



Global Inequalities Report

Global Social Policy

Sustainable Governance
Indicators 2016

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.

Sweden

Score 10 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 comparable 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 very strong.

The post-2014 red-green government has launched a campaign of “feminist foreign policy” which has gained international attention. International solidarity has a gender dimension, the argument goes, which has long been ignored. This foreign policy approach has been introduced in different international venues such as the UN and the EU. The new government has also become known for showing less tolerance than its predecessors with what it describes as “medieval” punishment techniques employed in Middle East countries. More broadly, the return of the Social Democrats party has re-energized Swedish foreign policy. It has become more visible but also more controversial.

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. In 2011, Denmark contributed 0.85% of GNI to development aid. The new Liberal government, which came to power in June 2015, decided to reduce Danish development aid but will still live up to the UN recommendation of 0.7% of GNI. There will be increased focus on the regions in the Middle East and Africa from where many refugees come. Denmark's humanitarian aid will not be reduced.

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.

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/oecd/development/oecd-development-assistance-peer-reviews-denmark-2011_9789264117082-en#page1 (Accessed 18 October 2014).

Foreign Ministry, "Øget fokus på nørómråderne og den humanitære bistand." <http://um.dk/da/nyheder-udenrigsministeriet/newsdisplaypage/?newsID=78F621ED-7A6B-4A89-B307-591316D6FCEE>

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 areas in which Estonia is acting as a trendsetter. 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 parallel to government efforts, NGOs and private enterprises work in the field of international development. Awareness-raising campaigns in the fair-trade movement offer one example of NGO activity. Due to the country's open economic policy and the absence of protectionist measures, 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

For several years, Luxembourg has contributed approximately 1% of its GDP to official development-assistance efforts. The country has focused its sustainable development-aid policy on poverty eradication and energy-saving programs, as well as on other programs that could help reduce carbon emissions in beneficiary countries.

Since 2000, the country's development agency, Luxembourg Development Cooperation (Lux-Development), has exceeded the U.N. industrialized-nation contribution target of 0.7% of GDP for development projects. Trailing Sweden (1.1%), Luxembourg spent 1.07% of GDP on public development-assistance funding in 2014 (EU-28 average: 0.41%). 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's development assistance focuses on training, health care, water-treatment, sewage, local-development and infrastructure projects, with a focus on supporting local initiatives 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.

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 served as a non-permanent member of the U.N. Security Council, elected in part on the basis of its strong contribution to cooperation policies.

Lux-Development has been responsible for the design and implementation of the country's development budget (€18 million in 2014) since 1992. Furthermore, about 17% of official development assistance is reserved for projects in cooperation

with 95 approved NGOs, which work in concert with the government minister responsible for cooperation and humanitarian action. In 1992, Luxembourg joined the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the OECD, which supports bilateral cooperation and monitors aid flows; this allows Luxembourg to work with other European countries on a regular basis. Luxembourg conducts multilateral cooperation together with international organizations. A total of €70 million of the country's official development aid (ODA) is intended for international organizations.

A recent DAC peer review recommended that policy coherence in the area of development issues be given a higher priority, and that coordination between state departments and Lux-Development be improved. Luxembourg has also implemented guidelines set by the OECD and the European Union to stop tax evasion on the part of developing countries or its citizens, although Luxembourg is one of the leading countries with regard to offering an advantageous tax home to companies seeking to avoid taxes.

Citation:

<http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/tgm/table.do?tab=table&init=1&plugin=1&pcode=tsdgp100&language=de>
<http://cercle.lu/le-zukunftspak-menace-lavenir-des-ong-de-developpement/>
http://www.lux-development.lu/files/documents/RAPANN_2014_web.pdf
http://www.cooperation.lu/_dbfiles/lacentrale_files/1100/1122/MAE-rapport%20EN_2014_web.pdf
<http://www.gouvernement.lu/5111541/27-cooperation-rapport>
<http://www.gouvernement.lu/4737059>
<http://www.wort.lu/de/politik/europaeisches-jahr-der-entwicklung-Luxembourg-liegt-an-der-spitze-54a6ce0a0c88b46a8ce4eafa>
<https://euaidexplorer.ec.europa.eu/AidOverview.do>
<http://www.globalpolicyjournal.com/blog/01/05/2014/worlds-top-donor>
<http://www.oecd.org/dac/peer-reviews/peer-review-luxembourg.htm>
<http://www.wort.lu/de/politik/luxleaks-und-co-einmal-anders-spart-euch-eure-entwicklungshilfe-557dcbbd0c88b46a8ce5b4f7>
<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 with regard to 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/aid-statistics> (accessed November 28, 2015).

