

SGI Sustainable
Governance
Indicators

2015 Global Inequalities Report

Global Social Policy



Indicator Global Social Policy

Question To what extent does the government demonstrate an active and coherent commitment to promoting equal socioeconomic opportunities in developing countries?

41 OECD and EU countries are sorted according to their performance on a scale from 10 (best) to 1 (lowest). This scale is tied to four qualitative evaluation levels.

- 10-9 = The government actively and coherently engages in international efforts to promote equal socioeconomic opportunities in developing countries. It frequently demonstrates initiative and responsibility, and acts as an agenda-setter.
- 8-6 = The government actively engages in international efforts to promote equal socioeconomic opportunities in developing countries. However, some of its measures or policies lack coherence.
- 5-3 = The government shows limited engagement in international efforts to promote equal socioeconomic opportunities in developing countries. Many of its measures or policies lack coherence.
- 2-1 = The government does not contribute (and often undermines) efforts to promote equal socioeconomic opportunities in developing countries.

Denmark

Score 9 Assisting developing countries has broad support in Denmark. Indeed, according to the Center for Global Development's Commitment to Development index, Denmark is ranked first in respect to overall commitment to development, first in respect to fostering institutions and third when it comes to reducing the burden of poverty. When it comes to efficiency, Denmark sits in the middle among OECD countries. Nearly all political parties support Denmark's development efforts and want the country to remain highly ranked in comparison with other countries.

Denmark is one of only five countries in the world to contribute more than the U.N. target of 0.7% of Gross National Income (GNI) to development assistance and it has done so since 1978. In 2011, Denmark contributed 0.85% of GNI to development aid. However, proposals to reduce aid are being discussed.

The priority areas of Denmark's development strategy are human rights and democracy, green growth, social progress, stability and protection. About 30% of Danish aid is provided through multilateral channels.

The OECD's Development Assistance Committee (DAC) regularly assesses Denmark's development policy. The latest DAC peer review of 2011 confirmed the high quality of Denmark's development cooperation.

Citation:

DANIDA, Activities, <http://um.dk/en/danida-en/aktiviteter/> (accessed 27 April 2013).

OECD, Development Assistance Committee (DAC), Peer Review Denmark 2011. http://www.keepeek.com/Digital-Asset-Management/occd/development/occd-development-assistance-peer-reviews-denmark-2011_9789264117082-en#page1 (Accessed 18 October 2014).

Estonia

Score 9

Development assistance is an important part of Estonian foreign policy. Financial resources allocated to these activities have grown steadily, exceeding €1.5 million in 2014. The 2011 – 2015 strategy underlying Estonian development cooperation and humanitarian aid takes the United Nations' Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) as a departing point. The strategy contains objectives and main fields of activities, and identifies major partner countries. The priority partners are former communist countries in Eastern Europe (i.e., Moldova, Ukraine) and the Caucasus region (i.e., Georgia); and Afghanistan. Estonia is active in various fields, but special efforts are made in transferring knowledge in the fields of education policy, health system reform and e-government. Dissemination of domestic expertise in implementing ICT in public administration and education are the areas in which Estonia is acting as a trend-setter. In 2014, Estonia actively participated in providing relief to war refugees in Syria, South Sudan, and Iraq, and also provided emergency assistance in Ukraine and the Central African Republic. In October 2014, Estonia was elected to a seat on the U.N. Economic and Social Council.

In parallel to government, NGOs and private enterprises work in the field of international development. Awareness raising campaigns in the fair trade movement is one example of NGO activity. Due to open economic policy and the absence of protectionist measures on trade, fair trade products can be found in most Estonian supermarkets.

Citation:

Overview of the Estonian development cooperation including the Strategy of Estonian Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Aid 2011-2015 <http://www.vm.ee/?q=en/nod e/4084>

Luxembourg

Score 9

Luxembourg contributes approximately 1% of its GDP to official development assistance efforts and could serve as a model for sustainable development. The country has a sustainable development aid policy focused on energy-saving programs, and which could help to achieve effective carbon-emission reductions in beneficiary countries.

Since 2000, the country's development agency, Luxembourg Development Cooperation (Lux-Development), has exceeded the U.N. target for industrialized

nations of earmarking 0.7% of GDP for development projects. Coming just after Norway (1.02% of GDP) and Sweden (1%), Luxembourg spent 0.97% of GDP (€399 million) on public development-assistance funding in 2013. Despite the still-strained state budget and fiscal tightening, Luxembourg did not forecast a reduction in development-aid spending 2015, with this continuing to be at 1% of gross national income. The NGO umbrella organization CERCLE has pointed out, that budgetary rigor will also apply to NGO development aid policy in the coming years, reducing national co-financing costs along with NGO administrative costs.

Luxembourg plays an important role in the microfinance sector, hosting firms that offer a full range of microfinance products, and supporting more than 50% of the global funds in this area. From 2013 to 2015, Luxembourg will serve as a non-permanent member of the U.N. Security Council, elected in part on the basis of its strong contribution to cooperation policies.

Luxembourg's development assistance focuses on training, health care, water treatment, sewage, local development and infrastructure projects, with a focus on local initiative through offering education and training programs. Some 15% of the cooperation budget is given for humanitarian help, which includes emergency assistance and reconstruction aid, based on EU and OECD guidelines.

