

STRATEGIC PROGRAMMING IN POLAND – CHANGES WITHIN HISTORICAL PERIODS

Janina Sawicka^{1✉}, Marcin Chciałowski²

¹The Mazovian Academy in Płock, Poland

²Warsaw University of Life Sciences – SGGW, Poland

ABSTRACT

Aim: The article aims to assess the dynamics and consequences of different periods on planning and development strategies as well as perturbation of the political system transformations, different governments, and the effect of election cycles. **Methods:** A review of the literature and the use of statistical analysis for synthesis and conclusions was conducted. The sources of materials were various: theoretical literature, legal acts, government documents, plans and strategies, and statistical data from GUS and Eurostat. **Results:** A comprehensive long-term period overview of changes in strategic programming in Poland was completed. The time frame of the study includes the period between 1918–1939, the centrally planned economy after World War II, the process of political transformation in 1989, and the economic and institutional transformation in the 1990s, up to the period after accession to the EU in 2004. **Conclusions:** Strategic programming in Poland within the EU is an important instrument for allocating public funds to directions and objectives adopted commonly by all member states and European Institutions. The last 8 years have shown how the policies of one government can affect the system in a state with unstable institutions guarding democratic values. Further reform of the economy is necessary both for the needs of developing strategic planning and, in the short term, primarily to meet the requirements necessary to unlock structural funds from the KPO.

Keywords: strategic programming, history, transformation stages, Poland

JEL codes: B22, E61, H7

INTRODUCTION

Strategic programming is understood as the development and implementation of various types of program documents, strategies and plans, and legal, institutional, and administrative regulations. The term “strategic programming” in relation to development programming at the national and regional levels, as well as at the supranational level, has its origin in the theory of strategic management at the micro level. The term emerged in economic policy with the spread

of the term “strategy” for public administration programming documents, influenced by the development of the theory and practice of strategic management at the level of companies and corporations. Originally, the concept of “strategy”, a term derived from the Greek’s *strategos* in economic literature, was taken from the theory of the art of war in the late 18th and early 19th centuries after the Napoleonic wars. The German general Carl von Clausewitz [2021] is the one who defined strategy as “the art of winning battles

Janina Sawicka <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8181-1723>; Marcin Chciałowski <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0194-1748>

✉ j.sawicka@mazowiecka.edu.pl

to achieve the goals of war”, which is recognized as a classic military understanding of that term.

Primarily, the term “strategy” was used in economic policy exclusively to describe long-term, comprehensive concepts for national development. Strategic programming is one of the main tools of a development policy and the formation of structural features of the economy, which determine its sustainable growth and international competitiveness. An attribute of strategic programming is an active, creative adaptation to changing external and internal development conditions. An important feature is a systemic approach, i.e., aimed at primarily activating the key elements of the system. Examples of some countries have shown that by implementing an appropriate strategy for national development, it is possible to achieve spectacular success. On the other hand, the lack of strategic planning results in the loss of competitiveness and degradation in the international division of labor. Of course, a strategy does not guarantee success, as the decisive factor is the operative tactics, but it significantly increases the chances of achieving it. In addition, strategies provide an opportunity to coordinate and concentrate efforts, making it possible to achieve goals more efficiently and effectively.

Strategic programming deals with areas related to the performing of state functions. As the government’s role and functions in the economy evolve, so do its spheres of influence. A symptom of this is, for instance, the expanding role of the state in performing the function of assuring conditions that foster economic competitiveness in the environment of globalization. It is believed that in order to achieve this goal, the state should create opportunities for the efficient functioning of businesses (including through the system of legislation, expansion of infrastructure, and reduction of bureaucratic barriers), conduct active macroeconomic and structural policies, and undertake pro-innovative activities (including co-financing of R&D activities) and the promotion of them. Thus, with changes in the role and functions of the state in the economy, both the scope of the objective programming and the priorities within the various sectors of a socio-economic policy are changing.

The role of governments evolves depending on political budget cycles. The wide range of time frames in

this article justifies drawing attention to this issue even though some empirical findings suggest that when the analysis was done over the long term, there were fewer signs of political budget cycles [Wyszkowski and Zegarowicz 2018]. The political budget cycle is a component of the state budget cycle caused by the election cycle. This term is most often associated with an increase in the level of government spending or a reduction in taxes in an election year. The decisions mentioned above are seen as motivated by the desire of those in power to maintain their dominant position on the political scene. There are numerous theoretical and empirical studies on political budget cycles. Looking at the history of economic thought, we should mention the classic work of Nordhaus, *The Political Business Cycle* [Nordhaus 1975]. In developing countries, cycles in fiscal policy and public spending tend to be larger and often rewarded by voters. In developed countries, cycles occur less frequently, are smaller in scale, can be moderated by well-designed institutions, and may even be punished by voters [Shi and Svensson 2006, Brender and Drazen 2008, Streb et al. 2009]. Bonfatti and Forni [2019] and Gootjes et al. [2021] showed that strict fiscal rules weaken political budget cycles. Media freedom plays a key role in determining electoral patterns in budget deficits. Sidorkin and Vorobyev point to corruption as a determinant of the level of the political budget cycle [2018]. Political systems and governance mechanisms have their own dynamics and directions of change both globally and regionally. Each country also has its own historically shaped experiences. The experience of Poland is extensively described by Rydlewski in his book “Rządy i rządzenie w Polsce 1918–2018 – ciągłość i zmiany” [2018], where he analyzes and evaluates the 100-year period of our national statehood from the perspective of governance, presenting all subsequent governments and commenting on the changes occurring in the background of transformations in governance in other countries.