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. It is also engaged in global health issues, the promotion of global education and efforts to prevent climate change. On the other hand, it maintains a high level of protectionism with respect to the import of agricultural products. As a response to the increased number of migrants that came to Norway during 2015, the share of money allocated to developing countries is likely to be slightly reduced.

United Kingdom

Score 8 Despite regular objections from politicians, the UK has been one of the few countries, which has maintained a commitment to devote 0.7% of GNI to foreign aid. In 2015, only Sweden, Norway, Luxembourg, Denmark and the United Arab Emirates did the same. Under the coalition government, this spending was ring-fenced against cuts and the recent spending review has reaffirmed the commitment.

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.

However, although the UK government has ring-fenced international development aid, this generosity has not been extended to the millions of refugees who, escaping war and poverty, have arrived in Europe over the last year. The UK government has repeatedly refused to shelter any refugee that has already made it to Europe. Instead, the UK government has offered to accept 20,000 refugees from camps in Syria over the next five years. Compared to the number of refugees already living in the overcrowded registration and aid facilities of other European Union countries, 20,000 is very little. While politically understandable in the context of the forthcoming EU referendum and recent general election results, this position contrasts sharply to the otherwise generous approach to international aid policy.

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. Recently, however, the federal government cut its foreign aid budget significantly. In 2014, Canada's foreign aid spending totaled CAD 4.9 billion, down from CAD 5.4 billion in 2013 and CAD 5.7 billion in 2011. This reduced 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. For the 2014/2015 fiscal year, overall foreign aid spending was CAD 5.7 or 0.29% of gross national income. However, the increase is made up of two factors: a one-off concessional loan of CAD 400 million to Ukraine in 2014-2015; and a double payment in 2014-2015 of CAD 441.6 million to the World Bank's International Development Association (IDA), which occurred due to a technical change in how countries make payments. If one subtracts these amounts, the actual aid budget is closer to \$4.8 billion, which is lower than that allocated in 2013-2014.

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 starting point of Czech development policy are the Millennium Development Goals. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) is the main coordinator of bilateral and multilateral development cooperation of the Czech Republic. Public institutions, private and non-governmental sectors are extensively involved in the dialogue about development cooperation priority countries and sectors as well as in on-the-ground activities in partner countries. Czech bilateral development cooperation focuses on projects implemented every year under the auspices of the Czech Development Agency (CzDA) in priority countries. Other Czech government bodies and authorities contribute to bilateral development cooperation as well: the Ministry of Finance through the Technical Cooperation Assistance on Public Financial Management program, Ministry of Industry Management, Ministry of Industry and Trade through the Aid for Trade program, and the Ministry of Interior through programs in the area of security and migration. In addition to these programs, the government, in connection with the refugee crisis, has taken a series of one-off decisions on targeted help and humanitarian assistance. As a percentage of gross national income, however, official development assistance has stagnated in recent years.

Citation:

Czech Republic Development Cooperation in 2014. Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic. http://www.mzv.cz/file/1609980/Leaflet_Czech_Devel_Coop_2014.pdf, accessed 03.11.2015.

Finland

Score 7

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. In 2014, Finland provided a record amount of humanitarian aid at over €105 million; the biggest recipients were Syria, South Sudan, Somalia and the Central African Republic. However, due to the severe strains in the Finnish economy, the government plans to make dramatic reductions in the amount of humanitarian aid it provides. Finland emphasizes the primary role of the United Nations in coordinating the provision of

aid, and in general channels its funds for humanitarian aid through U.N. 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. The Ministry for Foreign Affairs, in conjunction with external consultants, monitor the attainment of goals and the use of funds, and in June 2014 the ministry introduced an online service enabling anybody to report suspected misuse of development-cooperation funds. Generally, Finland is committed to promoting development, and has participated in a number of international efforts to promote equal social opportunities and fair trade globally. Surveys on the issue of development cooperation also indicate that the Finnish people perceive humanitarian assistance as an important form of aid. However, the overall efficiency of Finnish efforts is not high, and the country should not be counted as among the world's top aid initiators or agenda-setters. In short, in terms of advancing global social inclusion, Finland is a committed partner rather than a leader.