Since 1992, Lux-Development has been responsible for the design and implementation of two-thirds of the country's development budget. Furthermore, 20% of the budget is reserved for projects in cooperation with 97 approved NGOs, which work in concert with the cooperation and humanitarian action government minister. In 1992 Luxembourg joined the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the OECD, supporting bilateral cooperation and monitoring aid flows, allowing Luxembourg to work often with other European countries. Luxembourg has also implemented guidelines set by the OECD and the European Union to stop tax evasion from developing countries. The recent DAC peer review recommended the promotion of policy coherence over development issues and the improvement of coordination between state departments and Lux-Development for more positive results.

Citation:

<http://cercle.lu/le-zukunftspak-menace-lavenir-des-ong-de-developpement/>

<http://www.cooperation.lu/2011/>

http://www.cooperation.lu/_dbfiles/lacentrale_files/400/404/MAE-2011.pdf

<http://cooperation.mae.lu/fr/Partenaires-de-la-Cooperation-luxembourgeoise/Liens-vers-les-ONG-partenaires>

<https://euaidexplorer.jrc.ec.europa.eu/AidOverview.do>

<http://www.globalpolicyjournal.com/blog/01/05/2014/worlds-top-donor>

<http://www.oecd.org/dac/peer-reviews/luxembourg.htm>

For further informations: <http://www.taxjustice.net>

New Zealand

Score 9

New Zealand is highly committed to tackling global socioeconomic inequalities. Its aid program is managed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade. It is coherent and efficient in prioritizing economic development (New Zealand is ranked fifth of 41 countries by the Center for Global Development on the quality of its development assistance), despite being criticized by some NGOs. Free access to global markets for developing countries is high on its agenda. The government openly argues for its development program to be used for diplomatic and trade outcomes, and not solely development outcomes. Geographically, New Zealand focuses on countries in the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and in the South Pacific, although significant funding is channeled through multilateral and international agencies.

Citation:

Aid Statistics – Donor Aid at a Glance: New Zealand: <http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/documentupload/NZL.JPG> (accessed October 13, 2014).

International Development Policy Statement: Supporting Sustainable Development (Wellington: Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade 2011).

New Zealand Aid Programme: <http://www.aid.govt.nz/about-aid-programme/how-we-work/policies-and-priorities> (accessed 22 November 2014).

Sweden

Score 9

Promoting global social justice is an overarching policy goal for Swedish governments regardless of their ideological orientation. Sweden combines bilateral strategies with an active involvement in multilateral efforts toward those objectives. Additionally, public spending for development issues is comparably high. There has been a gradual shift from conventional aid to developing countries, mainly countries south of Sahara, toward aid directed at countries that are closer to Sweden, for instance promoting democratization and civil society in eastern Europe. That said, the commitment to international solidarity and aid to developing countries remains still very strong.

United Kingdom

Score 9

The coalition government, unlike earlier Conservative-led governments, is strongly committed to development aid. The government sees this as linking humanitarian efforts to its anti-terrorism agenda. As a consequence, the government has maintained the high levels of spending introduced by the previous Labour government, and it has even ring-fenced the development aid budget in its spending cuts – a move which met substantial opposition in public opinion. Both measured against United Nations' targets and against international reality, the United

Kingdom's public aid spending must be considered generous. The country has continued to champion the development agenda at G8 and G20 meetings.

Development assistance spending is coordinated by the Department for International Development, whose work is scrutinized by the newly created Independent Commission for Aid Impact.

In general, the United Kingdom is a proponent of open markets and fair access for developing countries, although an attempt in the late 1990s to espouse an ethical-trade policy was subsequently quietly dropped.

Finland

Score 8

Based on international humanitarian law, international human rights treaties and laws regarding refugees, Finnish humanitarian aid is committed to aid principles as laid down by the OECD Development Assistance Committee. These principles emphasize the provision of aid solely on the basis of need and Finland requires that recipient countries make formal requests to the UN for aid. Finland emphasizes the primary role of the UN in coordinating the provision of aid, and channels its funds for humanitarian aid through UN organizations. In terms of development coordination, such as work to improve the economic and social position of developing countries, Finland's contributions are implemented through various methods. While Finland's humanitarian assistance policies have focused on the poorest countries and most vulnerable people, portions of multilateral funds have been channeled through the EU. Generally, Finland is committed to development and has participated in several international efforts to promote equal social opportunities and fair trade globally. Surveys on development cooperation indicate that Finnish people perceive humanitarian assistance as an important form of aid. However, the overall efficiency of Finnish efforts is high, and the country should not be counted among top initiators and agenda-setters. In short, in terms of advancing global social inclusion, Finland is a committed partner rather than a leader.

Citation:

"Finland's Humanitarian Policy", Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, 4/11/2013.

"Finland's Development Policy Programme 2012", Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, 6/19/2012.

Ireland

Score 8

Despite the austerity measures that have been taken to correct the imbalances in public finances, Ireland has maintained its spending on overseas development assistance in the region of 0.5% of GDP since 2008. There is a special focus on countries in Sub-Saharan Africa and on poverty eradication, ending hunger and encouraging gender equality, good governance and human rights.

Ireland has consistently supported an international agenda that advances social inclusion. Its support for a fair global trading system is constrained by the overriding role of the European Union in framing trading policy and to some extent by concerns about domestic self-interest with regard to certain sectors, including farming.

Norway

Score 8 Norway is a leading contributor to bilateral and multilateral development cooperation activities, as well as to international agencies focusing on development issues. Its activities in these areas actively seek to combat poverty, exclusion and discrimination.

On the other hand, it maintains a high level of protectionism with respect to the import of agricultural products.

