

## Abstract

In recent years, the Structural Funds have been a very common phrase, which for many means hope and expectation of EU assistance, others use this phrase as a political instrument or as a lure for voters, and only a handful of scholars who already have the experience of EU funds, is perceived by the Structural Funds As a complicated administrative procedure. Structural funds have become an important tool and aid for all levels of government and self-government, as well as for non-profit, non-profit organizations and last but not least for entrepreneurs.

Self-assembling priority structural policy objectives lose to reality if the way to achieve them leads through unnecessary administrative obstacles. That is why I focused on the implementation of the Structural Funds as a key factor in the area's ability to receive EU aid. I decided to map the level of experience and the level of readiness of the territory to draw on EU funding and compare it with the information I collected during my yearly studies in Finland, where I conducted a number of identical structured interviews with representatives of the public and business sectors at a level similar to The Frýdlant peninsula. I deliberately wanted to link the issue of SF implementation with the region facing the above-average unemployment and population outflow to an area that the Liberec region perceives as one of the most problematic in the whole region, and the Liberec Region can be expected to use the SF for its development. In the Frýdlant region in the Liberec region, I met several representatives of local government, non-profit organizations and entrepreneurs to find out what the field's experience is. Similar interviews in Finland have become a treasure trove for comparative analysis.

Originally I intended to focus on the coherence of development documents with the objectives of European regional policy as a prerequisite for the successful use of EU funds, but soon I found that many municipalities on development documents are still working, others do not want to publish them, and unfortunately, Difficult to compare. Comparing the strategic documents of the regions of cities, municipalities or micro-regions does not make much sense, as most development strategy papers are written quite widely so that such documents can be used as support for requests for EU support. Strategic documents are deliberately close to the EU's priorities and objectives and can not be expected to unravel the contradiction of local strategies with European ones. Moreover, this work is completed when the European Commission discusses the real form of structural policy for the next programming period 2007-2013, from which the development objectives of the municipalities will also be developed.

In the first part of my thesis I am more focused on the basics of EU regional policy. Because I miss in the Czech literature focusing on EU regional policy a deeper insight into regional policy from the theoretical and historical level, although it is precisely such an approach and knowledge that will make it possible to understand in a wider context the motivation of the individual Structural Funds programs or the procedures for setting priorities for the 2007-2013 programming period. Debates arise from the positions of different theoretical directions, without it being clear what advantages or disadvantages can the given approach bring. Structural Funds are concerned with a number of practically based people, but to my experience, both from Finland and the Czech Republic, there is a lack of a framework picture of the EU's motivation to implement the policy or of the historical contexts of the whole Structural Funds process, and too narrowly assesses the shortcomings of the SF process As a whole, a complex political compromise.

I see the first part of this work as proof of my long study effort, which necessarily preceded the elaboration of the questionnaire and the subsequent analysis. How did I find out during my work: The issue of Structural Funds is so complex and interrelated that, for its understanding, it is necessary to know the wider context and not only a limited range of themes.

The second part is devoted to the analysis of implementation of Structural Funds in Finland and Bohemia based on the study of documents and especially on the comparison of structured interviews in Bohemia and Finland.