In the years 2014-2020 tourism was included in the Regional Operational Programs. The article presents the diversity of the use of EU funds for tourism in Eastern Poland. In all voivodships, both in terms of the number of projects and their values, projects in the field of culture (cultural heritage, cultural institutions, cultural events) definitely dominated. They constituted over 50% of the total number of all projects and 65% of their total value.

**Materials and methods:** The information base was data on projects co-financed from EU funds, collected in the National Information System (KSI SIMIK 2014-2020).

**Results:** In all voivodships, both in terms of the number of projects and their values, projects in the field of culture (cultural heritage, cultural institutions, cultural events) definitely dominated. They constituted over 50% of the total number of all projects and 65% of their total value.

**Conclusions:** In the years 2014-2020 tourism was included in the Regional Operational Programs methodologically, which impacted on the nature of implemented projects. Between them dominated projects related to the modernization and preservation of tourism resources, especially cultural projects.
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**Streszczenie**

Przedmiot i cel pracy: W artykule zaprezentowano zróżnicowanie wykorzystania funduszy unijnych na cele turystyczne w Polsce regionie Polski Wschodniej w latach 2014–2020. Skoncentrowano się na wskazaniu regionalnego zróżnicowania struktury wielkościowej i rodzajowej projektów.

Materiały i metody: Baza informacyjna stanowiły dane dotyczące projektów współfinansowanych ze środków UE, zgromadzone w Krajowym Systemie Informatycznym (KSI SIMIK 2014-2020) według standardów regionalnego zróżnicowania struktury wielkościowej i rodzajowej projektów.

 Wyniki: We wszystkich województwach, zarówno w odniesieniu do liczby projektów jak i ich wartości, dwie grupy projektów dominowały, które zdecydowanie dominowały projekt w zakresie kultury (dziedzictwa kulturowego, instytucji kultury, wydarzenia kulturalne). Stanowiły one ponad 50% ogólnej liczby wszystkich projektów oraz 65% ich wartości całkowitej.

Wnioski: W latach 2014-2020 turystyka została ujęta w RPO w sposób pośredni co przyczyniło się do zróżnicowania turystyki w latach 2014-2020 w wielu województwach, które domniemane są zmodernizowane w kształceniu zasobów turystycznych, zwłaszcza kulturowych, a nie ze sposobami ich wykorzystania w kształtowaniu projektów turystycznych.

**Słowa kluczowe:** region Polski Wschodniej, fundusze unijne, projekty turystyczne
Introduction

Poland’s accession to the European Union opened up the tourism sector and entities involved in shaping the conditions for tourism development (territorial self-governments, tourist organizations and others) unknown perspectives, in particular the possibility of overcoming existing physical infrastructure problems. Access to structural funds in the period 2004-2006, and later in 2007-2013, enabled the creation and modernization of accommodation and catering facilities, as well as sports and recreation and cultural related infrastructure, which contributed to the improvement of tourist attractiveness of municipalities, towns and regions (Parzych, 2017). In 2007-2013, Regional Operational Programs (ROPs), which are the main source of funding for tourist projects in Poland, allocated EUR 2.77 billion (14% of the sum of ROP funds) for tourism and their main beneficiary were local self-government units (Panasiuk, 2016). Beneficiaries were large municipalities with a highly developed tourist function and municipalities with tourist resources, which seen tourism as a factor of improving residents’ quality of life. Tourism in this period has been included directly in four national programs (Innovative Economy Operational Programme, Development of Eastern Poland OP; Human Capital Operational Programme and Rural Development Programme for 2007-2013) and 16 Regional Operational Programs (ROPs), identifying directly the areas of tourism support and type of interventions. In the new programming period, covering the years 2014-2020, there have been changes in the process of supporting tourism development. Funding tourism interventions has been very limited, and tourism enterprises and organizations have the opportunity to apply for financial support not directly dedicated to the tourism sector (Panasiuk, 2016).