Citation:

"Finland's Development Policy Programme 2012", Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, 6/19/2012. Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, <http://www.formin.fi/public/default.aspx?contentid=251855>

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.

The dramatic increase in refugees arriving in Germany in 2015 has increased the German government's awareness of the importance of stable social, economic and political conditions in developing countries to national self-interest.

Lithuania

Score 7

Lithuania's government participates in international efforts to promote socioeconomic opportunities in developing countries through its development-aid policy. 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. Lithuania's development aid totaled over €30 million, at least three times below the contribution commitments made when negotiating accession to the European Union. It is hard to judge the real impact of Lithuania's development aid given the absence of independent evaluations. Over the last several years, Lithuania's aid has focused on Ukraine and other Eastern Partnership countries.

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.

Switzerland

Score 7

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. In November 2014, the National Council re-approved this policy

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. In this context, development cooperation policies have become controversial. Whereas the SVP criticizes development cooperation as ineffective and calls for SDC budget cuts, the policy network of Swiss private development-aid agencies advocate a shift in policy that involves the mitigation of North-South inequalities by revising trade arrangements that disadvantage developing countries.

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 been 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. In September 2015, the United States committed to supporting the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals. The U.S. has spent about \$4.5 billion on humanitarian aid in the Syrian civil war, and President Obama asked Congress to accept about 150,000 refugees over a two-year period as a part of the 2015 refugee crisis.

Australia

Score 6

Australia plays a significant role in the region with regard to 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 five 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 free-trade agreements (FTAs) with all major economies in Asia (ASEAN, South Korea, China and Japan) and in 2015 was a party to the Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement.

:

<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 offers virtually no subsidies to domestic producers, and does not maintain protectionist trade barriers to imports.

Iceland

Score 6

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

The Icelandic International Development Agency (Próunarsamvinnustofnun Íslands, IIDA) is a public institution associated with the Foreign Ministry established in 1981. Its mandate is to cooperate with and assist developing countries. Recently, IIDA reduced the number of countries in which it ran projects from six to three: Malawi, Mozambique, and Uganda. In late 2015, the government decided to merge the IIDA with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, a decision which critics claim will weaken the IIDA.

In 2009, Iceland's contribution to development aid amounted to 0.33% of GDP. This was reduced to 0.21% in 2012, well below the UN target of 0.7%. In 2014 the contribution was still 0.21% of GDP. 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) due to many years of sluggish economic growth. The quality of the aid provided has been improved in recent years. Assistance has been better aligned with Japan's broader external-security concerns, a

trend which may also be seen somewhat critically from the perspective of potential recipients. In early 2015, Japan formulated a new Development Cooperation Charter that stresses the principle of cooperation for nonmilitary purposes, the important role of partnerships with the private sector and local governments, NGOs, civil society organizations and other country-specific organizations and stakeholders others, an emphasis on self-help and inclusiveness, and a focus on gender issues. Effectively, the new ODA guidelines will also enable Japan to support ODA recipients with regard to security matters, for instance by providing coast-guard equipment.

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.

The conclusion of the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) in autumn 2015, which would encompass some 40% of global trade, could herald an eventual opening of Japan's agricultural market. However, opposition within Japan's farming sector is still strong, and liberalization could be sidestepped through a focus on food-safety standards. Moreover, as of the time of writing, ratification of the TPP was not certain in Japan (or elsewhere), and doubts remain as to whether the Abe government will indeed be able or willing to overcome domestic opposition.

