









## Bratislavský kraj

### *General Information*

#### *Human Resources*

##### *Demographic situation*

The number of inhabitants in the region to the date December 31, 2006 has been 606 753.

During the period 1991 – 2006 the number of inhabitants increased in Bratislava County from 606 351 people to 606 753.

From the year 2002 the number of natural population have declining trend and in the year 2006 the natural population growth was recorded (68 people).

In Bratislava County was observed the total growth of population 3 054 people.

Population density in Bratislava County reached in 2006 the value 296 people on 1 sq. km.

The portion of youngest population in the year 2006 in Bratislava County was (13,0 %).

##### *Educational structure*

Within Slovakia regions Bratislava County has the highest educational level of population, what is related to the best high school network in this region and at the same time with the graduates' best chances to succeed in employment process.

In Bratislava County is 31,7% rate of high educated population (aged 25-64).

##### *Labour market*

The economically active population are people aged 15 that belongs among working people in civil sector, unemployed or member of armed sector. In the year 2006, at the regional level, the share of economically active population from the total population number represented 53,4%. The employment rate of people aged 15 + has reached 60,6% in Bratislava County in the year 2006. Unemployment rate in 2006 was recorded on the level 2,29%.

### *Settlement Structure*

#### *Development trends*

The settlement structure is characterized with relatively proportional spreading of middle large cities on the whole region with the dominant position of the Slovak Republic capital city Bratislava. The city with more than 100 000 inhabitation is only one in the region; it is Bratislava (426 000 inhabitation) which is also the largest city in the whole Slovak part of the region. The region has relatively good position toward the neighboring countries, from which development of the biggest regional cities benefited mainly. A development in these cities gives the development opportunities also to other hinterlands.

#### *Roles of importance of the towns*

In term of European conditions is the most important city as the centre of international importance the capital of SR Bratislava and its agglomeration.

#### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

The territory of analyzed region can be characterized in term of settlement structure as a territory with most developed agglomeration within Slovak Republic. It is concerned to Bratislava-Trnava agglomeration around capital city Bratislava with connection to Trnava city and also Nitra agglomeration, which is, in essence, interconnected with Bratislava-Trnava agglomeration. In discussed area we can expect within the individual agglomerations further development of suburbanization connected to trends of concentrated de-concentration around most important towns.

### *Interregional cooperation*

Potential interconnection of settlement structure of SR to other countries and their settlement structures is expressed by basic conception idea shown in picture from Slovak Spatial Development Perspective 2001 – International context of settlement centers of SR. Within cross-border territory creates formal and informal organizations. One of formal forms of trans-boundary cooperation is within the frame of established euroregions. In the border territory following euroregions occurred: Euroregion „Pomoravie“ (with Austria and Czech Republic). As a common association for publicity and support of economic development of cross-border region an association CENTROPE was established. Its participants are Slovakia, Austria, Hungary and Czech Republic. An information system VITEC was created as a joint database system for information between Bratislava and Vienna towns. Border and transborder towns within the region are practically all towns along borders, first of all those, which are in immediate vicinity of borders as Bratislava, Malacky, Senec.

### *Living standards*

Based on the data of Statistical Office SR, there has been 332 permanently inhabited dwellings on 1 000 inhabitation in the evaluated region in the year 2001. In the scope of the region, the highest number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitation was in Bratislava County. The regional average is 365 dwellings per 1 000 inhabitation.

### *Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants	377,69	406,31	424,32	439,81
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants	69,24	82,63	100,55	122,91
Regional vitality index	161,44	124,43	107,99	102,38

## Trnavský kraj

### *General Information*

#### *Human Resources*

##### *Demographic situation*

The number of inhabitants in the region to the date December 31, 2006 has been 555 075 people in Trnava County.

During the period 1991 – 2006, the increase has occurred in Trnava County, where the population raised from 541 992 in the year 1991 to 555 075 inhabitants until the year 2006, i.e. increase by 13 083 people.

The population density is 134 inhabitants/sq. km in Trnava County.

The population age structure and its processes of formation can be considered as a demographic phenomenon with relatively high complexity degree. The population age structure formation and its changes are referring to all inhabitants. Development of basic population processes for instance natality, mortality and migration movements are reflected in the age structure. On the other side, the age structure of each population can significantly influence levels of many population phenomenon and processes.

##### *Educational structure*

The population educational structure is a reflection of a society development degree, its economic and social forwardness. The education of population mainly depends on the educational system of society.

The evaluation of population educational structure is based on the data from population census as only and relatively most correct information about this population structure. During the last population, houses and dwellings census as of May 26, 2001, the education was surveyed based on the highest finished educational level.

At the regional level, the share of population aged 25-64 with high education represented 18,2%, the share of population aged 18-64 with highest secondary education level was 75,5% and the share of population aged 19-64 without education was 0,4%.

##### *Labour market*

The economically active population are people aged 15 that belongs among working people in civil sector, unemployed or member of armed sector. In the year 2006, at the regional level, the share of economically active population from the total population number represented 50,2%. In Trnava County it was 51,1%.

The employment rate, that is computed as the portion of working people aged 15+, potentially persons aged 15-64 and number of inhabitants aged 15+, potentially persons aged 15-64 are gained from the Statistical Office of SR but only data to the NUTS 3 level. The employment rate of people aged 15+ has indicated 51,2% in the year 2006 in the Slovak Republic and the employment rate of persons aged 15-64 is 59,4%, what is below the EU average.

The employment rate of people aged 15 + has reached 56,4 in the year 2006.

#### *Settlement Structure*

##### *Development trends*

The settlement structure is characterized with relatively proportional spreading of middle large cities on the whole region with the dominant position.

The region has relatively good position toward the neighboring countries, from which development of the biggest regional cities benefited mainly. A development in these cities gives the development opportunities also to other hinterlands. However, this development is not proportional.

In the region development, the main role plays the geomorphologic determinateness. The largest lowland with the best farmlands of Slovakia is located in this region. Main part of the region was and still is the leading area of an agricultural production. This fact together with restructuring of the whole agriculture has an influence on the dynamics of another development in its parts, where agricultural production is a dominant economic factor. In these parts of the region, the existing small and middle large cities play more important role in the inhabitants stabilization and in the dynamics of agricultural development.

*Roles of importance of the towns*

According to European model for polycentric development Trnava county belongs to Functional Urban Areas (FUA).

*Agglomerations areas and development axes*

The territory of analyzed region can be characterized in term of settlement structure as a territory with most developed agglomeration within Slovak Republic. It is concerned to Bratislava-Trnava agglomeration around capital city Bratislava with connection to Trnava city.

*Interregional cooperation*

Potential interconnection of settlement structure of SR to other countries and their settlement structures is expressed by basic conception idea shown in picture from Slovak Spatial Development Perspective 2001 – International context of settlement centers of SR.

The main potential for settlement trans-boundary cooperation is advisable to see in territorial vicinity of individual settlements on both/three border sides. Further to this supply also economic activities development within settlement centers, it underlies cross-border work trips. Plumbless potential for settlement trans-boundary cooperation are also cultural, tourist and historical given determinatenesses of cross-border regions.

*Living standards*

Trnava County had 306 dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants. Considering the portion of permanently inhabited dwellings connected to the pipelines permanently inhabited dwellings in Trnava County is 95,1%.

*Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants	339,7	347,75	358,67	368
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants	8,88	21,23	32,17	40,57
Regional vitality index	186,33	157,12	130,02	115,15



## Nitriansky kraj

### *General Information*

Population of Nitra Self-governing region is 707 305 inhabitants (31st of December 2006). The total number of inhabitants in the period of 2001 – 2006 decreased by 1 %. The total amount of population decrease was therefore 5 007 inhabitants.

The counties with the highest population are Nitra (23 % of the region's population) and Nové Zámky (20 %).

Positive trend of population number in period 2001 – 2006 was identified only in Nitra county and partially in Topoľany and Šaľa county. In the rest of counties was population decreasing, however the intensity of decrease was reducing during the period.

Negative trend of population number was caused mainly by the negative natural increase of population. Negative natural increase of population means that the number of departed was every year higher than the number of born, although the index was decreasing year after year.

Positive trend of migration was registered in 2001 – 2005 period. The index of net migration (difference between immigrants and emigrants) increased from 0,64 to 1,38 in the period. This increase was not enough high to overcome the negative natural increase, therefore the total increase of population was negative.

The highest figure of total increase was in the 2004 (-402), in 2005 the figure worsens to -852 inhabitants. The further worsening of the figure in 2006 was caused by negative migration.

The less favourable situation was in the counties Nové Zámky, Levice and Komárno.

Low rate of natality, followed by negative natural increase, affected also age structure of the population. Unfavourable tendency in the population structure is a serious problem for the further economic and social development of the region.

The share of population in pre productive age was low (15%) in 2005 and there is a tendency of further decrease. Another proof of population ageing is increasing ageing index, which increased to 141,24 (2005) from 117,18 (2001). This situation is unfavourable in terms of future development of the region.

The most unfavourable age structure is in the counties Zlaté Moravce and Nové Zámky, where the share of post productive population is 22%.

The ratio between sexes in the long term is stable: women 51,68%, men 48,32%.

Nitra Self-governing region could be characterized as less urbanized or rural, when the urbanization rate is cca 47%. The spread of population in the area of the region is uneven, with highest concentration of population around the city of Nitra, which is a settlement pole of supra regional relevance. The population of Nitra and its surroundings increases continuously, what is caused by its strong polarization attraction. Centres of settlements of regional relevance with certain growth population are towns Šaľa and Topoľany. Development of the rest of the towns of regional relevance was very slow in the recent years.

### Evolution of the settlement

Historically is Nitra Self-governing region one of the most important territories of the Slovakia. City of Nitra is a dominant within the settlement structure.

Current state of the settlement structure of the Nitra Self-governing region is a result of the effects of natural and civilization conditions.

Whole settlement structure is situated at lowland and modest upland, with dominant agriculture. The particular settlements are spatially distributed evenly, with one bigger central settlement (city of Nitra). The even spatial distribution of settlements is disrupted only by line settlement structure along the rivers. This basis of settlement, determined by the natural conditions was further developed by the civilization conditions – strong influence of the agriculture, transport routes (road and railway) and continual industrialization of the region.

### Settlement characteristics

The main settlement pole of the region is Nitra. This settlement pole is of supra regional and nationwide relevance. Other poles of the region are the seats of the counties, the towns of Komárno, Levice, Nové Zámky, Šaľa, Topoľany and Zlaté Moravce. Also Šurany, Štúrovo, Kolárovo, Šahy, Želiezovce are important towns of the settlement structure. Current features of the settlement structure are as follow:

- point settlement structure in the agricultural country, mainly in the southern and central parts of the region
- main towns (seats of the counties) with adjacent rural settlement, dominant is city of Nitra following with Topoľany, Zlaté Moravce, Levice, Šaľa, Nové Zámky, Šurany, Komárno and relatively isolated Štúrovo
- linear settlement structure along the rivers in north-south direction:

- along the river Nitra, almost continually from Topo any through Nitra to Šurany, following by discontinuous line between Nové Zámky and Komárno
- along the river Žitava, with centres Zlaté Moravce and Vráble
- along the river Hron, with centres Levice, Želiezovce and Štúrovo
- such significant linear settlement structure have not emerged along the river Váh
- specific types of settlements – small settlements by the villages

### *Human Resources*

#### *Demographic situation*

Significant changes in the evolution of the structure of demography which are reflection of economic and social situation of the region have been remarked. The long term tendencies are: deceleration of the population reproduction, decrease of natural increase of population (which was -1992 in 2007). The marriage and divorce rates are decreasing. The process of population ageing is continuing. The average age in the region was 39, 04 and the ageing index was 148, 33 in 2006.

#### *Educational structure*

Educational structure of the adult population of Nitra Self-governing region is average (in terms of Slovakia) with significant share of inhabitants with only elementary education or without education degree (31%). The share of inhabitants with university degree is 8%. In comparison with average figures of the Slovak republic, the region is worse mainly in share of inhabitants with secondary school and university education.

#### *Labour market*

The total number of employed inhabitants in the region is 260 496.

The number of employed inhabitants in particular counties is as follows:

Nitra: 68 600

Nové Zámky: 45 000

Levice: 36 500

Komárno: 33 500

Topo any: 26 500

Ša a: 16 000

Zlaté Moravce: 11 400

### *Settlement Structure*

#### *Development trends*

The territory of the region is in terms of settlement evolution one of the most important historical areas of the Slovak Republic.

Current state of settlement structure is a result of the effects of natural as well as civilization conditions. The settlement is spread across the lowland and modest upland, with dominant agriculture. The particular settlements are distributed evenly around core settlement centres. This even character of the settlement structure is disrupted only by linear settlement structure along the rivers. The basic conditions for settlement structure development determined by the natural conditions were affected by civilization conditions – mainly agriculture, development of transport infrastructure (roads and railways) and industrialization.

#### *Roles of importance of the towns*

Accessibility of all region's municipalities from Nitra by road is adequate. The distance of all municipalities from Nitra is less than 100 km – approximately 1,5 hour of driving.

All the municipalities of the region are connected to highway or expressway. The best accesibility to highway is from Nitra city, towns within 60 km distance are Ša a and Topo any. The distance of the other towns to highway is more than 80 km. The shortest distance to expressway is from Nitra, Zlaté Moravce, Vráble and Šurany. The distance of other towns is 30 km and more.

The access points to Hungary are in Komárno, Štúrovo and Šahy.

### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

Beside centres of settlement mentioned above, also the settlement development axes are noticeable. The settlement development axis raised on a basis of historical corridors along water courses. The development axes are defined by the Slovak Spatial Development Perspective 2001.

The first stage development axis connects the first group settlement centres with the first level settlement core areas in the country and comparable centres outside state borders. It includes at least one road communication link and one speed railway communication link.

The second stage development axis connects the second group settlement centres and second level settlement core areas with the first group settlement centres and the first level settlement core areas, including at least one road communication link and one railway communication link of supra-regional importance, or one highway.

The third stage development axis connects mid-sized centres with the third level settlement core areas and other evaluated settlement centres with other second group settlement centres.

In the west-east direction exist these development axes:

- the Nitra - Pohronie first stage development axis: Trnava – Nitra – Žiar nad Hronom – Zvolen
- the Žitný ostrov second stage development axis : Bratislava – Dunajská Streda – Komárno
- the Danube third stage development axis: Senec – Galanta – Nové Zámky
- the Dudváh – Danube development axis: Galanta – Dunajská Streda / Komárno – Štúrovo (this axis is mutual with Žitný ostrov axis, in the sector Dunajská Streda – Komárno)

The development axis of second stage in the north – south direction:

- the Nitra second stage development axis: Trenčín – Bánovce nad Bebravou – Topoľany – Nitra – Nové Zámky – Komárno
- the Pohronie second stage development axis: Tlmače – Levice – Želiezovce – Štúrovo

In future perspective is recommended to support:

- the Južné Slovensko second stage development axis: Nové Zámky – Želiezovce – Šahy – Veľký Krtíš - Lučenec

### *Interregional cooperation*

There are four present forms of cross border cooperation in Slovak republic:

- Intergovernmental agreements of cross border cooperation
- Cooperation of euroregions
- Cooperation of regional and local authorities
- Cooperation of chambers of commerce

There are two euroregions located in the territory of Nitra Self-governing region. Euroregion Váh-Dunaj-Ipe , which involves whole area of the region at Slovak side and self-governing regions Komárom-Esztergom, Veszprém and Fejér at Hungarian side. Euroregion Ipe /Ipoly involves two counties of Nitra SG region: Nové Zámky and Levice. Other Slovakian counties are: Banská Štiavnica, Krupina, Veľký Krtíš, Lučenec and Rimavská Sobota. At Hungarian side, the euroregion involves self-governing regions Nógrád and Pest.

Euroregion Váh-Dunaj-Ipe was established in 1999. The representative of the euroregion at the Slovak side is Regional Partnership Váh-Dunaj-Ipe (RPVDI). RPVDI is focused on concentrating of the knowledge and funds, in order to fulfill its main objectives:

- increasing of the region's attractiveness
- synchronizing the development in the fields of economy and tourism
- support of cross-border relations in education and science
- synchronizing of spatial development
- cooperation in the fields of nature protection, environment and water resources
- synchronizing the development of the transport
- cooperation in humanitarian and social field
- preservation of common cultural heritage
- successful participation at implementation of EU Regional Policy programs
- creation of adequate conditions for information Exchange

Ipe / Ipoly region was established in 1999, with objective of supporting the sustainable development in term of social, economic and environmental, as well as preparation and participation at EU integration.

Activities of the Euroregion are focused on:

- increasing of toleration
- economic development of the region
- preservation of environmental heritage
- culture of the region

### *Living standards*

#### *Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants	362,71	371,82	380,47	386,34
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants	17,46	27,44	34,78	38,45
Regional vitality index	158,96	137,31	114,73	103,59

## Budapest főváros

### *General Information*

#### *Human Resources*

##### *Demographic situation*

The population of Budapest in 2008 was 1.696.128.

The natural growth from 1990 to 2008 was -5,66%, a drastic decrease. The change from 2001 was -2,5%, this means that the decrease of population is a steady process. Besides natural decreasing, population reduction is derived also from the process of emigration. In the past 20 years many, mostly families moved to the growing agglomeration area, out of the borders of Budapest. In recent few years, with city centre rehabilitation the population of Budapest is not decreasing anymore.

##### *Educational structure*

Budapest has the best values of educational structure among Hungarian Danube regions. The reason for this is the fact that Budapest is the educational centre of the nation, its economy is based on educated labour force, the schools, educational institutes are accessible for most of the people.

At the last census in 2001, 94,2% of aged 15–X finished at least 8 grades of primary school, 58,7% of aged 18–X at least completed secondary school, and 23,8% of aged 25–X has a university, college, etc. degree.

##### *Labour market*

During the monitoring period number of economically active population reported positive trend. The economic activity rate in 2008 reached 59% of population aged 15-69, while this number was only 57% in year 2001.

The employment rate of population aged 15-64 has risen from 54 to 57%, a growth above the national average.

The unemployment rate indicator in the region reported a change from 5,1% (2001) to 4,2% (2008) which was the second lowest unemployment rate in the Hungarian Danube Regions. In 2008 employees worked mainly in the tertiary sectors especially in wholesale and retail trade and real estates business. The significant portion of workforce was employed in the industry sector as well.

The region has the largest representation of universities and colleges in Hungary. There were 9 state universities, 6 non-state universities 4 non-state colleges and 17 non-state colleges in the city of Budapest in 2008. The biggest university is Eötvös Loránd University (science, humanities, law etc.), the Budapest Technical University and the Corvinus University of Budapest (mainly economics). Share of university educated inhabitants reached 24% of population aged 25-x in 2008.

#### *Settlement Structure*

##### *Development trends*

The region of Budapest is built up of only one settlement, so it is hard to characterize the area in a spatial context. Budapest has a declining number of inhabitants, but the role of the capital has not weakened in the past decades, what is more, it became the one and only centre of international firms and the home of transnational HQs. There is a reorganization going on in the utilization of the land within the city, the former industrial areas and railway transfer stations are eliminated and the rust belts are turned into residential sections or office areas. The northern and southern riversides of river Danube are good examples for this change.

##### *Roles of importance of the towns*

Budapest is the first settlement in the Hungarian settlement structure. It is the only city with population over a million, with its agglomeration above 2,5 million. It is a NUTS<sub>3</sub> region itself and is the capital of surrounding Pest county as well.

### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

Budapest has the most developed and most populated agglomeration area in Hungary. Officially it is built up of 83 settlements and has a population of 2,5 million.

### *Interregional cooperation*

The city has interregional cooperation chances mainly in Hungarian context, as it lies relatively close to the Slovakian border, but to a remote area of Slovakia.

### *Living standards*

The living standards of the people of the Budapest region are moderate to upper-level. The private sector accounts for over 80% of GDP. Foreign ownership of and investment in Hungarian firms is widespread.

Subsistence type: Service and product industry.

Average Gross Income: 150,000.- HUF (Hungarian Forint) per month or 1,8 million HUF (11,000 USD) per year is the reported income nationwide.

Average gross nominal monthly wage reflects region's economy structure, labour productivity level and wage politics of private sector and public administration. Average gross nominal monthly salary in region of Budapest was (2008) approximately 850 €, which is far the biggest value in comparison to other regions in Hungary and the Danube Regions as well.

### *Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants	437,7634303	478,0833555	506,5833032	519,7569590
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants	19,44842976	21	23	24
Regional vitality index	68,05555556	64,81481481	50,6122449	43,7175611

## Pest megye

### *General Information*

#### *Human Resources*

##### *Demographic situation*

The population of Pest county in 2008 was 1 176 550. The natural growth from 1990 to 2008 was -1,73%, a slight decrease. The change of population from 2001 was +8,0%, this means that there was a serious growth in population.

Though there is a natural decrease under the national average (the agglomeration is growing with families moving to the area), population growth is derived from the process of immigration, people moving out of Budapest.

##### *Educational structure*

Pest county has average values of educational structure among Hungarian Danube regions. The reason for this is the fact that Budapest, the educational centre of the nation is close, its economy is based on educated labour force, and Budapest schools, educational institutes are accessible for most of the people, but institutes of higher education are missing in the region itself.

At the last census in 2001, 89,9% of aged 15–X finished at least 8 grades of primary school, 37,5% of aged 18–X at least completed secondary school, and 11,7% of aged 25–X has a university, college, etc. degree.

##### *Labour market*

During the monitoring period number of economically active population reported positive trend. The economic activity rate in 2008 reached 55% of population aged 15-69, while this number was only 51% in year 2001.

The employment rate of population aged 15-64 has changed less, from 53 to 54%, a smooth growth above the national average.

The unemployment rate indicator in the region reported no change from between 2001 and 2008.

In 2008 employees worked mainly in the tertiary sectors especially in wholesale and retail trade and real estates business. The significant portion of workforce was employed in the industry sector as well.

The region has small number of universities and colleges, as the main educational centre, Budapest is in the middle of the region. There was 1 state university and 2 non-state colleges in Pest region in 2008.

Share of university educated inhabitants reached 12% of population aged 25-x in 2008, slightly above national average.

#### *Settlement Structure*

##### *Development trends*

Pest county surrounds the capital of Budapest, therefore it became the area of suburbanisation in the past 20 years. The population shows a dynamic growth, such a way, the local infrastructure can not be developed in the same pace. This means that the human resources are in a good state, the growing population is young and well qualified, but possibilities of commuting population are getting worse. One of the most important objectives of settlements of Pest county is to create local workplaces. Development trends show that the Western, especially North-Western and in some ways North-Eastern small regions are developing faster than those of the North, East and South of Pest county.

##### *Roles of importance of the towns*

There are no major towns in the region in macroregional contexts, the biggest city is Érd recently gained the title City of County Rights with only 60000 inhabitants of whom most are commuters. There are rapidly developing gate cities in every direction (Budaörs, Gödöllő, Szentendre etc.) in which a new process, suburbanization of enterprises is noticeable. These are the HQs of more and more enterprises of at least regional importance.

### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

Pest county itself is practically the agglomeration area of Budapest. The area of commuters is naturally bigger than Pest county, but the official agglomeration is smaller with 82 settlements of the NUTS 3 region. The satellite cities are weak in their functions, most of them are only bedroom suburbs. Development axes are connected to transportation corridors, that is the highways of the region.

### *Interregional cooperation*

The region has interregional cooperation chances mainly in Hungarian context, as it has a short borderline with Slovakia, but only to a relatively remote area of the neighboring county.

### *Living standards*

Average gross nominal monthly wage reflects region's economy structure, labour productivity level and wage politics of private sector and public administration. Average gross nominal monthly salary in region of Budapest was (2008) approximately 600 €, which is above the average in comparison to other regions in Hungary and the Danube Regions as well.

### *Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants	356,8782004	365,4098061	365,2850502	364,6106758
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants	11,01760407	13	17	18
Regional vitality index	66,30824373	104,6242775	91,4893617	112,6550789



## Fejér megye

### *General Information*

#### *Human Resources*

##### *Demographic situation*

The number of population in Fejér 428 711, this is the fifth largest in the Hungarian Danube region. The natural growth from 1991 to 2008 was -2,08%, this means a slight natural decrease, but all in all the population did not change, as immigration compensated the natural loss.

##### *Educational structure*

Fejér county has average values of educational structure among Hungarian Danube regions. At the last census in 2001, 89,9% of aged 15–X finished at least 8 grades of primary school, 34,7% of aged 18–X at least completed secondary school, and 10,8% of aged 25–X has a university, college, etc. degree. There are big internal regional differences though: the cities of Székesfehérvár and Dunaújváros are much well educated than the rural areas situated mainly in the southern parts of the county.

##### *Labour market*

During the monitoring period number of economically active population reported positive trend. The economic activity rate in 2008 reached 56% of population aged 15-69, while this number was only 55% in year 2001.

The employment rate of population aged 15-64 has risen from 54 to 57%, a growth above the national average. The unemployment rate indicator in the region reported no change from 2001 to 2008, it was 5,5% both times with big differences from one year to the other meanwhile. In 2008 employees worked mainly in the tertiary sectors especially in wholesale and retail trade and real estates business. The significant portion of workforce was employed in the industry sector as well.

The region has only two institutes of higher education, there is only non-state college in Székesfehérvár and one state college in Dunaújváros. Share of university educated inhabitants reached 12% of population aged 25-x in 2008, that is slightly above average.

#### *Settlement Structure*

##### *Development trends*

Fejér county was one of the first NUTS 3 regions of Hungary to produce growth after the transformation of the nineties. The core of this development was the city of Székesfehérvár, where former industrial enterprises were privatised and foreign investments have been directed to the industrial parks. The growth of the city has declined, as some of these big employers have move out, creating high numbers of unemployment. The development of the region is now moving to the east as Dunaújváros hosts new and prosperous companies (e.g. Hankook) and transforming and strategically important enterprises such as the iron and the paper factory. The newly built M6 highway enlarged the commuting area of Budapest, making it possible for the local people to stay in the rural areas while work in the capital.

##### *Roles of importance of the towns*

The role of major towns (Székesfehérvár, Dunaújváros, Mór) is high especially in employment. In administrative point of view Székesfehérvár is the capital of the region but Dunaújváros also is a City of County Rights.

##### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

There is no explicit agglomeration in the region, though there is a small commuter area around Székesfehérvár, this city itself is highly linked to the Budapest agglomeration. The first and most important development axis is the one that links Budapest and Lake Balaton via Székesfehérvár. The second development axis is independent from this one, it is practically the line of river Danube, linking Pécs to Budapest via Dunaújváros. The third major

development axe links Székesfehérvár to Győr and Komárom through the city of Mór. The fourth development axe is only tangent to the region and is the line of M1 highway.

### *Interregional cooperation*

The city has interregional cooperation chances only in Hungarian context, as has no common borderline.

### *Living standards*

Average gross nominal monthly wage reflects region's economy structure, labour productivity level and wage politics of private sector and public administration. Average gross nominal monthly salary in region of Pest was (2008) approximately 600 €. This value is much above the average in comparison to other regions in Hungary, and it is the second largest, if we compare it to Hungarian Danube Regions.

### *Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants	363,0941744	373,5789185	381,0229406	387,3041141
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants	15,0248156	16	19	20
Regional vitality index	107,5144509	98,87640449	81,31313131	69,70000934

## Komárom-Esztergom megye

### *General Information*

#### *Human Resources*

##### *Demographic situation*

The number of population in Komárom-Esztergom was 315 036 in 2008, this is the second smallest county in population in the Hungarian Danube region. The natural growth from 1991 to 2008 was -3,19%, this means natural decrease. From 2001 to 2008 the population changed by -0,7%, the immigration could not compensate the natural loss.

##### *Educational structure*

Komárom-Esztergom county has higher than average values of educational structure among Hungarian Danube regions. Though its economy is based on well educated labour force, higher education institute (college) can only be found in Tatabánya.

At the last census in 2001, 90% of aged 15–X finished at least 8 grades of primary school, 34,4% of aged 18–X at least completed secondary school, and 9,7% of aged 25–X has a university, college, etc. degree.

Internal regional differences are not determining though, except for the lower values of the rural region of Kisbér.

##### *Labour market*

During the monitoring period number of economically active population reported positive trend. The economic activity rate in 2008 reached 59% of population aged 15-69, while this number was only 54% in year 2001. This growth rate is the highest among analysed regions.

The employment rate of population aged 15-64 has risen from 51,5 to 56%, a growth again high above the national average.

The unemployment rate indicator in the region all in all reported no change from 2001 to 2008, it was 5,5% both times with big differences from one year to the other meanwhile.

In 2008 employees worked mainly in the tertiary sectors especially in wholesale and retail trade and real estates business. The significant portion of workforce was employed in the industry sector as well.

The region has only two institutes of higher education, there are only two non-state colleges in Tatabánya and Esztergom.

Share of university educated inhabitants reached 8% of population aged 25-x in 2008, which is a low proportion among analysed regions.

#### *Settlement Structure*

##### *Development trends*

The development of the county was originally based on the primer resources (coal, bauxite). Nowadays the key factor of development is the location and position of the region. A successful industrial transformation took place in the region's capital city of Tatabánya, and generally cities and sites lying next to highway M1 are developing dynamically. From human point of view the region is in a good position, but the urban areas in the mountainous areas of Vértes hills are looking forward a big change as one of the biggest employers of the area, the coal mines of Pusztavém are to be closed in 2014 the latest. A major transformation and high number of unemployed and retired is foreseen in the region, in case there is no successful human resource programme employ these people.

##### *Roles of importance of the towns*

The region is one of the most urbanized regions of Hungary, as there are many historically industrial areas in the mountainous areas as well as on the Danube bank on the north. There are four cities with high importance: Tatabánya (capital), Esztergom, Tata and Komárom. The capital Tatabánya however is a relatively new, industrial town that grew out in the 50s.

### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

In Geographical point of view one of the unique agglomerations of Hungary developed in the Northern region of Komárom-Esztergom county when the cities of Komárom-Almásfüzitő-Dunaalmás-Neszmély and Süttő-Lábatlan-Nyergesújfalu practically grew into one city.

Development axes are determined by physical geographical facilities of the region: the first and most important development axe link Budapest and Győr and crosses the region 70 km long. The second development axe escapes Budapest and runs between Komárom and Esztergom on the North. The third and less important development axe runs along Komárom and Székesfehérvár and crosses the rural countryside of the county.

### *Interregional cooperation*

The region has one of the best chances for interregional co-operation among Hungarian NUTS 3 regions, as it has a long border to Slovakia. Co-operation between Komárom-Komárno and Esztergom-Sturovo (Ister-Granum Euroregion) is dating back to many decades and is being institutionalized nowadays.

### *Living standards*

Average gross nominal monthly wage reflects region's economy structure, labour productivity level and wage politics of private sector and public administration. Average gross nominal monthly salary in region of Pest was (2008) approximately 600 €. This value is much above the average in comparison to other regions in Hungary, and it is the second largest, if we compare it to Hungarian Danube Regions.

### *Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants	370,5510174	377,5983082	385,3694589	392,0461882
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants	13,86336639	15	18	18
Regional vitality index	102,247191	94,02173913	77,83251232	66,95246879

## Gy r-Moson-Sopron megye

### *General Information*

#### *Human Resources*

##### *Demographic situation*

The number of population in Gy r-Moson-Sopron county was 442 667 in 2008, this is a medium sized region according to in the Hungarian Danube region. The natural population growth from 1991 to 2008 was -2,73%, this means natural decrease. From 2001 to 2008 the population changed by +0,8%, due to the high number of people moving in to the three cities of Sopron, Mosonmagyaróvár and Gy r.

##### *Educational structure*

Gy r-Moson-Sopron county has the second highest values of educational structure among Hungarian Danube regions. The reason for this is the fact that its economy is based on well educated labour force, and higher education institutes (universities, college) are based in Gy r, Sopron and Mosonmagyaróvár as well.

At the last census in 2001, 91% of aged 15–X finished at least 8 grades of primary school, 37,9% of aged 18–X at least completed secondary school, and 11,7% of aged 25–X has a university, college, etc. degree.

There are some internal regional differences though, the southern, rural regions of Pannonhalma, Tét, Csorna and Kapuvár have less educated population than the northern, urbanised areas.

##### *Labour market*

During the monitoring period number of economically active population reported no change. The economic activity rate both in 2001 and in 2008 reached 57% of population aged 15-69.

The employment rate of population aged 15-64 has shown no big difference as well, it has risen from 55,2 to 55,9%. This means, Gy r-Moson-Sopron used to be the region with the best employment rate, but in 2008 it was only the 3rd among Hungarian Danube regions.

The unemployment rate indicator in the region has a unique value and has a very good trend as well. From 2001 to 2008 it dropped from 4,2 to 3,7 %, and this was the lowest rate in both years.

In 2008 employees worked mainly in the tertiary sectors especially in wholesale and retail trade and real estates business. The significant portion of workforce was employed in the industry sector as well.

The region has three institutes of higher education. Two state universities are located in Sopron and Gy r, and there is one non-state college in the latter.

Share of university educated inhabitants reached 10% of population aged 25-x in 2008, that is the third best rate in the analysed regions.

#### *Settlement Structure*

##### *Development trends*

Gy r-Moson-Sopron county is one of the few regions in Hungary with growing population. This due to the immigration from eastern regions and is centred upon the cities and commuting areas of Gy r and Sopron. The region was the first to bring about transformation after the fall of the iron curtain. The cores of the development are the universities and innovation centers of Gy r, Sopron and Mosonmagyaróvár. The ongoing development of the Audi factory of Gy r seems to enlarge the catchment area of the city.

##### *Roles of importance of the towns*

The most important urban area of the region is the Gy r agglomeration which is rapidly expanding. Besides Gy r the city of Sopron also has City of County Rights.

### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

Gy r-Moson county has no official agglomeration, though there is a large number of people living around and commuting to Gy r and Sopron as a daily routine.

Gy r is a hub for all development axes: the one running to Budapest diverges into three to Sopron, Vienna and Bratislava. All other axes (Gy r-Székesfehérvár, Gy r-Pápa, Gy r-Komárom) are minor compared to these.

### *Interregional cooperation*

The region has one of the best chances for interregional co-operation among Hungarian NUTS 3 regions, as it has a long border to Slovakia and Austria. Co-operation between Gy r and Bratislava and Dunajska Streda. The co-operation is being institutionalized nowadays.

### *Living standards*

Average gross nominal monthly wage reflects region's economy structure, labour productivity level and wage politics of private sector and public administration. Average gross nominal monthly salary in region of Pest was (2008) approximately 600 €. This value is much above the average in comparison to other regions in Hungary, and it is the second largest, if we compare it to Hungarian Danube Ragions.

### *Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants	364,2396430	380,5293376	398,2565792	406,0557332
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants	16,16418369	18	21	22
Regional vitality index	92,55319149	86,84210526	73,17073171	64,80621637

## Baranya megye

### *General Information*

#### *Human Resources*

##### *Demographic situation*

The number of population in Baranya county was 398 215 in 2008, this is a medium sized region according to population in the Hungarian Danube region. The natural population growth from 1991 to 2008 was -3,73%, this means one of the highest natural decrease rates among the analysed. From 2001 to 2008 the population changed by -2,0%, as the population was decreasing in all areas, except for the small region of Pécs: here the change was 0%.

##### *Educational structure*

Baranya county has lower than average values of educational structure among Hungarian Danube regions. The reason for this is the fact that many rural areas are located in this region, and there are structural problems with its economy. A major university is based in Pécs, this is why education is better here, than in the neighbouring Tolna and Bács-Kiskun regions.

At the last census in 2001, 89,1% of aged 15–X finished at least 8 grades of primary school, 34,9% of aged 18–X at least completed secondary school, and 11,0% of aged 25–X has a university, college, etc. degree.

Internal regional differences are important to mention: Pécs city is far the most educated area compared to the other small regions.

##### *Labour market*

During the monitoring period number of economically active population reported a smooth decrease. The economic activity rate reached 49% in 2001, but in 2008 it reached only 48% of population aged 15-69. With these values, Baranya is the region with far the worst values.

The employment rate of population aged 15-64 has shown similar change as well, it has dropped from 46,2 to 44%. This means, Baranya had and has the lowest employment rate among analysed regions.

The unemployment rate indicator in the region has a unique value and has a very unlikely trend as well. From 2001 to 2008 it increased from 7 to 10,2%, and this way, Baranya has the worst rate in 2008.

The region has two institutes of higher education. Pécs is the home of a state university and a non-state college. Share of university educated inhabitants reached 12% of population aged 25-x in 2008, that is a value of average in the analysed regions.

#### *Settlement Structure*

##### *Development trends*

Baranya region can be characterized by 3 major areas: the northern mountainous area of the hills of Mecsek with continuous shutdown of coal mines and growing tourism, the mostly flat, agricultural border areas in the south with structural problems and low chances of transformation with the prosperous wine growing village of Villány. Between these two different types of land lies the capital of Pécs with its agglomeration area. The city is based on mining (coal and uranium), but nowadays it is willing to be the tourism and cultural centre of the surrounding macroregion, as it is the European Capital of Culture in 2010. The city is rich in many types of cultural heritage, but lacked tourism infrastructure such as accommodation, conference facilities etc. The infrastructure has been developed in a notably way, but the structural problems of Pécs and the whole region are still unsolved.

##### *Roles of importance of the towns*

Pécs is the fifth most populated city in Hungary and the biggest one in Transdanubia, an oversized capital for Baranya county. The city has developed a large agglomeration area and has large number of commuters from all around the region. The role of any other city is minor compared to Pécs.

### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

One of the four official agglomeration areas of Hungary is located in Baranya region surrounding the city of Pécs. The agglomeration is relatively old, developed constantly from the 50s and is the home of 200 000 people total, of whom 160 000 live in the city of Pécs. Development axes are determined by physical geographical facilities of the region: the mountain range of the Mecsek hills cuts of this region of Hungary to the Southern border. The one and only major development axe runs from the direction of Budapest to Pécs via Mohács and continues to the west towards the Croatian border.

### *Interregional cooperation*

The more intensive activities of the local government related to international contacts extend to fifteen counties/regions/provinces, within the framework of which active contacts have operated for decades, and there are more recent contacts, some more active and some less efficient ones as well. In particular neighbouring countries are among our partners, but you can find a large number of regions geographically far from Baranya as well as EU Members, countries in the process of accession or states that will only join in the future, not to mention areas outside Europe.

Bilateral international contacts:

Styria Province (Austria)

Rems-Murr District (Germany)

Osijek-Baranya County (Croatia)

Cluj County (Romania)

Covasna County (Romania)

Olomouc Region (Czech Republic)

Département du Nord (France)

Vaucluse (France)

Rhône-Alpes Region (France)

Latina County (Italy)

Devon County (United Kingdom)

Päijät-Häme Region (Finland)

Kütahya Province (Turkey)

Hungarian-Swedish Development Foundation

Zhe Jiang Province (China)

### *Living standards*

Average gross nominal monthly wage reflects region's economy structure, labour productivity level and wage politics of private sector and public administration. Average gross nominal monthly salary in region of Pest was (2008) approximately 570 €. This value is below the average in comparison to other regions in Hungary, and it is the third lowest, if we compare it to Hungarian Danube Regions.

### *Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants	370,6475095	383,0160725	399,4566831	410,2271339
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants	15,81220614	17	20	21
Regional vitality index	91,14583333	84,84848485	71,36150235	62,66760919



## Tolna megye

### *General Information*

#### *Human Resources*

##### *Demographic situation*

The number of population in Tolna county was 240 966 in 2008, this is the smallest region according to population in the Hungarian Danube region. The natural population growth from 1991 to 2008 was -4,31% (the second biggest change). From 2001 to 2008 the population changed by -3,7%, so the population was decreasing did not slow. The reducing number of inhabitants is visible in all small regions with no big differences.

##### *Educational structure*

Tolna county has the second lowest values of educational structure among Hungarian Danube regions. The reason for this is the fact that many rural areas are located in this region, and there are no institutes of higher education in Tolna.

At the last census in 2001, 85,9% of aged 15–X finished at least 8 grades of primary school, 29,2% of aged 18–X at least completed secondary school, and 9,0% of aged 25–X has a university, college, etc. degree. Internal regional differences are relatively unimportant in the region.

##### *Labour market*

During the monitoring period number of economically active population reported a no change. The economic activity rate reached 52% both in 2001, and in 2008 of population aged 15-69. With these values, Tolna is the region with the second worst values.

The employment rate of population aged 15-64 has shown a smooth decrease, it has dropped from 48 to 47%. This means, Tolna had and has the second lowest employment rate among analysed ragions. The unemployment rate indicator in the region has an unique value and has a very unlikely trend as well. From 2001 to 2008 it increased from 8,2 to 10,1%. In 2007 Tolna had the highest unemployment rate among all regions: 11,7%. In 2008 Tolna had the second worst unemployment rate.

The region has no institutes of higher education. Share of university educated inhabitants reached 8,5% of population aged 25-x in 2008, that is the lowest value of the analysed regions.

#### *Settlement Structure*

##### *Development trends*

The region of Tolna was historically a region of “middle class” within Hungary with no spectacular problems on the western, rural areas but no significant core areas on the eastern, Danube-side more industrial-like side. The reason for this is that the nuclear power station of Paks has a very big effect on local income, employment and living standard.

According to expansion plans of the nuclear power station on governmental level, the development of the wider region shall start up in the next years.

With the handing over of highway M6 (2010) the growing regional differences are foreseen in the region..

##### *Roles of importance of the towns*

The development axe of Tolna county is based on the four well industrialized cities of Dunaföldvár, Paks, Szekszárd and Bonyhád. The role of cities is quite low here, Szekszárd, the capital of the county is the smallest of all Hungarian NUTS 3 regions with its 30000 inhabitants.

##### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

There is no agglomeration area in Tolna county. The one and only development axe runs parallel to the river Danube and links Szekszárd with Budapest and Pécs.

### *Interregional cooperation*

The city has interregional cooperation chances only in Hungarian context, as has no common borderline.

### *Living standards*

Average gross nominal monthly wage reflects region's economy structure, labour productivity level and wage politics of private sector and public administration. Average gross nominal monthly salary in region of Tolna was (2008) approximately 550 €. This value is below the average in comparison to other regions in Hungary, and it is the second lowest, if we compare it to Hungarian Danube Regions.

### *Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants	373,492438	381,727035	395,3289788	407,1244192
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants	16,23689652	17	22	21
Regional vitality index	92,85714286	86,93467337	72,55813953	63,8176486

## Bács-Kiskun megye

### *General Information*

#### *Human Resources*

##### *Demographic situation*

The number of population in Bács-Kiskun county was 536 290 in 2008, this is a high number compared to population in the Hungarian Danube region. The natural population growth from 1991 to 2008 was -4,32% (the biggest negative change). From 2001 to 2008 the population changed by -1,8%, so the population was decreasing did not slow. The reducing number of inhabitants is visible in all small regions with no big differences except for the capital of Kecskemét: this city is the only city with population above 100 000 in Hungary that has a positive natural growth in Hungary, not mentioning immigration.

##### *Educational structure*

Bács-Kiskun county has the lowest values of educational structure among Hungarian Danube regions. The reason for this is the fact that the region is a rural area with low accessibility and infrequent settlement structure. At the last census in 2001, 85,8% of aged 15–X finished at least 8 grades of primary school, 28,9% of aged 18–X at least completed secondary school, and 9,0% of aged 25–X has a university, college, etc. degree. Internal regional differences are relatively unimportant in the region, the capital, Kecskemét has better values, naturally.

##### *Labour market*

During the monitoring period number of economically active population reported a no change, not even the slightest change from one year to the other. The economic activity rate reached 53% both in 2001, and in 2008 of population aged 15-69. With these values, Bács-Kiskun is the region with the third lowest activity rate.

The employment rate of population aged 15-64 has been stagnating, it has decreased from 50 to 49%. This means, Bács-Kiskun had and has the third lowest employment rate among analysed regions. The unemployment rate indicator in the region has a unique value and has a very unlikely trend as well. From 2001 to 2008 it increased evenly from 5,5 to 8,5%. In 2008 Bács-Kiskun had the third worst unemployment rate.

The region has three institutes of higher education. Kecskemét and Baja are the bases of two state colleges, while Kalocsa is the home of a non-state college. Share of university educated inhabitants reached only 8,5% of population aged 25-x in 2008, that is the lowest value of the analysed regions.

#### *Settlement Structure*

##### *Development trends*

Bács-Kiskun is a region with economy in a relatively good state. The settlement system however is in trouble, as the remote, traditional farmlands are passing out. Whoever had a chance moved to the towns and cities, and only a little number of farms have been turned into sights of rural tourism. The city of Kecskemét is the only city with population above 100 000 in Hungary with natural population growth. The establishment of the new Mercedes factory of Kecskemét shall strengthen the position of the city and its wider region.

##### *Roles of importance of the towns*

Bács-Kiskun region is characterized by a large number of relatively big towns and cities. The biggest of these is Kecskemét with over 100 000 inhabitants, but it is a general feature of the Great Plain, that besides farms there are no villages, but traditional market towns with 10-20 thousand inhabitants.

##### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

There is no agglomeration area in the county, as the settlement structure contains relatively big and independent rural market towns.

The most important development axe lies between Budapest and Szeged and runs through Kecskemét.

*Interregional cooperation*

Though the region has a long border with Serbia, there is very low intensity of co-operation between the two regions, as there are no regional centres in the border regions.