This paper is devoted to the use of EU funds in tourism development in the period 2014-2020, on the example of the macroregion of Eastern Poland, comprising Lublin, Podkarpackie, Podlaskie, Świętokrzyskie and Warmińsko-mazurskie voivodeships. This region, neighboring directly with Ukraine, Belarus and the Kaliningrad Oblast and at the same time being the external border of the European Union, is still one of the least developed (one of the lowest GDP per capita in the EU28) and least competitive regions in the European Union (Annoni P., Dijkstra L., 2013). But in comparison to the rest of the country, the macroregion stands out with large forest complexes, a high share of protected and natural areas, rural and cultural landscape (sacred monuments and multiculturalism), low density population and low level of industrialization and urbanization. Natural and cultural resources are the important factor in the development of tourism (Kozak, 2011), especially active tourism, rural tourism and agritourism. At the same time, the poorly developed physical infrastructure and organizational base of tourism limit the possibilities of tourism development.

Wstęp

Akcesja Polski do UE otworzyła branży turystycznej oraz podmiotom zaangażowanym w kształtowanie warunków rozwoju turystyki (samorządom terytorialnym, organizacjom turystycznym i innym) nieznane dotąd perspektywy, a w szczególności możliwość zniwelowania istniejących zaległości infrastrukturalnych. Dostęp do funduszy strukturalnych w latach 2004-2006, a później w latach 2007-2013, umożliwił budowę i modernizację bazy nodegowej i gastronomicznej, infrastruktury sportowo-rekreatywnej i kulturowej, co przyczyniło się jednocześnie do poprawy atrakcyjności turystycznej gmin, miasteczek i regionów (Parzych, 2017). W latach 2007-2013 w ramach Regionalnych Programów Operacyjnych (ROP), będących głównym źródłem finansowania projektów turystycznych w Polsce, przeznaczono na ten cel 2,77 mld EUR (14% sumy środków RPO) a ich głównym beneficjentem były jednostki samorządu lokalnego (Panasiuk, 2016). O środki unijne aplikowały gminy z silnie rozwiniętą funkcją turystyczną oraz gminy posiadające zasoby turystyczne, wymagające udostępnienia i aktywizacji, traktując turystykę jako czynnik sprzyjający poprawie jakości życia mieszkańców. Turystykę uwzględniono bezpośrednio w czterech programach krajowych (PO Innowacyjna Gospodarka, Program Rozwoju Polski Wschodniej, PO Kapitał Ludzki i PROW) i 16 RPO, identyfikując bezpośrednio obszary wsparcia i projekt. W nowym okresie programowania, obejmującym lata 2014-2020, nastąpiły zmiany w procesie wspierania rozwoju turystyki, finansowanie działań zostało ograniczone, a przedsiębiorstwom i organizacjom turystycznym pozostała możliwość ubiegania się o wsparcie finansowe na zasadach ogólnodostępnych, niededykowanych bezpośrednio gospodarce turystycznej (Panasiuk, 2016).

W pracy podjęto temat wsparcia rozwoju turystyki z funduszy europejskich w nowym okresie programowania (2014-2020) na przykładzie regionu Polski Wschodniej, obejmującego tego województwa: lubelskie, podlaskie, podkarpackie świętokrzyskie i warmińsko-mazurskie. Region ten, sąsiadujący bezpośrednio z Ukrainą, Białorusią i Obwodem Kaliningradzkim i będący jednocześnie wschodnią granicą UE, wciąż należy do najmniej rozwiniętych (jeden z najniższych PKB na mieszkańca w UE-28) i najmniej konkurencyjnych regionów w Unii Europejskiej (Annoni P., Dijkstra L, 2013). Jednak na tle kraju, makroregion wyróżnia się dużymi kompleksami leśnymi, wyso kim udziałem obszarów chronionych i cennych przyrodniczo, zachowanym krajobrazem wiejsko-kulturowym (zyzaki sakralne i wielokulturowość), niską gęstością zaludnienia oraz niskim poziomem uprzywędzienia i urbanizacji. Walory przyrodniczo-kulturowe stanowią istotny czynnik rozwoju turystyki (Kozak, 2011), w tym w szczególności turystyki aktywnej, turystyki wiejskiej i agroturystyki. Jednocześnie słabo rozwinięta baza materialna i organizacyjna na turystyki ograniczają możliwości rozwoju ruchu turystycznego.
Material and methodology

The aim of the study is to assess the use of EU funds for the development of tourism in Eastern Poland in 2014-2020, and in particular to try to answer the following questions:

1. What type of tourism projects were co-financed by the EU funds?
2. Are there significant differences between the voivodships of the Eastern Poland region in the way these funds are used?