Citation:

Ken Okaniwa, Changes to ODA Charter reflect new realities, *The Japan Times*, 29 May 2015, <http://www.japantimes.co.jp/opinion/2015/05/29/commentary/japan-commentary/changes-oda-charter-reflect-new-realities/>

Mina Pollmann, What the TPP Means for Japan, *The Diplomat*, 08 October 2015, <http://thediplomat.com/2015/10/what-the-tpp-means-for-japan/>

Mexico

Score 6

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. Mexico has also been active in financing international development, providing modest levels of foreign aid. Moreover, foreign policy continues to embrace the topic of South-South-Cooperation and supports regional development projects.

Netherlands

Score 6

Since 2011, Dutch development aid has been cut first to 0.7% of GDP (€4.5 billion), and again in 2014 to €3.5 billion. The Netherlands's ranking in the Commitment to Development Index fell from second place in 2005 to seventh place in 2014. Aid is

no longer focusing on poverty reduction, and will instead be concentrated on about 10 countries in the categories of (a) countries too weak to achieve the U.N. Millennium Goals independently, (b) fragile states in terms of rule of law, and (c) emerging economies. The driving idea is that “economic diplomacy” can forge a coalition between Dutch business-sector experts (in reproductive health, water management and food security/agriculture) and business and civil-society associations in developing countries. Expenditures on international conflict management have been added to the diminishing state budget for development aid. No cutbacks in the areas of women’s rights or emergency aid have been made. 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. The Dutch policy response to the recent refugee crisis has mimicked Denmark’s efforts, seeking to discourage refugees from coming to the Netherlands. All of this shows declining commitment by the Dutch government to global policy frameworks and a fair global-trading system; the aspiration is instead 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...)

Center for Global Development, Commitment to Development Index, 2015 (cgdev.org, consulted 26 October, 2015)

Additional references:

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

Poland

Score 6

Development Cooperation has become a more relevant issue in Poland since EU accession, even though it is still not a priority of the Polish government. While Poland became the 28th member of the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) in October 2013, it remains one of its smallest donors. In October 2015, the Kopacz government agreed to implement its new development program for 2016-2020 and aims primarily to support projects with NGOs in Ukraine, Belarus, Georgia and Moldova, as well as projects in East Africa and South America for a total of 1.5 billion Zloty annually.

Slovakia

Score 6

Slovakia ceased to receive 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. However,

official development assistance (ODA) has remained substantially below the EU target of 0.33% of GNI. Slovakia's top priorities with regard to ODA, as formulated in an official 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 interest to Slovakia. In line with this strategy, Slovakia focuses its bilateral development cooperation on three countries (Afghanistan, Kenya and South Sudan) as well as on several countries in the Western Balkans (Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia), Eastern Europe (Belarus, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine) and Africa (Tunisia), which it shares similar experiences of transformation.

Citation:

-Strednodoba strategija rozvoje 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. However, the level of overseas direct aid remains low at 0.13% of gross national income (GNI) reflecting Korea's role as a latecomer in this field. 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. For the past several years, Iraq and Afghanistan received the largest amounts of Korean official development assistance (ODA), in part due to U.S. pressure. 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). The Park government has pointed to the New Village Movement (a rural-development program adopted by Park Chung Hee in the 1970s under Korea's authoritarian regime) as a model for international development cooperation policy; however, this has proved controversial.

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>

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 \$967 million in 2010 to \$4.5 billion in 2015. The increase in ODA was mostly related to its response to the refugee crisis in Syria. Aid to Syrian refugees, provided by the Turkish Cooperation and Coordination Agency (TIKA) and the Disaster and Emergency Management Presidency (AFAD), amounted to \$1.6 billion in 2013. The ratio of ODA as a share of GNI rose from 0.32% in 2012 to 0.54% in 2015.

Turkey's development cooperation is provided in line with the Statutory Decree on the Organization and Duties of the Turkish Cooperation and Coordination Agency (TIKA), adopted in 2011. Turkey engages in bilateral development cooperation mostly with South and Central Asia and the Middle East, but also with Africa. Social infrastructure and services, notably education and health, as well as governance and civil-society capacity-building efforts comprise the priority areas of Turkey's bilateral development cooperation.

Under the auspices of the United Nations, Turkey will organize the first World Humanitarian Summit in 2016.

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 is 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.