*Living standards*

Average gross nominal monthly wage reflects region's economy structure, labour productivity level and wage politics of private sector and public administration. Average gross nominal monthly salary in region of Bács-Kiskun was (2008) approximately 500 €. This value is below the average in comparison to other regions in Hungary, and it is the lowest, if we compare it to Hungarian Danube Regions.

*Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants	401,8306807	417,1024968	429,528056	437,8845261
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants	13,01277085	15	20	21
Regional vitality index	91,45728643	87,56218905	73,61111111	66,36402021

## Osje ko-baranjska županija

### *General Information*

The County encompasses 264 residential areas in 42 local self-government units, whereof 7 have the status of a city (Beli Manstir, Beliše, Donji Miholjac, akovo, Našice, Osijek and Valpovo) and 35 have the status of a municipality (Antunovac, Bilje, Bizovac, emina, epin, Darda, Donja Motina, Draž, Drenje, urenovac, Erdut, Ernestinovo, Ferianci, Gorjani, Jagodnjak, Kneževi Vinogradi, Koška, Levanjska Varoš, Magadenovac, Marijanci, Petlovac, Petrijevc, Podgora, Podravska Moslavina, Popovac, Punitovci, Satnica akovaka, Semeljci, Strizivojna, Šljivoševci, Trnava, Viljevo, Viškovci, Vladislavci and Vuka).

### *Human Resources*

#### *Demographic situation*

According to the 2001 Census data, 330,506 inhabitants reside in the territory of the County. Pursuant to the 2001 Census, 83,89% of population in the territory of the present County were comprised by the Croats, 8,73% by the Serbs, 2,96% by the Hungarians, 2,64% by other nationalities and 1,78% by the undecided. This population resided in 113,583 households, in 264 residential areas. According to estimations for 2008., there were 320.617 inhabitants living in the OBC (7,2% of population of Croatia, which makes the county 4th among all counties by the population number). Comparing to census of 2001., number of inhabitants approximately decreases by 1.650 inhabitants in average per year. The average population density in the County, according to the estimated population for 2008, is 77.2 people per km<sup>2</sup>. According to the 2001 Census, population density was 79.5 people per km<sup>2</sup>.

#### *Educational structure*

In relation to the education structure of the population in Osijek-Baranja County we could say that the structure is relatively lower, but does not show significant difference from the national average.

Table below shows comparison data on education level in Osijek-Baranja County and the national level:

Education structure – population: 15 years and older

OBC Croatia

No school 3,0% 2,9%

1-3 Grammar school 4,3% 4,5%

4-7 Grammar School 13,0% 11,2%

Primary School 25,5% 21,8%

Craft school/ 25,7% 27,2%

Basic qualification

Advanced qualification

Secondary School 14,6% 15,0%

Comprehensive school/

Gymnasium 4,2% 4,8%

Highschool/Pregrad 3,0% 4,1%

B.sc 6,0% 7,3%

Ma.sc 0,2% 0,3%

Phd 0,1% 0,2%

Census 2001 (State Institute for Statistics): Programme for environment protection – Osijek-Baranja County, page 37.

According to the 2001 Census in Osijek-Baranja County there were 5.814 citizens over 10 years old that were illiterate (definition of „illiterate“ : older than 10 years, no school or 4 classes of primary school), which amounts to 2% of total population older than 10. The illiteracy was significant for older age groups – 60 years and older.

### *Labour market*

Social matrix of the Osijek - Baranja County is marked by a lower employment rate than the state average and at the same time a higher

unemployment rate in comparison with the state average. The breakdown of employees by economic activities and the change of employment rate in the period from 2000 to 2004 lead to following conclusions: the number of employees in the primary sector is dropping, which reflects technological changes in contemporary circumstances; however, it is also evident that the number of employees in the secondary sector is increasing, which, in a way, points to the fact that the degree of modern development is still not significantly marked, especially in the field of industrial structure. The same remark applies to the tertiary sector, marked by a certain employment growth; however, an employment disproportion between the sector of classic services and the sector of intellectual services is present and still pronounced in the tertiary sector as a trend. Classic services sector is evidently significantly increasing while intellectual services sector is proportionally decreasing, which is a true development anachronism.

### *Settlement Structure*

#### *Development trends*

According to population census (2001.) 25% of the total number of the County population is located in towns and municipalities and 75% in municipalities only. In terms of the size, settlements with 200 to 1,000 inhabitants are prevailing, accounting for 52% of the total number of settlements, settlements with 1000 to 2,000 inhabitants account for 15% and those with 100 to 200 inhabitants account for 12% of the total number of settlements. The distribution of settlements according to their size and their main characteristics are the following:

- the smallest settlements are located in mountainous area in the south-west of the County,
- the majority of settlements with around 300 inhabitants are located in the western part of the County,
- settlements with approximately 800 inhabitants are evenly distributed in the County area,
- settlements with approximately 1,500 inhabitants are mostly located in the north-eastern, eastern and south-eastern parts of the County,
- other settlements with over 2,000 inhabitants are located around the cities, particularly the Osijek city.

The distribution of inhabitants in the area of the County, is characterized by the concentration of inhabitants in settlements located at the main roads. From the Osijek city as the County main center the settlement system is distributed in six main directions, mostly toward the cities of Našice, Donji Miholjac, Beli Manastir, Erdut and Vinkovci (located in the Vukovar - Srijem County).

From the employment point of view, there are intensive daily migrations within the county: 84,2% of employed inhabitants of the county are employed in towns, and only 15,8% out of towns. Authorities are trying to build and open more business zones out of towns, which should mitigate the metropolisation trend and decrease the level of daily migrations (along with the Lisboa strategy priority of equal opportunities).

Employed % (June 30,2010.) Population % (Census 2001)

Cities 84,2 62,7

Out of cities 15,8 37,3

Source: Croatian Pension Fund, July 2007.

### *Roles of importance of the towns*

The complex urbanization process has been marked by the transformation of settlements (from rural to urban settlements), increase of the number of population and its redeployment from natural - rural environment to the city environment. Starting from the evaluation given

in the Spatial Planning Strategy of the Republic of Croatia and Spatial Planning Strategy of the Osijek - Baranja County, it can be concluded that the areas with urban characteristics and areas with the established urbanization level are limited to the Osijek city (over 1/3 of the population of the county lives in Osijek) with its adjacent settlements, single settlements in the area of Baranja and the settlements situated on, or close to the Osijek - Donji Miholjac traffic route. Other areas are transitional areas, i.e. those with settlements between urban and rural or the areas with predominantly rural characteristics.

*Agglomerations areas and development axes*

Compared to the situation in the Republic of Croatia, urban agglomeration around the Osijek city as macro-regional centre is one of the biggest urban agglomeration in the entire country. Two axes of urbanization can be identified in the County: the Osijek city - Darda - Beli Manastir and the Osijek city - Valpovo - Beliš e. In the last fifteen years the process of urbanization in the entire area of the Republic of Croatia has been very fast; the growth rate of urban population amounted, on the average, between 12% and 14%, whereas in the area of the Osijek - Baranja County it amounted to only 5.4%. The reason for such discrepancy is the war which particularly affected urban population of the Osijek city and the ensuing emigration processes. It should be noted that in the period from 1880 to 1971 the dynamic of the development of the cities in the Osijek - Baranja County area was second to the dynamics of the development of the cities recorded for the Zagreb region. After the World War II urbanization process gained momentum. In the period from 1953 to 1961 the population polarization process started in the areas with the extremely high rate of population growth recorded within urban centers. In the period from 1961 to 1971 polarization process accelerated and from 1971 to 1981 a certain stagnation of the process was recorded. It may be expected that in the future, the tertiarization of economy and social progress will lead to a more even distribution of both inhabitants and activities in the region.

*Interregional cooperation*

In the scope of its competences, County establishes a series of contacts and periodical or more durable cooperative relations with congenial or other in- and outland organizations or institutions.

Currently, Osijek-Baranja County is a member of:

- \* Croatian Counties' Association;
- \* Danube - Drava - Sava Euroregional Cooperation;
- \* Danubian Regions' Working Community (ARGE Donauländer);
- \* Assembly of European Regions (AER)
- \* European Sustainable Cities and Towns Campaign,

i.e., has established cooperative relations with

- \* Baranya County (Baranya Megye) in the Republic of Hungary;
- \* Autonomous Region of Friuli – Venezia Giulia (Regione FVG) in the Republic of Italy;
- \* Vicenza Province in the Republic of Italy.

*Living standards*

According to the State Bureau of statistics for 2007., data on GDP for Croatia only the NUTS4 - North-Western Croatia reach over-average GDP/per capita (12.010eur), which is primarily caused by the city of Zagreb (with GDP/capita which is 73,6% higher than national average).

NUTS4 of Panonian Croatia (Central and Eastern Croatia) has almost 30% lower GDP/capita than the national average (6.851eur). GDP/capita in OB county in 2008. is 8.871eur.

*Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants	351	345	290	290
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants	17,87	19,52	28,11	43,2
Regional vitality index		116,85		92,76

## Vukovarsko-srijemska županija

### *General Information*

Vukovar-Srijem County is organized into 31 local government unit, of which 5 cities (Vinkovci, Vukovar, Županja Ilok and Otok), and 26 municipalities with 84 associated settlements. Administrative, economic and cultural center of County is Vukovar, while, according to population, the largest city is Vinkovci. Among the municipalities according to population and an area Nijemci, Ivankovo, Babina Greda Tovarnik and Nuštar stand out.

Characteristic of this region are many large villages with a few thousands of inhabitants.

Currently, 49% of VSC's inhabitants live in 5 urban centres and 51% in 26 rural settlements (municipalities). In addition to population shifts during the homeland war, negative population migrations have affected VSC since 1991, with both rural and border areas becoming increasingly abandoned as the population moves to urban centres within or outside the county to seek a better life. For the young and the active labour force struggling to survive in such areas, relocation is often a means of escaping a perceived lack of prospects in areas that are essentially 'pockets of poverty'.

### *Human Resources*

#### *Demographic situation*

According to the census conducted in 1991, 231,241 people lived in this County, which consisted of a share of 4.8% of the total Croatian population. The population density was 10 inhabitants higher than the average for the Republic of Croatia and was 95 inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup>. County population in 1991. were younger than the population of other counties of Croatia. The average age of the population was 35.4 years (37.1 years for Croatia), and the index of age 54.1 (66.7 for Croatia).

During the aggression on Croatia in 1991 great part of the county was occupied. Croatian and other non-Serb residents were exiled out of these settlements. Many of the refugees didn't return till now, which resulted in the decreased number of county inhabitants and according to census conducted in 2001 there are 204.768 inhabitants in the county. The 2001 census highlighted a 13% (26.473) decline in population over 10 years (1991 = 231.241; 2001 = 204.768).

The average density of VSC's population is 84 inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup>, slightly above the Croatian average of 78 per km<sup>2</sup>.

#### *Educational structure*

In terms of educational structure of the population in VSC in relation to the national level (2001), it can be said that it is unsatisfying. The share of population without any education and with primary education is higher than at the national level, while the share of population with secondary or higher education is falling behind the share at the national level. It can be said that educational structure of population in VSC is unsatisfying, especially in terms of higher education.

As expected, among the local units, there are distinct differences in educational level. The lowest level of education record of the local unit with a very high proportion of the rural population. On the other hand, the best educational structure showed three major units, Vukovar, Vinkovci and Zupanja.

#### *Labour market*

The unemployment rate in the county is significantly higher than the national average (2008. 21.4% in VSC vs. 12.1% in CRO). Specifically, the Vukovar-Srijem County is county with the highest unemployment rate in Croatia. However, in the period 2003-08 the unemployment rate has decreased significantly, from 29.8% in 2003. to 21.4% in 2008.

High unemployment is not specificity of Vukovar-Srijem County, already marked by almost all slavonian countrys. This indicates that the issue of high rates of unemployment associated with structural features of the wider area of the county.

After years of successive decline in the number of unemployed, 2009. and 2010. are characterized by their growth due to economic crisis. However, increasing the number of unemployed persons in crisis 2009 and 2010. was much less pronounced than at the national level. Indeed, the Vukovar-Srijem County recorded the lowest relative increase in the number of unemployed in the period 2008 -2010 compared to all other counties.



The causes of the relative low growth in unemployment should be sought partly in the sectoral structure of employment in which counties recorded a below-average share of employees in sectors particularly hard hit by the crisis, such as the manufacturing industry. At the same time, the county recorded above-average share of employees in the agricultural and public sectors, where the level of layoffs much smaller than in other sectors.

### *Settlement Structure*

#### *Development trends*

#### *Roles of importance of the towns*

Vukovar and Vinkovci are the largest towns in Vukovar-Srijem County, having characteristics of larger regional/development centres. There is also the town of Županja, a smaller development centre, which is somewhat less developed. Having less than 8,000 people, Otok has recently gained the status of a town. The towns Vinkovci and Vukovar are firmly connected by infrastructure corridors, while connection important for Ilok is connection with Tovarnik and Lipovac.

#### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

#### *Interregional cooperation*

Vukovar-Srijem County takes an active part in following forms of interregional cooperation:

1. Intergovernmental agreements of cross-border cooperation:

The Vukovar-Srijem County has signed Cooperation Agreements with surrounding regions: Autonomous Province Vojvodina and its regional authorities: South Ba ka District and municipalities of Srem District in the Republic of Serbia, with the Posavina County in Bosnia and Hercegovina and with Bacs-Kiskun County in Hungary

2. Cooperation of Euroregions:

- The Vukovar-Srijem County is since 2001 a member of the Euroregional Cooperation Danube-Sava-Drava, founded in 1998. The Euroregion is an international organization of regional and local self-governments, as well as regional chambers of industry, commerce and economy from Hungary, Croatia, Bosnia and Hercegovina or other regions which gravitates to the rivers Danube, Drava or Sava.

- The Vukovar-Srijem County is a member of the Working Community of Danube Regions (ARGE Donaulaender) since 2004. It is a community of 38 member regions from the Danube basin covering about 650.000 km<sup>2</sup> where ca. 80 million people live.

- The Institute of the Regions of Europe (IRE), an economical and scientific institution with its seat in Salzburg (Austria). With the establishment of the IRE a supra-regional and politically independent organization was created which, in an enlarged Europe and also on the basis of the Lisbon Treaty, addresses the issue of allowing the regions and municipalities an increasing degree of importance, reduces existing information deficits, attends to a variety of issues and aims to make use of the economic potential of regional and supra-regional cooperation between the regions of Europe. The Vukovar-Srijem County is a member of this institution since 2007.

3. Cooperation of some local authorities of 31 present in the Vukovar-Srijem County

4. Cooperation of the Croatian Chamber of Economy - County Chamber Vukovar and of the Croatian Chamber of Crafts.

#### *Living standards*

According to the State Bureau of statistics for 2007., data on GDP for Croatia only the NUTS<sub>4</sub> - North-Western Croatia reach over-average GDP/per capita (12.010 €), which is primarily caused by the city of Zagreb (with GDP/capita which is 73,6% higher than national average).

NUTS<sub>4</sub> of Panonian Croatia (Central and Eastern Croatia) has almost 30% lower GDP/capita than the national average (6.851 €). GDP/capita in Vukovar-Srijem County in 2008. is 6.647 €.

*Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants		327		
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants				
Regional vitality index		97,6	87,96	85,2

## Beogradska oblast

### *General Information*

Beogradska oblast consists of 17 municipalities (NUTS 4 / LAU 1) - 10 urban and 7 sub-urban, and 157 settlements (NUTS 5 / LAU 2), 18 of them being urban. Belgrade, the capital of the Republic of Serbia, is the centre of this county. Thanks to the attraction power of the capital city, the region records constant population growth though this growth is a consequence of positive migration balance and not of natural population growth. In 2008, 22% of Serbian population and 42.9% of the population in the Serbian part of the Danube project area lived in this region. Together with several municipalities belonging to neighbouring regions, Beogradska oblast is defined as the only MEGA in Serbia. Belgrade is the most important university and economic centre of Serbia. It is also the most visited region from the tourist point of view.

### *Human Resources*

#### *Demographic situation*

Beogradska oblast (City of Belgrade) is one among three (out of nine) Danube counties / NUTS 3 regions in Serbia that faced population growth in the period 1991-2008, the population growth being 4.5%. When looking at NUTS 4 level, only ten out of 68 municipalities (NUTS 4) in the Serbian part of the Danube area were facing permanent growth in the same period, nine of them belonging to Beogradska oblast. This is, however, not a consequence of natural growth but of positive migration balance. After Census 1991, the Region's natural population growth passed from positive to negative attaining -2.0‰ in 2008 (the second best value in the Serbian part of the Danube Region). In 1991, natural growth was positive in 13 Belgrade municipalities (Municipality of Surin was then included in the Municipality of Zemun) and in 2008, only in one (Municipality of Zemun) whereas in the Municipality of Ukarica, the natural population growth was 0.0‰.

Beogradska oblast has the highest population density in the Serbian part of the Danube region (503.2 inhabitants per 1km<sup>2</sup> against the average 129.3 inhabitants per 1km<sup>2</sup> in 2008). This is the only NUTS 3 region where population density above 1,000 inhabitants per 1km<sup>2</sup> can be found at NUTS 4 level (9 out of 17 municipalities). Municipalities with the highest population density are the smallest core Belgrade municipalities of Vračar (18,589.0 inhabitants per 1km<sup>2</sup>) and Stari Grad (10,509.2 inhabitants per 1km<sup>2</sup>).

The age structure of Beogradska oblast is not a favourable one. The share of young population (0-14) declined from 18.7% to 14.4% in the period 1991-2008 (the 9 counties' average being 15.2% in 2008). The share of population in working age (15-64) declined from 71.0% in 1991 to 69.2% in 2002 and then rose to 69.3% in 2008. Once lowest among the Danube NUTS 3 regions in Serbia, the share of old population (65 and more) is permanently increasing (10.3% in 1991 to 16.3% in 2008) occupying 4th place in 2008 (the 9 counties' average being 17.2% in 2008). The worst age structure can be found in the two core/CBD Belgrade municipalities – Vračar and Stari Grad. The share of young population is higher than the share of old population in only 4 out of 17 Belgrade municipalities (one urban and three suburban), the ratio being the most favourable in suburban municipalities of Grocka and Lazarevac. As far as regional vitality index is concerned, Beogradska oblast occupies the fifth place among nine Danube NUTS 3 regions.

Beogradska oblast had the fifth rank value of the Coefficient 1 (0-14 year old population as a percentage of 15-64 year-old population) among nine Serbian Danube NUTS3 regions in 1991 (26.3) (census data that also included population living abroad), the lowest value in 2002 (21.0) and the eighth rank value in 2008 (20.8). As far as the Coefficient 2 is concerned (population aged 65 or over as a percentage of 15-64 year-old population), the region occupied 2nd place in 1991 (14.5), 3rd in 2002 (22.6) and again 2nd rank in 2008 (23.5). In 1991, Beogradska oblast had 7th rank value of the Coefficient 3 (the child and the old-age population as a percentage of population aged 15-64) (40.9), the lowest value in 2002 (43.6) and in 2008 (44.3).

#### *Educational structure*

In Serbian statistics, data on education structure exist for the population aged 15 and more and are only collected during Census. Data on high education include university and college graduates (number of college graduates is always higher than of university graduates). Data on non-educated population include persons who have never gone to school, then persons who have finished 1 to 3 grades and persons who have finished 4 to 7 grades of primary education. Primary education in Serbia is compulsory and it takes 8 years. Children usually start their primary education at the age of seven and finish it at the age of fifteen.

Beogradska oblast has the most favourable education structure among the Danube NUTS 3 regions in Serbia as it has the highest share of high educated population (19.2%), the highest share of population with accomplished secondary education (49.7%) and the lowest share of non-educated population (9.3%), education level of 1.9% of inhabitants being unknown. At the municipal / NUTS 4 level, only 10 out of 68 municipalities in the Serbian part of the Danube region have a share of high educated population above regional average, nine of them being core Belgrade municipalities. With exception of the core Belgrade municipality of Vračar, a clear centre-periphery pattern can be observed in Beogradska oblast in the terms of education structure. As far as secondary education is concerned, 22 out of 68 municipalities had the share of population with secondary education above regional average, twelve of them belonging to the City of Belgrade, but with no clear centre – periphery pattern. Only 15 out of 68 municipalities have share of non-educated population below regional average, twelve among them belonging to Beogradska oblast. In 2008, there were 65 state faculties and 32 state colleges in Beogradska oblast with the total number of 121,223 students in the school year 2007/2008. The same year, there were 95 secondary and 287 primary state schools. The number of private education institutions is growing each year, offering more educational options.

#### *Labour market*

The share of economically active population in Beogradska oblast occupies the second place among the nine Serbian Danube counties with 62.7% in 1991, 57.1% in 2002 and 64.6% in 2008. In the period 1991-2002, all Serbian Danube regions faced a decrease in employment and increase in unemployment while in the period 2002-2008 Beogradska oblast (together with Južnobańska, Južnobaška and Braničevska oblast) experienced raise in the number of employed. At NUTS 4 level, the highest shares of economically active population were observed in the core municipalities of Savski Venac (245.3% in 1991, 264.0% in 2002 and 301.5% in 2008), Stari Grad (227.2% in 1991, 174.5% in 2002 and 218.0% in 2008) and Vračar (86.3% in 1991, 81.4% in 2002 and 112.2% in 2008). This is, however a consequence of a high number of working places (data on employment not being determined according to the place of living but according to the place of work).

#### *Settlement Structure*

##### *Development trends*

Beogradska oblast has 157 settlements, 18 of them being urban according to statistics. In 1991, there were 109 settlements with less than 2,000 inhabitants whereas this number dropped to 104 until 2002 and staid stable ever since. Furthermore, the share of inhabitants living in such settlements dropped from 7.1% in 1991 to 5.9% in 2008. Number of settlements with more than 5,000 inhabitants faced an increase from 18 in 1991 to 22 in all other observed years as well as the share of inhabitants living in those settlements (from 86.9% in 1991 to 88.4% in 2008). However, inhabitants living in the city of Belgrade that has not only more than 100,000 but also more than 1,000,000 inhabitants, are the most numerous (1,133,146 in 1991 and 1,149,104 in 2008). On the other hand, their relative share shows a decreasing tendency: from 73% in 1991 to 70.9% in 2008.

##### *Roles of importance of the towns*

According to the Spatial Plan of the Republic of Serbia 2010-2020, Belgrade is defined as the Capital city whereas the City of Belgrade / Beogradska oblast, together with the municipalities of Stara Pazova, Peinci, Inija, Ruma (Sremska oblast), Opovo and Pančevo (Južnobańska oblast), is defined as the sole Metropolitan Growth Area in Serbia - MEGA. Belgrade is at the same time NUTS 0, NUTS 2 and NUTS 3 centre. Belgrade city is spread over 10 municipalities, the municipalities of Vračar, Stari Grad, Savski venac, Novi Beograd and Zvezdara being completely within city limits. NUTS 4 centres in Beogradska oblast are centres of suburban municipalities - Obrenovac, Barajevo, Grocka, Lazarevac, Sopot, Surin and Mladenovac. In terms of functions, Belgrade was a big industrial centre according to the previous Spatial Plan of Serbia, Lazarevac, Obrenovac and Mladenovac were medium size industrial centres whereas Grocka was a small industrial centre. National Spatial Plan in force reports decline in a number and importance of industrial centres comparing to 1996: Belgrade remains a big industrial centre (more than 20,000 employed in industry) but no other centre in Beogradska oblast is ranked. However, new industrial zones and parks are planned to be established in this region. According to the earlier Spatial Plan of Serbia, Belgrade was both international and national tourist, where the National Spatial Plan in force defines it as a tourist place of international importance. The main assets include cultural heritage, namely archaeological findings from Neolithic period (Vinča in Belgrade), medieval fortress and monasteries (Rakovica in Belgrade, Fenek near Surin, Rajinovac near Grocka), etc. There is also Selters spa in Mladenovac.

*Agglomerations areas and development axes*

Agglomeration areas are not defined as such in Serbian planning documents. However, Beogradska oblast and the city of Belgrade itself can be considered as the strongest agglomeration area in the country. According to the previous Spatial Plan of Serbia (1996), Belgrade and eight other settlements (Bor a, Ov a, Dobanovci, Sur in, Beli Potok, Pinosava, Sopot and Grocka) fall into two development belts/axes with 1st rank importance. No belts/axes with 2nd rank importance cross this region but two settlements (Veliki Crljeni and Lazarevac) fall into a belt/axe with 3rd rank importance, going from Belgrade to a ak. The agglomeration of Belgrade lies in the very heart of the two major development axes indicated in the Spatial Plan of Serbia in force: Danube-Sava development axes and the Corridor X as development generator in north-south direction (Corridor Xb and Corridor X: section Belgrade-Niš).

*Interregional cooperation*

Not being a border region, Beogradska oblast is not eligible for cross-border cooperation within EU defined cross-border programmes. However, the capital city and its region develop different cooperation and twinning projects with other European cities, especially Vienna.

*Living standards*

Data on housing exist only for the Census year 2002 and the year 2008 (at NUTS 3 and NUTS 4 level). According to these data, there were 586,889 housing units for permanent housing in 2002 and 625,550 in 2008 in Beogradska oblast, representing 6.6% growth (38,661 in absolute terms). 97.3% of houses/dwellings were connected to a public drinking water network both in 2002 and 2008 whereas the share of dwellings connected to a public sewage increased from 67.1% in 2002 to 95.9% in 2008. At municipal level, the share of dwellings with access to a public drinking water network ranged from 79.9% in Sopot to 99.9% in New Belgrade, the access to a public sewage network ranging from 69.5% in Sopot to 99.8% in New Belgrade in 2008.

*Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants		372		385,8
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants		53,1	57,5	59,1
Regional vitality index		92,7	88,1	88,3

## Borska oblast

### *General Information*

In 2008, the region had 134,375 inhabitants and the lowest population density in the Serbian part of the DONAUREGIONEN+ area (38.3 inhabitants/km<sup>2</sup>).

Borska oblast consists of 4 municipalities (NUTS<sub>4</sub> / LAU<sub>1</sub> units) and 90 settlements (NUTS<sub>5</sub> / LAU<sub>2</sub> units). According to statistics, following six settlements are considered to be urban: Bor, Brza Palanka, Kladovo, Donji Milanovac, Majdanpek and Negotin. The biggest centre is Bor with 37,018 inhabitants in 2008.

### *Human Resources*

#### *Demographic situation*

In 2008, population of Borska oblast accounted for only 3.6% of the total population of Serbian Danube region. Borska oblast suffered the biggest population decline among nine Serbian Danube NUTS<sub>3</sub> regions in the period 1991-2008: -17.7%. This is mainly due to an industrial decline as well as intensive out-migration process and consequently aggravation of the age structure and natural population growth that appeared to have the second negative value in the Serbian Danube area in 2008: - 8.5‰. Borska oblast is among three NUTS<sub>3</sub> regions in the Serbian part of the Danube area where all municipalities (NUTS<sub>4</sub>) face a constant population decline since Census 1991. Municipality of Majdanpek experienced the third lowest value of natural population growth among 68 Danube NUTS<sub>4</sub> regions in Serbia in 2008: -12.8‰. Borska oblast has the lowest population density in the entire Danube area in Serbia. This density is also a declining one (41.8 inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup> in 2002 and 38.3 inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup> in 2008), the lowest density among four municipalities being found in the Municipality of Majdanpek (22.4 inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup> in 2008).

As data on age structure for the year 1991 also include population living abroad, there is no possibility to make precise comparison with data for 2002 and 2008. Borska oblast had the second lowest share of population in age 0-14 among nine Serbian Danube NUTS<sub>3</sub> regions in 1991 (17.8%) and 2002 (14.9%) and the third lowest in 2008 (14.6%). As far as the population in working age (15-64) is concerned, Borska oblast had the second highest share among nine Serbian Danube NUTS<sub>3</sub> regions in 1991 (70.3%) and the second lowest in 2002 (65.9%) and 2008 (66.1%). A bad age structure of Borska oblast is also confirmed by an important and increasing share of elderly population (65+): only 11.8% in 1991 but 18.2 and 19.3% in 2002 and 2008 respectively. Borska oblast encountered the second highest loss of population in working age in the period 1991-2008, namely 4.2%.

In the period 1991-2008, the share of young population (aged 0-14 years) dropped in all Danube municipalities in Serbia (except in Veliko Gradište and Golubac that belong to Brani evska oblast) and so in Borska oblast, too. A slight recovery can be observed in the municipalities of Kladovo and Negotin in the period 2002-2008, however the share remains low. As far as population in age 15-64 is concerned at NUTS<sub>4</sub> level, three out of four municipalities in Borska oblast faced a very important decline in the period 1991-2008, namely Kladovo (-7.8%), Negotin (-6.5%) and Majdanpek (-4.3%). This conclusion should, however, be taken with caution as this region (and Brani evska oblast) has the highest emigration rates among nine Serbian Danube NUTS<sub>3</sub> regions (population living abroad being included in the age structure in data for 1991). Three municipalities, in fact, faced a slight increase in the share of population in age 15-64 in the period 2002-2008 but not in absolute terms (Bor, Majdanpek and Negotin). The share of population old 65 and more has significantly risen so that in during the period 1991-2002, all municipalities in the Serbian part of the Danube region experienced its increase in relative terms, whereas in the period 2002-2008 some also experienced its moderate decline, for instance Municipality of Negotin. Municipalities of Negotin and Kladovo are among those with the highest shares of elderly population in the Serbian part of the Danube region (24.1% and 22.8% in 2008 respectively).

Borska oblast had the second lowest value of the Coefficient 1 (0-14 year old population as a percentage of 15-64 year-old population) among all nine Serbian Danube NUTS<sub>3</sub> regions in 1991 (census data that also included population living abroad), then the third lowest in 2002 and the four lowest in 2008. This can give a wrong picture of the real developments: though it seems that this region is getting better position among Serbian Danube NUTS<sub>3</sub> regions, the value of the Coefficient 1 is declining and the situation is worsening in the entire Serbian Danube area. As far as the Coefficient 2 is concerned (population aged 65 or over as a percentage of 15-64 year-old population), Borska oblast had the fourth highest value in 1991 and the second highest values in 2002 and 2008, just after Brani evska oblast. In 1991, Borska oblast had the third lowest value of the Coefficient 3 (the child and the old-age population as a percentage of population aged 15-64) and then the third highest in 2002 and the second highest in 2008.



### *Educational structure*

According to the Census 2002 data, there was 7.4% of people with high education, 30.2% with secondary education and 30.8% of people with no education in Borska oblast. These data are slightly better than in Brani evska oblast but are still bad comparing to other Serbian NUTS<sub>3</sub> Danube regions. They can partly be explained by a mountainous and rural character of this NUTS<sub>3</sub> region, important out-migration, mono-functional industrial development and a marginal geographic situation. Education status remains unknown for 5.7% of population aged 15 years and more which is the highest share in the entire Serbian Danube area. The lowest participation of educated population can be found in the Municipality of Majdanpek (5.1%) and the highest in the Municipality of Bor (8.9%) where the sole university in this region is situated, namely Faculty of Engineering belonging to the University of Belgrade (1683 student in the school year 2007/2008). The relative share of population with secondary education is the lowest in the Municipality of Negotin (23.3%) and the highest again in the Municipality of Bor (35.5%). There are 13 secondary schools in total: 4 in Bor, 4 in Negotin, 3 in Majdanpek and 2 in Kladovo. There are 108 primary schools in Borska oblast (schools and their rural branches) that are more or less evenly spread over three municipalities (22 at average) whereas their highest concentration can be found in the Municipality of Negotin (41) where the number of settlements is also the highest. However, share of non-educated population is extremely high.

### *Labour market*

The share of economically active population first faced an increase in the period 1991-2002 and then decline in the period 2002-2008. Except in 2002, these shares were below the average for the Serbian part of the Danube area. Decrease of the number of employed had almost the same rate in the period 1991-2002 as in the period 2002-2008 and the region lost some 19,000 working places in total. A slight recovery of unemployment in the period 2002-2008 was far from sufficient to reverse established negative trends.

Regarding economically active population at NUTS<sub>4</sub> level, municipalities could be divided in two groups: those with a higher share of economically active population but that is below regional average (Bor and Majdanpek) and those with a very low share of economically active population (Kladovo and Negotin). The share of economically active population shows an increasing tendency in all municipalities in the period 1991-2002, and a declining one in the period 2002-2008. As far as employment and unemployment trends at NUTS<sub>4</sub> level are concerned, the situation seems to be the worst in the Municipality of Negotin where there was no positive change in any of the examined years - the absolute number of employed is continuously declining while the absolute number of unemployed is constantly increasing.

### *Settlement Structure*

#### *Development trends*

Borska oblast consists of 4 municipalities (NUTS<sub>4</sub> / LAU<sub>1</sub> units) and 90 settlements (NUTS<sub>5</sub> / LAU<sub>2</sub> units), mainly rural ones. According to statistics, following six settlements are considered to be urban: Bor, Brza Palanka, Kladovo, Donji Milanovac, Majdanpek and Negotin. This means that all municipalities have urban settlements as NUTS<sub>4</sub> centres. Urbanization rate (as share of population living in settlements with over 5,000 inhabitants) grew from 48% in 1991 to 54.6% in 2008. Because of population decline, the number of settlements having from 2,000 to 5,000 inhabitants dropped from 7 in 1991 to 4 in 2008 while the number of settlements with less than 2,000 inhabitants grew from 79 in 1991 to 82 in 2008, the number of settlements with more than 5,000 inhabitants being stable and facing population growth. There is no settlement with over 100,000 inhabitants, the biggest centre being Bor with 37,018 inhabitants.

#### *Roles of importance of the towns*

According to the settlement network defined by the new Spatial Plan of the Republic of Serbia 2010-2020 there are only centres of local significance in Borska oblast, the town of Bor having lost its position as regional centre in the previous national spatial planning document. However, the town of Bor is at the same time NUTS<sub>3</sub> and NUTS<sub>4</sub> centre, whereas other three settlements are NUTS<sub>4</sub> centres, namely, urban settlements of Kladovo, Majdanpek and Negotin.

In terms of functions, Bor and Majdanpek were medium size industrial centres according to the previous Spatial Plan of Serbia, whereas Donji Milanovac, Kladovo and Negotin were small industrial centres. However, many industries faced decline or transformation since the adoption of that Plan in 1996. New Spatial Plan of the

Republic of Serbia 2010-2020 reports decline in a number and importance of industrial centres comparing to 1996: Bor remains in the category of medium size centres but those with 5,000 to 10,000 employed in industry, whereas Majdanpek, Kladovo and Negotin were listed as small industrial centres with 1,000 to 5,000 employed in industry. Industrial zones and industrial parks are planned to be established in Bor, Majdanpek, Negotin and Kladovo.

The education role of the cities was already underlined.

According to the previous national spatial plan, Kladovo was the only place defined as being of national and regional tourist interest, whereas national spatial planning document in force sees only local importance of settlements in this region. However, some tourist attractions are of international significance such as archaeological findings from Neolithic period (Lepenski Vir near Donji Milanovac) and Roman era (Diana in Kladovo, Traian's table and Pontes near Kladovo) and a medieval fortress (Fetislam in Kladovo). There is also an important monastery Vratna near Negotin and maybe the most known example of traditional architecture in Serbia (pimnice near Negotin). Internationally important natural asset for tourism is the Iron Gate or erdap gorge that extends to almost half of the territory of the municipalities of Majdanpek and Kladovo and to a very small extent on the territory of the Municipality of Negotin. Another key natural values as tourist attractions are listed in the description of natural conditions, many of them being rare examples of unique karst forms. Eurovelo 6 pass through all places on the Danube till Kladovo. According to the Tourist organisation of Serbia 11 settlements are considered to be tourist spots because of their own assets or because they are situated in the vicinity of important tourist attractions, namely: Bor, Brestovac and Zlot in the Municipality of Bor, Kladovo and Tekija in the Municipality of Kladovo, Donji Milanovac and Majdanpek in the Municipality of Majdanpek and Negotin, Rajac, Rogljevo and Smedovac in the Municipality of Negotin. Tourism along the Danube is gaining importance and aims at connecting different attractions and activities such as Roman Emperors' route, navigation and cruises, wellness and spa, Danube fortresses, etc. There is also a wine route in Borska oblast connecting villages of Rajac, Rogljevo and Smedovac.

#### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

According to the previous Spatial Plan of Serbia, settlements falling into the development belt/axe with 1st rank importance coincided with the European corridors 7 (and 10), main settlements in Borska oblast in this belt being Donji Milanovac, Kladovo and Prahovo/Negotin. One of the development belts/axes with 2nd degree importance went from Negotin to Zaje ar, Knjaževac and finally Niš. At the village of Rgotina this development axes was linked to the 3rd degree development belt/axe going from that place to Bor and Majdanpek and then to Požarevac and Smederevo. Spatial Plan of Serbia 2010-2020 does not specify agglomeration areas and development axes but gives indication for two development axes in the Danube area, namely the Danube belt (that also includes Sava River) as well as Corridor 10. Main centres along the Danube corridor in Borska oblast are Donji Milanovac, Kladovo, Brza Palanka and Prahovo, Negotin being situated in the hinterland. Corridor 10 does not pass through this NUTS 3 region.

#### *Interregional cooperation*

Borska oblast is eligible to participate in IPA Cross-border Cooperation Programme Serbia-Romania as well as in IPA Cross-border Cooperation Programme Bulgaria Serbia. Areas of support of the two programmes are:

IPA CBC SRB-RO:

Economic & Social Development

- Support for local/regional economic and social infrastructure
- Develop the tourism sector, including the strengthening of the regional identity of the border region as a tourist destination
- Promote SME development
- Support increased levels of R&D and innovation in the border region

Environment and Emergency Preparedness

- Improve systems and approaches to address cross-border environmental challenges, protection and management
- Develop and implement effective strategies for waste and waste water management
- More effective systems and approaches to emergency preparedness (including aspects such as flood prevention/control, food safety, health issues)

Promoting "people to people" exchanges

- Support the development of civil society and local communities



- Improve local governance in relation to the provision of local services to communities in the border areas
- Increase educational, cultural and sporting exchange
- Enhance social and cultural integration of border areas

Technical Assistance

- Support for the implementation, overall management and evaluation of the Programme
- Support for the publicity and information activities of the Programme.

IPA CBC BG-SRB:

Development of small-scale infrastructure

- Physical and information infrastructure
- Infrastructure concerning environmental issues
- Assistance for project preparation

Enhancing capacity for joint planning, problem solving and development

- Links and networking on institutional, business and educational levels
- Sustainable development through efficient utilization of regional resources
- People to people actions.

Borska oblast participates in Euroregion "Middle Danube – Iron Gate", together with partners from Romania and Bulgaria. Objectives of this Euroregion are:

- To facilitate transport and industry development in the region and in whole Europe
- Transport facilities
- Sustainable use of resources for transport, industry, agriculture and tourism
- Sustainable development (protection of natural resources).

*Living standards*

Data on housing exist only for the Census year 2002 and the year 2008 (at NUTS<sub>3</sub> and NUTS<sub>4</sub> level). According to these data, there were 61,652 housing units for permanent housing in 2002 and 62,779 in 2008 in Borska oblast, which represented 1.8% growth (1,127 in absolute terms). 69.6% of houses/dwellings were connected to a public drinking water network in 2002 whereas this share grew to 84.5% in 2008. The share of dwellings connected to a public sewage system also faced an increase: from low 43.4% in 2002 to 76.9% in 2008. At municipal level, the share of dwellings with access to a public drinking water network ranged from 76.9% in Majdanpek to 89.6% in Bor, access to a public sewage network ranging from 66.0% in Majdanpek to 81.9% in Kladovo in 2008.

*Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants		421		467,2
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants		3,4	11,7	10,9
Regional vitality index		82	81,6	75,7

## Brani evska oblast

### *General Information*

In 2008, the region had 191,906 inhabitants and the second lowest population density in the Serbian part of the DONAUREGIONEN+ area (49.7 inhabitants/km<sup>2</sup>), higher only than in Borska oblast.

The region has 8 NUTS<sub>4</sub>/LAU<sub>1</sub> units (municipalities) and 189 NUTS<sub>5</sub>/LAU<sub>2</sub> units (settlements), mainly being of rural character. According to statistics, only following five settlements are considered to be urban: Veliko Gradište, Ku evo, Kostolac, Požarevac and Petrovac. The biggest centre is Požarevac with 42,663 inhabitants in 2008.

### *Human Resources*

#### *Demographic situation*

In 2008, population of Brani evska oblast accounted for only 5.1% of the total population of Serbian Danube region. Brani evska oblast suffered an important and the second largest population decline among nine Serbian Danube NUTS<sub>3</sub> regions in the period 1991-2008, the decline being -12.9%. This is mainly due to an intensive out-migration process and consequently aggravation of the age structure and natural population growth that appeared to have the most negative value in the Serbian Danube area: - 11.6‰ in 2008. Seven out of eight NUTS<sub>4</sub> units (municipalities) are facing constant population decline, the only exception being the Municipality of Požarevac that faced a slight population increase in the period 2002-2005. Looking at NUTS<sub>4</sub> level in the entire Serbian Danube area, 5 municipalities in Brani evska oblast faced the most negative values of natural population growth among six listed, namely municipalities of Žabari (-23.7‰), Ku evo (-16.8‰), Žagubica (-12.6‰), Malo Crni e (-11.7‰) and Golubac (-10.8‰). Population density in Brani evska oblast declined from 51.9 inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup> in 2002 to 49.7 inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup>. Municipality of Žagubica has the lowest population density in the entire Serbian Danube Region (18.2 inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup>).

As data on age structure for the year 1991 also include population living abroad, there is no possibility to make precise comparison with data for 2002 and 2008. Brani evska oblast had the highest share of population in age 0-14 in the Serbian part of the Danube Region in 2008, together with Južnobanatska oblast (15.9%). This was, however, not the case in previously observed years and cannot be considered as positive trend because this share is rather small, reflecting negative trends in all Serbian Danube regions. In the case of Brani evska oblast this can be further confirmed with the fact that this NUTS<sub>3</sub> region had the highest share of elderly population (65+) in 2008, namely 21.0%. In the very same year, the region had the lowest share of population aged 15-64 (63.0%). Brani evska oblast encountered the highest loss of population in working age in the period 1991-2008, namely 5.8%.

In the period 1991-2008, the share of young population (aged 0-14 years) dropped in all Danube municipalities in Serbia except in Veliko Gradište and Golubac that belong to Brani evska oblast. As far as population in age 15-64 is concerned at NUTS<sub>4</sub> level, some municipalities in Brani evska oblast are among those that faced the most important decline in the period 1991-2008, namely Žabari (-11.5%), Žagubica (-9.3%), Ku evo (-8.4%) and Golubac (-7.2%). This conclusion should, however, be taken with caution as this region (and Borska oblast) has the highest emigration rates among nine Serbian Danube NUTS<sub>3</sub> regions (population living abroad being included in the age structure in data for 1991). A great majority of municipalities, in fact, faced an increase in the share of population in age 15-64 in the period 2002-2008 but not in absolute terms, for instance Municipality of Malo Crni e (2.8%). The share of population old 65 and more has significantly risen so that in during the period 1991-2002, all municipalities in the Serbian part of the Danube region experienced its increase in relative terms, whereas in the period 2002-2008 some also experienced its moderate decline (17 out of 68). Municipalities of Brani evska oblast are among those with the highest shares of elderly population (for instance, Municipality of Žabari: 30.5%).

Brani evska oblast had the lowest value of the Coefficient 1 (0-14 year old population as a percentage of 15-64 year-old population) among all nine Serbian Danube NUTS<sub>3</sub> regions in 1991 (census data that also included population living abroad), then the second highest in 2002 and the highest in 2008. As far as the Coefficient 2 is concerned (population aged 65 or over as a percentage of 15-64 year-old population), the region has the highest values in all three observed years. In 1991, Brani evska oblast had the second highest value of the Coefficient 3 (the child and the old-age population as a percentage of population aged 15-64) and the highest in 2002 and 2008.

### *Educational structure*

According to the Census 2002 data, there was 5.5% of people with high education, 27.7% with secondary education and 35.6% of people with no education in Brani evska oblast. These data are very disappointing (and the worst in the entire Serbian Danube area) but can be explained by a rural character of this NUTS<sub>3</sub> region, absence of education institutions and important out-migration. Education status remains unknown for 1.75% of population aged 15 years and more. The lowest participation of educated population can be found in the Municipality of Malo Crni e (1.7%) and the highest in the Municipality of Požarevac (8.9%) where the concentration of education institutions is the highest and where a sole college in this NUTS<sub>3</sub> region is situated. In the town of Požarevac there is also a Faculty of Business Studies belonging to a private university - Megatrend University based in Belgrade. While there were 593 students at the state college (polytechnics) during the school year 2007/2008, data on private universities are not covered by official statistics. The relative share of population with secondary education is again the lowest in the Municipality of Malo Crni e (15.8%) and the highest in the Municipality of Požarevac (39.7%). There are 11 secondary schools in total, seven of them being situated in the town of Požarevac and one in each of the following municipal/NUTS<sub>4</sub> centres: Veliko Gradište, Žagubica, Kulevo and Petrovac. There are 175 primary schools in Brani evska oblast (schools and their rural branches) that are more or less evenly spread over all municipalities. However, share of non-educated population is extremely high even in the Municipality of Požarevac where this share is almost half the share of other municipalities.