Methodology applied in the present study encompasses the method of literature studies, documentation analysis (review of the project database), statistical methods (grouping, counting) and descriptive methods. The time scope of the research covered the years 2014-2020, and the research material was data from the Central Telecommunication System SL2014 database (for the years 2014-2018), updated 30 September 2018. System SL2014 enabled the extraction of tourism projects based on titles and descriptions projects included in the projects database. On this basis, the following projects were distinguished: strictly tourist projects, i.e. projects having the word “tourism” in the title or description; projects that do not include the word “tourism” in the title or description, but have the potential to directly influence on the tourist attractiveness of the region (e.g. related to accommodation, gastronomy, tourist information, etc.); projects with the potential for indirect impact on the tourist attractiveness of the region (e.g. projects in the field of culture, sport, entertainment, recreation, revitalization and creating strategies and plans for tourism development). The assess of projects was made according to their number, total costs, value of co-financing from European Union funds and the topic of projects.

Projects financed from the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) and Cohesion Fund (CF) were analyzed. However, the study did not include projects financed from the European Social Fund (ESF), the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) and the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF).

Financing tourism development from European funds in 2014-2020

The 2007-2013 period has been an important one for the recognition at the European institutional level of the role of Tourism in the EU economy. According to the analysis conducted as part of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU, 2007), the main source of funding for tourism-related projects were the Structural Funds and the Cohesion Fund. In Poland, in the financial perspective 2007-2013, tourism projects, co-financed from European Union funds, were implemented under the Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen Infrastructure and Environment OP, the Operational Program Development of Eastern Poland and sixteen
regional operational programs (ROPs). These funds were allocated to tourist and supplementary infrastructure as well as promotion, protection of natural and cultural heritage and revitalization of degraded areas.

In the 2014-2020, tourism has been pushed to the margins of EU funding, which was accompanied by a lack of business continuity (Bosiacki, Panasiuk, 2017). This was the result of provisions specified in key EU and national documents, i.e. Europe 2020 and the National Development Strategy 2020 - Active society, competitive economy, efficient state (NDS 2020), setting directions for Poland’s development until 2020. The new Europe strategy changed the EU approach to tourism, treating it as an area of competitiveness of EU enterprises and emphasizing its links with the development of entrepreneurship.

The Partnership Agreement (adopted by the European Commission on May 23, 2014), which is a document defining the strategy for intervention of European funds in the new perspective 2014-2020 in Poland, indicated four areas of support from European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF): promoting business environment and facilitating entrepreneurship and innovation, social cohesion and active labour market participation, network infrastructure for growth and jobs, environment and resource efficiency, described through 11 thematic objectives (TO). Tourism did not mention directly among the 11 thematic objectives and the priorities implementing them. However, tourism projects can be implemented under 5 selected thematic objectives, indirectly related to tourism, i.e.:

- Objective 2. Increasing the availability, degree of use and quality of information and communication technologies and digital solutions in relation to the inclusion of digital e-culture,
- Objective 3. Strengthening the competitiveness of small and medium-sized enterprises, the agricultural sector and the fisheries and aquaculture sector,
- Objective 4. Supporting the transition to a low-carbon economy in all sectors (pro-ecological measures, e.g. thermo-modernization, etc.),
- Objective 6. Preservation and protection of the natural environment and support for efficient resource management (increasing the efficiency of the use of natural and cultural resources and their preservation),
- Objective 7. Promoting sustainable transport and removing capacity shortages in the operation of the most important network instruments (including the creation of bicycle paths).