Canada

Score 7 Canada's government has a long history of supporting international efforts to promote socioeconomic opportunities in developing countries, and has shown leadership on critical issues such as nutrition and child health. However, Canada recently cut its foreign aid budget by 8.2%, reducing Canada's share of official development assistance as a percentage of gross national income to 0.27%, a relatively low level for an OECD country. Furthermore, a recent North-South Institute study makes the case that Canada's current framework guiding foreign-aid efforts – that is, the focus on improving aid effectiveness and accountability – is insufficient as an overarching framework guiding the country's approach to development. This is because the focus on aid effectiveness captures only a small part of Canada's engagement with the developing world. A broader vision that includes aid and non-aid policies is needed in order for Canada to improve the coherence of its development policy and be an effective actor in the international development sphere. In principle, Canada promotes a fair global trading system. In practice, domestic interests are often paramount. For example, the government vigorously defends Canada's agricultural marketing boards in trade negotiations, even though the removal of the trade barriers related to these boards would give developing countries better access to the Canadian market.

Citation:

Millennium Development Goals Database, United Nations Statistics Division. Net ODA as percentage of OECD/DAC donors GNI data obtainable at <http://data.un.org/Data.aspx?d=MDG&f=seriesRowID:568#MDG>

Anni-Claudine Bulles and Sghannon Kindornay (2013) "Beyond Aid: A Plan for Canadian International Cooperation" North-South Institute, May. http://www.nsi-ins.ca/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/BuellesKindornay.2013_CNDPolicyCoherenceEN.pdf

Czech Republic

Score 7 The Czech Republic is not a major player in international development, but it has developed a coherent strategy for projects – particularly in countries where its experience of transition can be helpful. The government’s concept of international development cooperation is gradually being refined. Cooperation is concentrated in a small number of countries; in 2013, these were Moldova, Afghanistan, Mongolia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Ethiopia and Georgia. The Sobotka government has placed a greater emphasis on human rights, including economic, social and environmental rights. In April 2014, parliament approved a bill on foreign development cooperation and humanitarian aid, the first piece of legislation in this area.

France

Score 7 France has a long tradition of offering support to poor countries both in terms of financial support and promotion of policies in their favor. However, this should be qualified. First, France is reluctant to consider that free trade is one of the most effective instruments of support. As a consequence, France is often an obstacle to the lowering of tariffs and trade barriers, for instance in agriculture. Second, French aid is concentrated on African countries, where its economic interests have been traditionally strong. The temptation to link aid to imports from the donor country is quite common.

Within the framework of international organizations, France is active but for the above mentioned reasons, its policy preferences are deeply influenced by path dependency, such as colonization and the global network of French-speaking countries.

Germany

Score 7 In absolute terms, Germany ranks third among donor countries with respect to the provision of official development assistance. However, when considered relative to its gross national income (GNI), it is positioned only among the average performing OECD countries.

The country’s trading system is necessarily aligned with that of its European partners. In trade negotiations within the European Union, Germany tends to defend open-market principals and liberalization. This position is in line with the country’s economic self-interest as a successful global exporter. For agricultural products in particular, the EU’s Common Agricultural Policy still partially shields European farmers from international competition, thus limiting the ability of developing

countries to export their agricultural products to Europe. However, Germany has been more open than peers such as France to a liberal approach that would provide greater benefits to developing countries and emerging markets.

In order to enhance efficiency and cut administrative costs, three previously independent German developmental agencies were merged into GIZ (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit) in 2011. GIZ works with the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) in the context of international cooperative ventures focused on sustainable development. This concentration of tasks into a single agency has improved the efficiency of Germany's development activities.

Lithuania

Score 7

Through its development aid policy, the Lithuanian government participates in international efforts to promote socioeconomic opportunities in developing countries. Lithuania provides development aid to Belarus, Ukraine, Moldova and Georgia, as well as Afghanistan (where it is involved in the civilian-military mission) through its own development-aid and democracy-support program, as well as through the European Development Fund, to which it provides a financial contribution (representing 65% of the country's total development aid). Moreover, in 2011 Lithuania joined the World Bank's International Development Association, which provides loans and grants for anti-poverty programs. Although Lithuania committed to allocating 0.33% of its gross national product to development aid by 2015 as part of its contribution to the U.N. Millennium Development Goals, current levels of government expenditure in this policy area (about 0.11% in 2013) remain under the target. It is hard to judge the real impact of Lithuania's development aid given the absence of independent evaluations. In 2013, Lithuanian development-aid policy focused on advocating for women's rights and equal opportunities around the world.

As a member of the European Union, Lithuania is bound by the provisions of the EU's common policy toward external trade. Although the EU generally maintains a position of openness with regard to trade and investments, it has retained some barriers to market access and other measures that distort international competition. In rare cases, Lithuania has adopted measures within the EU's external trade regime that restrict trade (e.g., along with other countries, Lithuania prohibited import of a specific genetically modified maize, a measure related to consumer- and environmental-protection concerns, rather than being based on new or additional scientific information about the impact of GMOs). Despite being a small and open economy and officially advocating open global trade policies, Lithuania has often aligned itself in trade discussions with the EU's most protectionist countries, especially on the application of such instruments as antidumping duties. It has also supported trade protection in the farming sector, backing EU import duties on key agricultural products that hurt developing countries specializing in agricultural exports.

Citation:

The Lithuanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Lithuanian development aid, 2013. http://www.orangeprojects.lt/site/newfiles/files/Lietuvos_vystomasis_bendradarbiavimas_2013.pdf.

Elsig, M., "European Union trade policy after enlargement: larger crowds, shifting priorities and informal decision making," *Journal of European Public Policy*, 17:6, September 2010, p. 781-798.