### *Labour market*

Brani evska oblast is the only region in the Serbian part of the Danube area that shows a continual growth of the relative share of economically active population (41.4% in 2008 while in 1991 it was only 25.7%). This is, however, a consequence of an increase in the number of employed and unemployed and a decline of working age population. Nevertheless, this share remains the lowest among nine Serbian Danube NUTS<sub>3</sub> regions. In the period 1991-2002, all Danube NUTS<sub>3</sub> regions in Serbia faced a decrease in employment and increase in unemployment while in the period 2002-2008 Brani evska oblast was among those NUTS<sub>3</sub> regions that experienced a rise in the number of employed, all counties experiencing a drop of unemployment in the chosen period.

Municipality of Malo Crni e had the lowest share of economically active population among all 68 Serbian Danube NUTS<sub>4</sub> regions in 1991 (8.0%), in 2002 (15.1%) and in 2008 (18.5%). Other municipalities of Brani evska oblast also had the lowest shares with the exception of the Municipality of Požarevac that was close to the Serbian Danube region's average. This municipality saw its economic structure changed in line with new economic trends (development of SMEs, services, new administrative competences), which led to positive changes in employment-unemployment ratio in the period 2002-2008.

### *Settlement Structure*

#### *Development trends*

Brani evska oblast consists of 8 municipalities (NUTS<sub>4</sub> / LAU<sub>1</sub> units) and 189 settlements (NUTS<sub>5</sub> / LAU<sub>2</sub> units), mainly being of rural character. According to statistics, only following five settlements are considered to be urban: Veliko Gradište, Kulevo, Kostolac, Požarevac and Petrovac. This means that out of 8 municipalities only four of them have urban settlements as NUTS<sub>4</sub> centres whereas four NUTS<sub>4</sub> centres are rural settlements (Golubac, Žabari, Žagubica and Malo Crni e). Such situation explains a low urbanisation rate in this NUTS<sub>3</sub> region: share of population living in settlements with over 5,000 inhabitants was only 34.3% in 2008. Because of population decline, the number of settlements having from 2,000 to 5,000 inhabitants dropped from 10 in 1991 to only 4 in 2008 while the number of settlements with less than 2,000 inhabitants grew from 175 in 1991 to 181 in 2008, the number of settlements with more than 5,000 inhabitants being stable and facing population growth. There is no settlement with over 100,000 inhabitants, the biggest centre being Požarevac with 42,663 inhabitants.

#### *Roles of importance of the towns*

According to a settlement network that was defined within the new Spatial Plan of the Republic of Serbia 2010-2020, City/Municipality of Požarevac, together with municipalities of Malo Crni e and Žabari, is a regional centre. Town of Požarevac is at the same time NUTS<sub>3</sub> and NUTS<sub>4</sub> centre, whereas seven other settlements are NUTS<sub>4</sub>

centres, namely, urban settlements of Veliko Gradište, Ku evo and Petrovac and rural settlements of Golubac, Žabari, Žagubica and Malo Crni e.

In terms of functions, Požarevac was a medium size industrial centre according to the previous Spatial Plan of Serbia, whereas Kostolac, Petrovac, Ku evo and Žagubica were small industrial centres. However, many industries faced decline or transformation since the adoption of that Plan in 1996. New Spatial Plan of the Republic of Serbia 2010-2020 reports decline in a number and importance of industrial centres comparing to 1996: Požarevac remains in the category of medium size centres but those with 5,000 to 10,000 employed in industry, whereas Malo Crni e, Ku evo, Žagubica, Veliko Gradište and Golubac were listed as "other industrial centres" with less than 1,000 employed in industry. Industrial zones and industrial parks are planned to be established in Požarevac, Malo Crni e, Žagubica, Žabari, and Ku evo.

The education role of the cities was already underlined.

According to the national spatial planning document in force, leisure and tourism activities in the region are mainly of local character. However, some tourist attractions are of international significance such as archaeological findings from Roman era: Viminacium - a Roman town and military camp near Kostolac and medieval fortresses on the Danube at Ram and Golubac. There are also few important monasteries, namely Tumane near Golubac and Vitovnica and Gornjak near Petrovac. Internationally important natural asset for tourism is the Iron Gate or erdap gorge - the longest and the biggest penetrating gorge in Europe. National Park Iron Gate is mainly spread over Borska oblast but it also affects a small part of the Municipality of Ku evo and important part of the Municipality of Golubac. Another key spot in terms of visited natural values is Žagubi ko vrela or source of the river Mlava in the Municipality of Žagubica. Veliko Gradište is well known as the centre of water tourism on the artificial Silver Lake (former branch of the Danube) especially during summertime. There are some more ambitious plans for the development of this place that include construction of Silver Lake Resort, a marina etc. Eurovelo 6 pass through all places on the Danube. According to the Tourist organisation of Serbia 5 settlements are considered to be tourist spots because of their own assets or because they are situated in the vicinity of important tourist attractions, namely: Veliko Gradište, Golubac, Ceremošnja in the Municipality of Ku evo, Kostolac and Požarevac.

#### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

According to the previous Spatial Plan settlements falling into the development belt/axe with 1st rank importance coincided with the European corridors 7 (and 10), main settlements in Brani evska oblast in this belt being Kostolac, Veliko Gradište and Golubac. None of the development belt/axe with 2nd degree importance included Brani evska oblast whereas main places on the corridor of the 3rd degree development belt/axe included Požarevac and Ku evo (the belt going from Smederevo to Majdanpek and Bor and joining the belt/axe with 2nd degree importance going From Negotin to Niš). Spatial Plan of Serbia 2010-2020 does not specify development axes but gives indication for two development axes in the Danube area, namely the Danube belt (that also includes Sava river) as well as Corridor 10. Main centres along the Danube corridor in Brani evska oblast are Požarevac, Kostolac, Veliko Gradište and Golubac whereas corridor 10 does not pass through this NUTS 3 region.

#### *Interregional cooperation*

Brani evska oblast is eligible to participate in IPA Cross-border Cooperation Programme Serbia-Romania, the areas of support being:

##### Economic & Social Development

- Support for local/regional economic and social infrastructure
- Develop the tourism sector, including the strengthening of the regional identity of the border region as a tourist destination
- Promote SME development
- Support increased levels of R&D and innovation in the border region

##### Environment and Emergency Preparedness

- Improve systems and approaches to address cross-border environmental challenges, protection and management
- Develop and implement effective strategies for waste and waste water management
- More effective systems and approaches to emergency preparedness (including aspects such as flood prevention/control, food safety, health issues)

##### Promoting "people to people" exchanges

- Support the development of civil society and local communities

- Improve local governance in relation to the provision of local services to communities in the border areas
- Increase educational, cultural and sporting exchange
- Enhance social and cultural integration of border areas

#### Technical Assistance

- Support for the implementation, overall management and evaluation of the Programme
- Support for the publicity and information activities of the Programme.

Once established, the Euroregion Danube 21 has not achieved significant cohesion and results.

#### *Living standards*

Data on housing exist only for the Census year 2002 and the year 2008 (at NUTS<sub>3</sub> and NUTS<sub>4</sub> level). According to these data, there were 79,089 housing units for permanent housing in 2002 and 82,519 in 2008 in Brani evska oblast, which represented 4.3% growth (3,430 in absolute terms). Only 50.54% of houses/dwellings were connected to a public drinking water network in 2002 whereas this share grew to 82.20% in 2008. The share of dwellings connected to a public sewage system faced a more important increase: from 22.85% in 2002 to even 76.97% in 2008 (there was no public sewage network in the municipalities of Žabari, Žagubica and Malo Crni e in 2002). At municipal level, the share of dwellings with access to a public drinking water network ranged from 68.9% in Malo Crni e to 91.9% in Požarevac, access to a public sewage network ranging from 59.3% in Žabari to 88.8% in Požarevac in 2008.

#### *Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants		394,5		430
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants		0	0	0
Regional vitality index		73,4	77,4	75,9

## Podunavska oblast

### *General Information*

In 2008, Podunavska oblast had 204,442 inhabitants and the second highest population density among nine NUTS 3 regions in the Serbian part of the DONAUREGIONEN+ area (163.6 inhabitants/km<sup>2</sup>).

The region has 3 municipalities (NUTS<sub>4</sub> / LAU<sub>1</sub> units) and 58 settlements (NUTS<sub>5</sub> / LAU<sub>2</sub> units), mainly of rural character. According to statistics, only three NUTS 4 centres are considered to be urban, namely Smederevo, Velika Plana and Smederevska Palanka. The biggest centre is Smederevo with 63,333 inhabitants in 2008.

### *Human Resources*

#### *Demographic situation*

With 204,442 inhabitants in 2008, the population of Podunavska oblast accounted for 5.4% of the total population of Serbian Danube area. The region faces a constant population decline since 1991, the total balance for the period 1991-2008 being -5.4%. The same trend applies for all three municipalities, the negative balance being -2.0% in the City of Smederevo, -8.1% in the Municipality of Smederevska Palanka and -9.8% in the Municipality of Velika Plana. The main cause of the population decline in this region is an out-migration and a natural growth that passed to a negative one during '90s (it was 1.2‰ in 1991 attaining -5.7‰ in 2008). At the level NUTS 4, natural growth was 3.0‰ in Smederevo, -0.1‰ in Smederevska Palanka and -1.4 in Velika Plana in 1991 and -4.9‰ in Smederevo, -5.6‰ in Smederevska Palanka and -7.7 in Velika Plana in 2008.

Due to the population decline, population density in Podunavska oblast declined from 173.7 inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup> in 1991 to 163.6 inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup> in 2008 (2nd rank among 9 Danube regions in Serbia). At NUTS 4 level, population density was 224.2 inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup> in the City of Smederevo, 126.4 inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup> in the Municipality of Smederevska Palanka and 123.8 inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup> in the Municipality of Velika Plana in 2008.

As data on age structure for the year 1991 also include population living abroad, there is no possibility to make precise comparison with data for 2002 and 2008. The age structure of Podunavska oblast is unfavourable. The share of young population (0-14) declined from 20.1% to 15.8% in the period 1991-2008 (the 9 regions' average being 15.2% in 2008). The share of population in working age (15-64) declined from 68.9% in 1991 to 66.6% in 2002 and then rose to 67.5% in 2008. Once much lower, the share of old population (65 and more) is permanently increasing (10.9% in 1991 to 16.7% in 2008) occupying 5th place in 2008 (the 9 regions' average being 17.2% in 2008). The worst age structure can be found in the Municipality of Smederevska Palanka where there was the lowest share of young population (14.6%) and the highest share of elderly population (19.3%) in 2008. The age structure is the most favourable in the City of Smederevo where one can find the highest share of young population - 16.6%, the highest share of population in working age - 68.8% and the lowest share of elderly population - 14.6%, the share of young population being higher than the share of elderly population only in this NUTS 4 unit. As far as regional vitality index is concerned, Podunavska oblast occupied 4th rank among 9 Danube regions (94.6).

Podunavska oblast had the highest value of the Coefficient 1 (0-14 year old population as a percentage of 15-64 year-old population) among all nine Serbian Danube NUTS<sub>3</sub> regions in 1991 (29.2) (census data that also included population living abroad) and 2002 (26.8) and the second highest in 2008 (23.4). As far as the Coefficient 2 is concerned (population aged 65 or over as a percentage of 15-64 year-old population), the region occupied 5th rank in 1991 (15.9), then 6th in 2002 (24.4) and 4th in 2008 (24.7). In 1991, Podunavska oblast had the third highest value of the Coefficient 3 (the child and the old-age population as a percentage of population aged 15-64) (45.1), the second highest in 2002 (51.2) and again the third highest in 2008 (48.1).

#### *Educational structure*

According to the Census 2002 data, there was 7.3% of people with high education, 38.9% with secondary education and 25.0% of people with no education in Podunavska oblast. These data are rather disappointing and can be explained by a fairly rural character of this NUTS<sub>3</sub> region, insufficient number of higher and/or high education institutions and a bad age structure. Education status remains unknown for 1.3% of population aged 15 years and more. The share of highly educated population was 5.2% in the Municipality of Velika Plana, 7.5% in the Municipality of Smederevska Palanka and 8.0% in the City of Smederevo. The relative share of population with secondary education ranges from 35.4% in the Municipality of Velika Plana and 38.5% in the Municipality of Smederevska Palanka to 40.5% in the City of Smederevo. There are 12 secondary schools in total, 6 of them being situated in the City of Smederevo and three in the municipalities of Velika Plana and Smederevska Palanka. In



Podunavska oblast, there are 81 primary schools (schools and their rural branches), 33 being located in the City of Smederevo, 27 in the Municipality of Smederevska Palanka and 21 in the Municipality of Velika Plana. The relative share of population with no education varies from 30.0% in the Municipality of Velika Plana, and 27.1% in the Municipality of Smederevska Palanka to 21.8% in the City of Smederevo.

### *Labour market*

The relative share of economically active population in Podunavska oblast first faced an increase and then a decline since 2002 (44.5% in 1991, 49.6% in 2002 and 44.3% in 2008). This is mainly a consequence of an important decrease in the number of employed, as well as an increase in the number of unemployed, both phenomena being more evident in the period 1991-2002. According to the share of economically active population in 2008, Podunavska oblast occupied 8th place among nine Danube regions in Serbia.

Looking at municipal / NUTS 4 level, every municipality shows a different tendency. Smederevo first faced an increase and then a decrease in the share of economically active population, the balance for the period 1991-2008 being negative. On the other hand, Smederevska Palanka shows an increasing tendency whereas Velika Plana first faced an increase and then a decrease in the share of economically active population, both NUTS 4 units showing a positive final balance. In 2008, the share of economically active population was 39.3% in Velika Plana, 44.7% in Smederevska Palanka and 46.0% in Smederevo.

### *Settlement Structure*

#### *Development trends*

Podunavska oblast consists of 3 municipalities (NUTS<sub>4</sub> / LAU<sub>1</sub> units) and 58 settlements (NUTS<sub>5</sub> / LAU<sub>2</sub> units), mainly of rural character. According to statistics, only three NUTS 4 centres are considered to be urban, namely Smederevo, Velika Plana and Smederevska Palanka. The urbanization rate is above 50% but is not very high: share of population living in settlements with over 5,000 inhabitants was 56.1% in 2008. The number of settlements having from 2,000 to 5,000 inhabitants dropped from 18 in 1991 to 16 in 2008 while the number of settlements with less than 2,000 inhabitants rose from 33 in 1991 to 37 in 2008, the number of settlements with more than 5,000 inhabitants dropping from 6 to 5 in the same period. Settlements with less than 2,000 to 5,000 inhabitants and those with more than 5,000 inhabitants faced population decline whereas settlements with less than 2,000 inhabitants faced population growth. There is no settlement with over 100,000 inhabitants in this region, the biggest centre being Smederevo with 63,333 inhabitants in 2008.

#### *Roles of importance of the towns*

According to a settlement network that was defined within the new Spatial Plan of the Republic of Serbia 2010-2020, City/Municipality of Smederevo, together with the Municipality of Velika Plana, is a centre of national importance. Town of Smederevo is at the same time NUTS<sub>3</sub> and NUTS<sub>4</sub> centre, whereas two other settlements are NUTS<sub>4</sub> centres, namely, urban settlements of Smederevska Palanka and Velika Plana.

In terms of functions, Smederevo was a big industrial centre according to the previous Spatial Plan of Serbia, whereas Smederevska Palanka was a medium size industrial centre and Velika Plana a small size industrial centre. However, many industries faced decline or transformation since the adoption of that Plan in 1996. New Spatial Plan of the Republic of Serbia 2010-2020 reports decline in a number and importance of industrial centres comparing to 1996: Smederevo became a medium size industrial centre with 5,000 to 10,000 employed in industry, whereas Smederevska Palanka, Velika Plana and Lozovik were listed as "other industrial centres" with less than 1,000 employed in industry. Industrial zones and industrial parks are planned to be established in Smederevo and Smederevska Palanka.

The education role of the cities was already underlined.

According to the national spatial planning document in force, leisure and tourism activities in the region are mainly of local character. However, Smederevo is one of the major centres with important cultural heritage, the latest including one of the most significant medieval fortresses on the Danube in Serbia. Some important monasteries are to be found in this region, too, namely Pokajnica near Velika Plana and Koporin near Smederevska Palanka. According to the Tourist organisation of Serbia 5 settlements are considered to be tourist spots because of their own assets or because they are situated in the vicinity of important tourist attractions, namely: Velika Plana, Krnjevo, Staro selo, Dobri do and Smederevo.

### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

Agglomeration areas are not defined as such in Serbian planning documents. However, agglomeration of the town of Smederevo expands to 58 settlements. According to the previous Spatial Plan of Serbia (1996) settlements falling into the development belts/axes with 1st rank importance coincided with the European corridors 7 and 10, settlements in Podunavska oblast in this belt being Mala Krsna, Radinac, Ralja, Smederevo, Smederevska Palanka, Velika Plana, Markovac and 35 other settlements. However, there were no 2nd and 3rd degree development belts/axes in this NUTS 3 region. Spatial Plan of Serbia 2010-2020 does not specify development axes but gives indication for two development axes in the Danube area, namely the Danube belt (that also includes Sava river) as well as Corridor 10. The biggest centre along the Danube corridor is Smederevo whereas the main centres along the Corridor 10 are Smederevo, Smederevska Palanka and Velika Plana.

### *Interregional cooperation*

Not being a border region, Podunavska oblast is not eligible for cross-border cooperation within EU defined cross-border programmes

### *Living standards*

Data on housing exist only for the Census year 2002 and the year 2008 (at NUTS<sub>3</sub> and NUTS<sub>4</sub> level). According to these data, there was 74,443 housing units for permanent housing in 2002 and 76,298 in 2008 in Podunavska oblast, which represented 2.5% growth (1,855 in absolute terms). Only 55.5% of houses/dwellings were connected to a public drinking water network in 2002 whereas this share grew to 82.9% in 2008. The share of dwellings connected to a public sewage system faced a more important increase: from 39.5% in 2002 to 78.6% in 2008. At municipal level, the share of dwellings with access to a public drinking water network ranged from 76.4% in Smederevska Palanka to 88% in Smederevo, access to a public sewage network ranging from 72.9% in Smederevska Palanka to 83.5% in Smederevo in 2008.

### *Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants		354		373,2
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants		0	0	0
Regional vitality index		109,7	99	94,6



## Južnoba ka oblast

### *General Information*

In 2008, Južnoba ka oblast had 605,720 inhabitants and occupied the third rank among nine NUTS 3 regions in the Serbian part of the DONAUREGIONEN+ area in respect to regional population density (150.9 inhabitants/km<sup>2</sup>). The region has 12 municipalities (NUTS<sub>4</sub> / LAU<sub>1</sub> units) and 77 settlements (NUTS<sub>5</sub> / LAU<sub>2</sub> units). According to statistics, sixteen settlements are considered to be urban: Ba , Ba ka Palanka, Ba ki Petrovac, Beo in, Be ej, Vrbas, Žabalj, Novi Sad, Petrovaradin, Sremska Kamenica, Futog, Srbobran, Sremski Karlovci, Ba ki Jarak, Temerin and Titel. There is one settlement with over 100,000 inhabitants - Novi Sad with 211,071 inhabitants in 2008.

### *Human Resources*

#### *Demographic situation*

With 605,720 inhabitants in 2008, the population of Južnoba ka oblast accounted for 16.0% of the total population of Serbian Danube area. Since Census 1991, the number of the inhabitants of Južnoba ka oblast shows an increasing tendency (the only NUTS 3 region besides Beogradska oblast that shows a constant population growth), the total number of inhabitants facing 11.4% increase in the period 1991-2008. When looking at the NUTS 4 level, one can see that the situation is much more diverse. City of Novi Sad is the only NUTS 4 unit with a constant population growth but as more than 50% of the regional population lives in this municipality/city its growth reflects the tendency of the entire Južnoba ka oblast. On the other hand, three municipalities face a continuous population decline resulting in negative 1991-2008 balances: Be ej (-7.5%), Ba ki Petrovac (-8.4%) and Ba (-9.1%). Six municipalities first faced a population increase in the period 1991-2002 and the after a decline, the 1991-2008 balance being variable: Beo in (6.7%), Žabalj (4.9%), Titel (2.9%), Ba ka Palanka (-0.9%), Srbobran (-1.9%) and Vrbas (-4.3%). Municipalities of Sremski Karlovci and Temerin have a variable population development but both have positive balance for the period 1991-2008: Sremski Karlovci 19.3% and Temerin 15.8%. The main cause of the population growth lies in an important in-migration. Namely, during '90s the region received a significant number of refugees fleeing mainly from Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina, fostering at the same time its attractiveness for the time of peace. This task is closely linked to the growing role of the region and the city of Novi Sad as the administrative, economic, educational and cultural centre of the Autonomous Province of Vojvodina that gained important level of autonomy after the year 2000. However, natural growth in Južnoba ka oblast is negative and in five out of twelve municipalities it was negative already in 1991 (Ba , Ba ka Palanka, Ba ki Petrovac, Be ej, Žabalj, Srbobran, Titel). In 2002 and 2008, natural population growth was negative in all municipalities except in the City of Novi Sad where it was first 0‰ and then 1.1‰, negative natural growth ranging from -1.6‰ in Sremski Karlovci to -9.5‰ in Srbobran in 2008.

Due to the population growth, population density in Južnoba ka oblast increased from 135.4 inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup> in 1991 to 150.9 inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup> in 2008 (3rd rank among 9 Danube regions in Serbia). At NUTS 4 level, population density ranged from 41.2 inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup> in the Municipality of Ba to 463.1 inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup> in the City of Novi Sad in 2008.

As data on age structure for the year 1991 also include population living abroad, there is no possibility to make precise comparison with data for 2002 and 2008. The age structure of Južnoba ka oblast is not favourable in long terms but it is much better than in other Danube regions in Serbia. The share of young population (0-14) declined from 19.8% to 15.8% in the period 1991-2008 (the 9 regions' average being 15.2% in 2008). The share of population in working age (15-64) declined from 69.6% in 1991 to 69.2% in 2002 and then rouse to 69.3% in 2008. Once much lower, the share of old population (65 and more) is permanently increasing (10.6% in 1991 to 14.9% in 2008) occupying 1st place in 2008 (the 9 regions' average being 17.2% in 2008). There are seven municipalities where the share of young population was higher than the share of elderly population: Beo in, Be ej, Vrbas, Žabalj, Novi Sad, Temerin and Titel, the age structure being the most favourable (relatively speaking) in the City of Novi Sad (the highest share of population in working age - 70.3%, and the share of young population being higher than the share of elderly population - 15.6%:14.9%). As far as regional vitality index is concerned, Južnoba ka oblast occupied 1st rank among 9 Danube regions (106.3).

Južnoba ka oblast had the third highest value of the Coefficient 1 (0-14 year old population as a percentage of 15-64 year-old population) among all nine Serbian Danube NUTS<sub>3</sub> regions in 1991 (28.4) (census data that also included population living abroad), and then fifth in 2002 (23.4) and 2008 (22.8). As far as the Coefficient 2 is concerned (population aged 65 or over as a percentage of 15-64 year-old population), the region occupied 4th

rank in 1991 (15.2) and then 1st rank in 2002 (20.7) and 2008 (21.5). In 1991, Južnoba ka oblast had the fourth highest value of the Coefficient 3 (the child and the old-age population as a percentage of population aged 15–64) (43.7), and then eight 2002 (44.1) and 2008 (44.3).

### *Educational structure*

According to the Census 2002 data, there was 13.0% of people with high education, 46.9% with secondary education and 16.3% of people with no education in Južnoba ka oblast. These data are the second best among nine Danube regions in Serbia, thanks to the importance of Novi Sad as educational centre. Education status remains unknown for 0.9% of population aged 15 years and more. The lowest participation of highly educated population can be found in the municipalities of Žabalj and Titel (4.0%) and the highest in the City of Novi Sad (19.0%) where besides the state University of Novi Sad one can also find four colleges and many private universities and faculties. The relative share of population with secondary education is the lowest in the Municipality of Ba (33.4%) and the highest in the Municipality of Sremski Karlovci (52.1%). There are 39 secondary schools in total, 23 of them being situated in the City of Novi Sad, three in the municipalities of Ba ka Palanka, Be ej and Vrbas and one in the municipalities of Ba , Ba ki Petrovac, Žabalj, Srbobran, Sremski Karlovci, Temerin and Titel, Municipality of Beo ing being the only one with no secondary school. In Južnoba ka oblast, there are 107 primary schools (schools and their rural branches), the majority being located in the City of Novi Sad (36) and the Municipality of Ba ka Palanka (16). The relative share of population with no education is the highest in the Municipality of Ba (32.7%) and the lowest in the City of Novi Sad (10.1%).

### *Labour market*

The relative share of economically active population in Južnoba ka oblast was the most favourable among nine Danube regions in Serbia in all three years though. It first declined and then recovered (64.4% in 1991, 58.6% in 2002 and 66% in 2008).

At municipal / NUTS 4 level, the situation is diverse. In Ba and Temerin, the share of economically active population shows an increasing tendency, whereas in Ba ka Palanka and Be ej this share shows a decreasing tendency. In Ba ki Petrovac, Beo in, Žabalj, Srbobran and Titel the share first showed a less important increase and then an important decline, the final score being negative in all these municipalities and the most pronounced in Beo in (-97%) and Titel (-8.4%). In Sremski Karlovci, the share of economically active population first increased and then dropped, but with positive score for the entire observed period. In Vrbas and Novi Sad, the share first faced a decrease and then a more important increase bringing to a positive balance for the observed period, the phenomenon being much more pronounced in the Municipality of Vrbas. In 2008, the share of economically active population ranged from only 25.8% in Žabalj to 78.0% in Novi Sad.

### *Settlement Structure*

#### *Development trends*

Južnoba ka oblast consists of 12 municipalities (NUTS<sub>4</sub> / LAU<sub>1</sub> units) and 77 settlements (NUTS<sub>5</sub> / LAU<sub>2</sub> units). According to statistics, sixteen settlements are considered to be urban: Ba , Ba ka Palanka, Ba ki Petrovac, Beo in, Be ej, Vrbas, Žabalj, Novi Sad, Petrovaradin, Sremska Kamenica, Futog, Srbobran, Sremski Karlovci, Ba ki Jarak, Temerin and Titel. This means that all municipalities have urban settlements as their centres. The urbanization rate is high: share of population living in settlements with over 5,000 inhabitants was 81.9% in 2008. The number of settlements having from 2,000 to 5,000 inhabitants dropped from 30 in 1991 to 29 in 2008 while the number of settlements with less than 2,000 inhabitants dropped from 24 in 1991 to 22 in 2008, the number of settlements with more than 5,000 inhabitants growing from 23 to 26 in the same period. Settlements with less than 2,000 inhabitants and those with 2,000 to 5,000 inhabitants faced population decline whereas population growth was observed in settlements having more than 5,000 inhabitants. There is one settlement with over 100,000 inhabitants - Novi Sad with 211,071 inhabitants in 2008.

#### *Roles of importance of the towns*

According to a settlement network that was defined within the new Spatial Plan of the Republic of Serbia 2010–2020, City/Municipality of Novi Sad, together with municipalities of Sremski Karlovci, Temerin, Beo in, Žabalj, Ba ki Petrovac, Irig, In ija, Vrbas, Srbobran, Ba ka Palanka and Titel, is a centre of international importance and provincial (NUTS 2) capital. Novi Sad is at the same time NUTS<sub>3</sub> and NUTS<sub>4</sub> centre, whereas eleven other

settlements are NUTS<sub>4</sub> centres, namely, urban settlements of Ba , Ba ka Palanka, Ba ki Petrovac, Beo in, Be ej, Vrbas, Žabalj, Srbobran, Sremski Karlovci, Temerin and Titel.

In terms of functions, Novi Sad was a big industrial centre according to the previous Spatial Plan of Serbia, Ba , Be ej and Ba ka Palanka were medium size industrial centres whereas enej, Žabalj, Ba , Ba ki Petrovac, Senta and Temerin were small industrial centres. However, many industries faced decline or transformation since the adoption of that Plan in 1996. New Spatial Plan of the Republic of Serbia 2010-2020 reports decline in a number and importance of industrial centres and a change fo their pattern in this NUTS 3 region comparing to 1996: Novi Sad remains in the category of big industrial centres, Ba , Ba ka Palanka, Temerin and Be ej are listed as small industrial centres with 1,000 to 5,000 employed in industry whereas Ba ki Petrovac, Srbobran, Vrbas, Žabalj, Titel and Beo in are listed as "other industrial centres" with less than 1,000 employed in industry. Industrial zones and industrial parks are planned to be established in Vrbas, Novi Sad, Be ej, Ba ki Petrovac, Ba , Temerin, Titel, Beo in and Ba ka Palanka.

The education role of the cities was already underlined.

According to the national spatial planning document in force, leisure and tourism activities in the region are mainly of local character. However, some tourist attractions are of international significance such as National Park Fruška Gora, major centres with important cultural heritage being Novi Sad, Petrovaradin and Sremski Karlovci. Cultural heritage includes medieval fortresses at Ba and Petrovaradin as well as some monasteries (Bo ani and Ba near Ba , 16 monasteries in the mountain of Fruška Gora, Kovilj near Kovilj). According to the Tourist organisation of Serbia 9 settlements are considered to be tourist spots because of their own assets or because they are situated in the vicinity of important tourist attractions, namely: Ba , Ba ka Palanka, Neštin, Beo in, Rakovac, Cerevi , Novi Sad, Petrovaradin and Sremski Karlovci.

### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

Agglomeration areas are not defined as such in Serbian planning documents. However, Novi Sad, as the second biggest agglomeration in Serbia, expands to 108 settlements. According to the previous Spatial Plan settlements falling into the development belt/axe with 1st rank importance coincided with the European corridors 7 (and 10), settlements in Južnoba ka oblast in this belt being Ba , Ba ka Palanka, Ba ki Petrovac, Beo in, Novi Sad, Petrovaradin, Rumenka, Sremska Kamenica, Srbobran, Titel and 37 other settlements. None of the development belts/axes with 2nd degree importance included Južnoba ka oblast. There are three 3rd degree development belts/axes. One goes from Odžaci to Vrbas and includes settlements of Kosan i and Vrbas. The second one goes from Srbobran towards Subotica, Kanjiža and Kikinda and includes settlements of Radi evi and Be ej, the third one going from Temerin to Zrenjanin and including Žabalj. Spatial Plan of Serbia 2010-2020 does not specify development axes but gives indication for two development axes in the Danube area, namely the Danube belt (that also includes Sava river) as well as Corridor 10. Main centres along the Danube corridor are Ba ka Palanka and Novi Sad whereas main centres along the corridor 10 are Srbobran, Novi Sad and Petrovaradin.

### *Interregional cooperation*

Južnoba ka oblast is eligible to participate in IPA Cross-border Cooperation Programme Hungary - Serbia as well as in IPA Cross-border Cooperation Programme Serbia - Croatia. Areas of support of the two programmes are:

IPA CBC HU-SRB:

Infrastructure and environment

- Infrastructure for physical connections
- Common responsibility for the environment

Economy, education and culture

- Stimulating a synergic economy, tourism and R&D
- Education and culture for a common mind.

IPA CBC SRB-CRO:

Sustainable socio-economic development

- Economic Development
- Environmental Protection
- People to People

Technical Assistance

- Programme Administration and Implementation
- Programme Information, Publicity and Evaluation

The entire Autonomous Province of Vojvodina, to which this NUTS 3 region belongs, participates in the most successful Euroregion in Serbia: Danube - Kris - Mures -Tisa Euroregion. The aim of this Euroregion is to develop and broaden relationships among local communities and local governments in the field of economy, education, culture, science and sports, helping the region to join the process of the European integration.

### *Living standards*

Data on housing exist only for the Census year 2002 and the year 2008 (at NUTS<sub>3</sub> and NUTS<sub>4</sub> level). According to these data, there were 219,182 housing units for permanent housing in 2002 and 230,890 in 2008 in Južnoba ka oblast, which represented 5.3% growth (11,708 in absolute terms). In 2002, 90.9% of houses/dwellings were connected to a public drinking water network in 2002 whereas this share grew to 96.5% in 2008. The share of dwellings connected to a public sewage system faced a more important increase: from 49.8% in 2002 to even 92.9% in 2008 (there was no public sewage network in the municipalities of Temerin, Žabalj and Ba ki Petrovac in 2002). At municipal level, the share of dwelling with access to a public drinking water network ranged from 82.1% in Temerin to 98.1% in Žabalj, access to a public sewage network ranging from 76.5% in Temerin to 97% in Žabalj in 2008.

### *Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants		369,2		381,2
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants		42,9	55	62,6
Regional vitality index		112,6	107,3	106,3

## Južnobanatska oblast

### *General Information*

In 2008, Južnobanatska oblast had 303,392 inhabitants and occupied the sixth rank among nine NUTS 3 regions in the Serbian part of the DONAUREGIONEN+ area in respect to regional population density (74.3 inhabitants/km<sup>2</sup>).

The region consists of 8 municipalities (NUTS<sub>4</sub> / LAU<sub>1</sub> units) and 94 settlements (NUTS<sub>5</sub> / LAU<sub>2</sub> units), mainly being of rural character. According to statistics, ten settlements are considered to be urban, namely: Alibunar, Banatski Karlovac, Bela Crkva, Vršac, Kova ica, Kovin, Opovo, Ka arevo, Pan evo and Star evo. The biggest centre is Pan evo with 76,319 inhabitants.

### *Human Resources*

#### *Demographic situation*

With 303,392 inhabitants in 2008, the population of Južnobanatska oblast accounted for 8.0% of the total population of Serbian Danube area. Since Census 1991, the number of the inhabitants of Južnobanatska oblast shows a decreasing tendency (with an increase in the period 2002-2005), the total number of inhabitants facing -3.9% decline in the period 1991-2008. Looking at the NUTS 4 level, six municipalities face a constant population decline (Alibunar, Bela Crkva, Vršac, Kova ica, Opovo and Plandište), the 1991-2008 balance ranging from -14.7% in Alibunar to -2.9% in Vršac. Municipality of Kovin first faced a decline (1991-2002), then increase (2002-2005) and then again a decline (2005-2008) resulting in a negative balance of -1.9% for the period 1991-2008. On the other hand, City of Pan evo first faced an increase and then decline but the balance for the period 1991-2008 remains positive (2.0%). The main cause of population decline in this region is a natural growth that was negative already in 1991 (-2‰) attaining -5.6‰ in 2008. At the level NUTS 4, natural growth ranged from 0.3‰ (Pan evo) to -7.4‰ (Plandište) in 1991 and from -3.0‰ (Pan evo) to -12.2‰ (Plandište) in 2008.

Due to the population decline, population density in Južnobanatska oblast declined from 74.3 inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup> in 1991 to 71.5 inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup> in 2008 (6th rank among 9 Danube regions in Serbia). At NUTS 4 level, population density ranged from 31.1 inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup> in the Municipality of Plandište to 165.6 inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup> in the City of Pan evo in 2008.

As data on age structure for the year 1991 also include population living abroad, there is no possibility to make precise comparison with data for 2002 and 2008. The age structure of Južnobanatska oblast is unfavourable. The share of young population (0-14) declined from 19.4% to 15.9% in the period 1991-2008 (the 9 regions' average being 15.2% in 2008). The share of population in working age (15-64) declined from 68.4% in 1991 to 67.8% in 2002 and then rose to 68.1% in 2008. Once lower, the share of old population (65 and more) is permanently increasing (12.1% in 1991 to 16.0% in 2008) occupying 2nd place in 2008 (the 9 regions' average being 17.2% in 2008). The worst age structure can be found in the Municipality of Plandište where the share of young population was the lowest (14.3%) and the share of elderly population the highest (20.3%) in 2008. There are three municipalities where the share of young population was higher than the share of elderly population: Bela Crkva, Kovin and Pan evo, the age structure being the most favourable in the City of Pan evo (the highest share of population in working age - 69.8%, and the lowest share of elderly population - 14.9%). As far as regional vitality index is concerned, Južnobanatska oblast occupied 2nd rank among 9 Danube regions (99.2).

Južnobanatska oblast had the third highest value of the Coefficient 1 (0-14 year old population as a percentage of 15-64 year-old population) among all nine Serbian Danube NUTS<sub>3</sub> regions in 1991 (28.4) (census data that also included population living abroad), fourth highest in 2002 (23.5) and then again the third highest in 2008 (23.3), though with declining tendency. As far as the Coefficient 2 is concerned (population aged 65 or over as a percentage of 15-64 year-old population), the region occupied 1st rank in 1991 (6.5), then 4th in 2002 (23.2) and 2nd in 2008 (23.5). In 1991, Južnobanatska oblast had the lowest value of the Coefficient 3 (the child and the old-age population as a percentage of population aged 15-64) (34.9) and then the sixth highest in 2002 (46.7) and 2008 (46.8).

#### *Educational structure*

According to the Census 2002 data, there was 8.2% of people with high education, 41.4% with secondary education and 23.0% of people with no education in Južnobanatska oblast. These data are disappointing and can be explained by a quite rural character of this NUTS<sub>3</sub> region, limited number of education institutions and unfavourable age structure. Education status remains unknown for 1.2% of population aged 15 years and more.



The lowest participation of highly educated population can be found in the Municipality of Opovo (4.2%) and the highest in the Municipality of Vršac (10.4%) where there are several institutions of high and higher education: state Higher School of Education/Pedagogy, state Faculty of Teaching (belonging to the University of Belgrade), private Faculty of Business Studies (belonging to Megatrend University based in Belgrade). Being functionally linked to Belgrade, City of Pan evo as NUTS 3 centre lacks more institutions of high and higher education. However, there is a private Faculty of Dentistry (belonging to the Economic Academy in Novi Sad), as well as several faculties belonging to the state International University of Novi Pazar (humanities, law, management and IT). There are 18 secondary schools in total, eight of them being situated in Pan evo, four in Vršac, two in Bela Crkva and Kovin, one Alibunar and Kova ica and none in Opovo and Plandište. There are 106 primary schools in Južnobanatska oblast (schools and their rural branches), most of them being concentrated in the Municipality of Vršac (27) and Pan evo (19), distribution being quite uneven. The relative share of population with no education is the highest in the Municipality of Bela Crkva (31.9%) and the lowest in the City of Pan evo (16.3%).

### *Labour market*

The relative share of economically active population in Južnobanatska oblast first faced a slight increase in the period 1991-2002 and then important decline in the period 2002-2008, the total score being negative for the entire period 1991-2008 (53.5% in 1991, 55.0% in 2002 and 50.0% in 2008). This is mainly a consequence of an important decrease in the number of employed and a slight raise in the number of unemployed. According to the share of economically active population in 2008, Južnobanatska oblast occupied 4th place among nine Danube regions in Serbia.

Looking at municipal / NUTS 4 level, the situation is diverse. In Alibunar and Vršac, the share of economically active population shows an increasing tendency. In Bela Crkva and Plandište the share of economically active population first faced important increase and then a less important decline, the final score being positive for the two NUTS 4 units. In Kova ica, Kovin and Opovo the share first showed a less important increase and then an important decline, the final score being negative. This phenomenon is the most pronounced in the Municipality of Opovo. On the other hand, in the most influential NUTS 4 unit of the region - City/Municipality of Pan evo, the share of economically active population is constantly falling though it was the second highest in 2008 among the five NUTS 4 units of Južnobanatska oblast (56.3%), after the Municipality of Vršac (57.8%). In 2008, the share of economically active population in other municipalities ranged from 20.3% in Opovo to 49.3% in Bela Crkva.

### *Settlement Structure*

#### *Development trends*

Južnobanatska oblast consists of 8 municipalities (NUTS4 / LAU1 units) and 94 settlements (NUTS5 / LAU2 units), mainly being of rural character. According to statistics, ten settlements are considered to be urban, namely: Alibunar, Banatski Karlovac, Bela Crkva, Vršac, Kova ica, Kovin, Opovo, Ka arevo, Pan evo and Star evo. This also means that all municipalities have urban settlements as their centres. Urbanisation rate in this NUTS3 region is above 50%: share of population living in settlements with over 5,000 inhabitants was 68.2% in 2008. The number of settlements having from 2,000 to 5,000 inhabitants grew from 15 in 1991 to 16 in 2008 while the number of settlements with less than 2,000 inhabitants first dropped after 1991 and then grew again to 63 in 2008, the number of settlements with more than 5,000 inhabitants dropping from 16 to 15 in the same period. All types of settlements faced population decline. There is no settlement with over 100,000 inhabitants, the biggest centre being Pan evo with 76,319 inhabitants.

#### *Roles of importance of the towns*

According to a settlement network that was defined within the new Spatial Plan of the Republic of Serbia 2010-2020, City/Municipality of Pan evo and the Municipality of Opovo are part of the sole MEGA area in Serbia or the agglomeration of the capital city of Belgrade. On the other hand, City/Municipality of Pan evo, together with municipalities of Kovin, Kova ica, Opovo and Alibunar, is a centre of national importance whereas Municipality of Vršac, together with the Municipality of Plandište, is a centre of regional importance. Town of Pan evo is at the same time NUTS3 and NUTS4 centre, whereas seven other settlements are NUTS4 centres, namely, urban settlements of Alibunar, Bela Crkva, Vršac, Kova ica, Kovin and Opovo and a rural settlement of Plandište.

In terms of functions, Pan evo was a big industrial centre according to the previous Spatial Plan of Serbia, Vršac was a medium size industrial centre whereas Plandište, Kova ica, Alibunar, Bela Crkva and Kovin were small industrial centres. However, many industries faced decline or transformation since the adoption of that Plan in

1996. New Spatial Plan of the Republic of Serbia 2010-2020 reports decline in a number and importance of industrial centres comparing to 1996: Pan evo is listed as the only medium size industrial centre in the category of 10,000 to 20,000 employed in industry, small industrial centres with 1,000 to 5,000 employed in industry are Kova ica, Alibunar and Kovin, whereas Plandište, Bela Crkva and Opovo are listed as "other industrial centres" with less than 1,000 employed in industry. Industrial zones and industrial parks are planned to be established in Bela Crkva, Vršac, Alibunar, Kovin, Opovo, Kova ica, Plandište and Pan evo.

The education role of the cities was already underlined.

According to the national spatial planning document in force, leisure and tourism activities in the region are mainly of local character. However, some tourist attractions are of international significance such as archaeological findings from Neolithic period at the site Star evo near Pan evo. An important natural asset for tourism is the Natural Reserve Deliblatska peš ara. According to the Tourist organisation of Serbia 9 settlements are considered to be tourist spots because of their own assets or because they are situated in the vicinity of important tourist attractions, namely: Bela Crkva, Vatin, Veliko Središte, Vršac, Gudurica, Kovin, Banatski Brestovac, Pan evo and Star evo.

### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

Agglomeration areas are not defined as such in Serbian planning documents. However, the agglomeration area of the town of Pan evo expands to 42 settlements and the agglomeration of Vršac to 52 settlements. According to the previous Spatial Plan of Serbia (1996) settlements falling into the development belt/axe with 1st rank importance coincided with the European corridors 7 (and 10), settlements in Južnobanatska oblast in this belt being Opovo, Pan evo, Star evo, Kovin and 9 other settlements. Six settlements fall into the belt/axe with 2nd degree importance (Banatsko Novo Selo, Ka arevo, Alibunar, Banatski Karlovac, Vladimirovac and Nikolinci) going from Pan evo to Vršac and further towards Romanian border. There are two 3rd degree development belts/axes. One goes from Vršac to Banatska Palanka and includes 9 settlements whereas the other one goes from the direction of In ija (Sremska oblast) to Zrenjanin (Srednjobanatska oblast) and includes the settlements of Baranda, Sakule and Idvor. Spatial Plan of Serbia 2010-2020 does not specify development axes but gives indication for two development axes in the Danube area, namely the Danube belt (that also includes Sava river) as well as Corridor 10. Main centres along the Danube corridor in Južnobanatska oblast are Pan evo and Kovin whereas corridor 10 does not pass through this NUTS 3 region.

### *Interregional cooperation*

Južnobanatska oblast is eligible to participate in IPA Cross-border Cooperation Programme Serbia-Romania as well as in IPA Cross-border Cooperation Programme Hungary - Serbia (the latest in line with the 20% flexibility rule). Areas of support of the two programmes are:

IPA CBC SRB-RO:

Economic & Social Development

- Support for local/regional economic and social infrastructure
- Develop the tourism sector, including the strengthening of the regional identity of the border region as a tourist destination
- Promote SME development
- Support increased levels of R&D and innovation in the border region

Environment and Emergency Preparedness

- Improve systems and approaches to address cross-border environmental challenges, protection and management
- Develop and implement effective strategies for waste and waste water management
- More effective systems and approaches to emergency preparedness (including aspects such as flood prevention/control, food safety, health issues)

Promoting "people to people" exchanges

- Support the development of civil society and local communities
- Improve local governance in relation to the provision of local services to communities in the border

Areas

- Increase educational, cultural and sporting exchange
- Enhance social and cultural integration of border areas

Technical Assistance

- Support for the implementation, overall management and evaluation of the Programme

- Support for the publicity and information activities of the Programme.

Once established, the Euroregion Danube 21 has not achieved significant cohesion and results.

IPA CBC HU-SRB:

Infrastructure and environment

- Infrastructure for physical connections
- Common responsibility for the environment

Economy, education and culture

- Stimulating a synergic economy, tourism and R&D
- Education and culture for a common mind.

The entire Autonomous Province of Vojvodina, to which this NUTS 3 region belongs, participates in the most successful Euroregion in Serbia: Danube - Kris - Mures -Tisa Euroregion. The aim of this Euroregion is to develop and broaden relationships among local communities and local governments in the field of economy, education, culture, science and sports, helping the region to join the process of the European integration.