There are some interesting empirical studies in Poland [Wielechowski 2018]. He tested that post-communist history affects election cycles in the European Union countries. He observed that pre-election fiscal manipulation increases total public spending per capita in specific spending categories: general public services, public order, and safety. At the same time, there were

no significant spending deviations in the remaining EU Member States, except for expenditures linked to environmental protection. Earlier research conducted by Čajka [2012], stated that before elections (political cycles), the structural deficit usually increases.

Wyszkowski and Zegarowicz, in their studies using statistical analysis, observed that there is a connection between the election cycle and the condition of revenues and expenditures in Poland's public finance sector. They verified this division of public finance into three subsectors: central government, local government, and social security funds. The analysis enabled a positive verification of the hypothesis that in Poland, the occurrence of a political budget cycle that appears in a "loose" fiscal policy prior to elections and a "restrictive" policy right after elections can be observed [Wyszkowski and Zegarowicz 2018].

It should be noted that the occurrence of political budget cycles in Poland is not unique. The easing of a fiscal policy before an election can be observed in almost all EU economies [Efthyvoulou 2012, Ademmer and Dreher 2016]. This is also the case for non-EU economies, including Turkey [Eryilmaz and Mercan 2015] and China [Tsai 2016]. However, when analyzed over the long term, there are fewer signs of political budget cycles.

STRATEGIC PROGRAMMING (PLANNING) UNTIL 1989, BEFORE THE SYSTEM TRANSITION

In Poland's history, economic plans were carried out during both the communist period and the Second and Third Republics of Poland. Before the Second World War, two economic development plans were elaborated: the Four-Year Plan (1936–1940) and the Fifteen-Year Plan (1939–1954). As we know, World War II interrupted and ended that period. As a result of geopolitical changes after World War II, Poland found itself in the category of countries with a centrally planned economy. The doctrinal and regulatory principles of this economy were externally imposed; nevertheless, there was also the considerable baggage of experience resulting from the implementation of successive long-term economic plans: the Three-Year

Plan in 1957–1959; the Six-Year Plan for the industrialization of the country in 1950–1955; and the series of five-year plans that came after. In detail:

- The Three-Year Plan (1947–1949) was a plan for economic reconstruction after the war damage and for bridging the gap between the so-called "retaken territories" and the rest of the country.
- The Six-Year Plan (1950–1955) was a plan for economic development through increased investment and industrialization of the country using the model of the USSR, including mainly the development of heavy industry.
- The First Five-Year Plan (1956–1960) was an economic development plan aimed at completing the investments of the Six-Year Plan, with greater emphasis on the development of industry and agriculture.
- The Second Five-Year Plan (1961–1965) was a plan to develop the national economy through the development of heavy industry.
- The Third Five-Year Plan (1966–1970) was similar to the previous one.
- The Fourth Five-Year Plan (1971–1975) was a plan for the socio-economic development of the country, assuming an increase in national income, industrial production, agricultural production, and real wages. It was also planned to increase investments.
- The Fifth Five-Year Plan (1976–1980) was a national social and economic plan (the so-called "economic maneuver") aimed at saving an economy strained in the first half of the 1970s.
- The Second Three-Year Plan (1983–1985) was a national social and economic plan.
- The Sixth Five-Year Plan (1986–1990) was a national social and economic plan.

There were also central institutions established in the country's system of state governance responsible for economic planning: from 1945 to 1949, it was the Central Planning Office, and from 1949, the State Economic Planning Commission. In December 1956, the Economic Council was instituted.

Its main tasks were to design changes in the planning system, give comments on economic plans, and collect information on the state of the economy. The chairman of the council was Oskar Lange, and members included

