Ruse District

- Population (2015)
- Area (sq. km)
- Number of settlements
- Share of urban population (%)

226,680 2,803.4 88 77.4 VETOVO VETOVO VETOVO VETOVO VETOVO VETOVO VETOVO VETOVO

Overview

In 2014, the district of Ruse ranked sixth in terms of GDP per capita. Compared to 2010, Ruse had the second largest GDP growth (after Stara Zagora) in Bulgaria, both in absolute terms and relative to the population. Unemployment has been declining while employment keeps rising. Nevertheless, investment, both domestic and foreign, and the utilization of EU funds by municipalities in the district have remained below the national levels. The quality of road surfaces remains far below the average levels, and keeps deteriorating. Local taxes and fees are relatively low.

During the last decade, the demographic situation in the district has been deteriorating faster than nationwide, mostly because of the low natural growth. The district's students have traditionally received close to the national average grades at matriculation exams, and they had relatively few failing grades in 2016. Healthcare in the district suffers from lack of doctors and relatively few hospital beds. The clearance crime rate remains lower than the national average. A great part of the population is still living without access to public sewerage. The district has an intense cultural life.



ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Income and Living Conditions

In comparison to 2010, in 2014, the district of Ruse had the second largest increase in GDP in Bulgaria after Stara Zagora, both in absolute size (30%) and per capita (41%). It ranked sixth in GDP per capita, having ranked tenth in 2010. Regardless of this fact, GDP per capita in the district (9,675 BGN) was below the country average of 11,574 BGN.

In 2013 and 2014 incomes in Ruse district were lower than national average rates but in 2015 they grew by over 16% (vs. the national rate of 3%) to reach 5,303 BGN per household member, thus surpassing the average level in Bulgaria. However, salaries continued to lag behind in 2014, though they grew at rates comparable with the country average.

🕹 Labor Market 🛛 🗨 🖷

The key indicators for the labor market in Ruse are comparable with national average levels. Economic activity grew considerably in 2015 but was still unable to compensate for the slump in 2014. Unemployment continued to decline and reached 9% in 2015, remaining below average levels for the last three years. In 2014, employment grew after the decline to reach 60.0% in 2015, though still remaining below the national average of 62.9%.

Ruse is still among the districts with relatively unfavorable demographic replacement ratio, which means that there are relatively few youngsters between 15 and 19 who could replace the people aged between 60 and 64, who are about to retire.

🛱 Infrastructure 🛛 🗨 🗨 🖷

Ruse is an important transport hub and the density of the road and railway networks is above the national average. The share of motorways and first class roads is also bigger: 21.5% in 2014 vs. the national average of 18.1%. Still, road quality is low in the district and the share of road surfaces in good condition kept shrinking to reach 26.0% in 2015 vs. the national average of 40.7%.

Internet access and usage in the district are above national average levels. In 2015, 60.9% of households had internet access (vs. 59.1% nationally) and 64.8% of people used it during the last year (vs. 60.3% nationally).

% Taxes and Fees

Although the district of Ruse has a relatively well developed economy, most local taxes and fees in its municipalities were again lower than the average levels for the country in 2016. The only exception was the rate of the license tax for retailers, whose average rate was higher in the district. The reason is the relatively high rate in the municipality of Ruse: 17 BGN/sq. m, while the average rate of all other municipalities was 4 BGN/sq. m.

In 2016, the municipality of Byala raised the rates of all five monitored taxes and fees while in the other municipalities they remained unchanged.

In 2016, the waste collection fee remained again lowest compared to country average figures. The municipality of Ruse had the lowest rate, 4.20‰, while the average rates both in the district and in the country were almost double.

📥 Investment 💿 💿

Investment activity in the district remains below average in the country, judging by the number of non-financial enterprises relative to the population, and by foreign and domestic investment. By the end of 2014, FDI had reached almost 390 m euro or 1,701.8 euro per capita; the national average being 3,006.6 euro per capita.

The district has been lagging in the utilization of EU funds by municipalities as beneficiaries of operational programs. As of 31 May 2016, sums paid to municipalities amounted to 472.6 BGN per capita (vs. 688.8 BGN per capita for the country). The municipality of Byala had absorbed most funds relative to the population: 3,124.9 BGN per capita, while Vetovo had absorbed least: 57.4 BGN per capita.