### *Living standards*

Data on housing exist only for the Census year 2002 and the year 2008 (at NUTS<sub>3</sub> and NUTS<sub>4</sub> level). According to these data, there were 115,360 housing units for permanent housing in 2002 and 117,152 in 2008 in Južnobanatska oblast, which represented 1.5% growth (1,792 in absolute terms). In 2002, 87.8% of houses/dwellings were connected to a public drinking water network whereas this share grew to 93.1% in 2008. The share of dwellings connected to a public sewage system faced a more important increase: from 34.3% in 2002 to even 86.1% in 2008 (there was no public sewage network in the Municipality of Kova ica in 2002). At municipal level, the share of dwellings with access to a public drinking water network ranged from 86.4% in Bela Crkva to 96.7% in Pan evo, access to a public sewage network ranging from 78% in Bela Crkva to 93.3% in Pan evo in 2008.

### *Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants		365,5		386,1
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants	0	0	0	2,1
Regional vitality index		101,3	102	99,2



## Srednjobanatska oblast

### *General Information*

In 2008, Srednjobanatska oblast had 195,190 inhabitants and occupied the seventh rank among nine NUTS 3 regions in the Serbian part of the DONAUREGIONEN+ area in respect to regional population density (49.7 inhabitants/km<sup>2</sup>).

The region has 5 NUTS<sub>4</sub>/LAU<sub>1</sub> units (municipalities) and 55 settlements (NUTS<sub>5</sub> / LAU<sub>2</sub> units), mainly being of rural character. According to statistics, only following four settlements are considered to be urban: Žitište, Zrenjanin, Novi Be e j and Jaša Tomi , three of them being NUTS 4 centres: Žitište, Zrenjanin and Novi Be e j. The biggest centre is Zrenjanin with 77,362 inhabitants in 2008.

### *Human Resources*

#### *Demographic situation*

With 195,190 inhabitants in 2008, the population of Srednjobanatska oblast accounted for 5.1% of the total population of Serbian Danube area. Since Census 1991, the number of the inhabitants of Srednjobanatska oblast shows a decreasing tendency, the total number of inhabitants facing -9.9% decline in the period 1991-2008. The same applies for NUTS 4 level, all five municipalities facing population decline in range from -5.9% in Zrenjanin to -22.4% in Nova Crnja. The main cause of the population decline in this region is a natural growth that was negative already in 1991 (-4.5‰) attaining -7.2‰ in 2008. At the level NUTS 4, natural growth ranged from -3.9‰ (Zrenjanin) to -6.6‰ (Nova Crnja) in 1991 and from -5.7‰ (Zrenjanin) to -14.0‰ (Se anj) in 2008.

Due to the population decline, population density in Srednjobanatska oblast dropped from 66.6 inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup> in 1991 to 59.9 inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup> in 2008 (7th rank among 9 Danube regions in Serbia). At NUTS 4 level, population density ranged from 27.8 inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup> in the Municipality of Se anj to 95.2 inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup> in the City of Zrenjanin in 2008.

As data on age structure for the year 1991 also include population living abroad, there is no possibility to make precise comparison with data for 2002 and 2008. The age structure of Srednjobanatska oblast is unfavourable. The share of young population (0-14) declined from 18.7% to 14.9% in the period 1991-2008 (the 9 regions' average being 15.2% in 2008). The share of population in working age (15-64) declined from 68.3% in 1991 to 67.5% in 2002 and then rouse to 68.1% in 2008. Once lower, the share of old population (65 and more) is permanently increasing (13.0% in 1991 to 16.9% in 2008) occupying 6th place in 2008 (the 9 regions' average being 17.2% in 2008). The worst age structure can be found in the Municipality of Se anj where the share of young population was the lowest (14.6%) and the share of elderly population the highest (19.9%) in 2008. There is no municipality where the share of young population was higher than the share of elderly population, the age structure being the most favourable in the City of Zrenjanin (the highest share of population in working age - 69.1%, and the lowest share of elderly population - 16.2%). As far as regional vitality index is concerned, Srednjobanatska oblast occupied the sixth place among 9 Danube regions (88.0).

Srednjobanatska oblast had the fourth highest value of the Coefficient 1 (0–14 year old population as a percentage of 15–64 year-old population) among all nine Serbian Danube NUTS<sub>3</sub> regions in 1991 (27.3) (census data that also included population living abroad), sixth highest in 2002 (23.3) and the seventh highest in 2008 (21.9). As far as the Coefficient 2 is concerned (population aged 65 or over as a percentage of 15–64 year-old population), the region occupied 8th rank in 1991 (19.0) and then fifth in 2002 (24.3) and 2008 (24.9). In 1991, Srednjobanatska oblast had the highest value of the Coefficient 3 (the child and the old-age population as a percentage of population aged 15–64) (46.4), the fourth highest in 2002 (47.7) and the sixth highest in 2008 (46.8).

#### *Educational structure*

According to the Census 2002 data, there was 8.7% of people with high education, 43.3% with secondary education and 22.9% of people with no education in Srednjobanatska oblast. These data are disappointing and can be explained by a quite rural character of this NUTS<sub>3</sub> region, limited number of education institutions and unfavourable age structure. Education status remains unknown for 0.5% of population aged 15 years and more. The lowest participation of highly educated population can be found in the Municipality of Žitište (4.7%) and the highest in the Municipality/City of Zrenjanin (10.7%) where the concentration of education institutions is the highest. Besides primary and secondary schools, in the City of Zrenjanin one can find a polytechnic college (757 students in the school year 2007/2008) and the Faculty of Polytechnics "Mihailo Pupin" (2,286 students in the

school year 2007/2008), both education institutions being state ones. The relative share of population with secondary education is again the lowest in the Municipality of Žitište (31.3%) and the highest in the City of Zrenjanin (48.1%). There are 11 secondary schools in total, eight of them being situated in Zrenjanin and one in Nova Crnja, Novi Be ej and Se anj. There are 63 primary schools in Srednjobanatska oblast (schools and their rural branches), most of them being concentrated in the Municipality/City of Zrenjanin (32). The relative share of population with no education is again the highest in the Municipality of Nova Crnja (34.3%) and the lowest in the City of Zrenjanin (18.3%).

### *Labour market*

The relative share of economically active population faces a continual decline (55.8% in 1991, 54.8% in 2002 and 47.1% in 2008), this decline being stronger in the period 2002-2008. This is a consequence of an important decrease in a number of employed, a decrease in the number of unemployed not being significant enough to compensate declining employment. According to the share of economically active population in 2008, Srednjobanatska oblast occupied 6th place among nine Danube regions in Serbia.

Looking at municipal / NUTS 4 level, Žitište is the only municipality where the share of economically active population shows an increasing tendency, the highest rates being achieved in the period 1991-2002. On the other hand, in the most influential NUTS 4 unit of the region - City/Municipality of Zrenjanin, this share is constantly falling though it was still the highest in 2008 among the five NUTS 4 units of Srednjobanatska oblast (49.8%). In 2008, the share of economically active population in other municipalities ranged from 35.1% in Nova Crnja to 43.8% in Se anj.

### *Settlement Structure*

#### *Development trends*

Srednjobanatska oblast consists of 5 municipalities (NUTS<sub>4</sub> / LAU<sub>1</sub> units) and 55 settlements (NUTS<sub>5</sub> / LAU<sub>2</sub> units), mainly being of rural character. According to statistics, only following four settlements are considered to be urban: Žitište, Zrenjanin, Novi Be ej and Jaša Tomi . Three of these settlements are NUTS 4 centres: Žitište, Zrenjanin and Novi Be ej. The urbanisation rate in this NUTS<sub>3</sub> region is above 50% but it is not high: share of population living in settlements with over 5,000 inhabitants was 57.6% in 2008. The number of settlements having from 2,000 to 5,000 inhabitants dropped from 23 in 1991 to 15 in 2008 while the number of settlements with less than 2,000 inhabitants grew from 28 in 1991 to 34 in 2008, the number of settlements with more than 5,000 inhabitants raising from 4 to 6 in the same period. Both settlements with less than 2,000 inhabitants and those with more than 5,000 inhabitants faced a population increase to the detriment of settlements having from 2,000 to 5,000 inhabitants. There is no settlement with over 100,000 inhabitants in this NUTS 3 region, the biggest centre being Zrenjanin with 77,362 inhabitants.

#### *Roles of importance of the towns*

According to a settlement network that was defined within the new Spatial Plan of the Republic of Serbia 2010-2020, City/Municipality of Zrenjanin, together with municipalities of Žitište, Žabalj, Se anj, Nova Crnja and Novi Be ej, is a centre of national importance. Town of Zrenjanin is at the same time NUTS<sub>3</sub> and NUTS<sub>4</sub> centre, whereas four other settlements are NUTS<sub>4</sub> centres, namely, urban settlements of Žitište, Nova Crnja and Novi Be ej and a rural settlement of Se anj.

In terms of functions, Zrenjanin was a medium size industrial centre according to the previous Spatial Plan of Serbia, whereas Nova Crnja, Žitište and Se anj were small industrial centres. However, many industries faced decline or transformation since the adoption of that Plan in 1996. New Spatial Plan of the Republic of Serbia 2010-2020 reports decline in a number and importance of industrial centres comparing to 1996: Zrenjan remains in the category of medium size centres but those with 5,000 to 10,000 employed in industry, Novi Be ej belongs to the category of small industrial centres with 1,000 to 5,000 employed in industry whereas Žitište, Nova Crnja and Se anj are listed as "other industrial centres" with less than 1,000 employed in industry. Industrial zones and industrial parks are planned to be established in Zrenjanin, Novi Be ej, Nova Crnja and Se anj.

The education role of the cities was already underlined.

According to the earlier Spatial Plan of Serbia, Zrenjanin was defined as the tourist centre of national/regional interest whereas the Spatial Plan of Serbia 2010-2020 defines Zrenjanin as a tourist place of national importance. According to this document, there is one spa with national importance in Srednjobanatska oblast and that is Rusanda in Melenci (near Zrenjanin). Another important tourist asset of the area is the Natural Reserve Stari

Begej - Carska bara. According to the Tourist organisation of Serbia only Zrenjanin and Melenci are considered to be tourist spots.

### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

Agglomeration areas are not defined as such in Serbian planning documents. However, the town of Zrenjanin has its agglomeration area expanding to 49 settlements. According to the previous Spatial Plan settlements falling into the development belt/axe with 1st rank importance coincided with the European corridors 7 (and 10), settlements in Srednjobanatska oblast in this belt being Zrenjanin, Kni anin and enta. None of the development belts/axes with 2nd degree importance included Srednjobanatska oblast whereas main places within the corridor of the 3rd degree development belts/axes included Novi Be ej, Zrenjanin, Se anj and 18 other settlements (the two 3rd degree belts going from the direction of Novi Sad and In ija towards Kikinda, Kanjiža and Subotica on the north-east and north and towards Timisoara on the east). Spatial Plan of Serbia 2010-2020 does not specify development axes but gives indication for two development axes in the Danube area, namely the Danube belt (that also includes Sava river) as well as Corridor 10. Only two settlements in Srednjobanatska oblast are situated in the vicinity of the Danube corridor - Kni anin and enta whereas corridor 10 does not pass through this NUTS 3 region.

### *Interregional cooperation*

Srednjobanatska oblast is eligible to participate in IPA Cross-border Cooperation Programme Serbia-Romania as well as in IPA Cross-border Cooperation Programme Hungary - Serbia. Areas of support of the two programmes are:

#### IPA CBC SRB-RO:

##### Economic & Social Development

- Support for local/regional economic and social infrastructure
- Develop the tourism sector, including the strengthening of the regional identity of the border region as a tourist destination
- Promote SME development
- Support increased levels of R&D and innovation in the border region

##### Environment and Emergency Preparedness

- Improve systems and approaches to address cross-border environmental challenges, protection and management
- Develop and implement effective strategies for waste and waste water management
- More effective systems and approaches to emergency preparedness (including aspects such as flood prevention/control, food safety, health issues)

##### Promoting “people to people” exchanges

- Support the development of civil society and local communities
- Improve local governance in relation to the provision of local services to communities in the border

##### Areas

- Increase educational, cultural and sporting exchange
- Enhance social and cultural integration of border areas

##### Technical Assistance

- Support for the implementation, overall management and evaluation of the Programme
- Support for the publicity and information activities of the Programme.

Once established, the Euroregion Danube 21 has not achieved significant cohesion and results.

#### IPA CBC HU-SRB:

##### Infrastructure and environment

- Infrastructure for physical connections
- Common responsibility for the environment

##### Economy, education and culture

- Stimulating a synergic economy, tourism and R&D
- Education and culture for a common mind.

The entire Autonomous Province of Vojvodina, to which this NUTS 3 region belongs, participates in the most successful Euroregion in Serbia: Danube - Kris - Mures -Tisa Euroregion. The aim of this Euroregion is to develop and broaden relationships among local communities and local governments in the field of economy, education, culture, science and sports, helping the region to join the process of the European integration.

*Living standards*

Data on housing exist only for the Census year 2002 and the year 2008 (at NUTS<sub>3</sub> and NUTS<sub>4</sub> level). According to these data, there were 79,493 housing units for permanent housing in 2002 and 80,274 in 2008 in Srednjobanatska oblast, which represented 0.98% growth (781 in absolute terms). In 2002, 85.4% of houses/dwellings were connected to a public drinking water network whereas this share grew to 95% in 2008. The share of dwellings connected to a public sewage system faced a more important increase: from 28.6% in 2002 to even 87.9% in 2008 (there was no public sewage network in the municipalities of Žitište and Nova Crnja in 2002). At municipal level, the share of dwellings with access to a public drinking water network ranged from 88.3% in Žitište to 96.4% in Zrenjanin, access to a public sewage network ranging from 79.1% in Nova Crnja to 91.8% in Zrenjanin in 2008.

*Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants		381,3		411,3
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants		6,8	11,7	11,7
Regional vitality index		95,9	91	88

## Sremska oblast

### General Information

In 2008, Sremska oblast had 328,397 inhabitants and occupied the fourth rank among nine NUTS 3 regions in the Serbian part of the DONAUREGIONEN+ area in respect to regional population density (94.2 inhabitants/km<sup>2</sup>).

The region has 7 municipalities (NUTS<sub>4</sub> / LAU1 units) and 109 settlements (NUTS<sub>5</sub> / LAU2 units). According to statistics, seven settlements are considered to be urban: In ija, Irig, Ruma, Mavanska Mitrovica, Sremska Mitrovica, Stara Pazova, Šid. This means that all municipalities besides the Municipality of Peinci have urban settlements as their centres. The biggest centre is Sremska Mitrovica with 37,715 inhabitants in 2008.

### Human Resources

#### Demographic situation

With 328,397 inhabitants in 2008, the population of Sremska oblast accounted for 8.7% of the total population of Serbian Danube area. In the period 1991-2005, Sremska oblast faced a population growth but then the tendency change into a negative one, the total number of inhabitants facing however 8.3% increase in the period 1991-2008. When looking at the NUTS 4 level, one can observe two tendencies: municipalities of Peinci and Stara Pazova faced a population growth in the period 1991-2005 and then its decline whereas municipalities of In ija, Irig, Ruma, Sremska Mitrovica, and Šid faced a population growth only in the period 1991-2002 and then its decline. However, only two municipalities have a negative 1991-2008 balance: Irig (-1.0%) and Sremska Mitrovica (-1.5%), whereas this balance is positive in Stara Pazova (27.7%), In ija (13.5%), Peinci (9.9%), Ruma (5.8%) and Šid (0.8%). The main cause of the population growth in the period 1991-2005 and namely in the period 1991-2002, lies in an important in-migration because the region received a significant number of refugees fleeing from Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina during '90s. However, natural growth in Sremska oblast is negative in the entire period (-0.1‰ in 1991 and -5.1‰ in 2008). In three out of seven municipalities it was negative already in 1991 (In ija, Irig and Šid) whereas negative values were observed in all municipalities later on. In 1991, natural growth ranged from 1.5‰ (Peinci) to -4.9‰ (Irig), while in 2008 it ranged from -2.9‰ (Stara Pazova) to -9.6‰ (Irig).

Due to the population growth, population density in Sremska oblast increased from 87.1 inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup> in 1991 to 94.2 inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup> in 2008 (4th rank among 9 Danube regions in Serbia). At NUTS 4 level, population density ranged from 44.6 inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup> in the Municipality of Peinci to 203.2 inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup> in the Municipality of Stara Pazova in 2008.

As data on age structure for the year 1991 also include population living abroad, there is no possibility to make precise comparison with data for 2002 and 2008. The age structure of Sremska oblast is unfavourable. The share of young population (0-14) declined from 20.0% to 15.8% in the period 1991-2008 (the 9 regions' average being 15.2% in 2008). The share of population in working age (15-64) declined from 69.7% in 1991 to 68.1% in 2002 and in 2008. Once lower, the share of old population (65 and more) is permanently increasing (10.3% in 1991 to 16.1% in 2008) occupying 3rd place in 2008 (the 9 regions' average being 17.2% in 2008). The worst age structure can be found in the Municipality of Irig where there was the lowest share of young population (13.5%), the lowest share of population in working age (66.6%) and the highest share of elderly population (19.9%) in 2008. There are two municipalities where the share of young population is higher than the share of elderly population: Peinci and Stara Pazova, the age structure being the most favourable in the Municipality of Stara Pazova (the highest share of young population - 17.6%, the highest share of population in working age - 68.6%, and the lowest share of elderly population - 13.8%). As far as regional vitality index is concerned, Sremska oblast occupied 3rd rank among 9 Danube regions (98.1).

Sremska oblast had the second highest value of the Coefficient 1 (0-14 year old population as a percentage of 15-64 year-old population) among all nine Serbian Danube NUTS<sub>3</sub> regions in 1991 (28.7) (census data that also included population living abroad), third highest in 2002 (23.6) and the fourth highest in 2008 (23.2). As far as the Coefficient 2 is concerned (population aged 65 or over as a percentage of 15-64 year-old population), the region occupied 3rd rank in 1991 (14.7), then 2nd in 2002 (22.4) and again 3rd in 2008 (23.7). In 1991, Sremska oblast had the fifth highest value of the Coefficient 3 (the child and the old-age population as a percentage of population aged 15-64) (43.5), the seventh highest in 2002 (46.0) and again the fifth highest in 2008 (46.9).

#### Educational structure

According to the Census 2002 data, there was 7.3% of people with high education, 43.7% with secondary education and 22.6% of people with no education in Sremska oblast. These data are quite disappointing and can



be explained by a fairly rural character of this NUTS<sub>3</sub> region, insufficient number of higher and/or high education institutions and a bad age structure. Education status remains unknown for 1.7% of population aged 15 years and more. The lowest participation of highly educated population can be found in the Municipality of Pe inci (4.4%) and the highest in the City of Sremska Mitrovica (8.9%) where the concentration of education institutions is the highest, including the state Higher School / College of Education/Pedagogy. The relative share of population with secondary education is the lowest in the Municipality of Pe inci (36.0%) and the highest in the Municipality of Stara Pazova (49.4%). There are 19 secondary schools in total, 6 of them being situated in the City of Sremska Mitrovica, four in the Municipality of Ruma, three in the municipalities of In ija and Stara Pazova, two in the Municipality of Šid and one in the Municipality of Pe inci, Municipality of Irig being the only one with no secondary school. In Sremska oblast, there are 114 primary schools (schools and their rural branches), the majority being located in the City of Sremska Mitrovica (29), Municipality of Ruma (20), Municipality of Šid (19), the number ranging from 8 to 15 in other NUTS<sub>4</sub> units. The relative share of population with no education is the highest in the Municipality of Pe inci (29.2%) and the lowest in the Municipality of Stara Pazova (17.8%).

### *Labour market*

The relative share of economically active population in Sremska oblast has an important declining tendency since 2002 (50.8% in 1991, 52.6% in 2002 and 41.5% in 2008). This is mainly a consequence of an important decrease in the number of employed. According to the share of economically active population in 2008, Sremska oblast occupied 9th place among nine Danube regions in Serbia.

Looking at municipal / NUTS<sub>4</sub> level, two types of situation could be determined: municipalities of Irig and Šid face a constant decrease in the share of economically active population, whereas all other municipalities (In ija, Pe inci, Ruma, Sremska Mitrovica and Stara Pazova) first faced an increase and then decline in the share of economically active population, the final balance being negative in all NUTS<sub>4</sub> units. In 2008, the share of economically active population ranged from only 37.0% in Pe inci to 47.2% in In ija.

### *Settlement Structure*

#### *Development trends*

Sremska oblast consists of 7 municipalities (NUTS<sub>4</sub> / LAU<sub>1</sub> units) and 109 settlements (NUTS<sub>5</sub> / LAU<sub>2</sub> units). According to statistics, seven settlements are considered to be urban: In ija, Irig, Ruma, Ma vanska Mitrovica, Sremska Mitrovica, Stara Pazova, Šid. This means that all municipalities besides the Municipality of Pe inci have urban settlements as their centres. The urbanization rate is above 50% but is not very high: share of population living in settlements with over 5,000 inhabitants was 57.0% in 2008. The number of settlements having from 2,000 to 5,000 inhabitants dropped from 25 in 1991 to 22 in 2008 while the number of settlements with less than 2,000 inhabitants rose from 75 in 1991 to 76 in 2008, the number of settlements with more than 5,000 inhabitants rising from 9 to 11 in the same period. Settlements with less than 2,000 inhabitants and those with more than 5,000 inhabitants faced population growth whereas settlements with 2,000 to 5,000 inhabitants faced population decline. There is no settlement with over 100,000 inhabitants in this region, the biggest centre being Sremska Mitrovica with 37,715 inhabitants in 2008.

#### *Roles of importance of the towns*

According to a settlement network that was defined within the new Spatial Plan of the Republic of Serbia 2010-2020, City/Municipality of Sremska Mitrovica, together with the Municipality of Šid, is a centre of national importance whereas municipalities of Stara Pazova, Pe inci, In ija and Ruma make part of the sole MEGA area in Serbia - the agglomeration of the capital city of Belgrade. The town of Sremska Mitrovica is at the same time NUTS<sub>3</sub> and NUTS<sub>4</sub> centre, whereas six other settlements are NUTS<sub>4</sub> centres, namely, urban settlements of In ija, Irig, Ruma, Stara Pazova and Šid and a rural settlement of Pe inci.

In terms of functions, Sremska Mitrovica and Ruma were medium size industrial centres according to the previous Spatial Plan of Serbia, whereas In ija, Stara Pazova and Šid were small industrial centres. However, many industries faced decline or transformation since the adoption of that Plan in 1996. New Spatial Plan of the Republic of Serbia 2010-2020 reports decline in a number and importance of industrial centres comparing to 1996: Šid, Sremska Mitrovica, Ruma, Pe inci, Stara Pazova and In ija are listed as small industrial centres with 1,000 to 5,000 employed in industry, other industrial centres (with less than 1,000 employed in industry) being Vrdnik and Irig. Industrial zones and industrial parks are planned to be established in Ruma, In ija, Irig, Sremska Mitrovica, Šid, Pe inci and Stara Pazova.

The education role of the cities was already underlined.

According to the national spatial planning document in force, leisure and tourism activities in the region are mainly of local character. However, some tourist attractions are of international significance such as National Park Fruška Gora, Natural Reserve Obedska bara, Natural Reserve Zasavica etc. Sremska Mitrovica is one of the major centres with important cultural heritage. Cultural heritage in Sremska oblast includes important archaeological findings from Roman era (Sirmium in Sremska Mitrovica) as well as monasteries (16 monasteries in the mountain of Fruška Gora). Major centres of spa tourism to be found in this region are Slankamen and Vrdnik. According to the Tourist organisation of Serbia 12 settlements are considered to be tourist spots because of their own assets or because they are situated in the vicinity of important tourist attractions, namely: In ija, Stari Slankamen, Velika Remeta, Vrdnik, Grgeteg, Irig, Jazak, Mala Remeta, Ruma, Sremska Mitrovica, Šišatovac and Privina Glava.

### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

Agglomeration areas are not defined as such in Serbian planning documents. However, agglomeration of the town of Sremska Mitrovica expands to 77 settlements. According to the previous Spatial Plan of Serbia (1996) settlements falling into the development belt/axe with 1st rank importance coincided with the European corridors 7 and 10, settlements in Sremska oblast in this belt being Šid, Sremska Mitrovica, Ruma, Stara Pazova and 42 other settlements. There is one 2nd degree development belt/axe going from Novi Sad towards Western Serbia and including 5 settlements: Mali Radinci, Vitojevci, Klenak, Nikinci and Plati evo. None of the development belt/axes with 3rd degree importance included Sremska oblast. Spatial Plan of Serbia 2010-2020 does not specify development axes but gives indication for two development axes in the Danube area, namely the Danube belt (that also includes Sava river) as well as Corridor 10. The biggest centre along the Danube corridor is Nova Pazova whereas the main centre along the corridor 10 is Sremska Mitrovica.

### *Interregional cooperation*

Sremska oblast is eligible to participate in IPA Cross-border Cooperation Programme Serbia - Croatia, IPA Cross-border Cooperation Programme Serbia - Bosnia and Herzegovina as well as in IPA Cross-border Cooperation Programme Hungary - Serbia (the latest in line with the 20% flexibility rule). Areas of support of the three programmes are:

IPA CBC SRB-CRO:

Sustainable socio-economic development

- Economic Development
- Environmental Protection
- People to People

Technical Assistance

- Programme Administration and Implementation
- Programme Information, Publicity and Evaluation

IPA CBC SRB-BIH:

Social and economic cohesion through actions to improve physical, business, social and institutional infrastructure and capacity

- Improving the productivity and competitiveness of the areas' economic, rural and environmental Resources
- Cross-border initiatives targeting the exchange of people and ideas to enhance professional and civic society cooperation

Technical Assistance

- Programme administration and implementation
- Programme Information, Publicity and Evaluation

IPA CBC HU-SRB:

Infrastructure and environment

- Infrastructure for physical connections
- Common responsibility for the environment

Economy, education and culture

- Stimulating a synergic economy, tourism and R&D
- Education and culture for a common mind.

The entire Autonomous Province of Vojvodina, to which this NUTS 3 region belongs, participates in the most successful Euroregion in Serbia: Danube - Kris - Mures -Tisa Euroregion. The aim of this Euroregion is to develop and broaden relationships among local communities and local governments in the field of economy, education, culture, science and sports, helping the region to join the process of the European integration.

### *Living standards*

Data on housing exist only for the Census year 2002 and the year 2008 (at NUTS<sub>3</sub> and NUTS<sub>4</sub> level). According to these data, there was 112,257 housing units for permanent housing in 2002 and 114,114 in 2008 in Sremska oblast, which represented 1.7% growth (1,857 in absolute terms). In 2002, 85.5% of houses/dwellings were connected to a public drinking water network whereas this share grew to 92.7% in 2008. The share of dwellings connected to a public sewage system faced a more important increase: from only 19.7% in 2002 to even 87.1% in 2008. At municipal level, the share of dwellings with access to a public drinking water network ranged from 82.5% in Irig to 97% in Stara Pazova, access to a public sewage network ranging from 72.4% in Irig to 93.5% in Stara Pazova in 2008.

### *Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants		334,2		347,5
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants	0	0	0	0
Regional vitality index		105,3	105,2	98,1



## Zapadnoba ka oblast

### *General Information*

In 2008, Zapadnoba ka oblast had 197,974 inhabitants and occupied the fifth rank among nine NUTS 3 regions in the Serbian part of the DONAUREGIONEN+ area in respect to regional population density (81.8 inhabitants/km<sup>2</sup>). The region has 4 municipalities (NUTS<sub>4</sub> / LAU<sub>1</sub> units) and 37 settlements (NUTS<sub>5</sub> / LAU<sub>2</sub> units), mainly being of rural character. According to statistics, five settlements are considered to be urban, namely: Apatin, Kula, Crvenka, Odžaci and Sombor. The biggest centre is Sombor with 48,849 inhabitants.

### *Human Resources*

#### *Demographic situation*

With 197,974 inhabitants in 2008, the population of Zapadnoba ka oblast accounted for 5.2% of the total population of Serbian Danube area. Since Census 2002, the number of the inhabitants of Zapadnoba ka oblast is significantly declining, the total number of inhabitants facing -6.0% decline in the period 1991-2008 in spite of an important in-migration waves (refugees) in the period 1991-2002. Looking at the NUTS 4 level, one can distinguish two tendencies: municipalities of Apatin and Sombor first faced population growth (1991-2002) and then decline whereas in the municipalities of Kula and Odžaci the declining tendency was obvious since 1991. A common point for them all is a negative 1991-2008 balance: -4.0% in Sombor, -4.3% in Apatin, -6.6% in Kula and -12.1% in Odžaci. The main cause of the population decline in this region is a natural growth that was negative already in 1991 (-1.9‰) attaining -8.0‰ in 2008. At the level NUTS 4, natural growth ranged from -0.8‰ (Kula) to -2.6‰ (Odžaci) in 1991 and from -6.0‰ (Kula) to -9.2‰ (Ožaci) in 2008.

Due to the population decline, population density in Zapadnoba ka oblast declined from 87.6 inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup> in 1991 to 81.8 inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup> in 2008 (5th rank among 9 Danube regions in Serbia). At NUTS 4 level, population density ranged from 76.7 inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup> in the City of Sombor to 94.3 inhabitants per km<sup>2</sup> in the Municipality of Kula in 2008.

As data on age structure for the year 1991 also include population living abroad, there is no possibility to make precise comparison with data for 2002 and 2008. The age structure of Zapadnoba ka oblast is fairly unfavourable. The share of young population (0-14) declined from 18.8% to 14.1% in the period 1991-2008 (the 9 regions' average being 15.2% in 2008). The share of population in working age (15-64) declined from 68.8% in 1991 to 67.6% in 2002 and then rouse to 68.0% in 2008. Once lower, the share of old population (65 and more) is permanently increasing (12.4% in 1991 to 17.9% in 2008) occupying 7th place in 2008 (the 9 regions' average being 17.2% in 2008). There is no municipality where the share of young population was higher than the share of elderly population, the age structure being the most favourable in the Municipality of Kula (the highest share of young population - 14.9%, and the lowest share of elderly population - 17.3%). As far as regional vitality index is concerned, Zapadnoba ka oblast occupied 7th rank among 9 Danube regions (78.7).

Zapadnoba ka oblast had the fourth highest value of the Coefficient 1 (0-14 year old population as a percentage of 15-64 year-old population) among all nine Serbian Danube NUTS<sub>3</sub> regions in 1991 (27.3) (census data that also included population living abroad) and then eight in 2002 (22.4) and 2008 (20.8). As far as the Coefficient 2 is concerned (population aged 65 or over as a percentage of 15-64 year-old population), the region occupied 7th rank in 1991 (18.0), 8th in 2002 (24.9) and 6th in 2008 (26.4). In 1991, Zapadnoba ka oblast had the second highest value of the Coefficient 3 (the child and the old-age population as a percentage of population aged 15-64) (45.3), the fifth highest in 2002 (47.3) and the fourth in 2008 (47.1).

#### *Educational structure*

According to the Census 2002 data, there was 7.6% of people with high education, 44.8% with secondary education and 21.9% of people with no education in Zapadnoba ka oblast. These data are quite disappointing and can be explained by a fairly rural character of this NUTS<sub>3</sub> region, insufficient number of higher and/or high education institutions and a bad age structure. Education status remains unknown for 0.5% of population aged 15 years and more. The lowest participation of population with high education can be found in the Municipality of Odžaci (5.8%) and the highest in the Municipality of Sombor (8.9%) where the concentration of education institutions is the highest, including three faculty units: Pedagogical Faculty of the University of Novi Sad and two private faculties (according to the data on the portal of the City of Sombor). The relative share of population with secondary education is again the lowest in the Municipality of Odžaci (43.0%) and the highest in the Municipality of Apatin (44.9%). There are 15 secondary schools in total, six of them being situated in the City of Sombor, four

in the Municipality of Kula, three in the Municipality of Apatin and two in the Municipality of Odžaci. There are 49 primary schools in Zapadnoba ka oblast (schools and their rural branches), the majority being located in the City of Sombor (26) and the Municipality of Odžaci (10). The relative share of population with no education is the highest in the Municipality of Odžaci (25.5%) and the lowest in the City of Sombor (20.7%).

### *Labour market*

The relative share of economically active population in Zapadnoba ka oblast has a declining tendency, a more important decline happening in the period 2002-2008 (57.1% in 1991, 56.1% in 2002 and 49.6% in 2008). This is mainly a consequence of an important decrease in the number of employed and a slight raise in the number of unemployed. According to the share of economically active population in 2008, Zapadnoba ka oblast occupied 5th place among nine Danube regions in Serbia.

Looking at municipal / NUTS 4 level, the situation is diverse. In Odžaci and Sombor, the share of economically active population first showed a less important increase and then an important decline, the final score being negative. This phenomenon is much more pronounced in the Municipality of Odžaci than in Sombor. In Apatin, the share first decreased in the period 1991-2002 and then increased in the period 2002-2008 but so little that the final score remains negative. In the Municipality of Kula the share of economically active population has a declining tendency in both observed periods. In 2008, the share of economically active population in the municipalities of Zapadnoba ka oblast ranged from 31.4% in Odžaci to 53.2% in Apatin.

### *Settlement Structure*

#### *Development trends*

Zapadnoba ka oblast consists of 4 municipalities (NUTS<sub>4</sub> / LAU<sub>1</sub> units) and 37 settlements (NUTS<sub>5</sub> / LAU<sub>2</sub> units), mainly being of rural character. According to statistics, five settlements are considered to be urban, namely: Apatin, Kula, Crvenka, Odžaci and Sombor. This also means that all municipalities have urban settlements as their centres. Urbanisation rate in this NUTS<sub>3</sub> region is above 50%: share of population living in settlements with over 5,000 inhabitants was 59.4% in 2008. The number of settlements having from 2,000 to 5,000 inhabitants grew from 17 in 1991 to 19 in 2008 while the number of settlements with less than 2,000 inhabitants grew from 8 in 1991 to 11 in 2008, the number of settlements with more than 5,000 inhabitants dropping from 12 to 7 in the same period. Settlements with less than 2,000 inhabitants and those with 2,000 to 5,000 inhabitants faced population growth whereas population decline was observed in settlements having more than 5,000 inhabitants. There is no settlement with over 100,000 inhabitants, the biggest centre being Sombor with 48,849 inhabitants.

#### *Roles of importance of the towns*

According to a settlement network that was defined within the new Spatial Plan of the Republic of Serbia 2010-2020, City/Municipality of Sombor, together with the Municipality of Apatin, is a centre of national importance. Town of Sombor is at the same time NUTS<sub>3</sub> and NUTS<sub>4</sub> centre, whereas three other settlements are NUTS<sub>4</sub> centres, namely, urban settlements of Apatin, Kula and Odžaci.

In terms of functions, Sombor, Apatin and Kula were medium size industrial centres according to the previous Spatial Plan of Serbia, whereas Odžaci was a small industrial centre. However, many industries faced decline or transformation since the adoption of that Plan in 1996. New Spatial Plan of the Republic of Serbia 2010-2020 reports decline in a number and importance of industrial centres comparing to 1996: Sombor, Apatin, Odžaci and Kula are listed as small size industrial centres with 1,000 to 5,000 employed in industry, whereas Bogojevo is an "other industrial centre" with less than 1,000 employed in industry. Industrial zones and industrial parks are planned to be established in Sombor, Apatin, Odžaci, Bogojevo and Kula.

The education role of the cities was already underlined.

According to the national spatial planning document in force, leisure and tourism activities in the region are mainly of local character. However, some tourist attractions are of international significance such as Natural Reserve Upper Danube. Sombor is defined as one of the major centres with important cultural heritage by the Spatial Plan of Serbia 2010-2014. According to the Tourist organisation of Serbia 3 settlements are considered to be tourist spots because of their own assets or because they are situated in the vicinity of important tourist attractions, namely: Apatin, Odžaci and Sombor. Apatin tends to become an important nautical spot on the upper course of the Danube in Serbia. Once rehabilitate, a canal network should also become a significant tourist attraction offering also an important historical heritage in relation to the canals' infrastructure.

### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

Agglomeration areas are not defined as such in Serbian planning documents. However, the town of Sombor has its agglomeration area expanding to 37 settlements. According to the Spatial Plan of Serbia from 1996, settlements falling into the development belt/axis with 1st rank importance coincided with the European corridors 7 (and 10), settlements in Zapadnoba ka oblast in this belt being Sombor, Apatin, Odžaci and 15 other settlements. None of the development belts/axes with 2nd degree importance included Zapadnoba ka oblast whereas main places within the corridor of the 3rd degree development belts/axes included Ba ki Gra ac, Lali , Kula and Ruski krstur (the two 3rd degree belts going from Odžaci to Vrbas in the west-east direction). Spatial Plan of Serbia 2010-2020 does not specify development axes but gives indication for two development axes in the Danube area, namely the Danube belt (that also includes Sava River) as well as Corridor 10. The main centre along the Danube corridor is Apatin whereas corridor 10 does not pass through this NUTS 3 region.

### *Interregional cooperation*

Zapadnoba ka oblast is eligible to participate in IPA Cross-border Cooperation Programme Hungary - Serbia as well as in IPA Cross-border Cooperation Programme Serbia - Croatia. Areas of support of the two programmes are:

IPA CBC HU-SRB:

Infrastructure and environment

- Infrastructure for physical connections
- Common responsibility for the environment

Economy, education and culture

- Stimulating a synergic economy, tourism and R&D
- Education and culture for a common mind.

IPA CBC SRB-CRO:

Sustainable socio-economic development

- Economic Development
- Environmental Protection
- People to People

Technical Assistance

- Programme Administration and Implementation
- Programme Information, Publicity and Evaluation

The entire Autonomous Province of Vojvodina, to which this NUTS 3 region belongs, participates in the most successful Euroregion in Serbia: Danube - Kris - Mures -Tisa Euroregion. The aim of this Euroregion is to develop and broaden relationships among local communities and local governments in the field of economy, education, culture, science and sports, helping the region to join the process of the European integration.

### *Living standards*

Data on housing exist only for the Census year 2002 and the year 2008 (at NUTS<sub>3</sub> and NUTS<sub>4</sub> level). According to these data, there was 77,631 housing units for permanent housing in 2002 and 78,029 in 2008 in Zapadnoba ka oblast, which represented 0.5% growth (398 in absolute terms). In 2002, 93.1% of houses/dwellings were connected to a public drinking water network whereas this share grew to 96.1% in 2008. The share of dwellings connected to a public sewage system faced a more important increase: from 21.8% in 2002 to even 89.8% in 2008. At municipal level, the share of dwelling with access to a public drinking water network ranged from 93.8% in Apatin to 97.9% in Kula, access to a public sewage network ranging from 84.8% in Apatin to 93% in Kula in 2008.

*Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants		362,7		394,1
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants		6,5	6,1	5,2
Regional vitality index		89,8	83,2	78,7

## Judetul Braila

### *General Information*

In 2008 the county had 363 979 inhabitants and a density of 76 inhabitants/km<sup>2</sup>, less than the regional (101.5) and national (90.2) averages.

### *Human Resources*

#### *Demographic situation*

Population decreased with 10% between 1991 and 2008 and with 5.6% between 2001 and 2008, less than the regional population decrease of 11.2% respectively 5.6, but more than the national values (7.2% respectively 4%). In 2008, 65% of the county population was concentrated into its 4 urban localities. Population decreased more in urban than in rural: urban population decreased with 12.6% between 1991 and 2008 and with 7.5% between 2001 and 2008. Rural population decreased with 4.4%, respectively 1.5% in these periods.

#### *Educational structure*

The number of secondary school population in Braila county increased in the period 2001-2008 from 10860 to 11388. The number of secondary schools in the last 6 years was stagnant (24). The number of university students increased from 2354 in 2001 to 2412 in 2008. The number of students per 1000 people decreased from 6.1 in 2001 to 5.6 in 2008. In 2008 were functioning 3 faculties, although here was no tertiary education institution. According to last Census (2002), in Braila county only 9.36% of the people have high education (in the group age 23-65), less than the regional value (14.91%). In the group age of 19-65, non-educated people represented 7.75%, less than the regional average (8.7%).

#### *Labour market*

Employment rate increased yearly since 2004, until 56.6% in 2008, less than regional (66.7%) and national (63.6%) values or even lower than in the South-East region from which it belongs (57.5%).

### *Settlement Structure*

#### *Development trends*

Braila had approx. the same number of settlements between 1991 and In 2008: 1 municipality - county residence, 3 towns and 40 communes (until 2003 were 39) with 140 villages. Most of localities (90.7%) have less than 5000 inhabitants and this trend was almost constant since 1991.

Regarding the development of residential areas, in the 4 urban localities from Braila county were finished in the last 5 years (2005-2009) a number of 1573 new dwellings (60% from total number of new dwellings in the county), most of them in Braila municipality (1291).

#### *Roles of importance of the towns*

According to Law no.351/2001, Braila municipality, county residence, is a center of national importance, having a potential European influence and functioning as urban system together with Galati municipality. It is an important industrial, administrative and cultural centre, regional pole in the South-Eastern Romanian region. The other 3 urban localities (Ianca, Faurei, Insuratei) have county and zonal importance, having a role of balance in the settlement network or serving the proximity area. Braila municipality is a riparian Danube city.

#### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

Territorial distribution of the communes upon their number of localities shows a concentration of communes having more than 5000 inhabitants close to Braila municipality (Chiscani commune) and in central areas – close to Ianca town (Sutesti commune) and Insuratei town (Tufesti and Viziru communes), strictly related to main transport arteries (E 584, DN2B and the railway network).

In future, a Metropolitan area (Dimitrie Cantemir) will include Galati and Braila municipalities together with localities like Baldovinesti, Vadeni, Zagna-Vadeni, Lacu Sarat, Chiscani, Varsatura, I.C. Bratianu and other communes in the vicinity of these 2 big Danube cities. It will be the second big agglomeration in Romania (around

1 million people) and will include a new international airport and a new bridge across the Danube in the area of Braila city.

### *Interregional cooperation*

“Lower Danube” Euroregion is functioning is based on the Treaty signed in 1998. Galati County Council, as the managing body of the Euroregion, provided the chairmanship of the “Lower Danube” Euroregion for two years (December 2009 – December 2011).

Partners:

- Romania: Tulcea, Braila and Galati counties
- Republic of Moldova: (Cahul and Cantemir districts)
- Ukraine: (Odessa)

On December 10, 2008, following the signing of the documents establishing the Cross-border Cooperation Association of the “Lower Danube” Euroregion, it obtained legal personality.

Priorities:

- to implement the current development strategy of the “Lower Danube” Euroregion and to develop the strategy for 2010-2015;
- to attract funds by implementing projects under the Operational Program for Romania-Ukraine-Moldova Cross-border Cooperation 2007-2013;
- to create the “Lower Danube” multicultural centre;
- to improve cooperation and to enhance the administrative capability of the Cross-border Cooperation Association of the “Lower Danube” Euroregion;
- to improve the crossing conditions for people at the Tulcea-Izmail border;
- to create a regional and cross-border centre for prevention of and intervention in case of pollution of the Danube River; to create a cross-border information centre;
- to promote green tourism in this euroregion; to identify and to promote protected areas;
- to support regional development by establishing cross-border economic objectives – gross market in Cahul and agro-industrial park in Galati;
- to create a cross-border centre for innovation and research with a view to organizing joint activities, exhibitions, conferences, seminars in the fields of innovation and cross-border cooperation;
- to improve the ways to ensure the growth and innovation of the euroregion;
- to develop the trade between the partners of the euroregion and to create SMEs support organizations.

One of the main objectives of the Euroregion Chairmanship is to enhance the Euroregion external relationships by new partnerships and cooperation agreements having similar structures to those in EU, and to directly involve in the activity of international organizations that represent the interests of regions (Assembly of European Regions, Assembly of European Cross-border Regions etc.).

At the same time, it envisages to continue large projects aimed at developing new tourist facilities in the member towns and cities of the Euroregion, promoting the image of the Euroregion and ensuring a sustainable development.

The Lower Danube Euroregion is one of the most active cooperation models.

### *Living standards*

According to 2002 Census, in Braila county 97.9% of dwellings had electric energy supply, 48.7% were connected to natural gas pipelines, 69.2% had drinking water supply and 47.4% of dwellings were connected to public sewerage systems.

In 2007, every urban locality had drinking water supply network and public sewerage installations. In rural area only 77.5% of communes had drinking water installations and 5% sewerage systems. Very few dwellings are connected to wastewater treatment installations and the increasing was very slowly: from 5.9% in 1996 to only 7.3% in 2008.

*Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants	331	348	365	375
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants	5	6,1	5,8	5,6
Regional vitality index	151	115	85,2	82,2



## Judetul Constanta

### *General Information*

In 2008 the county had 719 727 inhabitants, following Bucharest as dimension. The density was 102.2 inhabitants/km<sup>2</sup>, more than regional (101.5) and national (90.2) averages.

Constanta county concentrates 70.7% from population in its 12 urban areas.

Constanta municipality (former Tomis city, founded by the Greeks in the VIth century b.Chr.) is situated at the Black Sea border and is the main political, administrative, economic, financial, bank, educational, cultural and scientific of the county. Its population is more than 310400 persons. In its Northern limit is situated Mamaia resort.