United States

Score 7

The United States is an important player in global social policy because it provides a large share of the world's development assistance. Relative to the size of its economy, however, its efforts lag behind those of most OECD democracies. For most of the postwar era, U.S. foreign aid has had four features that have reduced its impact on economic development and welfare in poor countries: It has been modest in amount relative to national income; it has been heavily skewed toward military assistance; it has not always been coordinated with assistance with international organizations; and – at least with regard to food assistance – it has often designed to benefit U.S. agricultural, shipping, and commercial interests along with aid recipients.

Presidents Bush and Obama have both made major efforts to reorient U.S. foreign aid. The Bush administration accomplished a transformation of aid policy by reducing the emphasis on military spending, increasing health-related assistance (especially, and effectively, for AIDS prevention and treatment through the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, or PEPFAR), and focusing economic assistance on countries with stable democratic political systems and a commitment to long-term pro-business development strategies. President Obama has continued in this direction, and in his 2014 budget proposed both a major increase in overall funding and a dramatic shift toward regional (rather than U.S. domestic) purchases of food for international-aid purposes. By September 2014, Obama had committed \$175 million plus supporting military troops – the largest commitment of any single country – to the belated effort to fight the Ebola outbreak in West Africa.

Citation:

Tarnoff, Curt, and Marian L. Lawson, *Foreign aid: An introduction to U.S. programs and policy*, Congressional Research Service, February 10, 2011. Accessed on May 9, 2013. <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R42042.pdf>

Gibler, Douglas M. and Steve V. Miller, *Comparing the Foreign Aid Policies of Presidents Bush and Obama*. *Social Science Quarterly* 93, 5, 2012, 1202-1217

Australia

Score 6

Australia plays a leading role in the region in promoting economic development and poverty alleviation in less developed countries, particularly in the Pacific. Australia is also a strong advocate of trade liberalization, especially in relation to agricultural products, which is critically important to economic development in most developing countries.

However, the 2014 government budget included cuts to foreign aid of \$7.6 billion over 5 years, which arguably represents a backward step in promoting economic opportunities in developing countries.

Due to its status as a middle power, Australia lacks leverage on some issues. It has been unable to provide a major impetus to further develop the multilateral trading system, for example. Australian governments have supported the multilateral trading system rhetorically, but have at the same time contributed to the weakening of the WTO by implementing a number of preferential trade agreements. Australia has concluded FTAs with all major economies in Asia (ASEAN, South Korea, China and Japan).

Citation:
<http://www.dfat.gov.au/fta/>

Chile

Score 6

Chile formally follows and promotes the United Nations' Millennium Development Goals and its post-2015 agenda in its foreign policies. However, in practice those criteria are not necessarily considered when it comes to decision-making regarding international cooperation with developing countries in the region (Chile cooperates nearly exclusively with Latin American developing and emerging countries). Regarding the promotion of fair trading access to global markets, Chile applies nearly no subsidies to domestic producers nor does it establish protectionist trade barriers for imports.

Iceland

Score 6

Iceland is a founding member of the United Nations, though failed to secure a seat on the Security Council in 2008.

The Icelandic International Development Agency (Þróunarsamvinnustofnun Íslands) is a public institution associated with the Foreign Ministry established in 1981. Its mandate is to cooperate with and assist developing countries. Recently, Icelandic International Development Agency reduced the number of countries in which it ran projects from six to three: Malawi, Mozambique and Uganda.

In 2009, Iceland's contribution to development aid amounted to 0.33% of GDP. However, this was reduced to 0.21% in 2012, well below the UN target of 0.7%. In 2014 the contribution was raised to 0.26% of GDP, with a goal of achieving 0.28% in 2015. Yet, there is still a long way to achieve the UN target of 0.7%. In 2013, Iceland joined the OECD's Development Cooperation Directorate.

Apart from its rather limited development assistance, Iceland has not undertaken any specific initiatives to promote social inclusion in the context of global frameworks or international trade.

Japan

Score 6

Compared to the OECD average, Japan has typically underperformed in terms of official development assistance (ODA). In 2013, however, Japan increased its disbursements by 11.1% in USD terms while OECD Development Aid Committee members raised their contributions on average by only 6.2%. The quality of the aid provided has also improved in recent years and assistance has been better aligned with Japan's broader external security concerns.

A recent regular WTO review found only a few changes in the country's international trade policy framework since 2011. In particular, tariffs for agricultural products remain high, as are those for other light industry products such as footwear or headgear, in which developing economies might otherwise enjoy competitive advantages. On the non-tariff side, questions about the appropriateness of many food-safety and animal- and plant-health measures (sanitary and phytosanitary measures) remain.

Japan's reluctance to move decisively on such issues, largely because of domestic vested interests, has contributed to the slow development of the Doha round of WTO negotiations. Moreover, the country's various attempts at bi- and multilateral free-trade agreements have been compromised by such reluctance.

Japan has worked toward fulfillment of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). It claims to have been the leading ODA provider in the water, environment, health and education sectors over the last 10 years. With respect to the post-2015 development agenda, Japan launched a Strategy on Global Health Diplomacy in mid-2013, encompassing, for example, a relaxation of its yen loan conditions for health-related projects.