1 https://www.funduszeeuropejskie.2007-2013.gov.pl/dzialaniapromocyjne/Documents/Turystyka.pdf
2 European Commission. Europe 2020: Strategy for Smart, Sustainable and Inclusive Growth, European Commission, Brussels 2010.
3 European Commission. Europe 2020. Strategy for Smart, Sustainable and Inclusive Growth, European Commission, Brussels 2010.
4 European Commission. Europe 2020. Strategy for Smart, Sustainable and Inclusive Growth, European Commission, Brussels 2010.
5 European Commission. Europe 2020: Strategy for Smart, Sustainable and Inclusive Growth, European Commission, Brussels 2010.
6 European Commission. Europe 2020: Strategy for Smart, Sustainable and Inclusive Growth, European Commission, Brussels 2010.
7 European Commission. Europe 2020: Strategy for Smart, Sustainable and Inclusive Growth, European Commission, Brussels 2010.
8 https://www.funduszeeuropejskie.2007-2013.gov.pl/dzialaniapromocyjne/Documents/Turystyka.pdf
9 European Commission. Europe 2020: Strategy for Smart, Sustainable and Inclusive Growth, European Commission, Brussels 2010.
10 European Commission. Europe 2020: Strategy for Smart, Sustainable and Inclusive Growth, European Commission, Brussels 2010.
11 European Commission. Europe 2020: Strategy for Smart, Sustainable and Inclusive Growth, European Commission, Brussels 2010.
12 European Commission. Europe 2020: Strategy for Smart, Sustainable and Inclusive Growth, European Commission, Brussels 2010.
13 European Commission. Europe 2020: Strategy for Smart, Sustainable and Inclusive Growth, European Commission, Brussels 2010.
14 European Commission. Europe 2020: Strategy for Smart, Sustainable and Inclusive Growth, European Commission, Brussels 2010.
15 European Commission. Europe 2020: Strategy for Smart, Sustainable and Inclusive Growth, European Commission, Brussels 2010.
16 European Commission. Europe 2020: Strategy for Smart, Sustainable and Inclusive Growth, European Commission, Brussels 2010.
17 European Commission. Europe 2020: Strategy for Smart, Sustainable and Inclusive Growth, European Commission, Brussels 2010.
18 https://www.funduszeeuropejskie.2007-2013.gov.pl/dzialaniapromocyjne/Documents/Turystyka.pdf
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The system of operational programs developed in Poland based on the guidelines of the Partnership Agreement indicates five national programs, two supra-regional programs and 16 ROPs, under which there are possibilities of applying for grants for tourism development. These are:
- Infrastructure and Environment OP,
- Knowledge, Education and Development OP,
- Digital Poland OP,
- Intelligent Development OP,
- Development of Eastern Poland 2014–2020 OP,
- Rural Development Program 2014-2020,
- European Territorial Cooperation Operational Programs,
- 16 Regional OPs.

Regional Operational Programs of all voivodships remain the main source of support for tourist enterprises. According to A. Panasiuk research, priority axes in 16 voivodships do not mention tourism directly, as it was in the years 2007-2013. The place of tourism in the ROPs of Eastern Poland voivodships in the years 2014-2020 (priority axis and measures) is presented in Table 1. There is a clear lack of direct indication of tourism among the priority axes in the ROPs. The exception was the voivodship Lublin indicating nature tourism as an area of support from European funds under measure 7.3. In all voivodships, the protection of cultural heritage was displayed. For this reason, entities involved in the development of tourism (entrepreneurs, local government units) must look for opportunities to finance projects under other programs dedicated to other sectors of the economy.

Table 1. Tourism in Regional Operational Programs in five voivodships of Eastern Poland in 2014-2020