Recent discussions have focused on the humanitarian situation in refugee camps outside of Syrian territory. Austria, as a member of the EU, has pledged increased payments to these camps via the United Nations. The next year will show if these promises will be kept.

Greece

Score 5

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. Since 2013, Greece has not contributed to humanitarian assistance in the same way, but in practice it has offered humanitarian assistance at the point it matters most, namely at its own shores. In 2014 and, particularly, in 2015, tens of thousands of Syrian, Afghani and Iraqi refugees landed on the shores of three large Greek islands (Kos, Lesbos and Samos) as well as smaller Greek islands opposite the coast of Turkey. The island of Lesbos has 100,000 inhabitants but in the first week of September 2015 hosted 20,000 refugees who had been washed ashore. Port authority officers registered the incoming refugees, while residents offered them food. Greek NGOs also stepped in, as the situation overwhelmed local Greek authorities. This does not amount to a concerted effort at humanitarian assistance by Greece, but one has to acknowledge Greece's efforts on the ground at a time when European Union officials were still pondering the number and distribution of refugees the rest of the EU members would admit.

Overall, because of the constraints on the government from the economic crisis, Greece has not helped curb inequalities in developing countries, but has done more than its share to help people from developing countries. It has received and helped, and continues every day to receive and help, refugees from developing countries of the Middle East who have fled their homes.

:

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>

Data on Lesbos and the rest of Greek islands receiving refugees are available at http://www.oregonlive.com/today/index.ssf/2015/09/greek_island_of_lesbos_pushed.html

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>

Portugal

Score 5

There has been virtually no change in this area vis-à-vis previous reporting periods. 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.

However, if the question were to be shifted to include foreign involvement beyond the financial and economic sphere, then Portugal is a “supplier of security” through its participation in U.N., NATO, and EU security- and humanitarian-support missions. Furthermore, in specific instances such as Guinea-Bissau, Portugal has been very active in attempting to stabilize national governments, promote security, and ultimately promote development.

Belgium

Score 4

The economic crisis has placed continued pressure on the government’s development-aid efforts. International-development policies, which are now split between the federal and federated entities, are increasingly being seen as an

instrument to help Belgian firms export to developing countries. Unrelated aid is being cut, and Belgium has repeatedly missed its own spending targets despite recognized Belgian expertise in the field, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa. At the international level, Belgium has been part of efforts to push for more fair-trade arrangements, but has not been an agenda-setter.

Croatia

Score 4

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.

Since joining the EU, Croatia's international assistance policy has improved. The National Strategy for Development Cooperation 2015-2020 has been adopted, and the country aims to increase its development aid to 0.33% of GDP by 2030. This includes funds for the European Development Fund, which distributes aid at the EU level.

Cyprus

Score 4

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, its official development assistance (ODA) amounted to only 0.16% of GDP in 2011. Its individual ODA target of 0.33% by 2015 would require an annual increase in aid by €38 million. No data were available on the relevant website for 2014 and 2015.

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.

1. Data on ODA, Cyprus
[http://www.cypirusaid.gov.cy/planning/cypirusaid.nsf/all/DAB6D9BBCC7DEF8DC2257C36003CD833/\\$file/2012%20-%20ENGLISH.pdf?openelement](http://www.cypirusaid.gov.cy/planning/cypirusaid.nsf/all/DAB6D9BBCC7DEF8DC2257C36003CD833/$file/2012%20-%20ENGLISH.pdf?openelement)

Israel

Score 4

Israeli policy regarding global inequalities mainly consists of offering humanitarian assistance, 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.

Israel is using its advanced technological position in the country's foreign relations with African and other developing countries (e.g., hydro-diplomacy).

Citation:

Ben Horin, Y., "Israel to aid developing countries," Ynet website, 18.12.2008, (Hebrew).

General Assembly of the United Nations, "Donor states should support efforts by developing countries to eradicate poverty, delegates say as second committee discusses secretary-general's report," United Nations official website, 20.10.2014: <http://www.un.org/press/en/2014/gaef3402.doc.htm> (English).

StandwithUS, "Humanitarian aid: Israel," StandWithUS official booklet, 2010, (English).