Citation:

ICTSD (International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development, WTO: Structural Reforms Needed for Japan to Sustain Economic Recovery, Bridges Weekly Trade News Digest 17.6, 20 February 2013, <http://ictsd.org/i/news/bridgesweekly/154773/> (accessed in May 2013)

Government of Japan, Japan's Strategy on Global Health Diplomacy, June 2013, www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/files/000005946.pdf

Netherlands

Score 6

Widespread criticism of development aid has undermined the long-standing Dutch commitment to spend 0.8% of GDP annually on development aid. Since 2011 it has been brought back to 0.7% (€4.5 billion), and starting in 2014 the amount will be further cut to €3.5 billion. Subsidies to Oxfam Novib and Cordaid will be negatively affected by as much as 50%. Aid will no longer focus on poverty reduction and will be concentrated on fewer countries (15 at first, 10 later) in the categories of (a) too weak to achieve millennium goals independently, (b) fragile states in terms of rule of law, and (c) emerging economies. Allegedly, 15% of every euro spent on development aid remains in the Netherlands and is used for administrative costs, grants to students from developing countries, coaching for asylum seekers, information campaigns and debt relief. The major idea is that “economic diplomacy” can forge a coalition between Dutch business expertise (in reproductive health, water management and food security/agriculture) and business and civil society associations in developing countries. Expenditures on international conflict management (the 3Ds – development, diplomacy, defense) have been added to the diminishing state budget for development aid. There will be no cutbacks on women’s rights or emergency aid. Good governance aid will be focused on helping developing countries to improve taxation systems. Following OECD guidelines, there will be a reassessment of the negative side effects of Dutch corporate policies in developing countries. All of this shows less commitment by the Dutch government to global policy frameworks and a fair global trading system; the aspiration is to link development aid to Dutch national economic and international safety interests.

Citation:

NCDO, Het Nederlandse ontwikkelingsbeleid. De feiten op een rij, juni 2012 (www.ncdo.nl/sites/default/files/Factsheet%20ontwikkelingsbeleid_0pdf)

WRR (2010), Minder pretentie, meer ambitie. Ontwikkelingshulp die verschil maakt, Amsterdam University Press

Nieuwe agenda voor hulp, handel en investeringen, april 2013 (www.rijksoverheid.nl/nieuws/2013/05/04/nieuwe-agenda...)

Additional references:

Volkskrant, 24 february 2014, 15 procent ontwikkelingshulp in Nederland gebruikt (volkskrant.nl, consulted 19 October 2014)

Poland

Score 6

Like its predecessors, the Tusk government did not take an active role in addressing global social inequalities. However, the new Act on Development Cooperation, approved by parliament in September 2011 after six years of debate, put development cooperation and foreign-aid programs on a new footing, paving the way for Poland to become the 28th member of the OECD Development Assistance

Committee (DAC) in October 2013. Since the country's EU accession, official development assistance has doubled, making Poland the world's 26th largest donor in 2013. That year, the country delivered 29% of ODA bilaterally and 71% within the framework of multilateral organizations. One of the priorities noted in Poland's Strategy for Development Cooperation from 2012 – 2015 is providing assistance to small and medium-sized enterprises in partner countries.

Slovakia

Score 6

Slovakia ceased to be a recipient of World Bank development aid in 2008, and has been a donor of development assistance ever since. In September 2013, the country became the 27th member of the OECD Development Assistance Committee. Slovakia's top priorities with regard to official development assistance (ODA), as formulated in an official new strategy for 2014 – 2018, include education and health care as well as the strengthening of stability and good governance in regions and countries that are of special concern for Slovakia. Under the current medium-term strategy, priority areas include first Afghanistan, Kenya and Moldova; in a second category Albania, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Kosovo and Ukraine; and in a third category South Sudan. In the period under review, Slovakia formulated a country strategy for Moldova and engaged in development-cooperation programs with Kenya and Afghanistan. While Slovakia's development assistance has become more focused, total ODA amounts to just 0.09% of its gross national income, thus falling substantially under the EU target of 0.33%.

Citation:

Strednodoba strategija rozvojei spoluprace Slovenskej Republiky na roky 2014-2018; http://www.foreign.gov.sk/en/foreign_policy/slovak_aid

South Korea

Score 6

South Korea has established itself as a new donor in the field of development cooperation and was admitted to the OECD Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC) in 2010. It put development on the 2010 G-20 agenda and hosted the OECD High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in 2011. South Korea has massively increased its official development aid. In 2011, for example, it increased its development aid budget by a remarkable 13%. However, the level of overseas direct aid remains low at 0.12% of GNI. The quality of South Korean aid also remains relatively low. Untied aid is preferred by the OECD-DAC for the least developed countries but actually declined from 37% in 2009 to 27% in 2010. This is much less than the OECD average of 88%. Another weakness is the focus on bilateral as opposed to multilateral aid. South Korea has recently played a stronger role in agenda-setting and overseas development assistance, but top priority is afforded to economic rather social issues (e.g. human rights issues).

In terms of a fair global trading system, South Korea has shown little initiative and instead focuses on negotiating a large number of preferential trade agreements with, among others, the European Union and the United States as well as many developing countries.

Citation:

OECD, KOREA Development Assistance Committee (DAC), PEER REVIEW 2012, <http://www.oecd.org/dac/peer-review/s/Korea%20CRC%20-%20FINAL%2021%20JA%20N.pdf>

Switzerland

Score 6 The Swiss government has increased its development-aid contributions since 2000. Currently Switzerland's contributions are average as compared to other mature democracies. The Swiss government has set the goal of spending 0.5% of its GDP on development aid in the long run.

Sustainable agriculture, decentralized governance, poverty reduction and vocational training are core issues driving Swiss development cooperation (SDC). In the countries where it supports projects or aid distribution, SDC has a good reputation for maintaining independence from home industrial interests and for making long-term commitments. Nevertheless, it is a small donor with limited impact. SDC is well embedded within international development agencies, and coordinates its activities with their agendas on issues such as poverty reduction, climate change and sustainable economic development.