| Voivodship/ Województwo | Priority Axis/ Oś priorytetowa | Measures/ Działania |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|
| Lubelskie               | 7. Protection of cultural and natural heritage/Ochrona dziedzictwa kulturowego i naturalnego | 7.2. Protection of natural diversity/Ochrona różnorodności przyrodniczej |
|                         |                                | 7.3. Nature tourism/Turystyka przyrodnicza |
|                         |                                | 7.4. Protection of biodiversity for integrated Territorial Investments of the Lublin Functional Area/Ochrona bioróżnorodności dla Zintegrowanych Inwestycji Terytorialnych Lubelskiego Obszaru Funkcjonalnego |
| Podkarpackie            | 4. Protection of the natural environment/ Ochrona środowiska naturalnego | 4.4. Culture and protection of cultural heritage/Kultura i ochrona dziedzictwa kulturowego |
| Podlaskie               | 6. Environmental protection and rational management of its resources/Ochrona środowiska i racjonalne gospodarowanie jego zasobami | 6.3. Protection of bio and geodiversity resources and landscape/Ochrona zasóbów bio i georóżnorodności oraz krajobrazu |
| Świętokrzyskie          | 4. Natural and cultural heritage/Dziedzictwo naturalne i kulturowe | 4.4. Preservation of cultural and natural heritage/ Zachowanie dziedzictwa kulturowego i naturalnego |
|                         |                                | 4.5. Protection and use of valuable natural areas/Ochrona i wykorzystanie obszarów cennych przyrodniczo |
| Warmińsko- mazurskie    | 5. Natural environment and rational use of resources/Środowisko przyrodnicze i racjonalne wykorzystanie zasobów | 5.3. Protection of biodiversity/Ochrona różnorodności biologicznej |
|                         |                                | 6.1. Culture infrastructure/Infrastruktura kultury |
|                         |                                | 6.2. Natural heritage/Dziedzictwo naturalne |

Source: Author’s own study based on five Regional Operational Programs and www.funduszeeuropejskie.gov.pl and A. Panasiuk, Finansowanie regionalnej gospodarki turystycznej ze środków Unii Europejskiej w perspektywach finansowych 2007–2013 i 2014–2020, Ekonomiczne Problemy Usług, nr 125/2016, s. 281. 

Źródło: Opracowanie własne na podst. 5 Regionalnych Programów Operacyjnych oraz www.funduszeeuropejskie.gov.pl oraz A. Panasiuk, Finansowanie regionalnej gospodarki turystycznej ze środków Unii Europejskiej w perspektywach finansowych 2007–2013 i 2014–2020, Ekonomiczne Problemy Usług, nr 125/2016, s. 281.
When we compiling the information from the table, it should be noted that in this period tourism was only included as part of a more wider group of activities related to culture and cultural institutions as well as natural biodiversity and innovation.

Results, discussion, conclusions

In the years 2014–2018, a total of 483 tourism projects were implemented in Eastern Poland, which accounted for 32.2% of all tourism projects implemented in Poland in this period (total of 1498). The largest number of projects was carried out in Warmińsko-mazurskie (164), then in Lubelskie (93) Podkarpackie (90), Podlaskie (71) and Świętokrzyskie (65).

The beneficiaries of the funds were mainly local self-governments (52.7%) and owners of historic sacred buildings - parishes, archdioceses (16.9%), while to a lesser extent natural and legal persons (14.7%), foundations and associations (3.7%), owners of museums (5.8%) and other entities, i.e. forest districts, spa and sanatorium facilities (6%).

In 2014-2018, a total of 10396008,5 thousand PLN was spent on projects related to the development of tourism in Eastern Poland. Until 95% of expenditure came from Regional Operational Programmes (ROPs) of individual voivodships. This demonstrates the key importance of the ROPs and the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) in financing tourism projects. It is worth emphasizing that the share of co-funding from EU funds (different in individual voivodships and in different projects), was on average 63% for all voivodships.

Most tourist projects in the Eastern Poland region are of low value. Most of them (43.5% of projects) had...
a budget of 1-5 mln PLN. The share of large projects (over 10 mln PLN) was 19.5%.

Most of the tourist projects in the Eastern Poland region are cultural projects (a total of 227 projects), including renovation and restoration or modernization of historic buildings to comprehensive revitalization of downtown areas. The highest share of this project category was recorded in the Podkarpackie voivodship (64.4%), while in the remaining it was at the level of 50%. The exception is the Warmińsko-mazurskie voivodship, in which projects in the field of culture accounted for only 25.6% of all projects, and projects in the field of tourism infrastructure predominated (55.5%). In all voivodships, projects in the field of tourism promotion and information were implemented only to a small extent.