The characteristic of Constanta county is the Black Sea Coast, running on more than 100 km on its territory (from the Romanian total of 244 km). This is why the tourism reserves of Constanta county are not uniform distributed, being developed especially in the Black Sea coast area. Here are concentrated 2/3 from the national tourism resources, 43% from the national accommodation capacity and 60% from the national and international tourism circulation.

### *Human Resources*

#### *Demographic situation*

The number of population decreased with 4.7% between 1991 and 2008 and with 3.7% between 2001 and 2008, a better situation even compared with the regional population decrease of 11.2% respectively 5.6 and even with the national averages (7.2% respectively 4%).

In 2008, 70.3% of the county population was concentrated into its 12 urban localities. Population decreased in urban area but increased in the rural one. Urban population decreased with 9.4% between 1991 and 2008 and with 7.7% between 2001 and 2008. Rural population increased with 8.7%, respectively 7.3% in these periods.

Since 2004 the total number of population slowly increased each year until 2010 (with 1.4%).

#### *Educational structure*

The number of secondary school population in Constanta county increased in the period 2001-2008 from 28205 to 30547. In 2008 were 54 secondary schools, their number being almost constant in the last years. The number of university students increased from 24787 in 2001 to 38915 in 2008. The number of students per 1000 people increased from 33.2 in 2001 to 55.7 in 2008. In 2008 were functioning 30 faculties in 5 tertiary education institutions. According to last Census (2002), in Constanta county 10.2% of the people have high education (in the group age 23-65) following Bucharest and Dolj county. In the group age of 19-65, non-educated people represented 7.44%, less than the regional average (8.7%).

#### *Labour market*

Employment rate increased yearly since 2003, until 63% in 2008, less than regional (66.7%) but comparative with national (63.6%) values and higher than in the South-East region from which it belongs (57.5%).

### *Settlement Structure*

#### *Development trends*

In 2008, Constanta county had 3 municipalities, out of which 1 is county residence, 9 towns and 58 communes (52 in 1991) with 188 villages. Almost 83% from localities have between 500 and 10000 inhabitants. Thus, 40% from total localities have between 2000 and 5000 inhabitants, 21.5% have less than 2000 inhabitants and also 21.5% have between 5000 and 10000 inhabitants. Small localities with less than 2000 inhabitants have a positive trend: from 8 localities in 1991 to 15 in 2008.

#### *Roles of importance of the towns*

According to Law no.351/2001, Constanta municipality, county residence, with a population of more than 100 000 inhabitants, is a center of national importance, having a potential European influence. It is an important industrial, administrative and cultural centre, regional pole in the South-Eastern Romanian region. The other 2 municipalities (Mangalia and Medgidia) are considered to be of rank II as hierarchy, having an area of influence of



approx. 30000-100000 inhabitants. The 8 urban localities have county and zonal importance, having a role of balance in the settlement network or serving the proximity area. Cernavoda (18488 inhabitants in 2009) and Harsova (10460 inh.) are riparian Danube towns.

### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

Regarding the development of residential areas, in the 12 urban localities from Constanta county were finished in the last 5 years (2005-2009) 8385 new dwellings (59.7% from total number of new dwellings in the county), most of them in Constanta municipality (4192) but also in others resorts at Black Sea coast: Navodari (1508), Eforie (659), Mangalia (559)

Territorial distribution of the communes upon their number of localities shows a concentration of 22 localities having more than 5000 inhabitants in the Eastern part of the county, in the proximity of Black Sea, from Corbu commune in North to Mangalia municipality and Limanu commune in South.

In 2007 it was born the „Constanta Metropolitan Area”, with a population of more than 500.000 inhabitants, representing the first such administrative structure in Romania, containing 14 localities (out of which 6 cities) situated at a distance of maximum 30 km from Constanta municipality: Constanta, Navodari, Eforie, Ovidiu, Basarabi, Techirghiol, Mihail Kogalniceanu, Cumpana, Valu lui Traian, Lumina, Tuzla, Agigea, Corbu si Poarta Alba.

The localities from this metropolitan area will be linked each other by an integrated transport network.

Constanta Metropolitan area is an important management tool in order to promote common projects for the integrated development of the area, to attenuate the disparities in the development of localities and to facilitate the attraction of Structural Funds.

### *Interregional cooperation*

Constanta county belongs to the Euroregion “Dunarea Inferioara” (Inferior Danube), together with Calarasi and Ialomita counties from Romania, Silistra and Dobric counties from Bulgaria.

The projects they implemented together are based on:

- the cross-border crossing point Calarasi-Silistra
- cross-border tourism at Low Danube
- a common partnership for a sustainable development of the cross-border transport infrastructure
- the development of business / enterprises in cross-border area
- the common environment management of the cross-border region Calarasi – Silistra.

Projects under development:

- Pro-active group for Romania-Bulgaria cross-border cooperation. Partner: Dobrodgea Danube Association for Cross-border Cooperation and Development.
- A common road – Romania-Bulgaria partnership for sustainable development of cross-border access infrastructure. Partner: Silistra Municipality.
- Development of business environment infrastructure in the cross-border area of Clrai – Silistra. Partner: Silistra Municipality.
- Joint management of the environment based on mosquito populations control in Clrai-Silistra cross-border area. Partner: Silistra Municipality.

### *Living standards*

According to 2002 Census, in Constanta county 97.6% of dwellings had electric energy supply, only 1.8% were connected to natural gas pipelines, 74.2% of dwellings had drinking water supply.

In 2007, every urban locality had drinking water supply network and public sewage installations. In rural area 98.3% of communes had drinking water installations and 3.4% had sewage systems.

In 2009, 80.4% from total inhabitants had access to drinking water.

The share of dwellings connected to wastewater treatment stations increased from 67.1% in 1996 to 68.4% in 2004.

In 2009, 388014 inhabitants had dwellings connected to municipal wastewater treatment stations (76.9% from urban population), with 16257 persons less than in 2006.

*Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants	312	332	354	362
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants	12,7	33,2	41,9	55,7
Regional vitality index	240,8	171,8	126,2	120,7

## Judetul Galati

### *General Information*

In 2008 the county had 613 509 inhabitants, being one of the most populated county in the region, following the Bucharest municipality, Constanta and Dolj counties as population. The density was 136.9 inhabitants/km<sup>2</sup>, higher than regional (101.5) and national (90.2) averages.

### *Human Resources*

#### *Demographic situation*

The number of population decreased with 5.7% between 1991 and 2008, less than the regional and national values (11.2% and 7.2%). Between 2001 and 2008 the population decreased with 4.7%, more than at national value (4%) and less than the regional one (4.4%). In 2008, 56.5% of the county population was concentrated into its 4 urban localities. Population increased in urban area between 1991 and 2001 with 1.1% and in rural area between 2001 and 2008 with 2.6%. Between 1991 and 2008 was observed a decreasing of population of 8.7% in urban area, less than the regional value of 12.4% but more than the national value of 5%. In the same period, in rural area it was observed a lower diminishing of population, of only 1.6%.

#### *Educational structure*

According to last Census (2002), in Galati county 9.99% in the group age 23-65 have high education. In the group age of 19-65, non-educated people represented 8.59%, less than the regional average (8.7%).

In Galati county is observed a progressive drop of school population, in 2008 being with 8.3% less than in 2003. The decreasing of school population leads to the decreasing of the education units (with 9.7% less than in 2008 compared with 2003) and of the school staff (with 6.4% less in 2008 than in 2003).

The number of secondary school population in Galati county increased in the period 2001-2008 from 18785 to 21125. In 2008 were 32 secondary schools, their number being almost constant in the last years.

In the county are functioning only 2 professional schools, which are confronting with a drastic dropping of the number of pupils (41.4% in 2008 compared with 2003).

The superior education is characterized by the increasing of the number of faculties and students and is represented by 2 universities: "Galati Lower Danube University" (having 16 faculties and 18000 students) and "Galati Danubius University" (having 4 faculties).

The number of university students increased from 15519 in 2001 to 21006 in 2008. In 2008, the number of students per 1000 inhabitants was 33.3.

#### *Labour market*

The problems of Galati county are linked to the decreasing of total, active and occupied population, with repercussions upon the labour force market. Nevertheless, at county level the decreasing was slow.

Employment rate increased yearly since 2004, until 50.6% in 2008, less than regional (66.7%), national (63.6%) values or even lower than in the South-East region from which it belongs (57.5%).

### *Settlement Structure*

#### *Development trends*

In 2008 Galati had 2 municipalities, out of which 1 is the county residence, 2 towns and 61 communes (in 2001 were 56) with 180 villages. In the same year, almost 83% from localities had between 2000 and 10000 inhabitants, out of these 67.7% having between 2000 and 5000 inhabitants. The number of localities between 2000 and 5000 inhabitants increased from 33 in 1991 to 36 in 2008.

It is envisaged to create "The Metropolitan area Dimitrie Cantemir" that will include Galati and Braila municipalities together with localities like Baldovinsti, Vadeni, Zagna-Vadani, Lacu Sarat, Chiscani, Varsatura, I.C. Bratianu and other communes in the vicinity of these 2 big Danube cities. It will be the second big agglomeration in Romania (around 1 million people) and will include a new international airport and a new bridge across the Danube in the area of Braila city.

### *Roles of importance of the towns*

According to Law no.351/2001, Galati municipality, county residence, is a center of national importance, having a potential European influence and functioning as urban system together with Braila municipality. It is an important industrial, administrative and cultural centre, regional pole in the South-Eastern Romanian region. There is another municipality (Tecuci) that is considered to be of rank II as hierarchy, having an area of influence of approx. 30000-100000 inhabitants. The other 2 urban localities (Beresti and Tg.Bujor) have county and zonal importance, having a role of balance in the settlement network or serving the proximity area. Galati municipality (291354 inhabitants in 2009) is a riparian Danube city.

### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

Territorial distribution of the communes upon their number of localities shows a concentration of communes having more than 5000 inhabitants close to Galati municipality (Frumusita and Tulucesti communes), in Western area – close to Tecuci municipality (Matca commune and other 8 communes having between 5000 and 10000 inhabitants) and in the Eastern part around Tg.Bujor town (Fartanesti and Mastacani communes), strictly related to main transport arteries (E 581, DN25 and the railway network).

Regarding the development of residential areas, in the 4 urban localities from Galati county were finished in the last 5 years (2005-2009) a number of 2224 new dwellings (34.1% from total number of new dwellings in the county), most of them in Galati municipality (1682).

### *Interregional cooperation*

“Lower Danube” Euroregion is functioning is based on the Treaty signed in 1998. Galati County Council, as the managing body of the Euroregion, provided the chairmanship of the “Lower Danube” Euroregion for two years (December 2009 – December 2011).

Partners:

- Romania: Tulcea, Braila and Galati counties
- Republic of Moldova: (Cahul and Cantemir districts)
- Ukraine: (Odessa)

On December 10, 2008, following the signing of the documents establishing the Cross-border Cooperation Association of the “Lower Danube” Euroregion, it obtained legal personality.

Priorities:

- to implement the current development strategy of the “Lower Danube” Euroregion and to develop the strategy for 2010-2015;
- to attract funds by implementing projects under the Operational Program for Romania-Ukraine-Moldova Cross-border Cooperation 2007-2013;
- to create the “Lower Danube” multicultural centre;
- to improve cooperation and to enhance the administrative capability of the Cross-border Cooperation Association of the “Lower Danube” Euroregion;
- to improve the crossing conditions for people at the Tulcea-Izmail border;
- to create a regional and cross-border centre for prevention of and intervention in case of pollution of the Danube River; to create a cross-border information centre;
- to promote green tourism in this euroregion; to identify and to promote protected areas;
- to support regional development by establishing cross-border economic objectives – gross market in Cahul and agro-industrial park in Galati;
- to create a cross-border centre for innovation and research with a view to organizing joint activities, exhibitions, conferences, seminars in the fields of innovation and cross-border cooperation;
- to improve the ways to ensure the growth and innovation of the euroregion;
- to develop the trade between the partners of the euroregion and to create SMEs support organizations.

One of the main objectives of the Euroregion Chairmanship is to enhance the Euroregion external relationships by new partnerships and cooperation agreements having similar structures to those in EU, and to directly involve in the activity of international organizations that represent the interests of regions (Assembly of European Regions, Assembly of European Cross-border Regions etc.).

At the same time, it envisages to continue large projects aimed at developing new tourist facilities in the member towns and cities of the Euroregion, promoting the image of the Euroregion and ensuring a sustainable development.

The Lower Danube Euroregion is one of the most active cooperation models.

*Living standards*

In the last 10 years the share of private dwellings constantly increased, at 95.8% in 2008, but the number of dwellings slowly increased with only 3% from 2003 until 2008.

According to 2002 Census, in Galati county 96.9% of dwellings had electric energy supply, 47.9% were connected to natural gas pipelines, 59.3% of dwellings had drinking water supply and 51.5% were connected to public sewerage systems.

In 2007, every urban locality had drinking water supply network and public sewage installations. In rural area 63.3% of communes had drinking water installations and 25% had sewage systems.

The share of dwellings connected to wastewater treatment installations increased from 7.9% in 1996 to 9.1% in 2005 but then decreased to 8.9% in 2008.

In 2009, 21898 inhabitants had dwellings connected to municipal wastewater treatment stations (6.4% from urban population), with 856 persons more than in 2006.

*Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants	321	334	351	361
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants	12,1	24,1	29,5	33,3
Regional vitality index	209,9	159,2	123,3	114,8

## Judetul Tulcea

### *General Information*

In 2008 the county had 249 779 inhabitants, being the less populated county in the region. Tulcea county had the lowest density in the region: 29 inhabitants/km<sup>2</sup> compared with the national average of 91 inhab/km<sup>2</sup>, because of the big water surfaces.

In the county live together from centuries about 17 nationalities (13% from total population) whose habits and beliefs were integrated into the cultural and spiritual life of the county. Most of the ethnic groups are Russians and Lipovans (10% from total population), Ukrainians (2%) and others (Gypsies, Greeks, Turks, Hungarians, Bulgarians, Germans and Armenians).

### *Human Resources*

#### *Demographic situation*

The number of population decreased with 7.7% between 1991 and 2008, less than the regional value of 11.2% but more than the national one, of 7.2%. Between 2001 and 2008 the population decreased with 4.9%, more than at national and regional levels (4% and 4.4%). In 2008, 49.2% of the county population was concentrated into its 5 urban localities. In the periods 1991-2008 and 2001-2008, population decreased in rural area more than in urban area.

#### *Educational structure*

The number of secondary school population in Tulcea county increased in the period 2001-2008 from 6791 to 7625. In 2008 were 19 secondary schools. In Tulcea are no university students, no faculties and no tertiary education institutions. According to last Census (2002), in Tulcea county 6.29% in the group age 23-65 have high education. In the group age of 19-65, non-educated people represented 10.68%, more than the regional average (8.7%).

#### *Labour market*

Employment rate decreased since 2000 until 51.7% in 2006, then increased until 52.1% in 2008. This value is lower than regional (66.7%) and national (63.6%) values or even than in the South-East region from which it belongs (57.5%).

### *Settlement Structure*

#### *Development trends*

In 2008 Tulcea county had 1 municipality - county residence, 4 towns and 46 communes (43 in 1991) with 133 villages. In the same year, 86.3% from total localities had between 500 and 5000 inhabitants, out of these 63.6% having 2000-5000 inhabitants. The number of localities having between 2000 and 5000 inhabitants increased from 21 in 1991 to 28 in 2008.

In 2009 in all 4 urban localities of the county didn't develop new commercial, residential, economical areas implying the development of infrastructure and utilities. The main works consisted in rehabilitations of drinking water supply network, sewerage systems, and electric energy.

In Macin, Babadag and Isaccea towns the urbanization process was much reduced, being represented by rehabilitations and extensions of main drinking water, sewerage and electric networks.

#### *Roles of importance of the towns*

According to Law no.351/2001, Tulcea municipality, county residence, is an important industrial, administrative and cultural centre, considered to be of rank II as hierarchy, with an area of influence of approx. 30000-100000 inhabitants. The other 4 urban localities (Babadag, Isaccea, Macin, Sulina) have county and zonal importance, with role of balance in the settlement network or serving the proximity area.

Tulcea municipality (91067 inhabitants in 2009), Macin (10936), Isaccea (5320 inhabitants) and Sulina (4400 inhabitants) are riparian Danube localities.

Tulcea municipality is still the most important urban area of the county, from both economic and social points of view. In Tulcea municipality is concentrated 37% from total population of the county and 75% from the urban

population of the county. Nevertheless, with its almost 92000 inhabitants, it can not be considered as being an urban concentration.

### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

Regarding the development of residential areas, in the 5 urban localities from Tulcea county were finished in the last 5 years (2005-2009) a number of only 347 new dwellings (32.7% from total number of new dwellings in the county), most of them in Tulcea municipality (1291).

Territorial distribution of the communes upon their number of localities shows a concentration of communes having more than 5000 inhabitants in the centre of the county, close to Macin town (Jijila and Greci communes) and in the North-Western part of the county, close to the border with Braila county, around Babadag town (Sarichioi commune) strictly related to main transport arteries (E 87, DN22D and the railway network).

### *Interregional cooperation*

“Lower Danube” Euroregion is functioning is based on the Treaty signed in 1998. Galati County Council, as the managing body of the Euroregion, provided the chairmanship of the “Lower Danube” Euroregion for two years (December 2009 – December 2011).

Partners:

- Romania: Tulcea, Braila and Galati counties
- Republic of Moldova: (Cahul and Cantemir districts)
- Ukraine: (Odessa)

On December 10, 2008, following the signing of the documents establishing the Cross-border Cooperation Association of the “Lower Danube” Euroregion, it obtained legal personality.

Priorities:

- to implement the current development strategy of the “Lower Danube” Euroregion and to develop the strategy for 2010-2015;
- to attract funds by implementing projects under the Operational Program for Romania-Ukraine-Moldova Cross-border Cooperation 2007-2013;
- to create the “Lower Danube” multicultural centre;
- to improve cooperation and to enhance the administrative capability of the Cross-border Cooperation Association of the “Lower Danube” Euroregion;
- to improve the crossing conditions for people at the Tulcea-Izmail border;
- to create a regional and cross-border centre for prevention of and intervention in case of pollution of the Danube River; to create a cross-border information centre;
- to promote green tourism in this euroregion; to identify and to promote protected areas;
- to support regional development by establishing cross-border economic objectives – gross market in Cahul and agro-industrial park in Galati;
- to create a cross-border centre for innovation and research with a view to organizing joint activities, exhibitions, conferences, seminars in the fields of innovation and cross-border cooperation;
- to improve the ways to ensure the growth and innovation of the euroregion;
- to develop the trade between the partners of the euroregion and to create SMEs support organizations.

One of the main objectives of the Euroregion Chairmanship is to enhance the Euroregion external relationships by new partnerships and cooperation agreements having similar structures to those in EU, and to directly involve in the activity of international organizations that represent the interests of regions (Assembly of European Regions, Assembly of European Cross-border Regions etc.).

At the same time, it envisages to continue large projects aimed at developing new tourist facilities in the member towns and cities of the Euroregion, promoting the image of the Euroregion and ensuring a sustainable development.

The Lower Danube Euroregion is one of the most active cooperation models.

### *Living standards*

According to 2002 Census, in Tulcea county 96.9% of dwellings had electric energy supply, only 1.8% were connected to natural gas pipelines, 37.7% of dwellings had drinking water supply.

In 2007, every urban locality had drinking water supply network and public sewage installations. In rural area 95.7% of communes had drinking water installations and 17.4% had sewage systems.



The share of dwellings connected to wastewater treatment installations increased from 5.5% in 1996 to 10.3% in 2008.

In 2009, 5911 inhabitants had dwellings connected to municipal wastewater treatment stations (4.8% from urban population), with 589 persons less than in 2006.

*Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants	338	357	371	378
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants	0	0	0	0
Regional vitality index	206,12	155,5	119,3	112,3

## Judetul Calarasi

### *General Information*

In 2008 the county had 314 081 inhabitants and a low density of population: 61.6 inhabitants/km<sup>2</sup>, less than regional (101.5) and national (90.2) values.

### *Human Resources*

#### *Demographic situation*

The number of population decreased with 8.1% between 1991 and 2008, less than at regional level (11.2%) but more than at national level (7.2%). Between 2001 and 2008 the population decreased with 5.4%, more than national and regional values (4% and 4.4%).

In 2008, only 38.5% of the county population was concentrated into its 5 urban localities. Between 1991 and 2008 population decreased more in rural (8.3%) than in urban areas (7.8%), more than at national level but less than the regional values. On the contrary, in the period 2001-2008 population diminished more in urban (7.7%) than in rural areas (4%).

The evolution of the structure on group ages shows the decreasing of young population and the constant demography ageing (characteristic phenomenon for all the country).

#### *Educational structure*

In Calarasi county there are few institutions of post high school and tertiary education. In primary and secondary schools is a high degree of pupils' coverage. Most high school educational units are in urban area. It is lacking a strategic management of educational institutions to cover the labour force necessities.

The number of secondary school population in Calarasi county increased in the period 2001-2008 from 7898 to 9262. In 2008 were 14 secondary schools, their number being almost constant in the last years.

The number of university students decreased from 714 in 2001 to 391 in 2008. In 2008, the number of students per 1000 inhabitants was 1.6, studying in 19 faculties belonging to 2 tertiary education institutions.

According to last Census (2002), in Calarasi county only 4.6% in the group age 23-65 have high education, situating the county on the last place in Danube region regarding this aspect. In the group age of 19-65, non-educated people represented 15.19%, much under the regional average (8.7%), situating Calarasi county also at the end of the list of the Romanian Danube counties.

#### *Labour market*

Employment rate was almost stagnant between 2002 and 2008 having a value of approx. 53%, less than regional (66.7%), national (63.6%) values or even lower than in the East-Muntenia region from which it belongs (58.8%).

### *Settlement Structure*

#### *Development trends*

In 2008 Calarasi county had 2 municipalities (out of which 1 is county residence), 3 towns and 50 communes (48 in 1991) with 160 villages. In the same year, 81.8% from total localities had between 2000 and 10000 inhabitants, out of these 71.1% having between 2000-5000 inhabitants. The number of localities having between 2000 and 5000 inhabitants increased from 27 in 1991 to 32 in 2008. In the same time, the number of localities having between 5000 and 10000 inhabitants decreased from 20 in 1991 to 13 in 2008.

#### *Roles of importance of the towns*

According to Law no.351/2001, Calarasi municipality, county residence, together with the second municipality of the county, Oltenita, are considered to be of rank II as hierarchy, having an area of influence of approx. 30000-100000 inhabitants. The other 3 urban localities have county and zonal importance, with a role of balance in the settlement network or serving the proximity area.

Calarasi (73000 inhabitants in 2009) and Oltenita (27328 inhabitants) are riparian Danube municipalities.

C l r a i municipality, fluvial port situated on the left side of Borcea branch, is located in a cross-border area with Bulgaria, having thus perspectives for the development of fluvial and terrestrial circulation towards the East of Central Europe and to the Balkan Peninsula.

### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

Territorial distribution of the communes upon their number of localities shows a concentration of communes having more than 5000 inhabitants close to Oltenita municipality, in South (Ulmeni and Chirnogi communes) and in South-Eastern areas – close to Constanta and Ialomita counties, around Calarasi municipality, strictly related to main transport arteries (DN 3, DN 3B, DN4, DN21, DN 31, DN41 and the railway network).

Concerning the development of residential areas, in the 5 urban localities from Calarasi county were finished in the last 5 years (2005-2009) a number of 950 new dwellings (37.8% from total number of new dwellings in the county), most of them in Calarasi municipality (577).

### *Interregional cooperation*

Calarasi county belongs to the Euroregion “Dunarea Inferioara” (Inferior Danube), together with Ialomita and Constanta counties from Romania, Silistra and Dobric counties from Bulgaria.

The projects they implemented together are based on:

- the crossborder crossing point Calarasi-Silistra
- crossborder tourism at Low Danube
- a common partnership for a sustainable development of the crossborder transport infrastructure
- the development of business / enterprises in crossborder area
- the common environment management of the crossborder region Calarasi – Silistra

### *Living standards*

According to 2002 Census, in Calarasi county 96.2% of dwellings had electric energy supply, 10.4% were connected to natural gas pipelines, 43.2% had drinking water supply and 23.5% were connected to sewerage systems.

In 2007, every urban locality had drinking water supply network and public sewage installations. In rural area only 70% of communes had drinking water installations and only one commune had sewage systems.

The number of dwellings connected to wastewater treatment installations increased from 32.8% in 1996 to 34.7% in 2008. In 2009, 64783 inhabitants had dwellings connected to municipal wastewater treatment stations (53.7% from urban population), with 5609 persons less than in 2006.

In 2009 were finished 714 dwellings, more than in 2008 with 100 dwellings and with 525 more than in 2005. The number of dwellings finished from budget funds was 241 in 2009, compared with 30 in 2005.

### *Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants	332	348	365	372
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants	0	2,2	2	1,6
Regional vitality index	148,4	121,3	94,7	95,2

## Judetul Giurgiu

### *General Information*

In 2009 the county had 281 201 inhabitants, out of which only 31.2% in urban area, being one of the smallest counties in the region in this aspect. The density was 80.1 inhabitants/km<sup>2</sup>, less than regional (101.5) and national (90.2) averages.

From the administrative point of view, Giurgiu county has 3 urban localities and 51 communes with 167 villages.

### *Human Resources*

#### *Demographic situation*

The number of population decreased with 10.6% between 1991 and 2008, less than at regional level (11.2%) but more than at national level (7.2%).

Between 2001 and 2008 the population decreased with 4%, close to national and regional situation (4% and 4.4%). In 2008, only 31.1% of the county population was concentrated into its 3 urban localities.

Between 1991 and 2008 population decreased more in rural (13.5% - one of the highest levels of the region) than in urban areas (3.6%). The same trend was observed in the period 2001-2008, when population diminished more rural (4.4%) than in urban areas (3%).

#### *Educational structure*

The number of secondary school population in Giurgiu county increased in the period 2001-2008 from 4456 to 6057. In 2008 were 11 secondary schools, their number being almost constant in the last years.

The number of university students decreased yearly. In 2008 there was no student, no faculties and no tertiary education institutions. According to last Census (2002), in Giurgiu county only 4.66% in the group age 23-65 have high education, situating the county on the last places in Danube region regarding this aspect. In the group age of 19-65, non-educated people represented 19.64%, much under the regional average (8.7%), situating Giurgiu county at the end of the list of the Romanian Danube counties.

#### *Labour market*

Employment rate decreased in Giurgiu county from 60.4% in 2001 to 51.8% in 2008, a value inferior than regional (66.7%) or national (63.6%) values, and also lower than that of the level of the East-Muntenia region from which it belongs (58.8%).

### *Settlement Structure*

#### *Development trends*

In 2008 Giurgiu county had 1 municipality - county residence, 2 towns and 51 communes (46 in 1991) with 167 villages. In the same year, 89.9% from total localities had between 2000 and 10000 inhabitants, out of these 72.9% having between 2000 and 5000 inhabitants. The number of localities having between 2000 and 5000 inhabitants increased from 26 in 1991 to 35 in 2008, but the others having between 5000 and 10000 decreased from 20 to 13.

The most important development advantages of Giurgiu county are:

- Its placement on the pan-European transport networks no. VII and IX
- Its agricultural potential (the quality and extension of the soil, agricultural traditions)
- The proximity to Bucharest. The circumstance that Giurgiu belongs to the conurbation around the capital can become an opportunity for the development of some service sectors necessary to the economical activities from the capital. As an example, it is already specialized in the waste collection and management necessary generated by the needs of economic agents from Bucharest.

#### *Roles of importance of the towns*

According to Law no.351/2001, Giurgiu municipality, county residence, is considered to be of rank II as hierarchy, having an area of influence of approx. 30000-100000 inhabitants. The other 2 urban localities have county and zonal importance, having a role of balance in the settlement network or serving the proximity area.

Giurgiu (approx. 68000 inhabitants in 2009) is a riparian Danube municipality. Its main functions are:

- administrative functions and superior public services of regional interest, with certain international functions (especially for the cross-border and Danube areas)
- services functions related to communication network, due to the fact that Giurgiu is a multimodal point of road, railroad and naval circulation
- commercial functions at national, international and regional level.

Bolintin Vale town is a locality having the role of service in the territory. From administrative point of view, it has 4 localities belonging to it.

#### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

The 3 urban localities are: Giurgiu municipality – 4694 hectares and 67823 inhabitants, Mihailesti town – 6843 hectares and 7401 inhabitants and Bolintin Vale town – 4342 hectares and 12384 inhabitants.

Regarding the development of residential areas, in the 3 urban localities from Giurgiu county were finished in the last 5 years (2005-2009) a number of 664 new dwellings (43.9% from total number of new dwellings in the county), most of them in Giurgiu municipality (503).

The degree of urbanization in Giurgiu county is of 31.2%. The general tendency the augmentation of the area within the built-up areas in order to achieve residential zones.

Territorial distribution of the communes upon their number of localities shows a concentration of communes having more than 5000 inhabitants close to Bucharest-Ilfov region, in the Northern part of the county, related to main transport arteries (E 70, E85, DN 5B, E 81, motorway and the railway network).

#### *Interregional cooperation*

1. Giurgiu – Ruse” Euroregion was established by a treaty that has been signed by the mayors of Giurgiu and Ruse municipalities on April 23, 2001, in Giurgiu.

This Euroregion has a joint secretariat and an Ecological and Health Committee that meets quarterly and examines public health and environment protection issues.

Partners:

- Romania: the Mayor of Giurgiu
- Bulgaria: the Mayor of Ruse and an NGO – Ruse Energy Municipal Agency; the Euroregion has 270,000 inhabitants.

Priority projects:

- treatment of waste water of the two towns in parallel operated plants or the building of a common plant
- reduction of emissions from the heating systems of the two towns (by using steam coal power plants)
- planning the Danube River embankments
- preparation of a sustainable development strategy for the Euroregion on long and medium term.

2. “Danubius” Euroregion was established in 2002 on the initiative of Giurgiu County Council and Ruse Prefect; it is an association that includes Ruse County from the Bulgarian side and Giurgiu County from the Romanian side. The Association main goal is to encourage cross-border cooperation in all fields of activity by implementing joint programs and projects funded from external sources.

Basic activities of the Association consist in:

- Providing support for local and central authorities in implementing the European Treaty for cross-border cooperation between territorial companies and authorities, and identifying appropriate solutions to shared cross-border issues /taxes for crossing the border.
- Encouraging and providing consultancy and coordination for cross-border cooperation between Bulgaria and Romania in the fields of economic development, environment, education, tourism, labour market, health protection and agriculture.
- Improving the relationships of its members based on mutual exchange, coordination and consultancy for similar responsibilities.

A priority action of the Association concerns the village authorities in Ruse and Giurgiu areas. Thus, a cross-border cooperation and twinning project was implemented. Particular focus is also put on the cooperation between economic operators in both areas.

*Living standards*

According to 2002 Census, in Giurgiu county 97.6% of dwellings had electric energy supply, only 0.75% being connected to natural gas pipelines. 20.6% of dwellings had drinking water supply and 16.9% were connected to public sewerage installations.

Due to the improvement of the drinking water supply network and of the increasing of water metering at domestic consumers from Giurgiu municipality, the quantity of drinking water per inhabitant reduced in the last years. In each urban locality were registered important quantities of loss water.

In 2007, every urban locality had drinking water supply network and public sewerage installations. In rural area only 29.4% of communes had drinking water installations and only one commune had sewage systems.

In urban settlements the domestic water is collected by a common sewerage system and treated in wastewater treatment stations.

In 2009, the main problem which is confronting the local authorities is the obsolete drinking water network of Giurgiu municipality and in other 2 urban localities that can have an effect upon water quality.

The length of house water sewerage network in Giurgiu municipality is of 114.93 km, in Mihailesti of 3.2 km and in Bolintin Vale of 3 km.

Regarding the population connected to house water sewerage network, in Giurgiu municipality are connected 70.5% from the total inhabitants, in Mihailesti town 10.4% and in Bolintin Vale town 12.7% from its total population.

In Giurgiu municipality the wastewater treatment station belongs to SC Water Service SA Giurgiu Section. In Mihilesti town the wastewater treatment station belongs to SC Service Avicola Mihilesti. In Bolintin Vale town, the wastewater treatment station belongs to SC Water Service SA Bolintin Section.

The share of dwellings connected to wastewater treatment installations increased from 25.3% in 1996 to 28.8% in 2008. In 2009, 52546 inhabitants had dwellings connected to municipal wastewater treatment stations (60% from urban population), with 4071 persons more than in 2006.

*Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants	361	375	386	394
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants	0	1,1	0,9	0
Regional vitality index	106,7	93,6	79,7	79

## Judetul Ialomița

### *General Information*

In 2008 the county had 289 501 inhabitants, being one of the less populated counties in the region. The density was 64.8 inhabitants/km<sup>2</sup>, less than regional (101.5) and national (90.2) averages.

### *Human Resources*

#### *Demographic situation*

The population density in the county is 64.6 inhab/km<sup>2</sup>, less than the national average. The population and population density have a decreasing tendency. Thus, the number of population decreased with 5.3% between 1991 and 2008, less than at regional and national levels (11.2% and 7.2%).

Between 2001 and 2008 it was observed a very small population decreasing, of only 0.3%.

In 2008, 45.9% of the county population was concentrated into its 7 urban localities.

Between 1991 and 2001 the population living in urban area increased with 3.6%.

Between 1991 and 2008 population decreased more in rural (6.7%) than in urban (3.6%) areas. In contrary, in the period 2001-2008 population diminished more in urban (6.9%) than in rural areas (3.4%).

#### *Educational structure*

The number of secondary school population in Ialomița county increased in the period 2001-2008 from 7960 to 9871. In 2008 were 17 secondary schools, their number being constant in the last years.

In Ialomița county were functioning 3 faculties in 2001, 2 faculties in 2005 and also 2 in 2009, when were registered 315 students.

According to last Census (2002), in Ialomița county only 5.52% in the group age 23-65 have high education, situating the county on one of the last places in Danube region regarding this aspect. In the group age of 19-65, non-educated people represented 15.19%, much under the regional average (14.46%), situating Ialomița county also at the end of the list of the Romanian Danube counties.

#### *Labour market*

Employment rate decreased constantly between 1998 (60.9%) and 2006 (54.1%) then increased to 56.2% in 2008. This value is lower than regional (66.7%) or national (63.6%) values, and lower than in the East–Muntenia region from which it belongs (58.8%).

In 2008, share of civil active population in total population was 26.5%, with 347 occupied persons at 1000 inhabitants. The share of population occupied in agriculture was 44.3%, in industry 16%, in construction 6.2% and in services 33.5%.

For 2009 there is no available data regarding the industrial restructuring or other situations. In actual context, the economic crisis endangered many active enterprises, with impact upon the labour force.

### *Settlement Structure*

#### *Development trends*

In 2008 Ialomița county had 3 municipalities, out of which one is the county residence, 4 towns and 59 communes (49 in 1991) with 127 villages. In the same year, 80.4% from total localities had between 2000 and 5000 inhabitants, and 33.3% have less than 2000 inhabitants. The number of small localities (less than 2000 inhabitants) increased 5 in 1991 to 17 in 2008, also increased the number of localities having between 2000 and 5000 inhabitants from 34 in 1991 to 41 in 2008.

#### *Roles of importance of the towns*

Urban area represents 12.9% from the total area of the county and has a density of 230 inhab/km<sup>2</sup>. In 2009 the share of urban population in total population was of 46%.

The urban localities of Ialomița county are 3 municipalities: Slobozia, Urziceni and Fetești (belonging, according to the Law, to the II<sup>nd</sup> rank) and 4 towns: Nenița, Amara, Căzănești, Fierbinți-Tîrg (of rank III). Also there are 59 communes with 127 villages, out of which 59 are commune residence and rank IV and the rest of rank V.



According to Law no.351/2001, Slobozia municipality, county residence, together with other 2 municipalities (Fetesti and Urziceni) are considered to be of rank II as hierarchy, having an area of influence of approx. 30000-100000 inhabitants. The other 4 urban localities have county and zonal importance, with a role of balance in the settlement network or serving the proximity area. Fetesti (approx. 34300 inhabitants in 2009) is a riparian Danube municipality.

### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

In Ialomița county there are no urban agglomerations, the urban concentrations being in block districts. Territorial distribution of the communes upon their number of localities shows a concentration of communes having more than 5000 inhabitants close to Slobozia municipality (Amara town) and in Eastern part of the county – close to Constanta and Calarasi counties, around Fetesti municipality (Facaeni and Bordusani communes), strictly related to main transport arteries (E 584, DN2C, DN3A, DN3B, A2 highway and the railway network). Regarding the development of residential areas, in the 7 urban localities from Ialomița county were finished in the last 5 years (2005-2009) a number of 1294 new dwellings (42% from total number of new dwellings in the county), most of them in Slobozia municipality (515).

### *Interregional cooperation*

Ialomița county belongs to the Euroregion “Dunarea Inferioara” (Inferior Danube), together with Calarasi and Constanta counties from Romania, Silistra and Dobric counties from Bulgaria.

The projects they implemented together are based on:

- the cross-border crossing point Calarasi-Silistra
- cross-border tourism at Low Danube
- a common partnership for a sustainable development of the cross-border transport infrastructure
- the development of business / enterprises in cross-border area
- the common environment management of the cross-border region Calarasi – Silistra.

Projects under development:

- Pro-active group for Romania-Bulgaria cross-border cooperation. Partner: Dobrogea Danube Association for Cross-border Cooperation and Development.
- A common road – Romania-Bulgaria partnership for sustainable development of cross-border access infrastructure. Partner: Silistra Municipality.
- Development of business environment infrastructure in the cross-border area of Clrai – Silistra. Partner: Silistra Municipality.
- Joint management of the environment based on mosquito populations control in Clrai-Silistra cross-border area. Partner: Silistra Municipality.

### *Living standards*

Almost all inhabitants from urban areas have water supply, household sewerage systems, and home centrals or heating with solid fuel, are supplied with electricity, and natural gas.

According to 2002 Census, in Ialomița county 96.9% of dwellings had electric energy supply, 19.4% were connected to natural gas pipelines, 48.2% of dwellings had drinking water supply and 26.1% were connected to public sewerage network.

In 2007, every urban locality had drinking water supply network and public sewage installations. In rural area 72.9% of communes had drinking water installations and no commune had sewage systems.

In 2009 the wastewater coming into Ialomița river was from municipal wastewater treatment stations (Urziceni - S.C.Ecoaqua S.A. Urziceni and Slobozia - SC Urban S.A. Slobozia), from the wastewater treatment stations belonging to SC Expur SA Slobozia, SC AGFD nd rei (that is undertaken also the wastewater of nd rei town), SC Amonil SA Slobozia and SC Agrisol Interna ional – Cz ne ti Farm.

The total length of house sewerage system in 2009 was of 162.29 km in Ialomița county: 75.75 km in Slobozia, 30.84 in Urziceni, 19 km in Fetesti municipalities and 11 km in Tandarei and 25.7 km in Amara towns.

*Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants	331	350	367	378
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants	0	2,3	1,2	0
Regional vitality index	160,7	131	101,1	99,8

## Judetul Teleorman

### *General information*

In 2008 the county had 410 288 inhabitants and a density of 70.4 inhabitants/km<sup>2</sup>, less than regional (101.5) and national (90.2) averages.

### *Human Resources*

#### *Demographic situation*

The number of population decreased with 17.6% between 1991 and 2008, values superior those of regional and national levels, the highest decreasing of population in the region. Between 2001 and 2008 the population decreased with 10.1%, much more than national and regional values (4% and 4.4%). In 2008, only 33.5% of the county population was concentrated into its 5 urban localities. Teleorman county has one of the most important decreasing of population in the region between 1991 and 2008: 15.8% in urban and 18.3% in rural areas. Between 2001 and 2008 population decreased more in urban (12.7%) than in rural (8.7%) areas, with much higher values than at regional or national ones.

#### *Educational structure*

The number of secondary school population in Teleorman county was stagnant in the last 8 years – about 12.3 thousand people. In 2008 were 20 secondary schools, their number being constant in the last years. Since 2002, the county has university students. Their number increased to 1353 in 2004 and decreased to 952 in 2008. In 2008 were 4 faculties and no tertiary education institutions. According to last Census (2002), in Teleorman county only 5.99% in the group age 23-65 have high education, situating the county on one of the last places in Danube region regarding this aspect. In the group age of 19-65, non-educated people represented 17.19%, much under the regional average (8.7%), situating Teleorman county also at the end of the list of the Romanian Danube counties.

#### *Labour market*

Employment decreased between 2000 (76.1%) and 2006 (63.9%). Also decreased from 65.2% in 2007 to 64.2% in 2008, a value inferior than the regional (66.7%) one, but superior to the national (63.6%) value to the East-Muntenia region from which it belongs (58.8%).

### *Settlement Structure*

#### *Development trends*

In 2008 Teleorman county had 3 municipalities (out of which 1 is county residence), 2 towns and 92 communes (83 until 2004) with 231 villages. In the same year, 88.7% from total localities had between 500 and 5000 inhabitants, out of which 72.1% have between 2000 and 5000 inhabitants. The number of small localities (less than 2000 inhabitants) increased from 5 in 1991 to 24 in 2008. The number of localities having between 5000 to 10000 inhabitants decreased from 19 in 1991 to 6 in 2008.

Regarding the development of residential areas, in the 5 urban localities from Teleorman county were finished in the last 5 years (2005-2009) a number of 716 new dwellings (54.4% from total number of new dwellings in the county), most of them in Alexandria municipality (234).

#### *Roles of importance of the towns*

According to Law no.351/2001, Alexandria municipality, county residence, together with other 2 municipalities (Turnu Magurele and Rosiorii de Vede) are considered to be of rank II as hierarchy, having an area of influence of approx. 30000-100000 inhabitants. The other 2 urban localities have county and zonal importance, with role of balance in the settlement network or serving the proximity area. Turnu Magurele municipality (approx. 28800 inhabitants in 2009) and Zimnicea town (15130 inhabitants) are riparian Danube localities.

### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

Teleorman county is organized in 97 localities, out of which 5 are urban. The share of urban population is of 33.6% from total population. The density of population in urban area is 281.12 inhab/km<sup>2</sup> and in rural area is 50.34 inhab/km<sup>2</sup>.

Urban settlements are Alexandria, Rosiorii de Vede and Turnu Magurele municipalities, Videle and Zimnicea towns. Their urban population is concentrated on 8.3% from the total area of the county.

Territorial distribution of the communes upon their number of localities shows a concentration of communes having more than 5000 inhabitants close to Rosiori de Vede and Alexandria municipalities, related to main transport arteries (E 70, DN51, DN52, DN65A and the railway network).

### *Interregional cooperation*

“Danube South” Euroregion was established in August 2001.

Partners:

- Romania (Alexandria, Turnu Magurele, Rosiorii de Vede and Zimnicea – Teleorman County)
- Bulgaria (“Euroregion Dunav Jug” Association)

The centre of the Euroregion is located in Svishtov (Bulgaria). The activities of the Euroregion are rather poor.

### *Living standards*

According to 2002 Census, in Teleorman county 97.0% of dwellings had electric energy supply, only 1.6% being connected to natural gas pipelines, 26.1% of dwellings had drinking water supply and 21.1% were connected to public sewerage installations.

In 2007, every urban locality had drinking water supply network and public sewerage installations. In rural area only 22.8% of communes had drinking water installations and only one commune had sewage systems.

The length of sewerage network in 2009 was of 209.475 km, ensuring the eviction of household waste water in central system in 7 localities, for 88882 inhabitants.

SC Apa Serv SA intends to rehabilitate and to extend the existent wastewater treatment stations in its 5 urban localities: Alexandria, Turnu Magurele, Rosiorii de Vede, Zimnicea and Videle.

The share of dwellings connected to wastewater treatment installations increased from 30.6% in 1996 to 32.9% in 2008. In 2009, 22108 inhabitants had dwellings connected to municipal wastewater treatment stations (16.9% from urban population), with 2947 persons less than in 2006.

### *Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants	354	366	395	411
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants	0	0	1,3	1,7
Regional vitality index	94,8	81,7	65,1	61,7

## Municipiul Bucuresti

### *General Information*

In 2008 Bucharest had the highest density of population in the Bucharest-Ilfov region and in Romania, comparing with regional (101.5) and national (90.2) averages.

### *Human Resources*

#### *Demographic situation*

Bucharest is the most populated city of Romania (1943981 inhabitants in 2008), having 10.15% from the total population from Romania. With a density of 8107.6 inhabitants/km<sup>2</sup>, is the 3rd most populated European capital-city (following Athens and Paris). Percentage of young population (0-20 years) in total population is 20%, less than the national average (25%) but comparable with other European capitals.

Bucharest-Ilfov region has the highest share of urban population in the country: 90.5%. Bucharest municipality has 16.2% from the country's urban population.

The population of Bucharest decreased yearly in the last 22 years. Thus, population decreased between 1991 and 2008 with 17.9% (more than at regional or national levels) and between 2001 and 2008 with only 2.6% (less than regional and national values).

#### *Educational structure*

The number of secondary school population in Bucharest increased in 2004 (92318) compared with 2001 (87675), but then decreased until 84850 persons until 2008. In 2008 were 111 secondary schools, their number remaining almost constant.

The number of students more than doubled in Bucharest in 2008 (389517) compared with 2001 (176449).

If the number of students enrolled in public tertiary education institutes in Bucharest increased with 54.6% between 1995/1996 and 2007/2008, in private similar institutions their number increased 5 times in the same period.