To a certain degree, SDC's activities differ from general patterns of Swiss foreign policy, which is more conventional. Foreign policy is mainly trade oriented, supporting policies of market liberalization through international agencies like the WTO.

Turkey

Score 6 During the period under review, Turkey used development assistance to advance social inclusion and development beyond its borders. The government expanded its annual official development assistance (ODA) disbursements from \$602 million in 2007 to \$1.27 billion in 2011, and to \$1.6 billion in 2013. The humanitarian assistance given by Turkey corresponds to 0.21% of its gross national income (GNI). With this amount Turkey, has become the fourth-largest government donor of humanitarian assistance in the world as a share of GNI. A large proportion of Turkey's humanitarian assistance since 2012 has gone to the surrounding region, especially due to the escalating Syrian war. Aid to Syrian refugees, provided by the Turkish Cooperation and Coordination Agency (TİKA) and the Disaster and Emergency Management Presidency (AFAD), amounted TRY 2.3 billion in 2013.

During its G-20 presidency in 2015, Turkey plans to assist the United Nations in developing the post-2015 Millennium goals agenda, push for integrating low-income countries into the world economy, support food security and agricultural productivity, and monitor implementation of the G-20 Energy Efficiency Action Plan.

Citation:

Hürriyet Daily News (2014) 'Turkey ranks 3rd most generous donor country', 4 October 2014.

'Turkish G20 Presidency Priorities for 2015', 1 December 2014, <https://g20.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/2015-TURKEY-G-20-PRESIDENCY-FINAL.pdf> (accessed 7 December 2014)

Austria

Score 5

Austria often gives rhetorical support to agendas seeking to improve the global social balance. However, when it comes to actions such as spending public money to improve development in poor countries, Austria often slow to fulfill its promises.

As an EU member, Austria's position concerning tariffs and imports is defined by the EU's position. This body also represents Austria in the World Trade Organization. To prevent certain agricultural products from entering the Austrian market, the Austrian media and political parties (including agricultural interest groups) use environmental rather than specifically trade-focused arguments.

The gap between political rhetoric and political activity with respect to equal socioeconomic opportunities in developing countries has grown even wider during the period under review. Austrian politics and Austria's public discourse have reacted to the ongoing volatile economic and fiscal situation by concentrating even more than before on internal demands. The debate regarding the EU-U.S. negotiations concerning a transatlantic free trade agreement has been dominated by a parochial outlook with little room for global arguments. According to this view, Austria's standards are the highest and any free trade agreement will result in a decline of quality for the consumer.

Italy

Score 5

The engagement of the Italian government in promoting socioeconomic opportunities internationally is generally rather limited. Over the years, the Italian level of international aid has been among the lowest for developed countries (0.13% of GDP for 2012 but increasing to 0.16% in 2013 according to OECD). A special sector where the current and past governments have displayed a significant activity is that of providing help at sea through the Italian navy for illegal immigrants crossing the Mediterranean Sea on unsecure boats belonging to traffickers.

On a more qualitative and organizational level Italy has stressed the importance of fighting hunger and developing food production and distribution. Probably because of this activism it hosts three major U.N. food agencies, the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and the World Food Programme (WFP).

Citation:

<http://www.oecd.org/newsroom/aid-to-developing-countries>

Mexico

Score 5

Mexico is one of a group of new donor countries such as India, China, Brazil and South Africa that were formerly only recipients of foreign aid, but in recent years have also become providers of foreign assistance. Related to this trend, in 2011 Mexico established the Mexican Agency for International Development Cooperation (AMEXCID). This agency is tied to the Foreign Ministry and is responsible for coordinating Mexico's foreign assistance. However, Mexico's provision of foreign aid is still far below the aid volumes provided by traditional OECD donors, and is also lower than the foreign assistance originating from China, Brazil or India. Nevertheless, Mexico has been engaged in international efforts seeking to bring together traditional and non-traditional donors. In summer 2014, for example, Mexico hosted the first ministerial-level meeting of the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation.

These activities are embedded in a historic setting under which Mexico has traditionally promoted South-South cooperation and global-development issues. Thus, compared to many developing countries, Mexico has a strong sense of global social justice. Still, compared to other countries of the OECD world, efforts to combat international poverty and injustice are still quite limited, and somewhat marked by contradictions. For example, there is a marked difference between Mexico's attitude toward undocumented migration to the north and its attitude toward migrants from Central and South America. It supports immigration north, but is quite intolerant of immigration from countries to its south. Its attitude toward social inclusion similarly depends on whether the subject is Mexican migrants or migrants to Mexico. As far as the former is concerned, Mexican officials have at times come close to encouraging law-breaking in the United States.

Regarding free trade, Mexico is supportive of open trade agreements and actively seeks good relations with any country that might counterbalance its heavy economic dependence on the United States. The one exception is China, which policymakers sometimes see as a threat. The country has implemented anti-dumping measures in the past though none are now operational.

Portugal

Score 5 There was virtually no change in this period vis-à-vis the previous report. Foreign aid remains very much a secondary consideration in foreign policy, with the main interest being in economic diplomacy to promote the Portuguese economy and exports. That does not mean that Portugal is disengaged – it still participates in terms of foreign aid, especially in the Portuguese-speaking countries of Africa and East Timor. However, while there is some funding for foreign aid projects, there is little concern with the overarching aid policy, which means that coherence was not as strong as it might be. This lack of interest also percolates through to the design of international policies and the lack of international leadership in that regard. It must also be kept in mind that Portugal is a follower, and not an international leader, and has very few resources. Therefore, while Portugal is supportive of the good intentions, it is in fact marginal with regard to the implementation and design of foreign assistance.