Administration •••••

The ratings of the district's municipalities for developing and providing electronic government and one-stop shop services were above the national average levels in 2016. The transparency of the local administrations also received a better rating. The municipalities in Ruse district were rated at 62.0% for their transparency by the AIP Foundation (vs. 54.2% for the country as a whole). The Ruse municipality was distinguished as the most "transparent" one (70.0%), while that of Byala was the least "transparent" with 24.0% in 2016.

The relatively low coverage by cadastral maps of the district's territory remains a problematic issue in the district. In 2010, it was 10.2% and has not changed since, while in the country reached 19.8% in 2015.

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT •••••

IIII Demography ••••

Negative demographic tendencies in the district have been more pronounced during the last decade than they have been in the country as a whole. In 2015, the age dependency ratio (the ratio of the population aged 65+ to that aged 0 to14) in the district was 181.1% vs. 146.4% in Bulgaria. The main reason was the natural growth rate for that year, which worsened to -8.6% in Ruse vs. -6.2% in Bulgaria. At the same time, the number of people migrating from the district was close to that of people migrating to it, so the population decreased mostly because of its natural growth and not as a result of the net migration rate.

A relatively large number of the population lives in urban areas – 77.4% (vs. 73.1% for the country), while the population density was above the national average in 2015.

Education ••••

In 2015, the share of children enrolled in 5th–8th grade in the district of Ruse dropped below the national average level: 77.8% in Ruse vs. 78.3% in the country. The share of high school repeaters, though, remained below average, whereas that of dropouts in primary and secondary education was for the first time below the 2014 national level.

The performance at state matriculation exams of the district's school leavers has traditionally been close to the national average figures; in 2016, the share of failing grades was considerably smaller.

The district's decline in college and university students for the third successive year corresponded to the overall tendency in the whole country. Yet, in 2015, the number of students relative to the population remained close to the average – 37 per 1,000 people (vs. 36 per 1,000 people in Bulgaria).

+ Healthcare ••

In 2015, the district of Ruse remained one of those with the highest deficiency of general practitioners. One GP was responsible for 2,119 people in the district (vs. 1,619 people per GP nationally). The relative number of specialist doctors was also lower than that in other districts.

Though the number of beds in general hospitals in the district increased (4.2 beds per 1,000 people in 2015), it remained below the national average of 4.6 beds per 1,000 people. That trend concerns the increased number of hospitalizations, too. Probably, as the number of beds increased, a greater number of people preferred to receive treatment in the district rather than looking for medical services outside it.

The workload of courts in the district remains lower than the national average level, perhaps because of the traditionally lower crime rates. The result is a higher rate of cases closed within 3 months: 97.0% in Ruse vs. 88.1% in Bulgaria, and a lower rate of pending criminal cases: 6.3% in the district vs. 9.4% in the country.

Following national trends, crimes registered in the district dropped – in 2015, there were 10.1 crimes against the person and property per 1,000 people in Ruse district vs. 13.6 per 1,000 people in Bulgaria. Still, the clearance crime rate in the district was lower than that in the country: 36.1% vs. 39.2% for the country in 2015.

Senvironment

Though most of the population lives in urban areas, the share of people with access to public sewerage (68.0%) remained lower than that in Bulgaria (74.9%) in 2014. At the same time, the wastewater treatment plants built in the last few years (primarily in 2011) increased the number of people connected to WWTPs, reaching 64.5% (vs. 56.8% nationally).

The level of carbon dioxide emissions into the atmosphere (208.3 t/sq. km) remained below the national average of 314.5 t/sq. km in 2014.

In 2014, generated household waste grew to reach 637 kg per capita (vs. 442 kg per capita nationally). The project for closing and rehabilitation of the existing municipal landfill site in the municipality of Ruse also began in 2014.