Czesław Bobrowski, Włodzimierz Brus, Michał Kalecki, Edward Lipiński, and Kazimierz Secomski [Bobrowski 1981, Karpiński 1986]. These are also well-known names of the people who left a significant contribution to publications relating both to the theory of planning and assessing the processes taking place in the economy. Research work was carried out, among others, within the framework of three committees of the Polish Academy of Sciences: the Committee for Spatial Planning, the Committee for Demographic Sciences, and the Committee of Research and Forecasting “Poland 2000” [Secomski 1974]. There were differentiating and striking opinions (having a different opinion than the officially ruling system doctrine seldom ended in banishment – an example of staff cleansing at universities after the March events of 1968) at many economic universities, e.g., at SGPiS (now SGH) and at research institutions. A notable case here is that of the eminent scholar and economist Kalecki, who in 1963 wrote a memorandum to Władysław Gomułka, in which he warned that in the adopted objectives of the five-year plan for 1966–1970, Poland was under a threat of economic crash at the end of the 1960s. The consequence was that the professor lost his position as advisor to the chairman of the Planning Commission. Kalecki commented on this fact with a paraphrase of the Polish economist’s Hamletian dilemma: “To be or not to be a government advisor”. In 1968, there was further persecution by the party authorities in the form of removing the professor from all of his positions, and the denial of publishing contracts for the publication of the collection of his works “Z zagadnień gospodarczo-społecznych Polski Ludowej” [Kalecki 1964]. A similar fate was met by Professor Kazimierz Łaski, a loyal follower and propagator of Kalecki’s theories, who was forced to emigrate and found work in Austrian scientific institutions, and is now ranked as one of the prominent international economists [Muller 1999].

It can be assumed that the reason for the complete rejection of the experience and often the research output in the area of central planning issues from the previous system, at least in the first period after the system change in 1990, was the prevailing doctrinal stigma weighing on many theories and models. It should be emphasized that in the past, researchers and,

at the same time, people with high-ranking positions in planning institutions were aware of the divergence of theory and practice, as can be seen from a statement from the work of Secomski [1975]: “The need for planning and practical implementation of development processes requires the search for clarification in new areas of social and economic policy in order to find the most effective solutions (...) in practice, such solutions are often adopted without being based on an appropriate research base”.

Worth highlighting is the research output from that period covering spatial planning issues. The works of the Committee on National Spatial Planning were published in dozens of volumes of “Studies” and “Bulletins” of the Committee [Kukliński 2003].

Secomski left a huge legacy of research in this area. He dealt with planning issues by analyzing three-year and six-year plans, highlighting their strengths and weaknesses. This was the starting point for the researcher’s interest in long-term perspective planning [Secomski 1996]. In this work, he has emphasized the necessity of rationalization rather than maximization of development, long before the United Nations adopted a definition of sustainable development at the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro.

He has pointed out the need and necessity of a structurally and time-balanced development. Analyzing the concept of prospective planning and its initial elements, such as socio-economic conditions, demographics, foreign trade, and technical progress, he pointed out the multidimensional aspects of long-term planning (structural, spatial, global, etc.).

In the 1960s, the dominant research trends focused on the analysis and evaluation of the direct role of investment in achieving the production goals of development, the role of input-output flows in the economy, and their technical and quantitative parameters. This peculiar economism, in the work of Secomski [Secomski 1970, Secomski 1976], was enriched by elements of social development theory, i.e., paying attention to and giving greater importance to social factors. In these works, there are elements that lose nothing of their significance with the passage of time, constituting a universal theoretical achieve-

ment and a bridge between the past and the present, encouraging researchers nowadays to draw on the rich achievements of their precursors [Czekaj et al. 1991, Rakowski 1981, Grala 2005].

STRATEGIC PROGRAMMING DURING THE POST-1989 POLITICAL PROCESS TRANSFORMATION

Stage I – the shift from planning: the first years of transition

Poland's previous socio-economic system was based entirely on central planning. Accordingly, academic achievement and practical experience in this area were both essential parts of the tasks of public administration and important areas of research. With the political transformation, the experience of this period was practically completely abandoned. A particular type of planning, such as centrally directed and controlled planning, was rejected. However, socio-economic planning, in general, was also initially rejected. This was due to several factors, i.e.:

- psychological factors related to the strong antipathy existing in the public consciousness to the planning institutions identified with central command planning blamed for the inefficiency and, consequently, the failure of the previous system;
- the logic of the systemic change: the increasing degree of autonomy of economic units as privatization progressed (i.e., the withdrawal of the state from ownership functions) required a change in the nature of the planning activities of the state;
- the belief in the self-regulating market mechanism characteristic of the breakthrough period (reflected in the famous statements of some politicians proclaiming that “the best plan is no plan” and “the best industrial policy – is having no such a policy”), treating privatization as a panacea for all difficulties and management and development problems.

As early as 1989, the law on socio-economic planning was abolished, and the Planning Commission, the main planning entity in the previous economic system, ceased to operate. It was the Council of Ministers that took over the task of formulating

the annual socio-economic policy assumptions that formed the basis for the Budget Act.

There was a lack of a program concept for the new authorities and the adoption in the economic policy of a version of the neo-liberal economic doctrine that questioned the need for the state to engage in development policy wider than macroeconomic policy.

The relatively few government program documents issued during this period were mainly concerned with ad hoc problem solving, although these were often matters with long-term, very important implications. Such issues included, in particular, the policy of privatization, which was the essence of the system transformation. The related policy of structural transformation of the economy was reduced to changes in the ownership structure, although the structure of the economy determines to a large extent the rate of growth that can be achieved.