Spain

Score 5 Since the onset of the crisis, the official development aid (ODA) budget has dropped by 70% as part of the efforts to fight the public deficit. According to a report published by the development NGO Oxfam Intermón, within Europe, Spain has been most consequential in scaling back its international cooperation for development support. Currently, Spain only gives 0.15% of its GDP to official development assistance, far below the levels of 2008 (when Spain reached its peak in international development aid with around €5 billion, or 0.45% of its GDP – the seventh-highest level of aid among the world's donor countries). The budget passed at the end of 2014 foresees that the overall ODA budget will amount to €1.798 billion, or 0.17% of Spain's GDP in 2015 (a very minor increase of ODA as a share of GDP).

Today, Spain – even though it is still engaged in international efforts to promote development – performs poorly in comparison with the other members of the Development Cooperation Directorate (DCD) of the OECD. In addition, the new focus of Spanish external action since 2011 under Rajoy's government, which is more business-oriented, has meant less political attention has been given to development and fewer contributions have been made to global public goods. However, a new multiannual Cooperation Director Plan was approved for the period 2013-2016 to introduce more coherence with other policies (e.g., trade) and foster specialization as well as the division of labor with the European Union and other EU member states' development strategies.

Citation:
www.aecid.es/es/

Oxfam Intermón. 2014. Spain is different: la realidad de la ayuda 2013. at www.oxfamintermon.org/sites/default/files/documentos/files/informe_AOD_v05_doble.pdf

Belgium

Score 4 The economic crisis has placed continued pressure on the government's development aid efforts. International development policies are becoming increasingly seen as an instrument in helping Belgian firms export to developing countries. The rest of the aid is being cut, and Belgium is repeatedly missing its own targets in terms of spending, in spite of recognized Belgian expertise in the field. At the international level, Belgium has been part of efforts to push for more fair trade arrangements, but has not been a leader in agenda-setting.

Cyprus

**Score
value_6**

Cyprus participates and contributes in development-cooperation programs within the context of its membership in the European Union, United Nations and other international organizations. Its main policy is tied to that of EU, and is manifested through international-cooperation and bilateral agreements in various fields. The country is a contributor to UNITAID, participates in financing mechanisms for climate change, and provides assistance for infrastructure development, social services including health and human development, and environmental protection. However, the country's total official development assistance (ODA) amounted to only 0.16% of GDP in 2011. To reach its individual ODA target of 0.33% of gross national income by 2015, Cyprus would need to increase its annual provision of aid by €38 million, which is highly unlikely given the country's condition of post-crisis austerity.

Actions and policies do not appear to form part of a specific national strategy; rather, they take place primarily within existing international frameworks. The country appears to have little agenda-setting ambition in terms of pursuing specific initiatives of its own design.

Citation:

1. Data on ODA, Cyprus,

[http://www.cyprusaid.gov.cy/planning/cyprusaid.nsf/all/DAB6D9BBCC7DEF8DC2257C36003CD833/\\$file/2012%20-%20ENGLISH.pdf?openelement](http://www.cyprusaid.gov.cy/planning/cyprusaid.nsf/all/DAB6D9BBCC7DEF8DC2257C36003CD833/$file/2012%20-%20ENGLISH.pdf?openelement)

Greece

Score 4 Until the onset of the economic crisis, Greece used to be active in assisting less developed countries, but later focused on managing its own national social policy problems. Still, under the crisis, Greece participated in all of the European Union's decision-making efforts related to global social policy. In fact, Greece has continued

to provide humanitarian assistance to developing areas of the world: in 2012, Greece contributed \$33 million to humanitarian assistance.

Data on the contribution of different countries to humanitarian aid are reported in chapter 2 of the “Global Humanitarian Assistance (GHA) Report 2013” available at <http://www.globalhumanitarianassistance.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/GHA-Report-2013.pdf>

Israel

Score 4

Israeli policy regarding global inequalities mainly encompasses offering humanitarian, medical and financial aid to developing countries during emergencies. In recent decades, this aid has been expanded to technological and agriculture knowledge-sharing. The government’s Center for International Cooperation (MASHAV) oversees cooperation with other developed countries and is responsible for launching emergency-assistance missions.

Although Israel signed a number of international cooperation agreements with parties such as the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), it is not considered to be a leader or an agenda setter in global fair trade policies. It is, however, improving its regulatory structure according to international trade agreements and WTO standards. In response to the 2011 social protests it dismantled some import barriers and announced a further initiative to eliminate or reduce import duties on items such as electrical appliances, textiles and apparel, and food.

Citation:

Ben Horin, Yitzhak, “Israel to aid developing countries,” Ynet website 18.12.2008

“Humanitarian aid: Israel,” StandWithUS official booklet 2010

“Israel and UNIDO sign aid cooperation agreement,” Permanent Mission of Israel to the United Nations website, 14.5.2012.

<http://www.mfa.gov.il/MFAHeb/Gene ral+info/departments+and+sections/m ashav+Israels+Agency+for+Internatio nal+Development+Cooperation.htm>

“Trade policy review: Israel”, WTO 2012:

http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/tp_r_e/tp372_e.htm.

Donor States Should Support Efforts by Developing Countries to Eradicate Poverty, Delegates Say as Second Committee Discusses Secretary-General’s Report, 20.10.2014,

<http://www.un.org/press/en/2014/gaef3402.doc.htm>.