Regarding the number of graduates, per total their number increased with only 1.7% in all levels of education. The number of graduates in tertiary education increased with 32% (from 31779 in 1996/1997 to 41862 in 2006/2007), due to the private tertiary education (in public high schools the number of graduates increased with only 1.8%). Also the number of graduates in vocational and apprenticeship education increased with 23% in the same period. It decreased the number of graduates from the following levels of education: with secondary education (with 36%), with high school education with 7% and of post high-school and foremen education with 40%.

In 2008 were 35 high education institutes, with 169 faculties, their number having a decreasing tendency compared with 2003. According to last Census (2002), in Bucharest is the highest percentage of people having high education in the Danube region: 31.36% in the group age 23-65. In the group age of 19-65, non-educated people represented only 2.8%, the best situation in all Danube counties.

#### *Labour market*

Employment rate increased yearly since 2000 from 58.3% to 85.9%, the highest value in the region, much higher regional (66.7%) and national (63.6%) values and higher than in Bucharest-Ilfov region from which it belongs (84.8%).

The structure of civil occupied population by activities of national economy changed in 2007 compared with 1990. The most important decreasing was in manufacturing activities, where the number of occupied population decreased from 39% in 1990 to 14% in 2007. Important increasing of occupied population was in trade, hotels and restaurants (from 10% to 22%), real estate (from 11% to 16%) and construction (from 11% to 13%).

The average number of employees increased in 2007 compared with 2000 with 31.2%. Due to the economic crisis, between July 2008 and July 2010 their number dramatically decreased with 10% (approx. 96500 persons). More than that, between July 2009 and July 2010 the average number of employees decreased in industry and constructions with 8% (the same as at national level), and with 8% also in services, more than at national level where the decreasing was of only 5.3%.

In Bucharest the number of unemployed persons continuously decreased from 44812 persons in 1997 to 18288 persons in 2007, but, due to economic crisis, their number increased again from 19628 persons in July 2009 to 30603 persons in July 2010 (with almost 56%). The unemployment rate also increased between 2008 and 2010

from 1.7-1.8% to 2.7%, lower values than at national scale, where the unemployment rate increased in this period from 6.3% to 7.4%.

According to statistics, monthly average net nominal earnings increased in the last years in Bucharest with 36% in 2009 compared with 2007 and in 2010 insignificantly decreased.

### *Settlement Structure*

#### *Development trends*

Bucharest municipality has a single urban concentration, administratively divided into 6 sectors. In Bucharest is a crisis of dwellings. The future development of the city will determine new jobs, stimulating the population migration towards rural areas or from other parts of the country towards Bucharest. The forecasts show the increasing of population, determining thus the growth of housing demand.

#### *Roles of importance of the towns*

Bucharest is the main administrative, finance, cultural, educational and research centre from Romania, an important transport centre, considered to be, according to Law no.351/2001, a center of national and international importance, with European influence and functioning as urban system together with Ilfov county, national pole, considered to be of rank 0 as hierarchy.

#### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

With a density of 8107.6 inh/km<sup>2</sup>, Bucharest together with Ilfov county have a density of 1211.7 inh/km<sup>2</sup>, the Bucharest-Ilfov region frames into the category of "urban area", although 10.8% of its population live in rural area.

#### *Interregional cooperation*

Increasing commercial exchanges were identified between Bucharest and surrounding areas: in Northern part (Bucharest-Voluntari-Otopeni-Ploiesti), as well as in South (with localities from Ilfov, Giurgiu, Ialomita and Calarasi counties). Local administration intends to support this trend, involving the concept of "Metropolitan area".

#### *Living standards*

In Bucharest the inhabitants are supplied with water in centralized system by its 3 treatment stations: Arcuda (on Dambovita river), Rosu and Crivina (on Arges river).

The sewerage system of Bucharest Municipality is managed by S.C. APA NOVA BUCURE TI SA, and the drainage by A.N. „APELE ROMÂNE”. In this drainage are evicted 12 main sewers and 11 secondary sewers collecting waste water and pluvial water from all over the city and partially from Ilfov county.

Nowadays the Bucharest waste water is evicted in Dambovita river without being treated, downstream the capital, close to Glina commune.

The dwelling stock decreased in 2007 compared with 199 with 8.2%, but since 1995 increased with 1.5%. Also in 2010 were finalized fewer dwellings compared with 2009. In Bucharest were finished in the last 5 years (2005-2009) a number of 12698 new dwellings.

Simple length of drinking water supply network increased yearly from 2066 km in 1990 to 2189 km in 2007, but the volume of drinking water supply decreased from 435 million cube meters in 1990 to 317 million cube meters in 2000 and 215 million cube meters, out of which for domestic use also decreased with 30% between 2000 and 2007.

Public sewerage network increased from 1698 km in 1990 to 1874 km in 2007 (with 10.4%).

*Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants	382	390	407	407
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants	68,6	88,4	131,4	199,7
Regional vitality index	128,1	93,2	77,1	82,7



## Judetul Ilfov

### *General Information*

Ilfov the county is one of the smallest in the region regarding the number of inhabitants (298 021 in 2008). Having a small area, it has one of the highest densities of population, following Bucharest municipality: 192 inhabitants/km<sup>2</sup>, more than regional (101.5) and national (90.2) averages.

### *Human Resources*

#### *Demographic situation*

Ilfov county is the only county in the region that constantly registered increasing of population, the population number increasing each year. Thus, between 1991 and 2008 the number of population increased with 10.4% and between 2001 and 2008 with 7.8%.

In 2008, 42.4% of the county population was concentrated into its 8 urban localities. Between 1991 and 2008 population increased more in urban (21.7%) than in rural areas (3.4%). The same trend was observed in the period 2001-2008, when population increased more in urban (11.1%) than in rural areas (5.5%).

In the 8 towns and 32 communes belonging to Ilfov county were living in 2009 308726 inhabitants (out of which 42.5% in urban area), with 32366 more persons than in 2001.

#### *Educational structure*

The number of secondary school population in Ilfov county increased from 2001 (5224) to 2008 (6835).

In 2008 were 14 secondary schools, their number being almost constant. In the same year it was functioning one high education institute having one faculty, with 252 students.

Until 2005 in Ilfov county was not functioning such institutions. According to last Census (2002), Ilfov county occupying one of the last places in the list of people having high education in the Danube region: 5.35% in the group age 23-65. In the group age of 19-65, non-educated people represented 10.34%, above the region average (which is of 8.7%).

#### *Labour market*

Employment rate increased yearly since 2003 from 63.2% to 77.9% in 2008, a higher value than regional (66.7%) and national (63.6%) values but lower than in Bucharest-Ilfov region from which it belongs (84.8%).

### *Settlement Structure*

#### *Development trends*

In the last 10 years, population from Ilfov county had a slightly increasing tendency.

Since 1994 Ilfov county was included in Bucharest municipality, as agricultural sector. This is why separate data for Bucharest and Ilfov exist only since this year.

In 2008 Ilfov county had 8 towns and 32 communes with 91 villages.

In the same year, 85% from total localities had between 2000 and 10000 inhabitants, out of which 72.1% have between 2000 and 5000 inhabitants, their number being almost constant since 1991.

#### *Roles of importance of the towns*

According to Law no.351/2001, Ilfov county has no municipality, but has 8 urban localities of county and zonal importance, with role of balance in the settlement network or serving the proximity area. The most important cities are Voluntari (about 33 thousand inhabitants in 2009) and Buftea (approx. 21 thousand inhabitants in 2009).

The 8 towns are situated around Bucharest municipality, excepting Buftea town, which is separated by Mogosoaia commune. Their population is quite reduced, the urbanization process being accelerated in the past years when many investments in infrastructure and in industry occurred.

The biggest town is Voluntari - 33438 inhabitants, followed by Buftea - 21202 inhabitants, Pantelimon - 19972 inhabitants, Pope ti Leordeni - 16169 inhabitants, the other towns having less than 15000 inhabitants.

The biggest town, Voluntari, is situated in the North-Eastern part of the Capital, between 2 water courses - Colentina and Pas rea, integrating 2 areas distinct as geographical location, but unitary from the administrative point of view: Voluntari and Pipera district.

Besides the 8 towns, Ilfov county has another 32 communes with villages separated by arable land. In the last years, the areas of arable land significantly decreased, being replaced with new constructions, unifying the urban areas.

The area occupied by urban settlements is 32787 hectares, meaning 20.7 % from the total area of the county.

The urbanization process in Ilfov county is continuously increasing. More and more localities have modernized access roads and streets and have extended their drinking water, gas and sewage supply networks (Br ne ti, G neasa, Berceni, Vidra etc).

In 2009 al towns followed their urbanization process, by the development of their infrastructure (Voluntari, Chitila, Pantelimon, Bragadiru, Buftea).

*Agglomerations areas and development axes*

Together with Bucharest, Ilfov county has a density of 1211.7 inh/km2, Bucharest-Ilfov region framing thus into the category of “urban area”, although 10.8% of its population is living in rural area.

Regarding the development of residential areas, in the 8 urban localities from Ilfov county were finished in last 5 years (2005-2009) a number of 10945 new dwellings (49.4% from total number of new dwellings in the county), most of them in Voluntari (3084), Popesti Leordeni (2780), Bragadiru (1864) and Otopeni (1230). Together with Bucharest was registered the highest number of dwellings in all Danube area.

*Interregional cooperation*

Increasing commercial exchanges were identified between Bucharest and surrounding areas belonging also to Ilfov county: in Northern part (Bucharest-Voluntari-Otopeni-Ploiesti), as well as in the Southern part (localities from Ilfov, Giurgiu, Ialomita and Calarasi counties). Local administration intends to support this trend, involving the concept of “Metropolitan area”.

*Living standards*

According to 2002 Census, in Ilfov county 96.5% of dwellings had electric energy supply, 17.3% being connected to natural gas pipelines, 35.3% of dwellings had drinking water supply 19% were connected to public sewerage systems.

In 2007, every urban locality had drinking water supply network and public sewage installations. In rural area only 43.7% of communes had drinking water installations and 31,3% had sewage systems.

The augmentation of the number of dwellings continued in 2009, but not in such alert rhythm as in 2008. In this regard, the development of the county was more accentuated in Northern and Southern areas.

*Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants	325	355	368	388
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants	0	0	0	0,8
Regional vitality index	146,6	115,2	100,4	102,2

## Judetul Dolj

### *General Information*

In 2008 the county had 710 669 inhabitants, following Bucharest and Constanta as volume of population, with a density of 95.6 inhabitants/km<sup>2</sup>, more than regional (101.5) and national (90.2) averages.

Craiova municipality, the Dolj county residence, is the historical capital of Oltenia region and the headquarters of the South-West Oltenia Agency of Regional Development, being both county and regional administrative center. It is the biggest urban agglomeration in the South-Western part of Romania and an important pole of economic development.

### *Human Resources*

#### *Demographic situation*

The number of population decreased with 8.3% between 1991 and 2008, less than at regional level (11.2%) but more than at national level (7.2%). Between 2001 and 2008 the population decreased with 4.4%, close to national and regional situation (4% and 4.4%). In 2008, 53.7% of the county population was concentrated into its 7 urban localities.

Between 1991 and 2001 population increased in urban area with 1% and in rural area was almost stagnant. Between 1991 and 2008 population decreased much more in rural area (13.7% - one of the highest levels of the region) than in urban one (3%). The same trend was observed in the period 2001-2008, when population diminished more in rural (13.9%) than in urban areas (5%).

#### *Educational structure*

According to last Census (2002), Dolj county was following Bucharest regarding people with high education in the Danube region: 12.88% in the group age 23-65. In the group age of 19-65, non-educated people represented 10.72%, above the region average (which is of 8.7%).

A positive aspect of the county is the existence of a polyvalent university center with a wide range of specializations, including faculties with agriculture and technical profile.

The number of secondary school population in Dolj county increased from 28779 in 2001 to 37634 in 2008. In 2008 were 46 secondary schools, their number being almost constant in the last years.

Also in 2008 were functioning 3 high education institutes having 24 faculties, with 37634 students, 30% more than in 2001.

The number of students increased from 30700 in school year 2005/2006 to 37634 in school year 2008/2009 and then dropped with 5.3% (until 35667) in 2009.

#### *Labour market*

Employment rate decreased yearly between 1999 and 2004 from 69.6% to 60%, then increased until 2008 until 63.9%. This value is inferior to regional (66.7%) value, but is comparable to that of national level (63.6%). In 2008, employment was higher in Dolj county than in the South-West region from which it belongs (61.9%).

In 2009 employment decreased with 4.5% compared with 2008 (from 276.6 th.persons in 2008 to 264.1 th.persons in 2009), especially in industry (with 15.5%) and constructions (with 11%).

### *Settlement Structure*

#### *Development trends*

In 2008 in Dolj were 3 municipalities, out of which 1 is the county-residence, 4 towns and 104 communes (94 until 2004) with 378 villages. In the same year, 30% from total localities had less than 2000 inhabitants and 51.3% have between 2000 and 5000 inhabitants. There are 14 localities (25 in 1991) having between 5000 and 10000 inhabitants. The number of small localities (less than 2000 inhabitants) increased from 9 in 1991 to 34 in 2008.

The urbanization process is continuously developed by the extension of existent towns and the tendency of development and embedment of the rural localities situated in their close vicinity.

The process of urbanization in Craiova municipality is still developing by the extension of peri-urban area that includes 7 localities. Another 17 communes are controlled by the metropolitan area.

The development of the metropolitan area Craiova, as national growth pole, represents an investment opportunity.

### *Roles of importance of the towns*

According to Law no.351/2001, Craiova municipality, county residence, is a center of national importance, having a potential European influence, important industrial, administrative and cultural centre, regional pole in the South-Western Romanian region. There are also 2 municipalities (Bailesti and Calafat), considered to be of rank II as hierarchy, having an area of influence of approx. 30000-100000 inhabitants. The other 4 urban localities (Bechet, Dabuleni, Filiasi and Segarcea) have county and zonal importance, having a role of balance in the settlement network or serving the proximity area. Calafat municipality (approx. 17900 inhabitants in 2009), Bechet (3900 inhabitants) and Dabuleni (12900 inhabitants) are riparian Danube localities.

### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

The urbanization process in Craiova municipality is in evolution by the extension of its peri-urban area that includes 7 localities (Facai, Mofleni, Popoveni, Simnicul de Jos, Rovine, Izvoru Rece, and Cernele). Situated at the periphery of Craiova municipality, they were “absorbed” by the evolution of the city. They still have a rural character and a residential-agrarian function. Another 17 communes (Breasta, Almaj, Bucovat, Calopar, Cosoveni, Cotofenii din Dos, Goesti, Ghercesti, Isalnita, Malu Mare, Pielesti, Mischii, Podari, Robanesti, Simnicu de Sus, Teasc, Tuglui) with their villages are “controlled” by the Craiova metropolitan area. Due to the introduction and generalization of the tramway as transport mean, the city is developing multi-axial along its runway.

In Calafat municipality the urbanization process is developing by the extension of the urban area towards the villages belonging to it (Basarabi, Ciupercenii Vechi, and Golenti).

In Filiasi the urbanization included the villages (Almajel, Bilta, Braniste, Fratostita, Racarii de Sus, Uscaci) situated in the extremity of the town.

Bailesti municipality administratively includes one village (Balasan).

Regarding the development of residential areas, in the 7 urban localities from Dolj county were finished in the last 5 years (2005-2009) a number of 3292 new dwellings (52.8% from total number of new dwellings in the county), most of them in Craiova municipality (2657).

Territorial distribution of the communes upon their number of localities shows a concentration of communes having more than 5000 inhabitants in the South-Western extreme part of the county, in Calafat-Bailesti area (7 localities) and in the South-Eastern extreme part of the county, in Bechet-Dabuleni area (7 localities). Around Craiova municipality only Podari commune has more than 5000 inhabitants, other 4 communes having between 40000 and 5000 inhabitants. These axes are related to main transport arteries (E 79, DN55, DN55A, DN54A and the railway network).

### *Interregional cooperation*

1. In regional European context, Dolj county is situated in the Romanian-Bulgarian cross-border cooperation area. In 2002, Dolj County Council and the Dolj prefecture initiated together with the Bulgarian partners (Vratsa, Vidin and Montana counties) the establishment of the Euroregion “EURODUNAREA”.

The Southern part of Romania and the Northern part of Bulgaria are characterized by social and economic indicators above the national averages, with high unemployment, depending of the subsistence agriculture and a lack of infrastructure that isolates large part of the territory, isolated especially from the West-East European road and railroad axes. The lack of adequate port infrastructures, the Danube River was a natural barrier for the development of the territory, and the construction of Calafat-Vidin Bridge opens new opportunities for the whole cross-border area. In this context, Dolj County, more urbanized and better equipped with infrastructure, inclusively with the educational one, hosting the most important university center in the South-Eastern part of Romania, is acting as pole of development at regional level, inclusively for the Bulgarian neighbouring regions.

2. Also, the mayors of Calafat, Vidin and Zaicear have signed, on January 18, 2002, in Vidin, the documents establishing the “Danube 21” Cross-border Cooperation Association.

Partners: Rural and urban localities from Danube area in:

- Romania: the town of Calafat, the communities of Poiana Mare, Desa, Cetate and Ciupercenii Noi
- Bulgaria: the town of Vidin and the communities of Rujniti, Macris, Belogradcic, Lom, Kula, Dimovo and Novo Selo

- Serbia: the town of Zaicear and the communities of Sokobania, Kladovo, Bolivat, Kniajevat, Bor, Negotin and Madanpec.

Priority projects:

- Building of a new gas pipe connecting the towns of Calafat, Vidin and Zaicear.
- Opening of Business Information Centres
- Creation of a free trade area
- Organization of fairs
- Rehabilitation of streets, heat supply networks, sewage and water supply networks in the concerned communities of the Euroregion.

The cooperation within the Euroregion is poor.

### *Living standards*

According to 2002 Census, in Dolj county 97.9% of dwellings had electric energy supply, 35.8% being connected to natural gas pipelines, 40.6% of dwellings had drinking water supply and were connected to sewerage installations.

In 2007, every urban locality had drinking water supply network and public sewage installations. In rural area only 13.5% of communes had drinking water installations and only 2 communes had sewage systems, situating Dolj county on the last place regarding this indicator.

The share of dwellings connected to wastewater treatment installations increased from 3.1% in 1996 to 6.2% in 2008.

In 2009, 20452 inhabitants had dwellings connected to municipal wastewater treatment stations (2.9% from urban population), with 2043 persons more than in 2006.

### *Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants	347	368	381	390
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants	21,1	38,7	42,6	53
Regional vitality index	128,5	106,4	88,5	84,9

## Judetul Mehedinti

### *General Information*

In 2008 the county had 296 609 inhabitants, and one of the lowest densities in the region: 59.9 inhabitants/km<sup>2</sup>, less than regional (101.5) and national (90.2) averages.

In 2008, Mehedinti county had 2 municipalities, 3 towns and 61 communes with 344 villages.

Drobeta Turnu Severin municipality, the county residence, has a direct contact with all riparian cities due to the Rhine-Main-Danube Channel. The bridge from Iron Gates shorted the road distances between Drobeta Turnu Severin and different European cities.

The localities belonging to the municipalities and towns have mainly rural and semi-rural structures.

### *Human Resources*

#### *Demographic situation*

The number of population decreased with 9.5% between 1991 and 2008, less than at regional level (11.2%) but more than at national level (7.2%). Between 2001 and 2008 the population decreased with 7.8%, much more than at regional or national level (4.4% and 4%). In 2008, 48.7% of the county population was concentrated into its 5 urban localities. Between 1991 and 2001 the population increased with 4.6% in urban area. In the period 1991-2008 population decreased more in rural (14.45% - one of the highest levels of the region) than in urban areas (7.8%). In the period 2001-2008 population diminished both in rural (7.7%) and in urban areas (7.8%), more than at regional or national levels.

Dependency ratio, effect of the decreasing number of labor resources and of the increasing number of old people, is specific to the process of population ageing, with negative consequences on demographic and social evolution. Thus, in the rural area, the volume of work force – necessary for activities specific for primary and tertiary sectors – has a decreasing tendency.

#### *Educational structure*

The number of secondary school population in Mehedinti county increased from 11512 in 2001 to 12894 in 2008. In 2008 were 19 secondary schools, their number being constant in last years. Also was functioning no high education institute, but still were 3879 students studying in 6 faculties.

According to last Census (2002), in Mehedinti county 9.04% of people had high education in the group age 23-65. In the group age of 19-65, non-educated people represented 10.65%, above the region average (which is of 8.7%).

#### *Labour market*

Employment rate decreased yearly between 1999 and 2004 from 68.7% to 57.4%, then increased until 2008 until 59.7%. This value is inferior to regional (66.7%) and national (63.6%) values and also lower than in the South-West region from which it belongs (61.9%).

### *Settlement Structure*

#### *Development trends*

In 2008, Mehedinti county had 2 municipalities, out of which 1 is the county-residence, 3 towns and 61 communes (59 until 2004) with 344 villages. In the same year, 90.9% from total localities had between 500 and 5000 inhabitants. The number of small localities (with less than 2000 inhabitants) increased from 16 in 1991 to 27 in 2008.

Drobeta Turnu Severin municipality is considered to be a big city, the small towns (the other urban localities) prevailing. The urban localities have a relatively balanced distribution: on the median line of the county, at West, are Drobeta Turnu Severin and Or ova, at East is Strehaia town, in the Northern and Southern parts are Baia de Aram and Vinju Mare towns.

Regarding the development of residential areas, in the 5 urban localities from Mehedinti county were finished in the last 5 years (2005-2009) a number of only 455 new dwellings (42.7% from total number of new dwellings in the county), most of them in Drobeta Turnu Severin municipality (319).



### *Roles of importance of the towns*

According to Law no.351 / 2001, municipality Drobeta Turnu Severin, the county residence, together with the other municipality (Orsova) are considered to be of rank II as hierarchy, having an area of influence of approx. 30000-100000 inhabitants. The other 3 urban localities have county and zonal importance, having a role of balance in the settlement network or serving the proximity area. Drobeta Turnu Severin (approx. 106500 inhabitants) and Orsova (approx. 12800 inhabitants) municipalities are riparian Danube localities.

### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

In Mehedin i county the development of human settlements was influenced by the natural resources and by important traffic ways between Central Europe and Orient.

Territorial distribution of the communes upon their number of localities shows a concentration of communes having more than 5000 inhabitants only along the Danube in the area Orsova-Drobeta Severin, related to main transport arteries (E 70, DN57, DN67 and the railway network).

A major ax is along European road E70 and Bucharest-Timi oara railroad. The importance of the axe is amplified at the contact area with the Danube at Orsova, from where it starts DN67 towards Banat, its modernization leading to a preferential development of the settlements accessing it;

- A main ax goes from Drobeta Turnu Severin towards the Southern part of the county and includes the DN56 road, crossing Vânju Mare town and other rural settlements;
- The second main ax, on the DN67 way it starts from Drobeta Turnu Severin towards Gorj county and it crosses several small and average localities, an area of tourist and ethnographic importance;
- A secondary ax starts from Baia de Aram towards the limits of Mehedin i and Gorj counties, especially to B ile Herculane from Cara Severin county and Târgu Jiu from Gorj county.

To these axes is adding the Danube naval circulation, with impact in the development of settlements along them and especially of the localities being nodes, situated at the intersection of axes.

### *Interregional cooperation*

Mehedinti county belongs to the Euroregion “Dunarea de Mijloc – Portile de Fier” (Middle Danube – Iron Gates), together with Vidin county from Bulgaria, Kladovo city and Bor district in Serbia. The projects were implemented mostly with Serbian partners.

The development of structural projects is also envisaged; they should ensure the fluidity of road and rail transport required by the construction of the Vidin – Calafat bridge, being thus envisaged projects implying transport improvement (road and rail infrastructure).

Approaches to open a border point at Iron Gate II and to use the roadway on Gogosu dam might have a good influence on the regional cooperation in Iron Gate Euroregion. Ensuring the traffic flows on the north-south axis and the road transport to and from Serbia would boost, view the visa liberalization, the development of trade exchange in the region and the Western Balkans area.

### *Living standards*

According to 2002 Census, in Mehedinti county 96.0% of dwellings had electric energy supply, no dwelling being connected to natural gas pipelines, 40.0% had drinking water supply and were connected to sewerage installations.

In 2007, every urban locality had drinking water supply network and public sewage installations. In rural area only 59% of communes had drinking water installations and 11.5% had sewage systems.

The share of dwellings connected at wastewater treatment installations increased from 8.7% in 1996 to 12.8% in 2008.

In 2009, 14354 inhabitants had dwellings connected to municipal wastewater treatment stations (10% from urban population), with 1264 persons more than in 2006.



*Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants	381	406	430	444
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants	1,9	9,8	13,1	10,8
Regional vitality index	133,3	109,5	93,6	88,1

## Judetul Olt

### *General Information*

In 2008 the county had 473 128 inhabitants and a density of 85.6 inhabitants/km<sup>2</sup>, less than regional (101.5) and national (90.2) averages.

On July 1st, 2009, the population counted 466,821 inhabitants, out of which 40.47% were living in urban area.

In administrative terms, the county comprises 112 administrative-territorial units: two municipalities (Caracal and Slatina), 6 cities (Bals, Corabia, Scornice ti, Potcoava Dr g ne ti-Olt, Piatra-Olt) and 104 communes with 377 villages.

### *Human Resources*

#### *Demographic situation*

The number of population decreased with 11.2% between 1991 and 2008, the same value as at regional level (11.2%) but more than at national level (7.2%). In this period the population decreased very much, both in rural (11.7%) and in urban areas (10.4%).

Between 2001 and 2008 the population decreased with 6.8%, more than national and regional values (4% and 4.4%), diminishing more in urban (8.4%) than in rural areas (5.7%).

In 2008, 40.5% of the county population was concentrated into its 8 urban localities. Together with the decreasing of the county population, between 2002 and 2008 the urban population also decreased, from 494707 inhabitants in 2002 to 470709 inhabitants in 2008, comparable with the number of inhabitants from 1966.

#### *Educational structure*

According to last Census (2002), in Olt county only 6.97% of people had high education in the group age 23-65. In the group age of 19-65, non-educated people represented 10.70%, above the region average (which is of 8.7%).

The number of secondary school population in Olt county decreased from 16158 in 2001 to 15896 in 2008. In 2008 were 26 secondary schools (25 in 2003).

In 2008 was functioning no high education institute, being only 655 students studying in 2 faculties.

#### *Labour market*

In Olt county employment rate had a fluctuant trend, decreasing from 59.5% in 2007 to 58.3% in 2008. This value is inferior to regional (66.7%) and national (63.6%) values and also lower than in the South-West region from which it belongs (61.9%).

### *Settlement Structure*

#### *Development trends*

In 2008, Olt county had 2 municipalities, out of which 1 is the county-residence, 6 towns and 104 communes (94 until 2004) with 377 villages. In the same year, 92% from total localities had between 500 and 5000 inhabitants. From these, almost 30% have less than 2000 inhabitants. The number of small localities (with less than 2000 inhabitants) increased from 6 in 1991 to 30 in 2008. Concomitant with population decreasing, between 2002 and 2008 the urban population had a descendent trend. It constantly decreased the number of population from towns with more than 20,000 inhabitants, which should have been important centers to support the national settlement network. This decreasing led to the diminution of their roles and functions, at the decline of the development potential in their whole area of influence. The population decreasing was the effect of the economic decline, a part of inhabitants leaving the urban areas.

#### *Roles of importance of the towns*

According to Law no.351/2001, Slatina municipality, county residence, together with Caracal municipality, are considered to be of rank II as hierarchy, having an area of influence of approx. 30000-100000 inhabitants. The other 6 urban localities have county and zonal importance, having a role of balance in the settlement network or serving the proximity area. Corabia town (19580 inhabitants in 2009) is a riparian Danube locality.

Slatina municipality is the county residence, an important industrial center beginning with the XIXth century. Here are the most representative institutions of the county on local and regional level.

Corabia town is situated in the Southern part of the county, on the Danube’s bank. It was established in 1871. Town and Danube port, at the end of the XIXth century was considered to be the second port as economical importance, following Braila port.

*Agglomerations areas and development axes*

Human settlements are strictly related to the relief and hydrographic network, to the circulation lines, being oriented on 2 main directions – north-south and west-east. The oldest settlements are those along the Danube and Olt rivers, settled from Roman period. Regarding the development of residential areas, in the 8 urban localities from Olt county were finished in the last 5 years (2005-2009) a number of 1504 new dwellings (44.4% from total number of new dwellings in the county), most of them in Slatina municipality (703).

Territorial distribution of the communes upon their number of localities shows a concentration of communes having more than 5000 inhabitants in the central part of Olt county, in the area Caracal – Draganesti Olt, strictly related to main transport arteries (E70, DN54, DN64 and the railway network).

*Interregional cooperation*

The traditional cross-border collaboration between Oltenia region and Vidin, Vratsa and Montana was materialized in the organization and functioning of the „Multi-functional Center of Cross-border Cooperation and Business Regional Development Romania-Bulgaria”, The project was launched within the Phare CBC Program Romania-Bulgaria, by the Oltenia Commerce and Industry Chamber, envisaging a regional affairs network Romania – Bulgaria, with the center in Craiova and other 5 points in Vidin, Vratsa, Montana, Drobeta Turnu Severin and Slatina. The center will function as a multiplying network for affairs and legislative information, for the techniques of environment protection, assistance and consultancy for economic agents, public and nongovernmental institutions and organizations from the two areas.

*Living standards*

According to 2002 Census, in Olt county 97.1% of dwellings had electric energy supply, 19.6% being connected to natural gas pipelines. 27% of dwellings had drinking water supply and were connected to sewage installations. In 2007, every urban locality had drinking water supply network and public sewage installations. In rural area only 41.3% of communes had drinking water installations and only 2 communes had sewage systems. The share of dwellings connected at wastewater treatment installations increased from 34.2% in 1996 to 37.1% in 2008.

In 2009, 121743 inhabitants had dwellings connected to municipal wastewater treatment stations (26% from urban population), with 21120 persons more than in 2006.

*Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants	343	366	387	401
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants	0	0,2	1,1	1,6
Regional vitality index	143,9	117,6	92,6	85,7

## Judetul Caras-Severin

### *General Information*

In 2008 the county had 326 067 inhabitants and one of the lowest densities in the region, higher only than the density in Tulcea county: 38.2 inhabitants/km<sup>2</sup>, less than regional (101.5) and national (90.2) averages. The county has 2 municipalities – Re i a and Caransebe , 6 towns: Anina, Boc a, B ile Herculane, Oravi a, Moldova Nou and O elu Ro u and 69 communes with 287 villages.

### *Human Resources*

#### *Demographic situation*

The number of population decreased very much between 1991 and 2008 (with 18.7% - the highest value in the region), more than at regional level (11.2%) or national level (7.2%).

Between 2001 and 2008 the population decreased with 7.3%, also more than national and regional values (4% and 4.4%). In 2008, 56.2% of the county population was concentrated into its 8 urban localities. Between 1991 and 2008 population decreased very much in urban area (with 21.5% - the highest value in the region), more than in rural area (14.8%, also one of the highest levels of the region).

In the period 2001-2008 population diminished also more in urban (8.9%) than in rural areas (5.2%).

The county population density in urban area was in 2009 between 57 and 424 inhabitants/km<sup>2</sup>. High densities are in the 2 municipalities of the county (Resita and Caransebes). Baile Herculane resort and Anina town have low densities of population (approx.60 inhab/km<sup>2</sup>).

The age structure of the population shows a tendency of population ageing, the number of persons having more than 62 years old (16.64% from total population) being higher than the number of persons between 0 and 15 years old (15.86%).

Birth rare decreased in Caras Severin county more than in the West region (8.4% compared with 6.53%) and is more evident in rural localities (12.38%) compared with the rural ones (5.18%).

Prognoses: According to local statistics, in the average version of the population prognosis, the population will decrease with 33.8 thousand persons in 2025 compared with 2003. The optimistic version shows a decreasing of population with 19 thousand persons and in the pessimistic one, with 38 thousand persons.

#### *Educational structure*

According to last Census (2002), in Caras-Severin county 8.75% of people had high education in the group age 23-65. In the group age of 19-65, non-educated people represented 7.27%, less than the region average (which is of 8.7%), a very good situation compared with all the other Danube counties (except for Bucharest).

The number of secondary school population in Caras-Severin county increased from 9470 in 2001 to 12746 in 2008.

Total school population that graduated in school year 2008/2009 was of 55402 persons. From these, 24% is represented by gymnasium graduates (13288). 12640 persons graduated high schools (22.8%), 3163 persons graduated professional schools (5.7%) and only 6.94% (3845 persons) graduated universities, less than in any other previous year.

In 2008 the University Eftimie Murgu, from Resita, had 2 faculties with 4195 students. In this county both the number of universities and the number of students decreased.

According to studies and prognoses, in the county the scholar population will significantly decrease, affecting in a few years the labour force too.

#### *Labour market*

The active population continuously decreased since 1998.

In the structure of occupied population, by sectors of activity, the following changes occurred after 1989:

- the restructuring of heavy industry led to the decreasing of the number of population occupied in this sector
- due to industrial unemployment, people returned to rural areas, increasing thus the activity in agriculture
- the dynamic of the services sector increased (commerce, especially), absorbing a big part of the active population.

The average number of employees decreased between 1995 and 2008 with 32.9%: the employees in industry decreased with 45.7%, out of which in mining with 94.7% (from 8648 in 1995 to 460 in 2008) and in manufacturing with 34.2%, in commerce with 19.7%, in transport with 74%.

Employed population decreased between 1995 and 2008 in industry, agriculture and services, increased in commerce and was almost constant in tourism. The highest share of employed population was in agriculture (34%), services (37.2%) and industry (22.2%). Employment rate decreased yearly between 1999 and 2004 from 69.1% to 57.2%, then increased until 2008 until 59.5%. This value is inferior to regional (66.7%) and national (63.6%) values and also lower than in the South-West region from which it belongs (61.9%).

### *Settlement Structure*

#### *Development trends*

In 2008, Caras-Severin county had 2 municipalities, out of which 1 is the county-residence, 6 towns and 69 communes with 287 villages. In the same year, 88.3% from total localities had between 500 and 5000 inhabitants. From these, almost 51.5% have less than 2000 inhabitants. It is the only county in the region having one locality with less than 500 inhabitants: Brebu Nou, 138 inhabitants.

In the communist period, the heavy industry had a priority in the development of the county. Here were concentrated investments to develop the mining industry, iron and steel and engineering industries. The economic recession happened in the mono-industrial towns had negative social consequences: an important decreasing of the number of urban population (and of the county also) and, due to the industrial unemployment, the population return to rural areas, increasing the activity in agriculture.

#### *Roles of importance of the towns*

The population of the county is grouped from the administrative point of view in a settlement network having 2 municipalities – Reia and Caransebe, 6 towns: Anina, Bocsa, Bile Herculane, Oravita, Moldova Noua and Otelul Roșu and 69 communes with 287 villages.

According to Law no.351/2001, Resita municipality, county residence, together with Caransebes municipality are considered to be of rank II as hierarchy, having an area of influence of approx. 30000-100000 inhabitants. The other 6 urban localities have county and zonal importance, having a role of balance in the settlement network or serving the proximity area. Moldova Noua town (approx. 13900 inhabitants in 2009) is a riparian Danube locality. Resita municipality, the residence of the county, is situated on both sides of Barzava river, in a mixture of residential areas and industrial objectives.

Caransebes municipality belongs to the IVth size category for urban localities. The other 6 towns belong to an inferior category. In Caransebes the enterprises have low productivity. It is a railway junction.

Bocsa town is situated at 25 km from Resita. It developed due to iron ores, but beginning with the XVIIIth century the demographic, economic and urban evolution depended of the development of Resita city.

Anina town developed due to the discovery of superior coal ores (1790). The main economic function of the town is coal industry and wood processing. By its positioning at 645 m altitude, Anina could assume an important tourist function.

Oravita town is situated along the homonym valley and has a territorial distribution along one street for many kilometers. It was an important center of copper and gold extraction and preparation and had an important cultural function. Oravita has several enterprises specialized in food industry and in wood processing.

Otelul Rosu town, situated on Bistra river, at 20 km from Caransebes municipality, became at the end of XIXth century one of the most 3 important siderurgic centers of Banat (following Resita and Nadrag), due to its favourable geographic positioning regarding the local raw materials and the 2 important metallurgic centers from Hunedoara and Resita, contributing to its development.

Moldova Noua town has an important position in the Western side of the Danube's gorge from Iron Gates and in the Southern part of the county. Re-opening the old mines developed the city, activating its industrial activity. It was developed the old port. Nowadays the town has problems due to its economic regression.

Baile Herculane city is situated along the Cerna river valley, being once an important spa, due to its thermal water.

#### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

According to Development Plan 2007-2013, the county was and will be without big urban concentrations.

Regarding the development of residential areas, in the 8 urban localities from Caras Severin county were finished in the last 5 years (2005-2009) a number of 596 new dwellings (62.2% from total number of new dwellings in the county), most of them in Resita (180) and Caransebes (184) municipalities.

Territorial distribution of the communes upon their number of localities shows a very poor concentration of communes having more than 5000 inhabitants. These are situated close municipalities and cities: Resita – Bocsa area, Anina – Oravita area and Caransebes area. The development axes are strictly related to main transport arteries (E 70, DN58, DN58 DN57B, DN68 B and the railway network).

### *Interregional cooperation*

Cross border cooperation is between the Serbian and Romanian Banat on economic, cultural and environment protection issues.

Caras Severin county belongs to the “Danube – Kris – Mures -Tisa” Euroregion. This cooperation originated from the bilateral cooperation agreement between Timi (Romania) and Csongrád (Hungary). The Danube-Mure -Tisa Regional Cooperation Protocol was signed in 1977. The objective of the Euroregion is to establish and develop the relationships of local communities with the representatives of local authorities in the fields of the environment, economy, education, culture, health, science, sports, as well as to establish cooperation relationships with a view to European integration.

Partners:

- Romania: Timi , Arad, Cara -Severin and Hunedoara counties;
- Hungary: Csongrád, Békés, Bács-Kiskun, Jacs Nagykun Szolnok counties;
- Serbia: Voivodina Autonomous Province

Projects under implementation:

- 2009-2010: opening new border crossings: rail (to Berliste - Iam) – of importance for the restoration of the oldest railway in Romania: Oravi a - Iam (Ro) - Bela Crkva / Biserica Alba / Weisskirchen (Serbia) - Socol - Bazia (Ro); road and rail (at Socol) – 2009-2010: remove from isolation the area at the entrance of the Danube in the country and highlight the natural riches in the Iron Gate National Park; road and rail at Gr dinari (CS / RO) - Markovat (VS / Serbia), which will support a joint cultural and tourism project between Cara -Severin County and Vrsac Community. The project aims at promoting cultural resources, tourism, wine-growing in the area of Vrsac - Markova – Gr dinari and the natural heritage, tourism and industry in the area of Anina - Oravi a - Iam.

- 2009-2010: creation of a cross border industrial park between Cara -Severin County and South Banat District (following the model of the one between Hungary and PAV)

- 2009-2010: creation of ethno-centres to facilitate the study and preservation of people’s customs and traditions, crafts, folklore

- 2009-2010: creation of a cross-border tourist route on both sides of the Danube River in the two natural parks: the Iron Gate Park (Cara -Severin and Mehedin i counties) and erdap Park (Borski and Brani evski districts)

- 2009-2010: “Disaster Monitoring and Coordination Centre - Cara -Severin”. The main applicant is the Public Service for Mountain Rescue and Disaster Assistance within the Department of Public and Private Domain Management in Cara -Severin County. Partners: Inspectorate for Emergency Situations “Semenic” and the Command for flood preventing of the Vâr e municipality

- 2009-2012 “Tourism Vocational School” training highly qualified hotel personnel.

### *Living standards*

According to 2002 Census, in Caras-Severin county 97.5% of dwellings had electric energy supply, 37.4% being connected to natural gas pipelines, 58.6% of dwellings had drinking water supply. According to the sane 2002 Census, in rural areas only 25.5% from dwellings have water supply and only 16.5% have sewage systems.

In 2006 were 27 settlements belonging to 9 communes that didn’t have electric energy installations. Also there are rural localities partially electrified (14 communes with villages partially electrified) and 5 towns needing networks extension.

In 2007, every urban locality had drinking water supply network and public sewage installations. In rural area only 44.9% of communes had drinking water installations and 16.2% had sewage systems.

Reported to the total length of water distribution, the length of the sewage network covers only 43,5%. Thus, there are many streets and localities with water distribution networks but without sewage networks, the household wastewater being discharged in river courses and/or on the soil, polluting them.

From 29 localities having sewage network in 2008, 8 were in urban area.

The share of dwellings connected at wastewater treatment stations decreased from 43.5% in 1996 to 40% in 2008.

In 2009, 82050 inhabitants had dwellings connected to municipal wastewater treatment stations (25,3% from urban population), with 6583 persons less than in 2006.

*Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants	354	374	396	405
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants	3,8	14,2	12,3	11,8
Regional vitality index	158,2	127,4	101,9	97,3



## Vidin

### *General Information*

Vidin District has 142 settlements, of which 7 cities and 135 villages, comprised in 11 municipalities. In the District predominates urban population, which inhabits mainly municipal centers and represents 61.0 % of the total population.

### *Human Resources*

#### *Demographic situation*

Population of Vidin District counts to 110,310 inhabitants (2008) , which accounted to 7.1 % of the total population of the Danube site zone. The district covers 142 settlements, of which 7 cities and 135 villages. In the demographic development of the district internal regional disparities in municipalities (NUTS 4) were observed according to all demographic indicators. The number of their population varies in a very wide range- from 1 797 inhabitants of Boynitsa municipality to 77,167 inhabitants in Vidin municipality. The population density is 36.4 people/km<sup>2</sup> - the lowest in the region. The Differences in the density of population amongst municipalities are significant, as they count from 8.79 people/ km<sup>2</sup> for Makresh municipality to over than 100 people/km<sup>2</sup> for Vidin municipality (131.38 people/ km<sup>2</sup>). Processes of depopulation and accumulation of municipalities with adverse structures were observed mainly in border areas of the district. Concentration of population and relatively favorable demographic situation is emerging in the district center of Vidin.

In the cities is concentrated 61.0% - 67,336 people of Vidin district, in the villages- 39% (42,974 people). Cities in view of population, except the district center are very small. ¾ of urban population in the District is concentrated in the town of Vidin. It is dominated by small and very small villages with populations under 1 000 inhabitants (over 90% of all villages), where lives 78% of rural population. Medium and large villages comprise less than 5% of the total number of villages with 22% of rural population.

The reduction of population in the district is associated with changes in the age structure. For the period 1991-2008, the number and proportion of young people (0-14 years) decreased from 17.1% to 12.0% (compared to the total population of the district). Working age population (15-64 years) also decreased in absolute numbers but relative increases from 60.9 % in 1991 to 64.2 % in 2008. The decrease the population in working age has been accompanied by an increase in the proportion of those aged over 65 years from 22.0% (1991) to 23.8% (2008).

As a result of these changes in 2008, the Vidin district is with the most aging population in the region of the Danube site zone. Internal differences in the age structure of the district at municipalities level are considerable. In nearly two thirds of the municipalities (52%) the share of young people is below the average for the district. The population in working age is also characterized by significant imbalances-from 46.2% in Makresh to 69.8% for Vidin. In the regional center (Vidin) is observed concentration of working age population as a result of the accumulation of labor force.

The number of those people over 65 years of age also varies greatly in comparison with the average share in the district- 48.9% in the municipality of Boynitsa to 17.3 % for the municipality of Vidin. Great part of municipalities (81%) had a share of the elderly people above the average for the district. For the period 1991-2008, the changes in age structure are with different intensity for the individual municipalities.

Following the trend of variation of population age structure in the direction of aging, the age dependency ratios increased – the number of people over 65 years of age relative to that of the working age population (15-64 years). In 2008, the population aged over 65 years in the district is 37.2% compared to that at working age (with the highest rate in the region), indicating that maintenance costs of older people for health and social services here are the most highest. The total dependency ratio (ratio of population under 15 years and over 65 years, compared to the population from 15 to 64 years) with average for the region of around 47.2% in Vidin district is 55.6%, in whose formation the higher ratio is of the elderly people.

The population of Vidin district is with negative natural growth, supplemented by a negative migration growth. In 2008 the value of the coefficient of natural growth in the district of Vidin is -14.5‰, in average for the Danube site zone of -8.3‰ and for Bulgaria 4.3‰. For the period after 2000 are not observed significant changes in the demographic development of Vidin district.

### *Educational structure*

Against the backdrop of the overall reduction in the population of Vidin district in the period 2005-2008, there was a minimal increase in people with higher education by 0.4 percentage points - from 16.3% to 16.7% compared to the age group of 25 to 64 years. Parallel increases the proportion of people with secondary education from 56.0 % to 59.9 % compared to the age group of 19 to 64 years, or with 3.9 percentage points while retaining its leadership position. The decrease of lower-educated persons is marked (with primary or lower education) of 32.4% to 29.0% (by 3,4 percentage points) compared to the age group of 15 to 64 years. For the period are not observed significant changes in the ratio between educational levels of the active population in the district – retained is the high proportion of people with secondary and higher education and the share of low educated population decreased.