😼 Culture 🛛 🗨 🗣

In 2015, the district of Ruse once again performed better than average in almost all indicators in this category. Visits to cinemas rose to reach 816 per 1,000 people while they were 744 per 1,000 people in Bulgaria. Visits to theaters grew for the third successive year to reach 645 per 1,000 people, which is more than twice the national figure of 302 per 1,000 people. Visits to libraries also grew in the district; this indicator was again above the national average.

Only museum visits (432 per 1,000 people) remained below the national average number (664 per 1,000 people) in spite of their annual increase in 2015.

Key Indicators for the District of Ruse

2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
6,872	8,125	8,595	8,903	9,675	n.a.
3,655	4,071	4,416	4,504	4,553	5,303
6,354	6,783	7,155	7,589	8,028	n.a.
13.1	17.0	14.6	16.3	n.a.	n.a.
66.9	65.6	66.4	66.0	63.5	65.9
62.6	58.0	57.8	57.7	56.6	60.0
6.8	11.6	12.9	12.5	10.8	9.0
20.4	22.0	22.1	23.6	23.6	24.4
47	47	47	47	48	n.a.
1,403	1,647	1,813	1,907	2,039	n.a.
1,465	1,428	1,493	1,630	1,702	n.a.
34.8	43.2	51.4	57.6	64.6	60.9
30.6	23.9	26.0	29.0	30.2	26.0
10.2	10.2	10.2	10.2	10.2	10.2
	6,872 3,655 6,354 13.1 66.9 62.6 62.6 6.8 20.4 47 1,403 1,465 34.8 30.6	6,872 8,125 3,655 4,071 6,354 6,783 13.1 17.0 66.9 65.6 62.6 58.0 6.8 11.6 20.4 22.0 47 47 1,403 1,647 1,465 1,428 34.8 43.2 30.6 23.9	6,872 8,125 8,595 3,655 4,071 4,416 6,354 6,783 7,155 13.1 17.0 14.6 66.9 65.6 66.4 62.6 58.0 57.8 20.4 22.0 22.1 47 47 47 1,403 1,647 1,813 1,465 1,428 1,493 34.8 43.2 51.4 30.6 23.9 26.0	6,8728,1258,5958,9033,6554,0714,4164,5046,3546,7837,1557,58913.117.014.616.366.965.666.466.062.658.057.857.76.811.612.912.520.422.022.123.6474747471,4031,6471,8131,9071,4651,4281,4931,63034.843.251.457.630.623.926.029.0	6,8728,1258,5958,9039,6753,6554,0714,4164,5044,5536,3546,7837,1557,5898,02813.117.014.616.3n.a.66.965.666.466.063.562.658.057.857.756.66.811.612.912.510.820.422.022.123.623.6474747481,4031,6471,8131,9072,0391,4651,4281,4931,6301,70234.843.251.457.664.630.623.926.029.030.2

Indicators of social development	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Rate of natural increase (‰)	-6.5	-8.1	-8.1	-8.0	-8.5	-8.6
Net migration rate (‰)	-3.5	0.8	-1.4	0.2	-0.7	-0.2
Average grades at state matriculation exams	4.3	4.4	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.2
Percent of failed students at state matriculation exams ("average" 3.00)	3.6	3.7	6.0	4.6	5.6	5.2
Net enrolment rate of the population in 5th-8th grade (%)	78.6	81.7	80.1	80.2	78.7	77.8
Health insured persons as share of the population (%)	86.0	89.4	88.2	86.6	87.1	88.3
Cases of hospitalization in general hospitals per 1,000 people	139	152	164	185	163	215
Registered crimes against the person and property per 1,000 people	12.9	11.9	12.3	13.5	12.0	10.1
Clearance rates for crimes against the person and property registered during the year (%)	46.1	33.7	29.9	27.0	30.8	36.1
Share of pending criminal cases (%)	3.2	4.4	3.9	3.1	11.7	6.3
Share of the population living in settlements with public sewerage systems, connected to WTTP (%)	0.0	63.7	63.9	64.2	64.5	n.a.
Carbon dioxide emissions into the atmosphere (t/km2)	304.4	304.4	225.1	208.3	208.3	n.a.
Number of visits to cinemas per 1,000 people	139	1097	753	760	769	816
Number of visits to theatres per 1,000 people	389	474	444	515	569	645