As a result, structural changes have taken place very quickly, but not always in the right direction. An example would be the restructuring of domestic enterprises by size. In a situation where the importance of large enterprises increased in the world, and the relative importance of small and medium-sized enterprises decreased, in Poland, there was a process of elimination of large enterprises (in practice, these were often modernized plants, operating under a faulty management system) and domination not even of small and medium-sized enterprises, but mainly of micro-enterprises. This, in turn, had a very negative impact in the long term on, in particular, the level of innovation in the economy, a factor determining the country's competitive position in the era of the knowledge-based economy. Similarly, the privatization of State Agricultural Farms contributed to the fragmentation of the agrarian structure. Small economic entities, unlike large companies, are not able to finance their own research and implementation activities and have little ability to purchase licenses ready for use. As a result of not having adequate financial resources, small businesses neither create progress on their own nor create the demand for progress and innovation, which is the development factor of the domestic R&D sector and its relationship with the economy. As a result, the level of innovativeness of the Polish

economy was very low, expressed by a sharp decline in the share of high-technology products in exports and a low number of patents.

Between 1989 and 1996, the function of the government planning institution was formally performed by the Central Planning Office (CUP), whose tasks included long-term planning, but in practice, its role was limited to advising the government on the preparation of various expert opinions. At a crucial moment of the system change in Poland, when a national development strategy was most needed, it was not developed, not in the least because of the widespread aversion at the time to the institution of central planning associated with the rejected system. Although there were attempts to construct a long-term development strategy (CUP had such a task included in the scope of its duties), none of the resulting projects achieved the status of an official document.

Stage II – a gradual revival of the development programming

From the mid-1990s, the gradual return to socio-economic planning began, although in a modified form adapted to the conditions of a market economy, naturally [Wilczyński 1996, Knakiewicz et al. 1997, Dudek 2002]. Transformation resulted both from a growing understanding of the necessity for program-oriented state action, even in market conditions, but was primarily associated with the process of preparation for accession to the European Union. Poland signed the European Agreement (Association Agreement) on 16 December 1991, submitted its official application for accession on 8 April 1994, and the membership negotiations, which had been conducted since March 1998, were closed on 13 December 2002 at the European Council summit in Copenhagen.

Poland, like the other accession countries, was gradually integrated into EU programming procedures. Information about the planning system in the Union and its member states was initially received with suspicion and distrust, as being diametrically opposed to the neo-liberal doctrine. Objections were only overcome by the requirements accompanying the first aid programs. Looking from the present perspective, it can be seen that even the process of integrating the accession countries into EU programming structures was clearly a planned

one. The requirements for the programming documents to be prepared, which were initially modest and relatively easy to meet, were consistently increased as the Polish side gained the relevant skills and experience. Poland, like the other candidate countries, was obliged to develop a several-year, annually updated so-called Pre-accession Economic Program (PPG) containing information on the current and projected macroeconomic situation (economic growth, inflation, balance of payments), the state of public finances (budget deficit and public debt), and structural reforms in the enterprise sector, the financial sector, the pension system, the labor market, etc.

The purpose of these plans was to:

- define medium-term economic policy objectives and priorities with a view to accession,
- prepare the new countries institutionally for participation in EU programming procedures.

Due to the low comparability of the data contained in the first edition of the PPG, the European Commission developed and presented the candidate countries with guidelines for the work on the next edition of such plans – their structure, method of data presentation, etc. Poland was also being prepared, for example, for full inclusion in the implementation of the European Employment Strategy. The document entitled “Joint Assessment Paper on Polish Employment Policy” (JAP) was prepared. The document was signed on 29 January 2001 by the Minister of Labour and Social Policy and the Commissioner for Employment and Social Affairs of the European Commission. In 2002 and 2003, reports on the implementation of the provisions contained in the JAP were drawn up and submitted to the European Commission in the area of social policy. The Joint Inclusion Memorandum (JIM) was prepared for the development of the post-accession time National Action Program for Social Inclusion. In addition to programs developed in direct coordination with the EU, the number of national programs and strategies also grew dynamically during this period. In Poland in the pre-accession period, for example, the Preliminary National Development Plan for the years 2000–2003 was developed as the basis for applying for PHARE, SAPARD, and ISPA funds, and later – the National Development Plan 2004–2006 as the base for benefiting from the structural funds after

accession. In the period between May 1994 and May 2004 (i.e., from the submission of the application for accession to the EU to the time of accession), more than two hundred government programming documents were prepared, a significant number of which referred to the relevant EU programs.

In 2000, the Council of Ministers adopted the first long-term national development strategy, prepared at the Government Centre for Strategic Studies, “Poland 2025. Long-term Strategy for Sustainable Development”. The document did not play a proper role in economic policy due to the lack of adequate legal anchoring in the relevant development programming legislation at that time, and the non-determinate financing of the strategy.