### *Labour market*

Economically active population in Vidin district numbered at 56.5 thousand people (2008) - 7.2 % of that of the Danube region. The coefficient of economic activity is 79.8 % (above the average for the region of 74.1%). The employment rate (54.7 %) is among the lowest in the region, which reflects onto the level of unemployment (11.57 % - average in 2009). In all municipalities in the district excluding Vidin, the unemployment rate is above the average for the region. In half of the municipalities the total unemployment rate is more than 1.5 times of the average for the Danube region. Variation scale showing the difference between the minimum (Vidin municipality) and maximum (Dimovo municipality) unemployment rate in the area is 23 percentage points. In 2009, no extreme deviations were registered compared to 2008, the trend with the lowest values to be presented the district center and with the highest level the municipalities in rural and mountainous parts of the district is kept.

### *Settlement Structure*

#### *Development trends*

The population of Vidin district is characterized by the highest negative growth rate among other districts in the region for the period 1992-2008, (-27.3%). The basis of the reduction of population is the negative natural population reproduction combined with a negative migration growth. There are significant intra district discrepancies in municipalities. Excluding Vidin, where growth (-21.6%) is lower than the average for the district, but above average for the region (-18.5%) in the other municipalities figures are from Belogradchik -27.7% to -46.0% for Boynitsa. In fact the reduction in the population of the district began in the middle of the last century and continues today with diminishing intensity.

#### *Roles of importance of the towns*

The density of the settlements on 100 sq. km is 4.7- close to the national average (4.8) and above the average for the region of the Danube site zone (4.2).

The population density is low - 36.4 persons / sq km (below the average for the region of - 56.0 and for the country of- 68.6).

The total population of the District, according data to 2008 is 110,310 people, of whom 61.1 % are on the territory of the municipality of Vidin. The other municipalities cover from 1.6 % (Boynitsa) to 6.6 % (Dimovo) of the total population of Vidin District.

In Vidin District is not registered an increase of population in any period between censuses after 1946. This continued downward trend is characteristic also for the population of individual municipalities.

Vidin District comprises of 7 cities. At the end of 2008 in the cities of Vidin District live 67,336 people, or 6.9 % of the urban population of the Danube region. The population of cities reduced in comparison with 2001, the reduction of the urban population of the District is by 7,8 thousand, or with 20%. Villages are mainly in the categories of small and very small villages with under 200 people inhabitants. The population of villages in the District reduce, and there are deserted villages with population less than 30 people.

Vidin District is characterized by low degree of urbanization (61% share of urban population). In the district city of Vidin is concentrated three quarters of the total urban population of the District. Urban areas include 14,227.9 ha of the total territory of the district or 4.7 %.

### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

Vidin is a municipal and district administrative center. Mainly due to economic problems and difficult period of transition Vidin did not form a strong field of spatial influence, exceeding the municipal and district boundaries. With significant importance for the district is the town of Belogradchik, a leading center for the district and with great potential for tourism development. The other towns are mostly of rural type and have a local impact on the organization of the rural hinterland around them.

Axis formation Vidin- Sofia- Blagoevgrad- Koluta along the European transport corridor 4 is the main axis of development and urbanization in the direction north- south of the country. The city of Vidin is also part of the Danube corridor for development. Vidin will strengthen its influence as a city-gate with the construction of the second Danube bridge between Bulgaria and Romania.

### *Interregional cooperation*

Vidin has a leading role in cross-border cooperation with neighboring regions from Romania and Serbia.

### *Living standards*

For the period 2005-2008 there has been an increase in housing per 1 000 residents from 542 in 2005 to 640 in 2008 due to two main reasons: an increase in the number of dwellings and a reduction in the population in the District. By municipalities there are observed differences in terms of a greater number of dwellings per capita in smaller municipalities and a less number in the Municipality of Vidin, respectively the city of Vidin. Excluding the municipality of Bregovo for all other municipalities the values of the indicator are above the average for the district.

The average number of persons per dwelling for the district is 1.56, which is below the average for the region (1.89) and for the country (1.94). For the period 2005-2008 there is a decrease in the number of persons per dwelling mainly due to a decrease in the number of the population.

The completion of the public works in the district is insufficient - 70.3% of dwellings built are connected to the public water supply system and 65 % - to the public sewage system.

Per municipality, there are significant differences. With the best indicators in view of the completion of public works are the municipalities of Vidin and Novo Selo - over 80% of dwellings are connected to public water supply and sewage systems. With the lowest indicators for the dwellings completion of public works are the municipalities of Boynitsa, Rujintsi and Kula.

### *Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants	450	549	598	640
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants	0	0	0	0
Regional vitality index	61	54,5	51,5	49,5

## Montana

### *General Information*

The Settlements in the District are 130, of which 8 cities - Montana, Lom, Berkovitsa Chiprovtsi, Varshets, Valchedram, Boychinovtsi and Brusartsi, centers of municipalities. Of all 11 municipalities, three villages are municipal centers- Yakimovo, Medkovets and Georgi Damianovo.

Urban population numbered 99,852 people- 63.1% of the total population of Montana District (2008).

The density of the settlements per 100 sq. km is 3.6- below the national average (4.8) and the region of the Danube site zone (4.2).

The total population of the District, according data to 2008 is 158,291 people, of whom more than half (55.2%) live in the municipalities of Montana and Lom. From the remaining municipalities only Berkovitsa has a population about 20 thousand people, while the rest eight municipalities included a total of one third of the population of the District. The average number of inhabitants living in a municipality numbered 14,390 (20,733 average for the region and for the country 28,813).

The population density is low - 43.5 people / sq km (below the average for the region - 56.0 and for the country - 68.6). Lower is the population density in the uplands and higher- in municipalities with prominent urban centers.

The degree of urbanization of Montana District, measured as a proportion from the urban population is 63.1 % and in some municipalities it is between 80.8% for Montana to 16.7% for Boychinovtsi. The level of urbanization measured by the proportion of people living in cities with more than 5 000 residents increased from 55.9 in 1996 to 57.5 in 2008. The share of population living in settlements with to 2 000 residents increased from 0.9 % in 1996 to 3.1 % - in 2008. The urban areas include 19,476.0 ha of the total territory of the district or 4.7 %. Per municipality the share varies widely- from 8,5 for Lom to 2,4 for Georgi Damianovo.

### *Human Resources*

#### *Demographic situation*

Montana District population numbered at 158,291 inhabitants (2008)- 10.2 % of that of the region. The district includes 130 settlements, including 8 towns and 122 villages. Two thirds of the population of the district is concentrated within the three municipalities (Montana, Lom and Berkovitsa). The population of other municipalities ranged from 2 to 7 % from the total for the district. The population density is 43.5 people/km<sup>2</sup>-below the average for the region. At the level of municipalities (NUTS 4) with the exception of Montana (83.8 people/km<sup>2</sup>) and Lom (94.7 people /km<sup>2</sup>) the density is below the average for the district ranging from 10.3 to people/km<sup>2</sup> for the municipality of Georgi Damianovo to 42 9 people/km<sup>2</sup> for the municipality of Berkovitsa. Depopulation processes occur mainly in border areas of the district. Concentration of population and relatively favorable demographic situation is emerging in the district center of Montana and the Danube town of Lom.

In the cities is concentrated 63.1% - 99,852 inhabitants of Montana district and in the villages- 36.9% (59,439 people). Cities are in view of the population average of middle size (district center), small and very small. 46% of urban population of the district is on the territory of Montana, and 39% - in other two cities. In the remaining five very small towns live only 15% of urban population. Most of the villages are small and very small (86% of all villages),in which lives 60% of rural population. Middle size villages cover 40% of rural population. Large villages in the territory of Montana district does not exist.

The development of the population in the district is associated with changes in age structure. For the period 1991-2008, the number and proportion of young people (0-14 years) decreased from 18.2 % to 12.9 % (compared to the total population of the district). Working age population (15-64 years) also decreased in absolute numbers but relative increases from 61.9 % in 1991 to 64.4 % in 2008. The decrease of the working age population has been accompanied by an increase in the proportion of those aged over 65 years of 19.9 % (1991) 22.7 % (2008). As a result of these changes in 2008, Montana district together with Vidin district are with most aging population in the region of the Danube site zone. Among the municipalities in the district there are differences in the age structure formed by the population and ongoing processes. With poor age structure are municipalities in rural and mountainous areas of the district with centers villages and small towns- Georgi Damyano, Chiprovtsi, Medkovets, Yakimovo. With relatively preserved reproduction potential are the municipalities of Montana and Lom.

Changes in age structure reflect on the coefficients of dependency. In 2008 the population aged over 65 years in the district is 35.2 % compared to those in working age and under 15 years- 20% on average for the region of the Danube site zone respectively 28.8 % and 18.9%.

Natural reproduction of the population of Montana district is negative, as for the whole region, but here the values of the indicators are less unfavorable. In 2008, the natural growth of the district is -10.9‰, 1.3 times over the average for the region. As a result of migrations processes the population of the district further reduces. The development of demographic processes influence on the formation of labor resources and the labor market.

#### *Educational structure*

According to regular statistical surveys the educational level of the population of Montana district is similar to that of neighboring districts of the Danube site zone. There is a reduction in the total population for the period 2001-2008, and to a lesser extent a reduction in the absolute number and proportion of people with higher education to the contingent of 25 to 64 years. Compared to 2005 the proportion of population with higher education decreased by 0.9 percentage points from 16.9 % to 16.0%. Population with secondary education increased by 0.7 percentage points from 58.8 % to 59.5 % compared to the age group of 19-64 years, as it retains at relatively high level (above average for the region and country). The process of reduction of the share of low educated people (with primary or lower education) from 34.4 % to 31.7 % (by 2.7 percentage points) compared to the age group of 15 to 64 years.

#### *Labour market*

Economically active population of Montana district number 79.9 thousand people- 10.2% of that of the Danube region. The economic activity rate is 78.4% (above average for the region)- similar to that of Vidin and Pleven districts from the North-Western region of the Danube site. The employment rate (60.1 %) is above the average for the region. The unemployment rate is traditionally high (12.56 % - the highest in the region in 2009). Unemployment rate by municipality ranging from 6.95 % in Montana to 23.14 % in Valchedram. These two municipalities are at the two poles and in 2009. In the rest of the municipalities, the unemployment rate is above the average for the region. Over the half of the unemployed are registered in the labor market more than one year. Socio-economic situation and demographic realities are among the main factors for the condition of the labor market in the district.

#### *Settlement Structure*

##### *Development trends*

Demographic trends in the development of Montana district are in the direction of reduction of the population. For the period 1992-2008, the rate of growth is 24.0 %, among the highest and above average for the region. To decrease of the population in Montana district, as and in Vidin district, greater role has negative natural reproduction, supplemented with a negative migration growth. Characteristic is that the trends of the decrease of population are higher in municipalities located in rural and mountainous areas of the district.

##### *Roles of importance of the towns*

Settlement network in the district is relatively well-balanced and develop. Settlements are evenly distributed on the territory of the district and the distances between them are not large. Basic centers - small towns are located in optimal closeness to the villages. The center of the District- city of Montana, where are focused service providing objects of a higher level, is located favorably according to other settlements and centers of the municipalities. This applies more to the municipalities in the southern part of the district, while municipalities in the north are relatively distant from the district center. Although it is not in the category of big cities, Montana is an important economic, administrative and cultural center of the District. Other prominent centers are Lom, Berkovitsa and Varshets, which serve as a base for the development of the system of settlements. Peripherality and depopulation are the major problem of the small settlements in all municipalities, especially in mountainous areas of the district.

*Agglomerations areas and development axes**Interregional cooperation**Living standards*

There has been registered an increase of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants from 529 in 2005 to 608 in 2008, determined as by an increase in the absolute number of dwellings, as well as a reduction in the population in the district. The average number of persons per dwelling for the district is 1.64, which is below the average for the region (1.89) and for the country (1.94). For the period 2005-2008 there is a decrease in the number of persons per dwelling mainly due to the decrease in the number of the population.

The district as a whole shows satisfactory performance for the standard of living- 74% of dwellings are connected to public water supply system and 70 %- to the public sewage system.

*Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants	447	534	576	608
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants	5,84	0	0	0
Regional vitality index	68,8	63,6	58	56,9



## Vratsa

### *General Information*

The settlement network of Vratsa District includes 123 settlements, of which 8 cities and 115 villages comprised in 10 municipalities. In the District predominant is the urban population, representing 57.4% of the total population. All cities are municipal centers, as well and two villages- Borovan and Hajredin.

### *Human Resources*

#### *Demographic situation*

The population of Vratsa District numbers 199,702 people (2008)- 12.8 % of that of the region. The District includes 123 settlements, including 8 towns and 115 villages. The population in the municipalities vary widely- from 5 456 people in Hajredin to 76,557 people in Vratsa. With a population ranged from 20 to 30 thousands people are 3 municipalities - Byala Slatina, Kozloduy and Mezdra, while in the rest of the municipalities people are around and below 10 thousand inhabitants. The population density is 55.2 people/km<sup>2</sup>- similar, but slightly lower than the average for the region (56.0 people /km<sup>2</sup>). Internal district differences in the municipalities show that with the exception of Vratsa (108.4 people /km<sup>2</sup>) and Kozloduy (78.2 people /km<sup>2</sup>) density in the rest is below the average for the district ranging from 25.0 to people /km<sup>2</sup> for Roman to 50.4 people /km<sup>2</sup> for Byala Slatina.

In the cities is concentrated 57.4 % - 114,630 people from Vratsa district and in the villages- 42.6% (85,072 people). Cities are middle sized according the population average (district center), small and very small. Over one half of the urban population of the district is in the district center, one third - in small towns and 13.5 % - in very small towns. Most of the villages are small and very small (79 % of all villages), in which lives 48 % of rural population. Medium and large villages comprise one fifth of the villages and 52 % of rural population. They are located mainly in the plains area and are with the most favorable age structure compared to other villages.

Changes in the age structure are in the direction of an aging population. For the period 1991-2008, the number and proportion of young people (0-14 years) decreased from 18.9 % to 13.6 % (compared to the total population of the district). Working age population (15-64 years) also decreased in absolute numbers, but relative increases from 63.6 % in 1991 to 66.8 % in 2008. Increased is the proportion of those aged over 65 years from 17.5 % (1991) 19.6 % (2008). The age composition of the population of the district is not significantly different from that of the region as a whole. Amongst municipalities in the district are differences in the age structure. With poor age structure are outlined Hajredin and Krivodol and with progressive type- Kozloduy and Vratsa. For the rest of the municipalities is typical the trend of reduction of population in the under working ages.

Changes in age structure reflect on the coefficients of dependency. In 2008 the population aged over 65 years in the district is 29.4 % compared to those of working age and under 15 years- 20.3 %, which is similar to the average for the area of the Danube site zone.

The Natural growth for the district in 2008 was negative (-9.4 ‰), formed by the higher overall mortality rate compared with birth. Migration also contributes to the reduction of the population of the district as its intensity (-5.6‰) is higher than the average for the Danube site zone (-3.4‰).

#### *Educational structure*

Trends in educational level of the population in Vratsa district are similar to those of other districts of the North Western region of the Danube site zone. For the period 2005-2008, the number of people with higher education shows a reduction compared to the age group of 25 to 64 years. Their share declined by 1.4 percentage points from 19.1 % to 17.7 %. Despite the reduction, together with the District of Pleven the district of Vratsa is with the highest share of people with higher education in the North Western region of the Danube site zone. The proportion of people with secondary education for the period increased slightly from 59.1 % to 59.5 % compared to the age group from 19 to 64 years, or 0.4 percentage points while retaining its leading position. The district is characterized by the lowest share of the population with primary or lower education (28.9 %) compared with other districts of the region. For the period after 2005, the share of low educated population decreased (by 1,6 percentage points) in the overall structure of the population from 15 to 64 years.



### *Labour market*

Economically active population in Vratsa District numbered at 97.7 thousand people- 12.5% of that of the Danube region. The economic activity rate is 73.2 % (below average for the region)- the lowest among the districts from the North Western region of the Danube site zone. Similar is the situation in terms of employment rates (57.0 %), that is below the average for the region. The unemployment rate is high (10.27 %, 2009) as in municipalities varies widely - from 6.07 % in Vratsa and 6.7 9% in Kozloduy to 19.30 % for Borovan. The trend the district center to have the lowest unemployment is kept. By staying in the labor market over 1 year is one third of the unemployed, as their share is higher in municipalities with high unemployment rate. In 2009, are not observed significant changes in the structure of unemployed persons compared to 2008.

### *Settlement Structure*

#### *Development trends*

The population of Vratsa District for the period 1992-2008, shows a decrease. The negative growth rate amounted to -20.8 %, and it is due primarily to the negative natural growth and to a lesser degree to the negative balances of migration, including emigration. Aside from Kozloduy municipality, where negative growth is minimal (-5.7 %), in rest of the municipalities the population reproduction is characterized by a negative growth rate around and above the average for the district and the region.

#### *Roles of importance of the towns*

Municipalities with a predominantly urban population in the District of Vratsa are Vratsa and Kozloduy. In the remaining eight municipalities, over 50% of the population lives in villages. In two municipalities Borovan and Hajredin, 100% of the population lives in settlements of rural type. Municipalities Borovan, Hajredin, Mezdra, Mizia, Krivodol, Roman, Byala Slatina and Oryahovo may be characterized as municipalities of a rural type.

The total population of the District, according data to 2008 is 199,702 people, of whom 38.3 % are in the Municipality of Vratsa.

The density of the settlements per 100 square kilometers in the District is 3.4- below the national average (4.8) and the region of the Danube site zone (4.2).

The population density is 55.2 people / sq km - similar to the average for the region (56.0) but below the national average (68.6).

The degree of urbanization of Vratsa District, measured by the proportion of urban population is relatively low - 57.4%. The level of urbanization, measured by the proportion of people living in cities with more than 5 000 residents increased from 47.7 % in 1996 to 52.4%- in 2008. Urban areas include 21,258.4 ha of the total territory of the district or 5.9 %. Per municipality their share vary in ranges widely from 7.6 for Kozloduy to 3.7 for Roman.

For the period 1992-2008, the urban population has decreased by 20% and in the villages- with 35%.

#### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

Settlement network in the district is unevenly developed. Urban population of Vratsa District is balanced between the district center and other cities. To 2008 in Vratsa District there are no villages without population. Unlike many other districts, which are dominated by the smallest villages in the Vratsa District they are 18% of all villages , in which live 2 926 persons from the District. Municipalities of Vratsa, Mezdra and Byala Slatina form an agglomeration area.

#### *Interregional cooperation*

#### *Living standards*

Dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants increased continuously for the period 2005-2008 they increased from 512 to 580. Differences per municipality are not significant. With a greater number of dwellings per inhabitant outline the rural municipalities, and with the lowest- Kozloduy (441). In the municipality of Vratsa index values are similar to the average for the district.

The average number of persons per dwelling for the district is 1.73, which is below the average for the region (1.89) and the country (1.94). For the period 2005-2008 there has been minimal reduction in the number of persons in a dwelling (from 1.95 to 1.73).

Average level of the completion of public works housing for the District, measured by indicators -% of dwellings connected with public water supply and sewage systems is respectively 76.5% and 72.5%. There are similarities in the levels of these indicators per municipality, with a lower performance is Borovan municipality, but with a higher- municipalities of Kozloduy and Mizia.

*Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants	452	516	553	580
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants	8,1	0,9	2,43	1,02
Regional vitality index	85,7	78,5	71,1	68,97

## Pleven

### *General Information*

Settlement network in Pleven District includes 123 settlements, 14 cities and 109 villages, comprised in 11 administrative-territorial entities - municipalities. In the District predominates urban population, which represents almost two thirds (65.4%) of the total population (average for the region 62.5%). Of all the cities 11 are municipal centers, and 3 – are centers of communes (Slavyanovo, Trustenik and Koynare). There are no municipalities with centers villages in the District.

The density of the settlements per100 square kilometers is 2,6- below the national average (4.8) and for the region of the Danube site zone (4.2).

The population density is 63.2 people / sq. km - more than the average value for the region (56.0), but below the national (68.6).

The total population of the District, according data to 2008 is 294,277 people, of which nearly half (47.3%) are on the territory of the municipality of Pleven.

The degree of urbanization in the District measured by the proportion of urban population is 65.4 %. The level of urbanization measured by the proportion of people living in cities with more than 5 000 residents decreased from 61 % in 1996 to 53.5% in 2008. The share of residents living in cities with over 100 thousand people (Pleven) increased from 37.7% in 1996 to 38.2 % - in 2008. Urban areas include 27,516.4 ha of the total territory of the district or 5.9%. Per municipality their share varies widely- from 8.3 for Pleven to about 4.2 for Iskar.

Only one fifth of the settlements are with fewer than 500 inhabitants. The Most numerous group are settlements with a population from 500 to 2000 people, covering 56.1 % of the villages in the District. With population from 2000 to 10000 people are also a considerable number of settlements- 17.1%, with a population from10 000 to 20 000- 3 (cities Cherven Briag, Knezha and Levski). Pleven district center according the population is included in the group from 100,000 to 500,000 inhabitants and is the second largest in the region (after Ruse) and seventh in the country.

### *Human Resources*

#### *Demographic situation*

The population in Pleven (the largest district of the Danube site zone) numbered 294,277 people (2008) - 18.9 % of that of the region. The district includes 123 settlements, including 14 towns and 109 villages. The number of municipalities excluding Pleven (139,121 inhabitants), where the population size is determined entirely by the district town, is within 7 249 people for Pordim to 30,911 people for Cherven Briag. The population density is 63.2 people /km<sup>2</sup>- similar, but slightly lower than the national average (68.6 people /km<sup>2</sup>) and above average for the region (56.0 people /km<sup>2</sup>). With the highest population density is Pleven (171.8 people /km<sup>2</sup>) - well above the average for the district, region and country. Very close to the average density for the district is the municipality of Cherven Briag (63.6 people /km<sup>2</sup>). In the remaining 7 municipalities the indicator values are below the average for the district ranging from 26.2 to people /km<sup>2</sup> in Nikopol to 52.6 people /km<sup>2</sup> for Levski.

In the cities is concentrated 2 / 3 - 192,443 inhabitants of the Pleven district, in villages- 101,834 people. Cities in view of population re large (district center), small and very small sized. Over the half (58.4 %) of urban population of the district is in the district center, 18.8 % - in small towns and 22.8 % - in very small towns. Pleven is the second largest in view of the population after Rouse in the region of the Danube site zone, with significant demographic potential for growth. 56 % of villages in the district are small, but there also large share have the medium size villages- 27.5 %. Characteristic is that nearly two thirds of the rural population lives in Pleven medium and large villages (with more than 2 000 inhabitants).

Changes in age structure are similar to those of the country and the region, characterized by an aging population. For the period 1991-2008, the number and proportion of young people decreased (0-14 years) from 19.0 % to 13.1 % (compared to the total population of the district). Working age population (15-64 years) also decreased in absolute numbers, but relative increases from 63.6 % in 1991 to 66.4 % in 2008. Iso increased the proportion of those aged over 65 years from 17, 4 % (1991) 20.5 % (2008). The age composition of the population in the district is similar to that of the adjacent district of Vratsa and it is not significantly different from that of the region. Between municipalities in the district are no major differences in the age structure excluding Pleven, where there

is concentration of population in active age (15-64 years), characteristic for the major cities and district centers in the region and country.

Population structure by age groups is based on the dependency ratio. In 2008 the population aged over 65 years in the district is 30.8 % compared to population in working age and under 15 years- 19.7%, which is close but above the average for the region of the Danube site zone.

Natural growth for the district in 2008 was negative (-8.4‰), but less than that of other districts in the North Western region of the Danube site zone. The migration rate is also negative (-3.9‰), with values close to the average for the region of the Danube site zone (-3.4‰).

#### *Educational structure*

The distribution of population by level of education Pleven district is similar to the average for the North Western region of the Danube site zone, including District of Vratza. For the period 2005-2008, it was observed preservation of the proportion of people with higher education to the contingent of 25 to 64 years in 2008, so its value is 17.6 % - close but above the average level for the Danube region. Similar is the situation according the population with secondary education- during the period it keeps its share, that in 2008 was 59.5 %, compared to the age group of 19-64 years- relatively high level (above the average for the region and country). Naturally, a decrease was observed in low educated population ( with primary and lower educational level) from 32.7 % to 31.7 % (by 1 percentage point) according to the population from 15 to 64 years.

#### *Labour market*

The economically active population of the Danube region around one fifth (148.2 thousand people) is concentrated in the territory of Pleven district. The economic activity rate was 75.8 % (above the average for the region). The employment rate (60.8 %) is highest compared to other districts from the region. Workforce mobility in the labor market determines the total number of unemployed. The unemployment rate (9.29 %, 2009) in the district is lower than the average for the Danube region (9.83 %). Differences among municipalities in terms of unemployment rate, excluding Pleven (5.43 %), range from 6.34 % at Belene to 15.63% in Gulyantsi. In 2009, there is a rise in unemployment in the district by 1.26 percentage points compared to 2008. The unemployment mostly affects people without qualifications and specialty and with the lowest education.

#### *Settlement Structure*

##### *Development trends*

The Trends of variation in the population of Pleven district are one way to those in the other districts, ie downwards. For the period 1992-2008, the rate of growth is- 19.4 %- close, but above the average for the region. For the decrease in the population contribute as adverse changes in the level of natural growth, as well as net migration. Among the Municipalities in the district Pleven stands with lower rates of reduction. Relatively slowly, about average for the district are Belene and Dolni Dubnik and Knezha, while for the others decline was widespread and above average for the region. Onto the nature of population growth, reflect the structural changes in the population of the municipalities from the district.

##### *Roles of importance of the towns*

On the territory of the District, near to its center lies the only major city- district center-Pleven, surrounded evenly by smaller towns, centers of municipalities. The only exception is Dolna Mitropolia located too close to the district center and beyond the periphery of the municipality.

##### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

Agglomeration area in the District is formed by the municipalities of Pleven, Dolna Mitropolia, Dolni Dabnik and Cherven Briag.

##### *Interregional cooperation*

##### *Living standards*

The number of Dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants marked increase for the period 2005-2008, as they increased from 446 to 504. Differences among municipalities ranged from 600 for Nikopol and Pordim to 468 for Pleven.

The average number of persons in one house for the district is 1.99, which is above the average for the region (1.89) and similar but slightly above the average for the country (1.94). For the period 2005-2008 there is a reduction in the number of persons in a dwelling (from 2.24 to 1.99).

Pleven District is characterized by relatively high indicators of the completion of housing public works within the Danube region of the country- 89.3 % of dwellings in the district are connected to public water supply system and 87.7 % -to the public sewage system. Per municipality there is no significant differentiation in the level of these indicators.

*Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants	412	450	483	504
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants	4,6	3,7	2,5	4,4
Regional vitality index	83	73,3	65,1	64

## Veliko Tarnovo

### *General Information*

The settlement network of Veliko Tarnovo District includes 336 settlements, of which 14 cities and 322 villages, comprised in 10 municipalities. In view of the number of settlements Veliko Tarnovo District ranks first in the region and third in the country (after Gabrovo and Kardzhali). In the District predominates urban population, which constitutes 67.6 % of the total population (average for the region of 62.5%). Ten of the cities are centers of municipalities, and four are centers of communes- (Debelets, Kilifarevo, Dolna Oryahovitsa and Byala cherkva). There are no municipalities with centers villages in the District.

According settlements density on 100 sq km Veliko Tarnovo District (7.2) is first in the region and fifth in the country.

The population density is 59.5 people / sq km - more than the average for the region (56.0) but below the national average (68.6).

The total population of the District, according data to 2008 is 277,520 people, of whom one third are in the Municipality of Veliko Turnovo. The average number of inhabitants of a municipality is 27,752 above the average for the region (20 733), formed mainly from Veliko Tarnovo, Gorna Oryahovitsa, Svishtov and Pavlikeni.

### *Human Resources*

#### *Demographic situation*

The population of Veliko Tarnovo district numbered 277,520 inhabitants (2008)- 17.9% of that of the region. It is the second biggest in population in the population number in the region (after Pleven) and first in number of settlements. The district comprises of 336 settlements, including 14 towns and 322 villages. In view of the population number, the municipalities may be grouped into three main groups: 50-100 thousand people- Veliko Tarnovo, Gorna Oryahovitsa and Svishtov, in which is concentrated 67.7 % from the population of the district; under 50 thousand people, but over than 10 thousand people – Pavlikeni, Polski Trambesh, Strazhitsa, Lyaskovets, lena with 29.5 % of the population of the district, less than 10 thousand people - Zlataritsa and Suhindol (2.8 % of the population in the district). The population density is 59.5 people/km<sup>2</sup>- above the average for the region (56.0 people /km<sup>2</sup>). With the highest population density are municipalities of Veliko Tarnovo (100.4 people /km<sup>2</sup>), Gorna Oryahovitsa (155.1 people /km<sup>2</sup>), Lyaskovets (78.0 people /km<sup>2</sup>) and Svishtov (79.5 people /km<sup>2</sup>) - above the average for the district, region and country. In the rest of the municipalities density ranges from 15.6 people /km<sup>2</sup> in Elena to 43.3 people /km<sup>2</sup> for Pavlikeni.

In the cities is concentrated 67.6 % - 187,539 inhabitants of Veliko Tarnovo district and 32.4 % in villages - 89,981 inhabitants. In view of the population number, cities are medium, small and very small sized. In medium sized cities (3 ), including the district center is concentrated 72.1 % of the urban population of the district. In the remaining 11 small and very small towns live 28 % of urban population. Over 90 % of villages in the district are small and very small, with about half the rural population (55.5%) living in. Medium and large sized villages (25 ) comprise 45.5 % of the population of the villages.

Changes in demographic behavior of the population give a reflection of its age structure. Continues its process of aging. For the period 1991-2008, the number and proportion of young people decreased (0-14 years) from 18.7 % to 11.8 % (compared to the total population of the district). Working age population (15-64 years) also decreased in absolute numbers, but relative increases from 64.7 % in 1991 to 69.5 % in 2008. Iso increased is the proportion of those aged over 65 years from 16. 6 % (1991) 18.7 % (2008). Amongst municipalities in the district there are differences in the age structure. With the concentration of population in active age (15-64 years) are municipalities with local centers of medium sized - Veliko Tarnovo, Gorna Oryahovitsa and Svishtov. Relatively favorable is the age structure of population of the municipality Strazhitsa. Among other municipalities there are no major differences in the age composition of their populations.

Dependency ratios are formed by main age groups. In 2008 the population aged over 65 years in the district is 26.9 % compared to those in working age and under 15 years- 17.0 %, which is close but below the average for the Danube site zone.

Natural growth for the district in 2008 was negative (-7.8‰), highest among the districts of the North Central region of the Danube site zone, but below average for the region (-8.3‰). The migration rate was positive (3.4‰). Veliko Tarnovo is the only district in the region with positive net migration in 2008.

### *Educational structure*

Veliko Tarnovo district is with the most highly educated working age population in the territory of the Danube site zone. The proportion of persons with higher education is the highest-24.6% in the age group from 25 to 64 years, or one in four has a university degree. For the period 2005-2008 there has been an increase in the proportion of graduates higher education in the district. Population with secondary education also increased during the period from 53.9 % to 57.7 % (compared to the age group 19-64 years), the value above the average for the region and country. Population with primary or lower education decreased in absolute numbers, but there is relatively small increase from 29.8% to 30.2% (by 0,4 percentage points) on the age group from 15 to 64 years.

### *Labour market*

In view of the number of the active population (135,5 thousand people) Veliko Tarnovo District is second in region after Pleven. From the economically active population of the Danube site zone 17.4 % lives of the territory of Veliko Tarnovo district. The economic activity rate was 70.2 %, while the employment rate is 56.8%. The trend of increasing employment in the private sector and in services is kept. The unemployment rate is one of the lowest in the region - 8.11 % (2009). Unemployment in the municipalities varies in the range of 5.22% for Veliko Turnovo to 17.09 % for Strazhitsa. In 2009, it is registered an increase in unemployment (by 1,3 percentage points), including in the district center and other cities.

### *Settlement Structure*

#### *Development trends*

The population of Veliko Tarnovo district for the period 1992-2008, marked reduction. The negative growth rate (-12.8%) was the lowest among the other districts in the region. For the district as a whole breeding potential is low, which is a prerequisite for the reduction of the population. Amongst the municipalities protrude Veliko Tarnovo and Svishtov, the population of that for the period is with minimal negative growth. Another municipality with a relatively favorable demographic development is Gorna Oryahovitsa. Among other municipalities there are no significant differences in growth rates, which range from -20.2% for Zlataritsa abd Strazhitsa to -26.2% for Polish Trambesh.

#### *Roles of importance of the towns*

In the District are formed two types of typical urban network, driven by natural geographical conditions and historical development. In the north is the plain area-network of compact and large villages. To the south in the mountain area- dispersed network of many very small villages, hamlets and huts, that are depopulated and going to die.

Cities fall in the following categories (as urban class): 3 medium-sized cities over 30 thousand people (Veliko Turnovo, Gorna Oryahovitsa and Svishtov), one small town just over 10 thousand people (Pavlikeni), ten very smaller cities with less than 10 thousand people (Lyaskovets, Elena, Dolna Oryahovitsa, Polski Trambesh, Debelets, Strazhitsa, Zlataritsa Byala cherkva, Suhindol and Kilifarevo).

The degree of urbanization (percentage of urban population) in the District is 63.4%, at the average of 68% for the country. The level of urbanization measured by the proportion of people living in cities with more than 5000 people increased from 57.3 percent in 1996 to 59.5% in 2008. Urban areas included 29,249.3 ha of the total territory of the district or 6.3 percent. Per municipality the share varies widely -from 10.6 for Gorna Oryahovitsa and Lyaskovets to 3.8 for Suhindol.

The settlement network is balanced and evenly developed. Base centers- small towns are located in good proximity to rural settlements. This suggests future opportunities to further improve the relations between the city and the village.

There is a trend to increase the number of very smaller settlements with less than 500 people inhabitants and to reduce the remaining group of settlements, with exception of the group of settlements with a population from 20 to 100 thousand people.  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the settlements are with less than 500 inhabitants. Another relatively large group are the settlements with a population from 500 to 2000 people, which covers 18.8 percent of the villages in the District. With a population from 2000 to 10000 people are only 4.2 percent of the settlements- 17.1%, with a



population from 10000 to 20000- 1 (city of Pavlikeni). In view of the population size are included in the group of 20,000 to 100,000 inhabitants.

#### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

In the District there is not a large city. The Territorial proximity of the cities of Veliko Tarnovo, Gorna Oryahovitsa and Lyaskovets is a prerequisite for the formation of urbanization core with population of about 100 thousand people, which dominates in the District. In the west, east and south of this core are situated very small towns. There is only one serious rocker in the north- Svishtov with 30 thousand people. Preserved is the traditional link between the city and the village. There is well-developed network of settlements and even small towns are located throughout the District.

#### *Interregional cooperation*

#### *Living standards*

Dwellings per 1000 inhabitants in Veliko Tarnovo District marked increase, which is characteristic of all Districts from the region. For the period 2005-2008, they increased from 481 to 517. Differences among municipalities ranged from 780 for Suhindol to 439 for Svishtov.

The average number of persons per dwelling for the District is 1.93 (close to the average for the region - 1.89 and for the country - 1.93). For the period 2005-2008 there was a reduction in the number of persons per dwelling (from 2.08 to 1.93).

The District is characterized by relatively good performance of the medium indicators of the completion of housing public works - 88.3% are connected to public water supply system and 83.6% to public sewage system. With the most unfavorable indicators is characterized the municipality of Elena. The other municipalities are approaching the average indicators for the District.

#### *Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants	435	483	498	517
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants	86	61,3	72,3	88,1
Regional vitality index	80,5	71,7	64,1	63,1

## Ruse

### *General Information*

The settlement network of Ruse District includes 83 settlements (the lowest number in the region), of which 9 cities and 74 villages included in the composition of the eight administrative territorial units - municipalities. The District has the highest urban population share of around 75.6% (average for the region of 62.5%). Of all the cities, six are municipal centers, and 3 – centers of communes (Senovo, Marten and Glodzhevo). Two municipalities are with centers villages - Ivanovo and Tsenovo.

### *Human Resources*

#### *Demographic situation*

Population of Ruse district counts to 251,236 people (2008) - 16.2% of that of the region. It ranks third in population in the region (after Pleven and Veliko Turnovo), with at least settlements. The district includes 83 settlements, including 9 towns and 74 villages. In the largest municipality by population- Ruse has concentrated 70 % of the total population of the district. Other municipalities are with population under 15 thousand people. The population density is 87.4 people/ km<sup>2</sup>- the highest among the districts in the region and above the average for the country. Crucial importance has the values of the indicator for municipality of Ruse (307.5 people/ km<sup>2</sup>). In other municipalities density ranges from 21.4 people/ km<sup>2</sup> for Ivanovo to 46.2 people/ km<sup>2</sup> for Vetovo. In the cities is concentrated 75.6 % - 189,870 people from the population of Ruse district and 24.4% in villages - 61,366 people. According to the population in the district is a large city- Ruse district center, and all others (8) are very small towns (population under 10 thousand people). Ruse (157 thousand people) is the largest city in the territory of the Danube site zone and fifth in the country (after the capital Sofia, Plovdiv, Varna and Burgas). The majority (73%) of villages in the district are small and very small, in which lives 45% of rural population. Multiple group are and medium-sized villages, which include one fifth of the villages in the district. Total medium and large villages covering 55% of rural population. They mainly form and age structure of rural population.

Population age structure of Ruse district is similar to that of other districts of the region and especially in the districts of Vratsa, Pleven and Veliko Turnovo and is characterized by processes of aging. For the period 1991-2008, the number and proportion of young people (0-14 years) decreased from 18.8% to 12.1% (compared to the total population of the district). Working age population (15-64 years) also decreased in absolute numbers but relative increases from 67.0% in 1991 to 69.7 % in 2008, also increased the proportion of those aged over 65 years from 14 .2% (1991) 18.2% (2008). Between municipalities in the district the existing differences in age structure are expressed in the aging population in rural municipalities (Ivanovo and Cenovo) and high proportion of the working forces (72.5%) in Ruse municipality. Relatively favorable is population age structure of the municipality of Vetovo while among the other municipalities is not great differences.

The type of age structure formed correlations between different age groups and the dependency ratio. In 2008 the population aged over 65 years in the district is 26.2% compared to working age, and under 15 years - 17.3%, ie in aging of the population it is observed higher working forces pressure for the support of the elderly.

Natural growth for the district in 2008 was negative (-6.56‰), and it is as for the North Central region (6.53‰) of the Danube site zone, but below average for the entire region (-8.3‰). The migration rate was negative, but close to Zero (0,5‰).

#### *Educational structure*

Ruse district is second after the district of Veliko Tarnovo in the highest proportion of people with higher education in the working age within the Danube region. The proportion of graduates higher education is 19.3 % of the population in the age group from 25 to 64 years, or one in five has a university degree. For the period 2005-2008 there has been minimal reduction in the proportion of graduates higher education in the district by 0.7 percentage points. Population with secondary education marks an increase for the period from 52.2 %t to 56.0 %t (compared to age group 19-64 years), the value close but above the average for the region and country. Persons with primary or lower education decreased in absolute numbers and relative share from 32.4 % to 30.4 percent (2 percentage points) on the age group from 15 to 64 years.

### *Labour market*

Economically active population of Ruse district numbered 121.1 thousand people- 15.5% of that of the Danube region. The economic activity rate is 69.2% and employment rate- 60.7%. The observed trend of higher employment in the urban areas of the district is determined by offered in them greater employment opportunities. The unemployment rate (7.44%) was lowest in the region, depends on the lowest unemployment in the district center. In 2009, it remains uneven distribution of employment and unemployment in the municipalities, the unemployment rate is higher in rural areas of the district.

### *Settlement Structure*

#### *Development trends*

Trends of variation of population in Ruse district are similar to those of neighboring district of Veliko Tarnovo. For the period 1992-2008, the rate of growth is -13.6% (one of the lowest negative values in the region). For the decrease in the population in the district contribute primarily unfavorable changes in natural growth, as well as migration. Analysis of the dynamics of population in the municipalities set out three main groups: with minimal negative growth- Ruse; above average growth for the district similar to that of the region- Vetovo and Slivo pole, with high negative growth (20-30%)- other municipalities in the district, especially those in rural areas.

#### *Roles of importance of the towns*

The density of the settlements per 100 sq. km is 2.9- below the national average (4.8) and for the Danube site zone (4.2).

The population density is high- 89.4 people / sq km - more than the average for the region (56.0) and for the country (68.6).

The total population in the District, according data to 2008 is 251,236 people, of whom 70% lives on the territory of the municipality of Ruse. The proportion of the population of the remaining 7 municipalities is totally 30%, for each of them is below 10%. The average number of inhabitants per municipality is 31,405, above the average for the region (20 733), formed by the population of the district center - city of Ruse.

The degree of urbanization in the District is high - 75.6 percent. The level of urbanization measured by the proportion of people living in cities with more than 5000 residents decreased slightly from 67.5 percent in 1996 to 66.1% in 2008. The share of population living in settlements to 2000 inhabitants reduced slightly from 0.7 percent in 1996 to 0.6 percent - in 2008. The share of population living in cities with more than 100 thousand people (Ruse) increased from 60% to 62.5%. Urban areas include 17,331.6 hectares of the total area of the District or 6%. Per municipality the share varies from 9,1 for Ruse to 4,0 for Ivanovo.

1/3 of the settlements have less than 500 inhabitants. The Most numerous group are the settlements with a population from 500 to 2000 people, covering nearly a half (48.2%) of the settlements in the District. With a population from 2000 to 10000 people are also 12 cities, including all cities without Ruse. The district center Ruse in view of the population size is included into the group from 100,000 to 500,000 inhabitants and is the largest city in the region and fifth in the country.

### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

#### *Interregional cooperation*

Ruse is the dominant center in the District. The city is an important center for cross-border cooperation and the basic support center for the European Danube corridor.

### *Living standards*

The number of dwellings per 1000 inhabitants marked continuous increase as for the period 2005-2008 they increased from 457 to 498. Differences among municipalities ranged from 731 for Ivanovo to 452 for Vetovo and 479 for Ruse.

The average number of persons per dwelling for the district is 2.01, which is above the average for the region (1.89) and for the country (1.94). For the period 2005-2008 there is a reduction in the number of persons per dwelling (from 2.19 to 2.01).

Ruse District is characterized by the best performance of the indicators of the completion of housing public works in the Danube region of the country - 93% of dwellings are connected to public water supply system and 92% are related to public sewage system. In addition, there are no significant differences per municipality.

*Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants	417	459	478	498
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants	26,2	26,4	29,3	32,3
Regional vitality index	90,8	78,9	68,6	66,3

## Razgrad

### *General Information*

The settlement network of Razgrad District consists of 103 settlements, of which six towns and 97 villages included in the composition of the 7 municipalities. In the cities is concentrated 46.3% of the total population of the District. All cities are municipal centers, one municipality is with the center village (Samuil). Six of the seven cities in the District are in the category of the very small towns- less than 10 thousand people. Only the center of the District- Razgrad, with 35 thousand people, is in the category of medium-sized cities (over 30 thousand people). There is concentrated 56% of urban population and 26% of the total population of the District.

The density of the settlements per 100 sq. km is 4.3- below the national average (4.8) and similar to the average for the area of the Danube site zone (4.2).

The population density is 55.7 people / sq km - similar to the average for the region (56.0) but below the national average (68.6).

The total population of the District, according data to 2008 is 134,485 people, of whom 41.1 percent are in the Municipality of Razgrad

Razgrad District is characterized by very low degree of urbanization. The degree of urbanization of the municipalities is between 63.3% in Razgrad to 24.7% for Loznitsa. With the exception of the municipalities of Razgrad and Tsar Kaloyan, in the other municipalities, more than 50% of the population lives in villages. The level of urbanization measured by the proportion of people living in cities with more than 5000 inhabitants increased from 37 percent in 1996 to 39 percent in 2008. Urban areas comprised of 14,321.0 ha of the total territory of the district or 5.9 percent. Per municipality the share varies from 9,7 for Loznitsa to 4,5 for Zavet.

The District is remote from major urban centers such as Varna and Ruse. In this situation of remoteness from major urban centers and the absence of a major cities municipal centers, the role and importance of Razgrad increases as service center for the inhabitants of the District.

The Settlement network in the District is relatively well balanced and evenly developed. Base centers - small towns are located close to rural settlements. This suggests opportunities to improve linkages city- village.

As in other Districts, the trend in the structure of the urban network is unfavorable and is associated with increasing number of settlements with less than 500 inhabitants. 42.7% of the settlements have less than 500 inhabitants, as for the period 1992 to 2008, their number increased from 32 to 44. Another large equivalent group are settlements with a population of 500 to 2000 people, covering 45.6 percent (47 pcs.) of the settlements in the District. Total settlements with less than 2000 people comprise 88% of all 103 and 42% of the population in the District. With a population from 2000 to 10000 people are 11 settlements, including 5 cities. Razgrad District Centre in the size of the population is included in the group 20000-100000 inhabitants.

### *Human Resources*

#### *Demographic situation*

Population of Razgrad district numbered 134,485 people (2008)- 8.6% of that of the region. The district includes 103 settlements, including 6 towns and 97 villages. The population of municipalities ranges from 6412 people in Tsar Kaloyan to 55,305 people for Razgrad. With a population ranged from 20 to 30 thousand people are two municipalities- Kubrat and Isperih while other are with population around and below 10 thousand people. The population density is 55.7 people /km<sup>2</sup>- close to the average for the region (56.0 people /km<sup>2</sup>). Intra district differences per municipalities show that with the exception of Razgrad (84.7 people /km<sup>2</sup>) density in the other is around and below the average for the district ranging from 57.8 people /km<sup>2</sup> for Isperih to 30.4 people /km<sup>2</sup> for Samuil.