Among all 227 projects concerning cultural values, there were 92 projects for the renovation of sacred buildings (churches, synagogues, e.g. Tykocin, Lublin, Zamość), 38 projects for the renovation of other historic buildings (e.g. the Chełmno Bishop’s Castle, the Castle in Kętrzyn, Boyen Fortress in

| Voivodship/ Województwo | Groups of projects by total value (PLN)/ Grupy projektów wg wartości całkowitej (zł): |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                        | Less than 0,5 mln/ poniżej 0,5 mln | 0,5-1 mln | 1-5 mln | 5-10 mln | Above 10 mln/ 10 mln i więcej |
| Lubelskie              | 6,5 | 14,0 | 46,2 | 12,9 | 20,4 |
| Podkarpackie           | 4,4 | 13,3 | 55,6 | 14,4 | 12,2 |
| Podlaskie              | 36,6 | 19,7 | 29,6 | 5,6 | 8,5 |
| Świętokrzyskie         | 3,1 | 24,6 | 29,2 | 12,3 | 30,8 |
| Warmińsko-mazurskie    | 12,2 | 11,6 | 53,7 | 11,0 | 11,6 |
| Total/ Razem           | 7,3 | 10,4 | 43,5 | 19,3 | 19,5 |

Table 3. Tourism projects in Eastern Poland in 2014-2020 according to total value (%)
Tabela 3. Projekty turystyczne w Polsce Wschodniej w latach 2014-2020 wg wartości całkowitej (%)

| Voivodship/ Województwo | The numer of projects/ Liczba projektów | Groups of projects by category/ Grupy projektów wg zakresu przedmiotowego |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                         |                                        | Natural assets/ walory przyrodnicze | Tourism infrastructure/ infrastruktura turystyczna | Cultural assets/ walory kulturowe | Promotion and information/ promocja i informacja | Other /inne |
| Lubelskie               | 93                                     | 17,2 | 21,5 | 59,1 | 2,2 | 0,0 |
| Podkarpackie            | 90                                     | 1,1 | 26,7 | 64,4 | 7,8 | 0,0 |
| Podlaskie               | 71                                     | 11,3 | 33,8 | 52,1 | 2,8 | 0,0 |
| Świętokrzyskie          | 65                                     | 13,8 | 30,8 | 53,8 | 1,5 | 0,0 |
| Warmińsko-mazurskie     | 164                                    | 15,9 | 55,5 | 25,6 | 2,4 | 0,6 |
| Total/ Razem            | 483                                    | 13,5 | 36,0 | 48,1 | 2,3 | 0,2 |

Table 4. Category of tourism projects in in Eastern Poland in 2014-2020
Tabela 4. Zakres przedmiotowy projektów turystycznych w Polsce Wschodniej w latach 2014-2020

Source: Author’s own study based on KSI SIMIK as of 30 September 2018.
Źródło: Opracowanie własne na podstawie danych KSI SIMIK wg stanu na 30.09.2018 r.
Gżycko, castles in Działdowo and Szczycno, Łańcut Castle, Branicki Palace in Białystok), 26 projects in the scope of adjusting historic buildings to perform a tour or recreational function and 19 projects for the revitalization of downtown areas of large and small cities, i.e. Choroszcz, Susz, Nurzec, Międzyrzec Podlaski, Lublin, Olsztyn, Starachowice, 13 projects in the field of restoration of park and court complexes as well as park and palace complexes, which include Łęczna, Koźłówka, and Międzyrzecz Podlaski. Other projects concerned cultural institutions, their modernization or building a cultural offer. The number and value of projects from 2014-2020 related to the protection and use of cultural heritage in individual voivodeships are presented in Tables 4 and 5.

Projects involving the adaptation of historic buildings to tourist, recreational or cultural functions seem to be particularly important for the development of tourism. However, the analysis of the projects leads to the conclusion that the majority of historic buildings (e.g. granaries, manor houses, court outbuildings, market hall in Łomża) are of local importance, it does not constitute the core attraction of any wider tourist product, therefore it will require intensive marketing activities in the field of tourism promotion and information.

