracts of Selected Publications." Compiled by Eugenia Carey and Linda Rotblatt. Special Publication No. 2. 1995. \$14.60

---

Copies of publications available for circulation can be obtained from PACT Publications, 777 United Nations Plaza, Sixth Floor, New York, NY, 10017, U.S.A.

9/95

50