Urban population is 46.3 % - 62 215 inhabitants of district of Razgrad, rural population - 53.7% (72,270 people). Cities in population are middle size (district center) and other 5 - very small (less than 10 thousand people). Over half (56.3 %) of urban population of the district is in the city of Razgrad. Most of the villages are small and very small (79.4% of all villages) in which lives 51% of rural population. Medium and large villages comprise one fifth of the villages and 49% of rural population. They have a progressive type of age structure and age composition in young people.

Population age structure of Razgrad district is the most favorable in terms of breeding potential, compared with other districts in the region. With similar age structure is only the district of Silistra. Although there are processes to increase the proportion of people over 65 years and reduce the proportion of younger generations, the age structure is maintained in normal proportions. For the period 1991-2008, the proportion of young people (0-14 years) is amended from 22.3% to 14.6% (compared to the total population of the district). Working age population (15-64 years) increased from a relatively 65.6% in 1991 to 69.6% in 2008 also increased the proportion of those aged over 65 years of 12.0% (1991) to 15.8% (2008). Between municipalities in the district there are no significant differences in age structure.

Progressive age structure reflects on the dependency ratio. In 2008 the population aged over 65 years in the field is 22.7% compared to those in working age and under 15 years- 21.0%, ie almost equal participation of young people and adults amongst the groups in working age. These ratios are most favorable in comparison with other districts of the region of the Danube site zone.

Natural growth for the district in 2008 was negative (-4.3‰), least in the area below the average for the North Central region (6.5‰) on the Danube site zone and for the whole region (-8.3‰). Net migration was negative (-7.4‰), with greater influence in the overall population growth compared with natural processes.

### *Educational structure*

Against the backdrop of the overall reduction in the population of Razgrad district in the period 2005-2008 was observed keeping the proportion of population with high education (14.2% of the population from 25-64 years). Razgrad has the lowest proportion of people with higher education among other districts of the Danube region. Analogous situation exists in the population with secondary education (40.5% of the 19-64 years age group has secondary education, the lowest value in the region). Population with low educational levels (with primary or lower education) constitute 52.4% of age group from 15-64 years - the highest share in the region. For the period after 2005 there does not outline significant changes in the educational structure of the population of the district.

### *Labour market*

Economically active population in Razgrad district constitutes 9.5% (93.6 thousand people) on the Danube region. The economic activity rate was 79.0%, while the employment rate - 50.2% (lowest in the region), which determines the high unemployment rate- 11.67% (average in 2009). In all municipalities excl. Razgrad unemployment rate is above average for the region. Variation between the minimum amplitude (municipality Razgrad) and maximum (municipality Samuil) in the unemployment rate in the district is 14.6 percentage points. In 2009, there has been an increase in registered unemployment in the district compared with 2008, which is typical for the region and the country as a whole.

### *Settlement Structure*

#### *Development trends*

Population of Razgrad district is characterized by a negative growth rate (-16.3%) for the period 1992-2008. On the basis of reduction in population is negative net migration, combined with additional negative natural growth. There were no significant intra district differences in municipalities, excl. Razgrad, where growth is -12.0%. In other municipalities the values are from -15.4% for Zavet to -22.7% for Tsar Kaloyan. Negative growth is influenced by the negative migration balance (-7.4‰, 2008), which is among the highest in the region.

#### *Roles of importance of the towns*

In a situation of remoteness from major urban centers and the absence of major cities- municipal centers, an important role and importance as supporting center of the urban network has Razgrad. The city is situated in the relatively convenient location to other cities and centers of the municipalities. This applies more to the municipalities in the southern area of the district, which are located along the transport corridor Varna- Ruse and are served by first class road and railway line. Municipalities in the North area of the district – Kubrat, Zavet and Isperih are relatively distant from the district centre of Razgrad. Although it is not in the category of large cities, Razgrad is an important economic, administrative and cultural center for the district.

*Agglomerations areas and development axes**Interregional cooperation**Living standards*

The Dwellings per 1000 inhabitants marked increase, as for the period 2005-2008 the increase is from 427 to 463. Differences in the municipalities are not significant. With a greater number of dwellings per capita is Tsar Kaloyan (515) and with the lowest- Zavet (401). In Razgrad municipality values of the indicator (485) are close but above the average for the District.

The average number of persons per dwelling is 2.16, which is above the average for the region (1.89) and the country (1.94). For the period 2005-2008 there is a decrease in the number of persons in a dwelling (from 2.34 to 2.16).

In Razgrad District the average indicator of the proportion of dwellings connected to public water supply system is 84.2%, to the public sewage system- 82%. With the highest public works completion is Razgrad municipality and the city of Razgrad- about 90% of housings are connected to public water supply and sewage systems. Relatively lower in the performance of indicators are the municipalities Samuil and Loznitsa, where % of dwellings connected to public water supply and sewage systems are around 70%.

*Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants	417	459	478	498
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants	2,4	1,1	1,5	2
Regional vitality index	134,5	117,5	99,7	92,3



## Silistra

### *General Information*

The settlement network of Silistra District consists of 118 settlements, of which 5 towns and 113 villages, incorporated in 7 municipalities. In the cities is concentrated 45.1% of the total population of the District. All cities are municipal centers and two municipalities have a village center (Kaynardzha and Sitovo). With the exception of Silistra other cities are very small- less than 10 thousand people. Only the center of the District- Silistra (38,320 people) is from the category of medium-sized cities (over 30 thousand).

The density of the settlements per 100 sq. km is 4.1-below the national average (4.8) and similar to the average for the area of the Danube site zone(4.2).

The population density is 45.4 people / sq km- below the average for the region (56.0) and for the country (68.6).

The total population of the District, according data to 2008 is 129,121 people, of whom 43 percent are in the Municipality of Silistra.

The degree of urbanization in the District is the lowest in the Danube region and country (45.1 percent). Per municipality is between 68.8% in Silistra to 15.2% for Glavinitsa. Urban areas include 14,314.7 ha of the total territory of the district or 5.0 percent. In municipalities the share is from 7.0 for Silistra to 3.6 for Alfatar

More than the half (54.2%) of settlements are with less than 500 inhabitants,as for the period 1992 to 2008, their number increased from 52 to 64. Another large group are settlements with population from 500 to 2000 people, covering 40.7 percent (48 pcs.) of the settlements in the District. Total settlements with less than 2000 people comprise 95% of all 118 and nearly half the population of the District. With population from 2000 to 10000 people are 5 settlements, including 2 towns and 3 villages. In Silistra District is the only very large village near the Danube coast (Aydemir- 6752 inhabitants). Silistra District Centre in the size of the population is included in group with 20000-100000 inhabitants.

As per the number and proportion of the population, dominated small and medium-sized villages. Silistra Municipality is the only in the region of the Danube area with 2 villages in the category "Very large" (Aydemir- 7 thousand inhabitants and Kalipetrovo- 5 thousand inhabitants).

### *Human Resources*

#### *Demographic situation*

Population of Silistra district numbered 129,121 people (2008)- 8.3% of that of the region. The district includes 118 settlements, including 5 cities and 113 villages. The total population of the municipalities varies widely - from about 3390 people in Alfatar to 55,669 people in Silistra. Second after Silistra, but significantly less is a municipality of Dulovo- with a population of 28,956 people, within 10 to 20 thousand people are Tutrakan and Glavinitsa and below 10 thousand people - other municipalities. The population density is 45.4 people/km<sup>2</sup>-below the average for the region (56.0 people/km<sup>2</sup>). Intra district differences in municipalities show that with the exception of Silistra (107.9 people/ km<sup>2</sup>) density in the other is below the average for the district ranging from 13.6 to people/km<sup>2</sup> in Alfatar to 51.1 people /km<sup>2</sup> for Dulovo.

Urban population is 45.1 % - 58 218 inhabitants from the population of Silistra district rural population is - 54.9% (70,903 people). Silistra is with the lowest absolute number and proportion of urban population among the other districts of the region.

Cities in view of population are middle (district center) and other 4 - very small (less than 10 thousand people). Two thirds of the urban population of the district is concentrated in the town of Silistra. Most of the villages are small and very small (with fewer than 1000 residents) - 83% of all villages in which live half of the rural population. Medium, large and very large villages comprise 17 % of villages, and 50% of rural population. They are experiencing a high reproduction potential, young population with high fertility.

Population age structure of Silistra district is generally relatively favorable. With old age structure are characterized Alfatar and Sitovo, but their population is only 7% of that of the district, while in other municipalities the young population is with high proportion. In Silistra as in Razgrad, although the share of those over 65 years increases and the share of younger generations decreases, the age structure is maintained in relatively normal proportions. For the period 1991-2008, the proportion of young people (0-14 years) in the district is replaced by 21.1 % to 13.4 % (compared to the total population of the district). Working age population (15-64

years) increased from a relatively 66.4% in 1991 to 68.9 % in 2008. Also increased is the proportion of those aged over 65 years from 12.5% (1991) to 17.7% (2008).

Emerging age structure reflects on the dependency ratio. In 2008 the population aged over 65 years in the district is 25.7% compared to those in working age and under 15 years- 19.4%. These relationships are one of the most advantageous in comparison with other districts of the region of the Danube site zone.

Natural growth for the district in 2008 was negative (-5.9‰), but below average for the North Central region (6.5‰) on the Danube site zone and the whole region (-8.3‰). Migratory growth (-7.8‰) and natural growth is negative, but with greater participation in the overall growth.

#### *Educational structure*

Silistra district together with Razgrad district is characterized by the lowest level of highly educated populations in the region. For the period 2005-2008 there is a reduction in the proportion of population with high education from 16.8% to 15.1% of the population from 25-64 years. The relative share of the people with secondary education is maintained with minimal reduction, as in 2008 its value is 48.1%, from the age group 19-64 years (one of the lowest in the region after that of the district of Razgrad). Population with low educational levels (with primary or lower education) constitute 45.9 % of the age group 15-64 years- relatively high share.

#### *Labour market*

Economically active population of Silistra district constitutes 8.6% (89.0 thousand people) of that of the Danube region. The economic activity rate was 75.4 %, while the employment rate - 56.4 %. Data from the Labour Force survey on the employment ratio indicate that it is directly dependent on the socio-economic development and demographic situation of the territory. The unemployment rate in the district is 11.48 % (2009). At the level of municipalities with the lowest unemployment rate are Silistra and Tutrakan, while in other municipalities the indicator values are above the average for the district and the region. In 2009, against the backdrop of increasing unemployment intra district differences remain in municipalities.

#### *Settlement Structure*

#### *Development trends*

Demographic trends in the development of Silistra district are similar to those of Razgrad. The population of the district is characterized by a negative growth rate (-19.8%) for the period 1992-2008. On the basis of reduction in population is negative net migration, combined with negative natural growth. There were no significant intra district differences in municipalities, excl. Dulovo and Kaynardzha, where growth is respectively -13.6%, and -13.5%. In other municipalities the values are from 18.0% for Glavinitsa to -26.7% for Alfatar. Silistra also is characterized by a high rate of negative growth (-22.6%). The negative growth in the district, as in the neighboring district of Razgrad is influenced largely by the negative migration balance (-7.8‰, 2008).

#### *Roles of importance of the towns*

Overall structure of the urban network is relatively homogeneous and there are no prominent depopulated territories in the district.

#### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

Urban development of the territory should continue on the axes formed Silistra -Alfatar Dulovo and Silistra-Tutrakan. Particular attention should be paid to setting up industrial zones in the town of Silistra and securing its southern bypass.

#### *Interregional cooperation*

#### *Living standards*

Dwellings per 1000 inhabitants tend to increase, as for the period 2005-2008 they increased from 420 to 461. Differences in municipalities ranging from 576 for Alfatar to 327 for Dulovo. In Silistra municipality the indicator values (512) are above the average for the District.

The average number of persons per dwelling is 2.17, which is above the average for the region (1.89) and for the country (1.94). For the period 2005-2008 there is a reduction in the number of persons per dwelling (from 2.38 to 2.17).

The Average indicators of housing public works completion in Silistra District show that the proportion of dwellings connected to public water supply system is 87.9%, to the public sewage system- 84%. With the lowest indicators are municipalities Kaynardzha and Glavinitsa and with the best - Silistra municipality and the district town.

*Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants	378	422	444	461
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants	9,1	3,4	3,1	2,7
Regional vitality index	124,1	102,8	82,3	75,4

## Izmai kyj rayon

### *General Information*

The population of the district, including Izmail Town, amounts to more than 129,000 people, 77,100 people living in Izmail.

Population density in the district is rather high for a peripheral district of Ukraine and exceeds 103 persons/km<sup>2</sup>.

Urbanization level (specific weight of urban population) is also sufficiently high – 63.4%.

The total number of settlements in the district is 24 (1 town, 1 urban type settlement and 22 villages). At that, rural population of the district is basically characterized with availability of big settlements: out of 22 villages 18 have the population exceeding 1,000 persons, including 14 settlements where the population exceeds 2,000, village Ozernoye having the population exceeding 5,000 persons. It should be noted that such settlement system facilitates more efficient development of the infrastructure and social and welfare servicing.

### *Human Resources*

#### *Demographic situation*

Demographic situation in the district is characterized by negative trends which have been formed from the beginning of the 90-ies. From 1996 to 2008 the population reduced almost by 14%, the highest rate of such reduction was observed in towns. Thus, Izmail population was reduced by 17% during the indicated period. At that, the natural growth and the balance of migration are negative at the level of “minus” 3-5 pro mille. It should be noted that by 2008 these indices have somewhat improved as compared with the middle of the 90-ies.

Demographic situation in the district is characteristic of ageing processes: the people of post-productive age prevail over the population of the below employable age by more than 28%. A peculiar feature is that in the rural areas the ration of said categories of population is equal while in the urban areas the people of post-productive age prevail over the people of the below employable age by more than 50%.

#### *Educational structure*

There are 19 schools in Izmail district, 10 of them are schools with teaching in Russian, 5 – in Ukrainian, 4 – in Moldovan language. Also there is a boarding school (Utkonosivka), vocational school (Suvorovo), 17 kindergartens, 25 libraries, 1 children's sports school.

Population of the region is characterized by a high educational level (higher than the average throughout Ukraine) which is due to the influence produced by Izmail Town. Izmail is one of the centres of higher education in the region and it got an additional developmental impulse during the period of independence. In Izmail there are higher educational institutions of all levels of accreditation and all kinds of ownership (according to various assessments 8 of such institutions altogether), the leading role belonging to the state-owned higher educational institutions. Also, there are branches of the state and private higher educational institutions registered in other cities (Odessa and Kiev). The official statistics reflects the figures related to state higher educational institutions. For the last 15 years the number of students and the people in the district who obtained a higher education has increased considerably, by as many as half. There is a trend towards a growth of the number of people who has received the second higher education. As a rule, they work outside of the district, i.e. in the place other than the place of their official registration. Such people might be occupied in the state management and self-government bodies as well as in the sphere of other administrative services. State higher educational institutions are engaged in training a vast range of specialists. A considerable number of the graduates get employment outside of the district. It is particularly the case with the graduates of marine specialities (Izmail Institute of Water Transport, Izmail Branch of the Odessa National Marine Academy) who seek employment, as a rule, with foreign shipping companies therefore contributing to labour migration of the most active part of population.

1. Share of inhabitants with primary education – 8,7%;
2. Share of inhabitants with secondary education – 47,7%;
3. Share of inhabitants with higher education- 24,8%.

#### *Labour market*

The official unemployment rate in the district reached 2.4% in 2008. Latent unemployment figures are much higher. Reduction of the annual average number of employees during the studied period exceeded 40% and

reached 29,000 persons or 28.7% of the economically active population. Such situation is due to unofficial employment of workers by entrepreneurs.

### *Settlement Structure*

#### *Development trends*

Urban population is concentrated in the district centre Izmail and the urban-type settlement (small town) Suvorovo (4,700 persons).

Izmail Town plays the major role as the economic, administrative and social centre. Specifically, as Izmail is located centrally with respect of its neighbouring Danubian districts it is a centre of the inter-district (Danubian) settlement system according to its population number and administrative and business functions.

Because of its domination in the settlement system Izmail Town (comprises almost 60% of the total population of the district) the structure of this system is less uniform by settlement as compared with the neighbouring districts. At that, as regards the closest settlements, Izmail Town plays the agglomerating function having the total population to 100,000 persons or more than 77% of the district population. So, within up to 15 km radius around Izmail there is a sufficient concentration of settlements (up to 10 out of 24) which has a semi-radial shape of settlement system. In doing so it is necessary to mention that on the whole the settlements are situated in the territory of the district rather evenly. We also mark that the settlement system formation, same as in the neighbouring Danubian districts, feels an impact of the natural and geographic conditions, including peculiar features of the hydrographic network and of the economic factors.

#### *Roles of importance of the towns*

Izmail Town plays a dominating role within the economic structure and settlement pattern as it forms a kind of a small city-like monocentric agglomeration. Actually, Izmail is the main town of the Ukrainian Greater Danube area – a business, social, cultural, educational and scientific centre of the sub-region. A new impact can be given by upgrading of the transport infrastructure, namely road and rail communication along the international transport corridor (ITC) routes, which is targeted at provision of transit transportation. An infrastructural amalgamation of two ITCs – the 9th and the 7th of the Danube – may serve this purpose.

#### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

The frame and the development axes of the Danube settlement system are formed along the Danube River which links the main settlements of the region: Izmail Town and the main towns of the neighbouring districts – Reni, Kiliya and Vilково. Also, a certain role in the formation of the development axes is attached to motorways and railroads though their technological level is low and requires considerable improvement by upgrading the transport infrastructure.

#### *Interregional cooperation*

The main direction of interregional cooperation is formed on the basis of the borderline location of the district and development of economic ties with the neighbouring districts and adjacent countries (Romania, Moldova, Bulgaria). The leading role in these ties is played by the Danube, and the transport industry is one of the main sectors of the region economy together with the industry and agriculture.

Cross-border cooperation of the district is presented by accomplishing transport communication with the neighbouring countries – Romania and Moldova, as well as with the countries of the Danube basin – Bulgaria and Austria. Inter-regional cooperation with other district is maintained on the same principles. An additional push to enhance inter-regional cooperation may be due to a development of ferry-boat communication, particularly with Rumania. Cross-border cooperation is accomplished, basically, within the frame of the «Lower Danube Euroregion». It should be noted that this cooperation is based both upon business, economic and cultural contacts. To some extent the cultural ties prevail over the economic contacts as yet.

#### *Living standards*

Living standards of population of the district are below the average, though they are better than in other districts. Quality of life and living standards are influenced to a considerable extent by the existing local enterprises. Taking into consideration unstable dynamics of the transport sector and low chances to get employment at the local level, a migration of labour takes place outside of the district and the state.

*Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants	328	353	380	393
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants	22,37	29,64	38,23	41,29
Regional vitality index	100,14	90,12	86,76	77,86

## Kilii kyi rayon

### *General Information*

The population of the district amounts to 55,400 people.

Population density is about 40 persons/km<sup>2</sup>.

Urbanization level (specific weight of urban population) is also rather high - 54%. Urban population is concentrated in the district centre of Kiliya Town where more than 21,000 persons reside, and in Vilkovovo Town where more than 8,600 people dwell.

### *Human Resources*

#### *Demographic situation*

Demographic situation in the district is characterized by negative trends. From 1996 to 2008 the population reduced by 16%.

At that, the natural growth and the balance of migration are highly negative at the level of “minus” 5-6 pro mille. Urban population reduction rate is higher as compared to rural areas.

Demographic situation in the district is characteristic of ageing processes: the people of post-productive age prevail over the population of the below employable age by more than 14%.

#### *Educational structure*

Population of the district is characterized with a sufficiently high educational level (higher than the average throughout Ukraine). In the district there are no officially registered (recorded by the state statistics) higher educational institutions. At the same time there are branches of the higher educational institutions of various kind of ownership, as a rule they are private, which are registered in other cities. For the last 10-15 years the level of people who obtain higher education has increased by 30-35% and there is a growth trend to get the second higher education. As a rule, these people work outside of the district, i.e. in the place other than the place of their official registration. Also, such people are employed with the state management and self-government bodies and with the organizations providing other administrative services.

1. Share of inhabitants with primary education – 10,4%;
2. Share of inhabitants with secondary education – 53,14%
3. Share of inhabitants with higher education – 14,0%.

#### *Labour market*

The official unemployment rate in the district reached 3.3% in 2008 and the latent unemployment figures are higher. Reduction of the annual average number of employees during the studied period exceeded 60% and reached 8,200 persons or 21% of the economically active population. Such situation is due to unofficial employment of workers by entrepreneurs.

### *Settlement Structure*

#### *Development trends*

The total number of settlements in the district is 20 (2 towns, 2 urban-type settlements and 16 villages). A network of rural settlements of the district is characterized, basically, by the average population density of villages – out of 16 villages 10 villages comprise more than 1,000 dwellers. Among the biggest villages it is necessary to single out Shevchenkovo with about 5,600 inhabitants and Dmitrovka where more than 3,000 people reside. There are two settlements which perform specific functions: Dzinilor which is the only railway station, and Belyi which is located on Zmeinyi Island. It should be noted that the prospects of developing the settlement structure are limited by a high specific weight of nature reserves – more than 1/3 of the total district area, including the Danube Biospheric Reserve, wetlands, etc. The district has the most developed hydrographic network which includes Kiliya arm of the Danube, other arms, channels and lakes which also influence the settlement features and prospects of further development of the territory. Due to all these factors there is no clear-cut configuration of the settlements. The main axis runs along the Danube between Kiliya and the second of importance town of Vilkovovo. Available waterways are of high significance for business, transport and other links within the district.



During last 15 years the population of the district gradually revised its employment pattern moving from the production and transport spheres to services, above all to tourism and trading. These processes were influenced by a shift to market forms and methods of business, loss of traditional markets, establishment of private ownership for the means of production as well as crisis events in the economy, etc.

Local population actively targets to a provision of services to tourists and other travellers. This kind of activity has, basically, a seasonal nature as yet. Regretfully, now there are more of non-organized forms of services provided to tourists. The appropriate infrastructure develops at a slow pace. State support and organization of these processes is either practically absent or is of a non-systematic nature.

Considerable changes in the district economy took place in the agricultural sector due to an abrupt change of the organization: a move from the large forms (collective farms, state farms, large agricultural enterprises) to smaller forms (cooperatives, farms and private agricultural enterprises) which was connected, also, with the land sharing process. Fragmentation leads to worsening of the land use practices and crop structure. Simultaneously, the number of people engaged in farming and self-employed in this sector grew which reflects on the general figures of labour use.

It should be noted that from 1990 to 2008 the specific weight of people engaged in the state management sphere and in administrative service provision considerably increased. During the period of independence there appeared and developed a sector of small and medium entrepreneurship (both legal entities and natural persons). As a result, a new social stratum of entrepreneurs was formed which influences the social and economic processes. At that, this employment category of population is still unstable as of now.

On the whole the district has a distinctive feature, namely an absence to a considerable extent of free areas for business development which facilitates a development of ecologically-friendly kinds and forms of business activities.

#### *Roles of importance of the towns*

The towns of Kiliya and Vilково play a leading role in the district. It is here that the main production, industrial and transport potential is concentrated. These towns perform certain social, cultural, welfare and other servicing functions. No clearly formed axes in the district settlement are observed in the district. A coastal stretch from the Danube delta to Sasyk Lake with a centre in Primorskoye village with its well pronounced recreational value may become a promising development axis of the district

#### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

As the distance between Kiliya and Vilково is rather long (about 30 km), these towns do not form an agglomeration. Generally, the settlements in the district territory are distributed rather evenly. Due to a small number of people and peculiar features of the settlement structure, there are no agglomerated settlement forms.

#### *Interregional cooperation*

Inter-regional and cross-border links are, basically, formed with the neighbouring Rumania, along the Danube. Besides, such ties are influenced by the transit potential of the district and the transport functions it performs, including an exit to the Black Sea via the Danube. As compared to the adjacent districts of Ukraine Kiliya district is rather isolated also because of a poorly developed infrastructure.

#### *Living standards*

Living standards of population of the district are below the average. Quality of life and living standards are influenced to a considerable extent by the functioning local enterprises and their economic condition. Taking into consideration unstable dynamics of the transport sector and, above all, a sharp drop of the turnover and low chances to get employment at the local level, a migration of labour takes place.

*Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants	305,32	361,19	375,65	384,69
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants	0	0	0	0
Regional vitality index	99,34	84,97	82,16	87,28

## Renii kyï rayon

### *General Information*

The population of the district amounts to about 38,800 people.

Population density is about 45 persons/km<sup>2</sup>.

Urbanization level (specific weight of urban population) is 51%.

Urban population is concentrated in the district centre of Reni where more than 19,000 persons reside.

The total number of settlements is 8 (1 town and 7 villages). At that, the rural population of the district is characterized by a high concentration – in each village the number of dwellers exceeds 2,000 persons.

The district population is composed of Moldovans (49,6%), Ukrainians (17,5%), Russians (15,4%), Bulgarians (8,4%), Gagauz (7,9%), other nationalities (1,2%).

The settlement system is characterized with certain dispersion. Besides, a peculiarity of the settlement system in the district is a sufficiently high concentration of population and a small number of settlements on the whole. Such settlement system facilitates more efficient infrastructural, social and welfare servicing of people.

### *Human Resources*

#### *Demographic situation*

On the whole, demographic situation is characterized by negative trends. The natural population growth has a negative index at a level of 4.1 pro mille. As compared to the 1999 figures a certain improvement is noted: a decrease of the natural growth was reduced almost twice. Demographic situation is described by the population ageing processes: the population of the post-productive age prevails over the population of the below employable age (by more than 3 per cent points). Recorded in the district are higher rates of the urban population reduction as compared with rural areas. From 1996 to 2008 urban population reduced by 5,200 persons and the rural population – by 2,600 persons.

#### *Educational structure*

Population of the district is characterized with a sufficiently high educational level (higher than the average throughout Ukraine). In the district there are no officially registered (recorded by the state statistics) higher educational institutions. At the same time there are branches of the higher educational institutions of various kind of ownership, as a rule they are private, which are registered in other cities. For the last 10-15 years the level of people who obtain higher education has increased by 30-35% and there is a growth trend to get the second higher education. As a rule, these people work outside of the district, i.e. in the place other than the place of their official registration. Also, such people are employed with the state management and self-government bodies and with the organizations providing other administrative services.

1. Share of inhabitants with primary education, 11,6%
2. Share of inhabitants with secondary education, 53,6%
3. Share of inhabitants with higher education, 15,5%

#### *Labour market*

The official unemployment rate in the district reached 3,4% in 2008. Latent unemployment figures are much higher taking into consideration the economic specialization of the district, including such big enterprises as the port where a steady reduction of turnover takes place and, correspondingly, the production personnel is reduced or employed part-time.

Labour resources comprise about 40% of the total population while economically active people comprise 32.5%. Employed people percentage is about 86%, including in transport – about 32%, in industries – 5% and in agriculture – more than 26%. The labour of the district has specific labour skills in the marine sector.

Total employment of population in small enterprises does not exceed 1,000 persons, the average figure being 7 persons per 1 enterprise. Those employed in the service industry is also insignificant so far – to 300 persons, however it has an upward trend. Latent employment in this sphere takes place as well.

## *Settlement Structure*

### *Development trends*

The district centre of Reni plays an important role in the district life as its administrative and economic centre as well as a centre of social servicing of the people. However, in parallel with a change of the economy structure and further stagnation of production and a decrease of the port turnover, the role of Reni may further reduce. On the whole, because of a small population and specific features of the settlement structure in the district territory there are no agglomerated settlement forms.

As the structure of economy of the district has changed considerably (shifting to the market forms and methods of business, loss of traditional markets, formation of private ownership for the means of production as well as crisis events in the economy, etc.), the population revised its employment pattern moving from the production and transport spheres to services and trading. Besides, considerable changes have taken place in agriculture – there was a great shift from large farms (collective and state farms, collective agricultural enterprises) to smaller agricultural enterprises (cooperatives, farms and private farms) which was due to land sharing process. Fragmentation leads to worsening of the land use practices and crop structure. Simultaneously, the number of people engaged in farming and self-employed in this sector grew which reflects on the general figures of labour use. It should be noted that from 1990 to 2008 the specific weight of people engaged in the state management sphere and in administrative service provision considerably increased. During the period of independence there appeared and developed a sector of small and medium entrepreneurship (both legal entities and natural persons). As a result, a new social stratum of entrepreneurs was formed which influences the social and economic processes. At that, this employment category of population is still unstable as of now.

### *Roles of importance of the towns*

Significance of Reni within the structure of settlements is rather high. Reni is the administrative centre of the district. In the town there is a port, and a border railway terminal engaged in transit. The Port of Reni is the biggest enterprise of the district.

### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

The main axes of development of the district are linked with transport roads: railroad and motorways; the settlement system is also influenced by a developed hydrologic network – the Danube River and big lakes. At that, the lakes preclude good transport communication among the majority of the district settlements, above all with the administrative centre Reni, and there is a single motorway which connects the district with the other territory of the state – in the direction to Izmil.

### *Interregional cooperation*

Due to its borderline position and transit potential as well as with an access to the Danube the inter-district and inter-state links are developing actively (Moldova, Rumania). Besides, a high specific weight of population of Moldova nationality and the dependence on rail transport of Moldova facilitate active contacts with the neighbour states.

### *Living standards*

Living standards of population are below the average taking into consideration the continuing stagnation in the field of transport and a weak alternative to get employment at the local level.

*Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants	296,72	343,59	358,69	363,11
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants	0	0	0	0
Regional vitality index	101,55	74,02	83,74	85,03

## Moldavian Danube Area

### General Information

NUTS4 Cahul is one of the 32 districts of Moldova, which were formed under the Law On administrative-territorial organization of the Republic of Moldova, No. 764-XV of 24 December 2001. Cahul is geographically situated in the south-west of Moldova, the Prut Lower Plain, Plain the Western of Black Sea and Plateau Tigheci. District is bounded to the north with Cantemir district, north-east of Gagauzia, Taraclia region to the east, west by the Prut River County Galati (Romania), southwest on the river Danube in Tulcea County (Romania), the south Reni district, region Odessa (Ukraine).

Cahul district includes 37 municipalities with 55 villages, including - Cahul town, total surface of 1540 km<sup>2</sup>, representing 4,6% of the country with a stable population of 124100 inhabitants, of which:

- urban – 35488
- rural – 83743

Population density is 80,6 inhabitants per 1 km<sup>2</sup>.

NUTS4 Cantemir is located in the south-west of Moldova. Located 120 km from capital city. NUTS4 Cantemir is fondat la date 25 march 1977. Total area - 870 km<sup>2</sup>. Cantemir district population was 63400 inhabitants, of which:

- 6000 - urban population
- 57400 - rural population

Density is 72,4 people per 1 km<sup>2</sup>.

Cantemir district has 51 locations including: a city (Cantemir), 26 municipalities and 24 villages.

In the South region of the Republic of Moldova the number of people in the past five years has not changed essentially. On January 1, 2008 the total population in this territory consisted of 391,540 persons. The largest number of people it is NUTS4 Gagauzia (159,717 people), which is almost four times greater than the population in NUTS4 Taraclia approximation coincides with the number of cities (by 32 and 26 in each of these NUTS4). This can be explained by the fact that the NUTS4 Gagauzia are located three cities and 22 towns population is over 1,500, when in NUTS4 Taraclia is only one city and number of towns with population over 1500 inhabitants is only 5. Positive dynamics in population over the past five years is observed in NUTS4 Cantemir, Taraclia, Gagauzia and a slight decrease in NUTS4 Cahul.

NUTS4 Taraclia is 150 km to Chisinau the south of Moldova. Total area 674 km<sup>2</sup>. Taraclia region's population is 43,100 people, of which:

- urban population 14800 people
- rural population 28300 people

Population density 64 people in a km<sup>2</sup>.

District shall be composed of 26 villages, including the city Taraclia. In the district are 15 municipalities.

NUTS4 Gagauzia is located in the southern part of Moldova and belongs to the southern economic-geographical region of the country. Autonomy has a production and economic ties with the areas of the region „South“ Cahul, Cantemir, Taraclia, Bessarabeasca and Cimi lia. In the east it borders with the autonomy of the Odessa region of Ukraine. The territory of Gagauzia, in accordance with the Law On legal status of Gagauzia (Gagauz Yeri) and On administrative-territorial unit of Gagauzia is divided into 3 areas: Comrat, Ciadâr-Lunga and Vulc ne ti. Share Comrat area in the formation of the territory of Gagauzia was 48,2%, Ceadâr-Lunga district - 35,3%, Vulc ne ti district - 16,5%. The structure consists of Gagauzia 1 municipality, 2 cities, 3 communes and 20 villages. Comrat city is the capital and administrative center of Gagauzia.

The total area of Gagauzia is 1848 km<sup>2</sup> or 5,5% of total territory of Moldova. The population of Gagauzia - 155,7 thousand people. The population density is 84 people 1 km<sup>2</sup> or less than RM 37 attendees. Total land area of Gagauzia is 184.8 thousand ha, including 17.3 thousand ha - land state property (9,3%), 42,3 thousand hectares - of land located in public property of administrative-territorial units (23%), 125.2 thousand. ha - in private ownership (67.7%). In Gagauzia population of 155.7 thousand. people, or about 4,6% of the population. Value of urban and rural population is 37,4%: 62,6%. In 3 cities of Gagauzia live 58,2 thousand people. Most people live in villages with a population of more than 3 thousand. people. Average age of residents of autonomy is 34.6 years (RM - 35.6 years).

On territory NUTS4 Gagauzia living 155 600 citizens or 4.6% of the population of Republic of Moldova. Autonomy structure by ethnic population:

- 82.1% - up Gagauz of the total autonomy population (127,800 citizens),
- 5.1% - Bulgarian (8000 citizens)
- 4.8% - Moldovan (7500 citizens)
- 3.8% - Russians (5900 citizens)

- 3.2% - Ukrainians (4900 citizens)
  - 1% - other nationalities.
- Most people - 62.6% live in rural areas.

### *Human Resources*

#### *Demographic situation*

In the year 1991, when Moldova became independent state, in a number of cities and towns is noted that the increase in the number of residents exceeded 30%, including in Cantemir. In most urban settlements increase was smaller than the average country. In the next decade have been significant changes, particularly in the demographic structure of population. Although, in general, the urban network of Moldova has maintained its structure, was a qualitative shift from the general decrease in growth in the number of inhabitants. It is essential number of cities, the population decreased over the average in the country, but did not exceed 10%. In town Cahul population decreased by 7% - 10%.

Data on overall population structure in RM on large groups of people under the age indicates the share of working age to 18,2% in working age - 66,6%, over working age - 15,3%. It is obvious emphasis on population aging process, primarily by reducing the number of young people under the age of 14 years and, concurrently, by increasing elderly population (60 years and over). In 1989 these categories of population that constituted 29,6%, 57,8% and 12,6% of total population. Aging population ratio (number of persons aged 60 years and over per 100 inhabitants) was 14,0, versus 13,7 in 2008, 13,6 - in 2000, 12,6-in 1989. Please note that in accordance with the scale Bojio-Garnier indicator value of 12,0 and more people classified as an Ancient.

The composition of the rural population 15% are aged over 60 years and over.

The wave of population aging will produce considerably since 2014, when the population structure will equal the share of persons aged 0-14 years with the share of persons aged 60 and over. According to demographic forecasts Academy of Sciences, the first variable after 2015 will have decreased steadily, and the second - a steady increase during the forecast until 2050.

Low level of birth is registered in the districts of project area Vulcanești and Taraclia.

The most pronounced increase in mortality in districts in the project area is noted in Cantemir - 6,8 ‰ (5 months 2009 to 5,6 ‰).

According to the latest census from 2004 district Cantemir was inhabited by ethnic groups as follows:

- 90,1% Moldovan,
- 6,1% Bulgarian,
- 3,8% others (mostly Russian and Ukrainian).

In the South region, as throughout Moldova predominates the rural population. In NUTS4 Taraclia urban population is 34% and he is second in the region.

#### *Educational structure*

Pertaining to the educational level of population in the southern region of Moldova can observe the following trends: the total population by age must already have some level of education majority were secondary education all 4 NUTS4. Highest percentage of highly educated people is NUTS4 Taraclia – 7,34%, the lowest - in NUTS4 Cantemir (4.25%). Largest share of people non-educated one has NUTS4 Gagauzia – 6,25%. In this NUTS4 as in NUTS4 Cantemir rate of people non-educated is almost equal to that of persons with higher education. In NUTS4 Cahul persons with higher education share is double the free trials - 6,91% and 3,30%. One explanation may be that in NUTS4 Cahul, Gagauzia, Taraclia are several educational institutions like vocational schools, colleges, universities, when the NUTS4 Cantemir operates only one vocational school and high school graduates in the district schools and are forced to leave studies in other administrative-territorial units of Moldova.

In NUTS4 Cahul total number is 129 education institutions. Total number of pupils (students) - 28 417, including in:

- schools - 23 059
- colleges - 1450
- polyvalent vocational schools - 776
- university - 2547
- school sport - 585.

In NUTS4 Cantemir active 41 educational institutions. Total number of students - 9101, including:

- 8967 children in schools,



- 130 vocational school students in town Cantemir.

In educational institutions in Cantemir district teachers operate 1121.

In NUTS4 Taraclia active 45 educational institutions, including 21 undergraduate education institutions:

- 12 high schools that teach high school 4310,
- 9 gymnasiums - 1335 students.

Here working State University Taraclia where 350 students studying in 3 pedagogical faculties. Nr13 vocational school in the village Ciulai teaches 140 students. At boarding school for children with disabilities village Corten learn 145 children. Also working NUTS4 Taraclia arts school where open 29 rounds for interest on 495 children; in school sport is training 348 children in 29 group. Total number of students in NUTS4 Taraclia is 7123.

In a 1000 population aged 10 years and above by level of education their duties:

- university education - 69 people,
  - with special secondary education - 98 citizens
  - with incomplete secondary education 306 citizens,
- with studies average full - 285 people,
- -179 beginner educated citizens. Level population studies of autonomy is high.

Percentage of population with higher education is 8.2%. In Gagauzia works:

- 58 kindergartens for children
- 55 - schools, gymnasiums and lyceums,
- 3 schools multi-professional,
- 2 - colleges
- a university.

### *Labour market*

On January 1, 2008 in NUTS4 Cahul population of economically active was 80.1 thousand people. Activity rate (the proportion of active population in total population) in 2007 was 64,5% for district. The field work are employed 45800 people or 57,2% (occupancy) of working age population. Most busy performing their occupation in agriculture - 54,7%, the share is much smaller industrial and commercial - on 10,7%, public education - 10,5%, other sectors having much smaller share.

The economically active population in NUTS4 Cantemir is 41613 people, which occupied the district's economy - about 25600 people. Retired people - 9840 persons. District budget volume for 2010 was 131.4 million lei.

The total population of Gagauzia autonomy proportion of population aged under 15 years is 22,2%. Percentage of population of working age in the structure of the number of inhabitants of Gagauzia is 64,3% of the population older than working age - 13,5%. Per 1 thousand. people of working age have Gagauzia 217 people. retirement age and 286 attendees to the working age. On the territory of the autonomy of all sectors of the economy employs about 39 thousand. man, whose share among working-age population of autonomy is 37,9%. The bulk of the working population engaged in agriculture - 29,2%, trade - 17%, industry - 13,8%, in education - 16,8%, in health care - 6,6%, services - about 5 %.

### *Settlement Structure*

#### *Development trends*

The territory of Republic of Moldova can be eliminated 6 internal cores and 5 border. The most developed nuclei form and close common spheres of influence.

In southern Moldova is in the process of developing economic Danube zone, which connects both river and sea of Romanian and Ukrainian ports Braila, Galati, Reni, Izmail, Tulcea, Chilia and neighboring cities in Moldova - Giurgiule ti, Cahul, Cantemir, Vulcane ti, Taraclia and Ceadir Lunga.

In terms of economic nuclei can be considered as "growth poles" - subjects of targeted state policy for sustainable economic development and poverty reduction.

#### *Roles of importance of the towns*

In the Republic of Moldova is a group of 10 to 12 cities, the viability of which was highlighted in various historical periods, including the transition period of 90 years. It is these cities viable, maintained the economic could be

considered as "growth centers" growth poles to stimulate economic and social development of regions surrounding cities.

In NUTS<sub>4</sub> Cahul is Cahul city.

Cahul city (year 1452) - population 42 500 inhabitants, is historically the most famous city in the south. Placement of its transport advantages: Airport A Class, railway, highway assets in five directions, r. Prut. Customs Office Cahul-Oancea (Romania) is an economic advantage, in addition to the food and light industry enterprises work. Also in this region activate sanatorium complex based on local mineral water springs. Regional importance of the city grew considerably after finishing construction of port and terminal Giurgiulesti located 40 km to the south, r. Danube.

Thus, each of those growth poles has certain advantages and problems created by the existing environment and future development. Making policy is oriented to support urban growth poles towns, it seems to be more attractive to prospective business.

In NUTS<sub>4</sub> UTAG is Comrat city.

Comrat (1443) - with a population of 25. 7000 inhabitants (2003 data), the city occupies a central position within Bugiac steppe, south-west of the country. Comrat is the capital ATU Gagauzia, including the following districts: Ciadâr-Lunga and Vulcanesti. The advantage of placing highway Chisinau-Giurgiulesti (r. Danube), railway station Bugiac. Increased activity of entrepreneurs and administration ATU to diversify production and attracting foreign investments (Turkey, Russian Federation, Italy), particularly wine and light industry. The problems facing the region are scarcity of water resources, agricultural soil erosion, lack of qualified staff.

In NUTS<sub>4</sub> Taraliaa is Taraclia city.

City Taraclia (1813) - with a population of 15. 5000 people is a central town of Bulgarian community in Moldova. Enable effective free economic area (another free economic area - village Tvardita). The locality enables enterprises producing high quality wines. This region are cultural links and economic relations with Bulgaria and the neighboring regions of Ukraine, or. Bolgrad. There are problems: the need for irrigation of agricultural land, this is due to climate and periodic droughts, lack of natural construction materials.

#### *Agglomerations areas and development axes*

In the year 1991, when Moldova became independent state, in a number of cities and towns is noted that the increase in the number of residents exceeded 30%, including in Cantemir. In most urban settlements increase was smaller than the average country. Only in four towns, including Vishnyovka, Cantemir district, the observed decline in population.

In 1991 there were five urban settlements with more than 20 thousand inhabitants of the towns of district subordination Comrat and Ciadir-Lunga (NUTS<sub>4</sub> UTAG). In Taraclia town increase the number of inhabitants was 25-30%, or about as the country. In most localities urban growth was lower than the country average.

In the next decade have been significant changes, particularly in the demographic structure of population. Although, in general, the urban network of Moldova has maintained its structure, was a qualitative shift from the general decrease in growth in the number of inhabitants. City Vi niovca of Cantemir district lose status of town. In 24 cities observed population stabilization or reduction to 7%, ie not more than the average country, including the city Comrat. On the background of general decrease in population, in town Cantemir observed population increase by 10% and more and in cities Taraclia Ceadâr-Lunga and population increase to 10%.

In the last decade in Moldova can be seen crowds formed, in the process of formed (Cahul) and nascent (Ceadâr-Lunga, Comrat, Taraclia).

On the territory NUTS<sub>4</sub> Cahul is in the process of creating congestion to agglomeration areas Cahul, with extending the territory NUTS<sub>4</sub> Cantemir, until town Cantemir.

In town Cahul, as in many cities over the past two decades the population has decreased over the average in the country, but did not exceed 10%. On the territory NUTS<sub>4</sub> Cahul is in the process of creating congestion to agglomeration areas Cahul. Due to increased population density in the border regions cross-border traffic jams are formed.

On the territory NUTS<sub>4</sub> Cahul is system Cahul - Oancea at the border Moldova and Romania. Agglomerations core housing support sustainable urban development with the most important economic centers - the industrial and transport hub, which means "hot spots" of potential producer-consumer.

*Interregional cooperation*

Cahul and Cantemir district is a member of Euroregion "Lower Danube". Euroregion "Lower Danube" is a modern form of cross-border cooperation between adjacent local authorities, considered one of the most effective practices of economic recovery, diversification of infrastructure, increasing investment, strengthening human ties and reducing regional conflicts.

*Living standards**Indicators of Settlement Infrastructure and Human Resources*

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>1996</i>	<i>2001</i>	<i>2005</i>	<i>2008</i>
Number of dwellings per 1 000 inhabitants	256,18	264,36	272,48	230,65
Share of university students per 1 000 inhabitants	0	0	9,53	9,84
Regional vitality index	2,07	1,89	1,95	1,98





Contact to Lead partner of the project:  
Tibor Németh  
Head of Spatial Planning Unit  
Ministry of Transport, Construction and Regional Development of the Slovak Republic  
Nameštie Slobody 6, P.O. BOX 100  
810 05 Bratislava  
Phone: +421259364493, Mobil:+421908893355, Fax: +421259364204  
Email: tibor.nemeth@mindop.sk, donaregionen@gmail.com

[www.donaregionen.net](http://www.donaregionen.net)