POLAND IN THE EUROPEAN UNION: STRATEGIC PROGRAMMING AFTER 2004

Stage III – Poland’s inclusion in the EU programming structures

The next stage of programming started with the accession to the EU on 1 May 2004, when Poland was included in all procedures of coordination of the European Union’s economic policy. In practice, this meant, among other things, an obligation for member states to periodically prepare a number of programming documents, which gradually became part of the national development programming system. The development of strategic programming within the European Union was primarily determined by the following circumstances: the introduction of the principle of programming aid funds, the creation of the Economic and Monetary Union (EMU), and the passing of the Lisbon Strategy.

In the Third Republic of Poland, various economic plans were implemented:

- Strategy for Poland (1994–1997) – a program of social and economic development,
- The First National Development Plan (2004–2006),
- Strategy for Responsible Development,
- National Reconstruction Plan (in Polish – KPO).

The rules of programming the aid funds were established in the 1989 reform known as the Delors

package, as the result of which the Community budget and individual policies began to be programmed on a multi-annual basis, and the cohesion policy became the second most important policy in terms of the scale of the resources. One of the basic principles for implementing Structural Funds has been the rule of programming. This means that only projects that contributed to a specific development strategy are financed. The use of funds requires specific programming procedures. In accordance with the general principles of the Structural Funds, their implementation is the result of programming at the level of the EU, the Member State, and the beneficiary region. Despite some shortcomings of the Act, its enactment, as well as the development and adoption in late 2006 of the National Development Strategy 2007–2015, were important events in the history of the system transformation. Indeed, they have opened another stage in the development of strategic programming (i.e., socio-economic planning in a market economy) in Poland, where strategic programming has become a statutorily decreed official tool of development policy. For the first time, it is possible to speak of the emergence of a coherent, legally mandated system of development programming in Poland within the framework of European Union membership.

Strategic programming at the state level assumed the construction of the four-level system of strategic documents: (in accordance with the Act of 7 November 2008 amending certain acts related to the implementation of the Structural Funds and the Cohesion Fund) [Bober et al. 2008]:

The first level of strategic programming: horizontal long-term strategies with an implementation horizon of at least 15 years are developed at this level.

1. The second level of strategic programming: horizontal medium-term strategies with an operational period of 4 to 10 years, will be developed at this level.
2. The third level of strategic programming: other development strategies are prepared at this level. In the case of strategies developed by the central government, these are documents with an implementing perspective of 4–10 years, but no longer than the implementing perspective of the existing medium-term national development, unless a longer time horizon

results from the development specifics in a given area. Strategies developed by local self-government units may have a different time horizon. However, they must not go beyond the period covered by the current first-level strategies.

3. The fourth level of strategic programming – at this level, programs are developed with an implementation perspective of one to several years, but not longer than the implementation perspective of the respective development strategy.

Due to the subject matter of the strategic documents, we can specify the following areas of strategic programming:

1. Programming the state's social and economic development. It results from the definition of programming that it should take into account the main objectives and tasks of development, covering the economic and social sphere, macroeconomic development and directions of the main sectors' development, social conditions and needs, as well as implementation instruments, methods, and programs. Examples of strategic documents are a long-term national development strategy, a medium-term national development strategy, a national cohesion strategy, and other development strategies and programs: among them operational programs and development programs (including multi-annual ones).
2. Programming of regional development (without the local level). In this area, we can include such strategic documents as a national regional development strategy, supra-regional strategies, voivodeship development strategies, regional operational programs (negotiated with the European Commission), and voivodeship development programs.
3. Programming of spatial development (without the local level). Programming in this area is extremely important. This is due to the fact that the lack of spatial development plans may hamper the dynamics of investment processes both from national and EU funds. The following strategic documents can be presented in this area: a long-term national development strategy (in the section concerning the national spatial development guidelines), a mid-term national development strategy (in the section

concerning the spatial development), a national spatial development plan, and voivodeship spatial development plans (and resolutions of voivodeship self-governments on establishing temporary land reserves for public purpose investments of voivodeship and powiat significance).

4. The important category is horizontal documents, with their thematic scope covering the most important issues of national economic and social development, also from a regional perspective, placing them in spatial determinants. Due to their thematic range, these documents are intended, on the one hand, to consolidate various development activities undertaken in the country, and on the other hand, to coordinate them. Horizontal documents include: a long-term national development strategy and a medium-term national development strategy, horizontal documents resulting from international agreements, such as the National Cohesion Strategy, and other horizontal documents, such as the National Spatial Development Plan.

The development management system creates a framework for guiding the state development policy, which allows for defining the country's development goals and planning how and with what methods or instruments these goals will be achieved. The basis for these activities is the Act of 6 December 2006 on the principles of development policy (Polish Journal of Laws No. 227 Item 1658) and for the current government (for the last 8 years), the document Development Management System of Poland, which was adopted by the Council of Ministers on 29 October 2018. Since then, a package of strategies has been created, existing documents have been put in order, and laws creating the legal framework for the proposed solutions have been adopted.