Table 5. Groups of tourism projects in Eastern Poland in 2014-2020 by total value (%)

| Voivodship/ Województwo | Total value of projects in Thousand PLN/ Łączna wartość projektów (tys. zł) | Groups of tourism projects by category/ Grupy projektów wg zakresu przedmiotowego | Promotion and information/ Promocja i informacja | Other/ inne |
|--------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|-------------|
|                          | Natural assests/ walory przyrodnicze/ Turystyka/ Natural assets and information/ | Tourism infrastructure/ infrastruktura turystyczna/ | Cultural assests/ walory kulturowe/ | |
|                          | In%/w %                                                                         | in%                                                                          | in%                                                                           | | |
| Lubelskie                | 812 122                                                                         | 12,2                                                                         | 3,4                                                                         | 70,0         | 14,3         | 0,0         |
| podkarpackie             | 483 006                                                                         | 0,1                                                                         | 29,3                                                                         | 66,4         | 4,1          | 0,0         |
| Podlaskie                | 178 310                                                                         | 6,2                                                                         | 25,9                                                                         | 67,6         | 0,3          | 0,0         |
| świętokrzyskie           | 544 659                                                                         | 13,2                                                                         | 18,8                                                                         | 67,3         | 0,6          | 0,0         |
| warmińsko- mazurskie     | 820 248                                                                         | 9,1                                                                         | 51,2                                                                         | 31,3         | 8,3          | 0,0         |
| Total/ Razem             | 10 396 009                                                                      | 9,7                                                                         | 27,1                                                                         | 60,8         | 2,3          | 0,1         |

Source: Author’s own study based on KSISIMIK as of 30 September 2018.

Religious buildings of great historical and architectural importance (e.g. Post-Camaldolese monastery in Wigry, church in Tykocin, cathedral complex in Frombork, Basilica of the Dominican Fathers in Lublin, churches in Włodawa, Sosnowica), which co-create a tourist product, had an limited impact on employment, local income or municipality budget.

The second group of projects in terms of quantity and value were projects in the field of tourist infrastructure (basic and complementary), which provides tourists with the right conditions

Obiekty sakralne, o dużym znaczeniu historycznym i architektonicznym (np. pokamedulski klasztor w Wigrah, kościół w Tykocinie, zespół katedralny we Fromborku, Bazylika Ojców Dominikanów w Lublinie, cerkwie we Włodawie, Sosnowicy), mimo iż współtworzą produkt turystyczny, to ich wpływ na zatrudnienie, lokalne dochody czy budżet gminy wydaje się być ograniczony.

Drugą grupę projektów pod względem ilościowym i wartościowym stanowiły projekty z zakresu infrastruktury turystycznej (podstawowej i uzupełniającej), która zapewnia turystom odpowiednie wa-
for travelling (accommodation, catering and other services).

A total of 179 projects were identified in the Eastern Poland region, including 46 projects in the field of modernization of the accommodation, covering 69% of the energy modernization of accommodation facilities (mainly hotels) through the installation of photovoltaics, thermo-modernization and the use of renewable energy sources. Other projects in this group concerned the construction of lodging facilities, such as boarding houses, summer houses and a complexes of summer houses and their equipment. The exceptions are the construction of the innovative campsite „Karowny Glamping” in the Świętokrzyskie voivodeship in Lechów and the construction of an eco-pension in the Podkarpackie voivodeship. Much more projects (133) concerned complementary infrastructure: 24 projects - construction and modernization of tourist routes, 20 projects - construction of sports and recreation complexes, 62 projects - construction and modernization of sports and recreation infrastructure and 27 the projects - spa infrastructure.

In the period 2014-2020, natural assets gives the way to cultural assets. Among the 60 projects co-financed from EU funds, dominated projects for the construction and modernization of tourist infrastructure of protected areas (33) and projects for green area revitalization for tourist purpose, e.g. in Lipsk, Biskupiec, Morąg, Kolno, Międzyzdroje, Grajewo, Jedwabne (19), then revitalization of historic parks (Durów, Goniądz, Olsztyn), modernization of the botanical garden (Kielce) and arboretum (Kamień) - 8 projects. Most projects were located in the Podlaskie and Warmińsko-mazurskie voivodeships.

Tourism projects in the area of promotion and information were in the region of Eastern Poland rarely implemented. In total, only 15 projects received financial support in all voivodeships, including 1 project concerning the construction of a tourist information center (Nowe Miasto Lubawskie), 4 projects in the field of tourism promotion of tourist assets (Podkarpackie, Lubelskie voivodeships, Wigry National Park) and 10 projects in the field of Information and Communications Technology (ICT).