Romania

Score 4

Even though in theory Romania became a donor of development assistance following its EU accession, in practice the Romanian government shows limited engagement in international efforts to promote equal socioeconomic opportunities beyond its borders, particularly in developing countries. The most important exceptions are a series of cooperation programs with neighboring Moldova.

Slovenia

- Score 4** With EU accession in 2004, Slovenia's status changed from donor to recipient of official development assistance. However, Slovenia has not been very active in international efforts to promote equal socioeconomic opportunities in developing countries. The few initiatives that exist are mostly focused on the former Yugoslavia. The prevailing attitude is that Slovenia has its own measure of socioeconomic problems to tackle and that potential Slovenian international influence is negligible. Still, Slovenia's official development assistance comes close to the EU target.

Bulgaria

- Score 3** The promotion of equal socioeconomic opportunities in developing countries is not on the agenda of Bulgarian society and its government. Bulgarian officials take positions on this issue only when they are required to do so by the agendas of international bodies such as the European Union and the United Nations. On such occasions, the behavior of Bulgarian officials is reactive and not proactive. However, Bulgaria does not resort to protectionist trade barriers beyond the structure of such barriers imposed by the European Union, and does not impede or attempt to undermine efforts by the international community to promote equal opportunities in developing countries.

Croatia

- Score 3** The Croatian government takes part in the activities of international organizations to which the country belongs; these are mostly in the field of international security and involve armed-forces personnel in various roles. The government does not have a well-developed international-development policy and is little more than a passive participant in most other joint international activities. Trade policy is mostly focused on regional and EU relations, with the government lacking an independent policy beyond this context. For trade issues related to international development, the government follows the policy of the European Union and other international organizations.

Hungary

- Score 3** Hungary pays little policy attention to developing countries. According to OECD statistics, Hungary spent \$120 million on official development assistance (ODA) in

2013, or just 0.10% of gross national income. The target commitment for 2015 is 0.33%; therefore a gap of 0.23 percentage points persists. ODA is directed to countries with strong trade links with Hungary both in the local neighborhood (Serbia, Ukraine) and in Asia (China, India), or where Hungary has been militarily involved (Afghanistan).

Citation:

<http://www.oecd.org/hungary/hungarys-official-development-assistance.htm>

<http://iif.un.org/content/brussels-eu-target-2015-oda-hungary>

Latvia

Score 3

As a result of government austerity programs, funding for bilateral development cooperation was reduced to a minimum between 2009 and 2011. As a result of this reduction, Latvia's ability to directly contribute to efforts to tackle global social inequalities is negligible. Latvia's ODA expenditure, according to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, was €7.9 million in 2012. This was equal to 0.8% of GDP, the lowest such rate of any EU country. Over 90% of ODA from Latvia is intended for multilateral efforts.

Citation:

1. State Development Cooperation Policy Plan (2012), Available at (in Latvian): <http://www.likumi.lv/doc.php?id=246719>, Last assessed: 20.05.2013

2. State Development Cooperation Policy Plan (2013), Available at (in Latvian): <http://www.likumi.lv/doc.php?id=255960>, Last assessed: 20.05.2013

Malta

Score 3

The Maltese government has very limited opportunities to help shape or advance social inclusion beyond its borders. What little influence of this kind it has acquired is related to its participation in international organizations (UN, WHO and so on) and EU ministerial councils. According to the European Union and the United Nations, the country devotes a below-average sum to official development assistance (ODA) purposes in comparison to its own GDP. In 2011, aid-related donations reached 0.25% of GDP, but fell again to 0.20%, in 2013. Malta has said it plans to achieve an ODA/GNI ratio of 0.33% by 2015. There has been some controversy over the amount of development assistance used locally by the government to provide for asylum seekers; however, the foreign ministry has stated that it plans to redress this imbalance.

Malta's development policy attaches special importance to countries in the Horn of Africa and in Sub-Saharan Africa. Countries in these regions are the main source of asylum seekers and clandestine immigrants for Malta (mainly Sudan, Eritrea, Ethiopia and Somalia). Malta's development policy seeks to assist with development

in Mediterranean states, notably North Africa and the Palestinian territories, by providing scholarships and other forms of aid. Malta also highlights the need to focus on the special characteristics and particular development needs of small island states, and already actively assists other small states through the Commonwealth by making available its acquired experience and expertise as a developed small island state. In general, Malta follows the lead of the European Union, and its policies on tariffs are in line with those agreed on in Brussels.

Citation:

An Overseas Development Policy and a Framework for Humanitarian Assistance for Malta
[www.foreign.gov.mt/.../Malta's%20Over seas%20Development%20Policy...](http://www.foreign.gov.mt/.../Malta's%20Over%20seas%20Development%20Policy...)

Malta : Donor Profile ec.europa.eu/europeaid/.../development...development/.../malta-donor-pr...

Over €360,000 in development aid for developing country projects. Malta Today 24/01/12

Transparent overseas development aid. Time of Malta 13/05/13

Sammut, J.M., The Goals that Malta want to achieve, Social Watch 2014

This country report is part of the Sustainable Governance Indicators 2015 project.

© 2015 Bertelsmann Stiftung

Contact:

Bertelsmann Stiftung
Carl-Bertelsmann-Straße 256
33311 Gütersloh

Dr. Daniel Schraad-Tischler
daniel.schraad-tischler@bertelsmann-stiftung.de

Dr. Christian Kroll
christian.kroll@bertelsmann-stiftung.de