A new impulse for reviewing and possibly revising national development strategies, beginning with the medium-term national development strategy, is the forthcoming elaboration of a Concept of National Development with a time horizon up to 2050.

The Concept of National Development to 2050 is currently underway and should be adopted by the Council of Ministers by the end of 2023. This document will identify global development trends, their

potential impact on Poland, and possible development scenarios in the 30-year perspective. The concept will include a vision of possible national development paths and the current knowledge of how global factors affect the shape of the socio-economic and environmental/spatial situation.

This document will form the background for the preparation of the development strategies. The recommendations it contains on the methods, objectives, and directions of public agencies would be used to update the medium-term strategies of the government and would be a reference point for preparing other public (e.g., local government) and private agencies' strategies.

The country's medium-term development strategy

The Strategy for Responsible Development up to 2020 (with a perspective to 2030) – the Strategy (in Polish – SOR) – was adopted on 14 February 2017 by the Council of Ministers. It is the obligatory and key document of the present government, defining the objectives and directions of social, economic, and spatial development from a medium-term perspective.

The Strategy contains recommendations for implementing public policies. SOR approval has also initiated the implementation of the project-based approach in public administration [Informacje... 2023].

In the current development management system, the next level of governance is represented by nine integrated development strategies, specifying the SOR in priority development areas. Within the strategies, seven have been updated:

5. the National Ecological Policy 2030 – Development Strategy for Environment and Water Management (Ministry of Climate and Environment), adopted by the Council of Ministers on 16 July 2019;
6. the National Regional Development Strategy 2030 (Ministry of Funds and Regional Policy), adopted by the Council of Ministers on 17 September 2019;
7. Sustainable Transport Development Strategy 2030 (Ministry of Infrastructure), adopted by the Council of Ministers on 24 September 2019;
8. the Strategy for Sustainable Rural Development, Agriculture and Fisheries 2030 (Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development), adopted by the Council of Ministers on 15 October 2019;
9. Social Capital Development Strategy (Interaction, Culture, Creativity) 2030 (Ministry of Culture and National Heritage), adopted by the Council of Ministers on 27 October 2020;
10. Human Capital Development Strategy 2030 (Ministry of Family and Social Policy), adopted by the Council of Ministers on 14 December 2020;
11. the Energy Policy of Poland until 2040 (Ministry of Climate and Environment), adopted by the Council of Ministers on 2 February 2021.

Integrated strategies aim to combine social, economic, and spatial planning and take into account the links between different sectors. That way, they facilitate better coordination and greater efficiency. All government development programs and public policies should be in line with the provisions of integrated strategies. The Council of Ministers has adopted 13 public policies and 88 development programs, including 49 multi-annual programs (March 2022).

The Act on the Principles of Development Policy specifies what conditions a supra-regional strategy must meet and what the procedure for its adoption is. The competence to prepare supra-regional strategies is the responsibility of the voivodeship self-government.

The supra-regional strategy is facultative and may be prepared jointly by the self-governments of the voivodeships whose area is covered by the strategy. As a rule, the supra-regional strategy is adopted by the regional assemblies of the voivodeships. The Council of Ministers adopts a supra-regional strategy if the voivodeships request it. Such a solution is applied in the case of the necessity to prepare a supra-regional strategy defining a strategic framework for programs as the basis for applying for EU funds.

The adoption of the SOR and the revision of the Amendment to the Act on the Principles of Development Policy, which came into force on 13 November 2020, were important steps in building a new system

for managing Poland's development. The amendment was aimed at integrating the socio-economic and spatial dimensions in strategic documents.

The most important changes resulting from the Act include:

- introduction of a national development concept: an instrument identifying global development trends in the perspective of 2050; at the same time, the long-term national development strategy and the concept of spatial management of the state have lost legal force;
- regulation of public policy status: a document prepared at the national level, which shows how, in relation to the state's development goals, the goals concerning a given sector, area, or territory are being met;
- introduction of a new approach to the agreement of development activities with the territorial self-governments based on a catalog of instruments: a program contract, a sectoral contract, and a territorial agreement; the program contract has been linked to the co-financing and conditions for the use of EU funds under the regional operational programs; the sectoral contract is a mechanism for agreeing with the scope of the territorially oriented sector;
- activities from the level of the government administration; both types of contract are concluded between the government administration and the self-governments of the voivodeships; the territorial agreement is a tool for agreeing with interventions relevant to local communities;
- definition of "areas of strategic intervention" (OSI), i.e., an instrument that strengthens the development policy with a mechanism serving areas with specific social, economic, and spatial conditions, which require integrated public interventions; OSIs are introduced at the national and regional level and at the same time are linked to investment or regulatory support;
- giving the voivodeship development strategy a leading role in planning development activities in the region in social, economic, and spatial terms;
- legal empowerment of the local (gmina) development strategy and introduction of the possibility to prepare supra-local development strategies – these documents are of a non-obligatory character;

- alignment of the process of appraising draft development strategies, development programs, or public policies with the new catalog of strategic documents and new requirements regarding the content of these documents.