Conclusions

The assessment of the use of European funds for tourism-related projects in the Eastern Poland region in 2014-2020 leads to several conclusions:

1. The use of European funds for tourism projects in the Eastern Poland region is very diverse. Most projects were carried out in the Warmińsko-mazurskie Voivodeship and the least in the Podlaskie Voivodeship.

2. Among the beneficiaries who received financial support from European funds, the largest group were local government units (over 50%), next are the owners of historic sacred buildings and at least local foundations and associations.

runiki uprawiania turystyki (baza noclegowa, gastro-

dynamiczna oraz usługi towarzyszące).

W regionie Polski Wschodniej zidentyfikowano łącznie 179 projektów, w tym 46 projektów w zakresie modernizacji bazy noclegowej, obejmujących w 69% modernizację energetyczną obiektów noclegowych (głównie hoteli) poprzez montaż instalacji fotowoltaicznej, termomodernizację i wykorzystanie źródeł OZE. Pozostałe projekty w tej grupie dotyczyły budowy obiektów noclegowych typu pensionat, domek letniskowy i kompleks domków letniskowych i ich wyposażenia. Wyjątek stanowi budowa innowacyjnego kempingu „Karowny Glamping” w województwie świętokrzyskim w Lechowie oraz budowa ekopensionatu w województwie podkarpackim. Znacznie więcej projektów (133) dotyczyło infrastruktury uzupełniającej, w tym 24 projekty - budowy i modernizacji szlaków i tras turystycznych, 20 projektów - budowy kompleksów sportowo-rekreacyjnych, 62 projekty - budowy i modernizacji urządzeń infrastruktury sportowo-rekreatyjnej, służącej w założeniu mieszkańcom oraz 27 projektów dotyczyło infrastruktury uzdrowiskowej.

W okresie 2014-2020 znaczenie wafortorów przyrodniczych ustępuje zdecydowanie znaczeniu wafortorów kulturowych. Wśród 60 projektów dofinansowanych ze środków unijnych dominovali projekty budowy i modernizacji infrastruktury turystycznej obszarów chronionych (33) oraz projekty zagospodarowania terenów zielonych na cele turystyczno-rekreatyjne, m.in. w Lipsku, Biskupcu, Morągu, Kolnie, Międzyzdroju, Grajewie, Jedwabnie (19) oraz rewitalizacja zabytkowych parków (Durów, Goniądz, Olsztyn), modernizacja ogrodu botanicznego (Kielce) i arboretum (Kamień) – łącznie 8 projektów. Najwięcej projektów zlokalizowano w woj. podlaskim i warmińsko-mazurskim.

W niewielkim zakresie w regionie Polski Wschodniej realizowano projekty promocji i informacji turystycznej. Łącznie we wszystkich województwach wsparcie finansowe otrzymało 15 projektów, w tym 1 projekt dotyczący budowy centrum informacji turystycznej (Nowe Miasto Lubawskie), 4 projekty w zakresie promocji turystycznej wafortorów turystycznych (woj. podkarpackie, lubelskie, Wigierski Park Narodowy) oraz 10 projektów w dziedzinie nowoczesnych technologii informacyjnych (ICT).

Podsumowanie

Analiza wykorzystania funduszy europejskich na projekty związane z turystyką w regionie Polski Wschodniej w latach 2014-2020 prowadzi do kilku wniosków.

1. Wykorzystanie funduszy europejskich na projekty z zakresu turystyki w regionie Polski Wschodniej jest bardzo zróżnicowane. Najwięcej projektów zrealizowano w województwie warmińsko-mazurskim a najmniej w województwie podlaskim.

2. Wśród beneficjentów, którzy otrzymali wsparcie finansowe z funduszy europejskich, największą grupę stanowiły jednostki samorządu
3. In the studied perspective, projects in the field of culture dominate, the purpose of which is to preserve or make better use of cultural heritage resources. Almost half of these projects concern renovation or restoration of sacred buildings. There were only a few projects in the field of tourism promotion and tourist information.
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