CONCLUSIONS

Existing weaknesses and limitations of the strategic programming system, which prevent the proper definition of Poland's development goals, are related to the lack of continuity of programming efforts (resulting, for example, from changes in governing teams; strategic documents are updated after a change of government). Budgetary planning is not sufficiently linked to the strategic objectives of the development policy, which results in financial resources being dispersed or duplicated (e.g., national multiannual programs, which are often created ad hoc, are not being correlated with investment projects provided for within individual operational programs co-financed from EU funds). There is still a lack of effective multiannual financial planning covering all public funds, which hampers the extension of the strategic planning horizon. The situation is further complicated by so-called election time budgets. There is also no system for evaluating (assessing) the use of public funds to achieve the public objectives set. At the same time, there is a lack of a clearly outlined long-term vision for state development – which results in the dispersion of objectives, duplication of actions, or even support for mutually overlapping ideas. A number of documents of a strategic nature are at the same time characterized by internal and external incoherence and inconsistency of the terminology used in these documents. For the practical implementation of the development strategies, on the other hand, good governance is of fundamental importance, the essence of which is contained in the idea of good governance understood as efficient and partnership in management, based on the principles of transparency, responsibility, efficiency, and cohesion.

The last part of the article discusses the strategies and plans for distributing European Union funds, of which Poland is a beneficiary after accession in 2004. One of the basic principles for implementing Structural Funds has been the rule of programming. Strategic

programming in the EU is an important instrument for allocating public funds to directions and objectives adopted commonly by all member states and European Institutions. This is not an easy path, as shown by the latest example of the National Recovery and Resilience Plan (in Polish – Krajowy Plan Odbudowy, KPO) practically agreed upon between the Polish government and the European Commission, but two years have passed since the European Commission adopted the KPO; however, the funds have still not been transferred to Poland. Grants and loans will be launched when Poland as a member state meets the so-called milestones, including reform of the judiciary and restoring the rule of law. Prolonging the reforms means giving up about 300 billion PLN. The society and economy of Poland cannot afford it.

REFERENCES

- Ademmer, E., Dreher, F. (2016). Constraining Political Budget Cycles: Media Strength and Fiscal Institutions in the Enlarged EU. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 54(3), 508–524.
- Bober, J., Górniak, J., Mazur, S., Zawicki, M. (2008). Strategic programming and its implementation as the tools of development policy. Expert opinion for the Ministry of Regional Development. Ministry of Regional Development.
- Bobrowski, C. (1981). Planowanie gospodarcze: źródła, problemy, przemiany. Wiedza Powszechna, Warszawa.
- Bonfatti, A., Forni, L. (2019) Fiscal rules to tame the political budget cycle: Evidence from Italian municipalities. *European Journal of Political Economy*, 60, 101800. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpoleco.2019.06.001>
- Brender, A., Drazen, A. (2008). How do budget deficits and economic growth affect reelection prospects? Evidence from a large cross-section of countries. *The American Economic Review*, 98, 2203–2220.
- Clausewitz, C. (2021). O wojnie (About war). Wydawnictwo Bellona, Warszawa.
- Čajka, R. (2012). Impact of political cycles on structural deficits – evidence from the Central European Countries. *International Proceedings of Economics Development and Research*, 50, 10–14.
- Czekaj J., Hausner, J., Indraszkiewicz, J., Owsiak, S. (1991). *Polityka i gospodarka. Polska w latach 80.* PWE, Warszawa.
- Dudek, A., (2002). *Pierwsze lata III Rzeczypospolitej 1989–2001.* Wydawnictwo Arcana, Kraków.
- Gootjes, B., de Haan, J., Jong-A-Pin, R. (2021). Do fiscal rules constrain political budget cycles? *Public Choice*, 188, 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11127-020-00797-3>
- Efthyvoulou, G., (2012). Political budget cycles in the European Union and the impact of political pressures. *Public Choice*, 153, 295–327.
- Eryilmaz, F., Mercan, M. (2015). Political budget cycles: evidence from Turkey. *Annals of the „Constantin Brâncuși” University of Târgu Jiu, Economy Series*, 2, 5–14.
- Grala T.D., (2005). *Reformy gospodarcze w PRL (1982–1989).* Wydawnictwo TRIO, Warszawa.
- Informacje o Strategii na rzecz Odpowiedzialnego Rozwoju. Retrieved from <https://www.gov.pl/web/fundusze-regiony/informacje-o-strategii-na-rzecz-odpowiedzialnego-rozwoju> [accessed: 10.05.2023].
- Kalecki, M. (1964). *Z zagadnień gospodarczo-społecznych Polski Ludowej (On economic and social issues of the Polish People’s Republic).* PWN, Warszawa.
- Karpiński, A. (1986). 40 lat planowania w Polsce: problemy, ludzie, refleksje (40 years of planning in Poland: problems, people, reflections). PWE, Warszawa.
- Kukliński, A. (2003). Europe in the perspective of global change – in memoriam of Professor Kazimierz Secomski. Oficyna Wydawnicza „Rewasz”, Warszawa.
- Knakiewicz, Z. (1997). *Od Grabskiego do Balcerowicza: systemy pieniężne w gospodarce polskiej (From Grabski to Balcerowicz: monetary systems in the Polish economy).* Poznań UAM, Poznań.
- Muller, A. (1999). Michał Kalecki – wspomnienia i refleksje (Michał Kalecki memories and reflections). *Gazeta SGH*, No 108 (18). Retrieved from <https://web.sgh.waw.pl/~thorrel/gazeta/archiwum/108/t1.htm> [accessed: 10.05.2023]
- Nordhaus, W.D. (1975). The political business cycle. *Review of Economic Studies*, 42, 169–190.
- Rakowski, M.F. (1981). *Rzeczpospolita na progu lat osiemdziesiątych (The Republic of Poland on the threshold of the 1980s).* PIW, Warszawa.
- Rydlowski, G. (2018). *Rządy i rządzenie w Polsce 1918–2018 (Governments and governance in Poland 1918–2018).* Elipsa, Warszawa.
- Secomski, K. (1970). *Elementy polityki ekonomicznej (Elements of economic policy).* PWE, Warszawa.
- Secomski, K. (1974). *Spatial planning and policy theoretical foundations.* KPZK PAN, Warszawa.
- Secomski, K. (1975). The essence of the present policy of socioeconomic development. *Eastern European Economics*, 14(2), 60–88. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00128775.1975.11648143>

- Secomski, K. (1976). *Polityka społeczno-ekonomiczna. Zarys teorii (Socio-economic policy. Outline of the theory)*. PWE, Warszawa.
- Secomski, K. (1996). *Podstawy planowania perspektywicznego (Fundamentals of forward planning)*. PWE, Warszawa.
- Sidorkin, O. Vorobyev, D. (2018). Political cycles and corruption in Russian regions. *European Journal of Political Economy*, 52, 55–74. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpolco.2017.05.001>
- Shi, M., Svensson, J. (2006). Political budget cycles: do they differ across countries and why? *Journal of Public Economics*, 90, 1367–1389.
- Tsai, P.H., (2016). Fiscal incentives and political budget cycles in China. *International Tax & Public Finance*, 23, 1030–1073. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10797-016-9392-5>
- Wielechowski, M. (2018). Political budget cycles in the European Union – post-communist heritage. *Acta Scientiarum Polonorum. Oeconomia*, 17(2), 125–132. <https://doi.org/10.22630/ASPE.2018.17.2.28>
- Wilczyński, W. (1996). *Ekonomia i polityka gospodarcza okresu transformacji. Wybór prac z lat 1991–1995 (Economics and economic policy of the transformation period. A selection of works from 1991–1995)*. Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Bankowej, Poznań.
- Wyszkowski, A., Zegarowicz, Ł. (2008). Ocena występowania politycznego cyklu budżetowego w Polsce. *Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu*, 509, 451–466. <https://doi.org/10.15611/pn.2018.509.38>

PROGRAMOWANIE STRATEGICZNE W POLSCE – ZMIANY W UJĘCIU HISTORYCZNYM

STRESZCZENIE

Cel: Ocena dynamiki i następstw zmieniających się okresów planowania strategicznego, a także perturbacji związanych z transformacją ustrojową, zmianami rządów i efektami cykli wyborczych. **Metoda:** przegląd literatury i wykorzystanie analizy statystycznej do syntezy i wnioskowania. Różnorodne źródła materiałów: literatura teoretyczna, akty prawne, dokumenty rządowe, plany i strategie, dane statystyczne GUS i Eurostatu. **Wyniki:** Dokonano kompleksowego przeglądu zmian w programowaniu strategicznym w Polsce w długim okresie. Ramy czasowe badania obejmują lata 1918–1939, gospodarkę centralnie planowaną po II wojnie światowej, proces transformacji ustrojowej w 1989 roku, transformację gospodarczą i instytucjonalną w latach 90. XX wieku, oraz okres po przystąpieniu do UE w 2004 roku. **Wnioski:** Programowanie strategiczne w Polsce w ramach UE jest ważnym instrumentem alokacji środków publicznych na kierunki i cele przyjęte przez wszystkie państwa członkowskie i instytucje europejskie. Ostatnie 8 lat pokazuje, jak polityka jednego rządu może wpływać na zmiany systemowe w państwie o niestabilnych instytucjach stojących na straży wartości demokratycznych. Dalsza reforma gospodarki jest konieczna na potrzeby rozwoju planowania strategicznego, ale w krótkim okresie przede wszystkim dla spełnienia wymogów niezbędnych do odblokowania funduszy strukturalnych i środków z KPO.

Słowa kluczowe: programowanie strategiczne, historia, etapy transformacji, Polska