UN, "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/General+info/departments+and+sections/mashav+Israels+Agency+for+International+Development+Cooperation.htm> (Hebrew).

World Bank "Israel and World Bank Group sign agreement to share innovative best practices in water", The World Bank website, 17.6.2015:

<http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/press-release/2015/06/17/israel-world-bank-group-agreement-innovative-best-practices-water> (English).

World Trade Organization, "Trade policy review: Israel", WTO, 2012:

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

Romania

Score 4

Even though Romania became a development assistance donor following its EU accession, the Romanian government shows limited engagement in international efforts to promote equal socioeconomic opportunities beyond its borders, particularly in developing countries. The flow of refugees and migrants from the Levant, North Africa, and further abroad dominated Romania's attention in the period under

review, as the country sought to negotiate and implement solutions at the transnational, regional and national levels. In addition to participating in consultations held by the European Commission, President Iohannis spoke to the United Nations General Assembly on the need for comprehensive solutions to the flow of migrants into Europe.

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.

Spain

Score 4 The economic crisis had a significant impact on Spain's international engagement, as overcoming the crisis was the government's top priority, and policy initiatives that did not bear directly on this goal received much-diminished attention. Budget cuts severely restricted the funding available for policies and instruments designed to enhance Spain's influence abroad; development cooperation suffered, as did more general contributions to global public goods. Since 2009, the country's official development-aid (ODA) budget has declined by 70%. According to a report published by the development NGO Oxfam Intermón, Spain has seen Europe's largest cutbacks with regard to international development support. Currently, Spain gives just 0.14% of its GDP to official development assistance, far below 2008 levels when Spain peaked at around € billion in international development aid, or 0.45% of its GDP. At that time, that was seventh-highest aid share among the world's donor countries. However, the budget passed at the end of 2015 foresees an overall ODA budget equal to 0.21% of Spain's GDP in 2016, representing a 39% increase as a share of GDP.

Today, Spain – even though it is still engaged in a number of international development-promotion efforts – performs poorly in comparison with the other members of the Development Cooperation Directorate (DCD) of the OECD. In addition, the focus of Spanish external action since 2011 under the Rajoy government has been more business-oriented, which 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 2013 – 2016 period with the aim of introducing more coherence

with other policies (e.g., trade), fostering specialization, and better aligning the country's efforts with other EU member states' development strategies.

:

www.aecid.es/ES/Paginas/Sala%20de%20Prensa/Noticias/2015/2015_08/18-aod.aspx

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

OECD(2015), "Spain", in Development Co-operation Report 2015: Making Partnerships Effective Coalitions for Action, OECD Publishing, Paris. www.keepeek.com/Digital-Asset-Management/oecd/development/development-co-operation-report-2015/spain_dcr-2015-50-en#page1

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.

Hungary

Score 3

Hungary pays only relatively little policy attention to developing countries. The Orbán government adopted a strategy for international development cooperation and humanitarian aid for the period 2014-2020 in March 2014. This strategy was later transformed into a law that went into force in July 2015. Hungary's development cooperation focuses on countries which have strong trade links with Hungary (Serbia, Ukraine, but also China and India) or in which Hungary has been militarily involved (Afghanistan). While Hungary's net ODA increased from 0.1% to 0.13% of GNI from 2013 to 2015, it still falls short of the official EU and OECD targets.

:

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

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 was negligible. Latvia's official development assistance (ODA) expenditure, according to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, was €17.9 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. Economic recovery enabled

a slight rise in ODA expenditures to €19 million in 2014, which still represented just 0.8% of GDP.

Bilateral development cooperation focuses on the three top-priority countries of Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine.

:

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. The country devotes a below-average proportion of GNI to Official Development Assistance (ODA). In 2004, Malta committed itself to allocate 0.33% of GNI to ODA by 2015. Data published by the EU in second quarter of 2015 indicates that Malta's commitment in 2013 amounted to €14 million or 0.20% of GNI. Preliminary data for 2014 indicates that this has increased to €16 million, though the proportion of ODA to GNI remains equivalent at 0.20%. Nonetheless, projections for 2015 indicate that ODA spending will be €15 million, 0.19% of GNI. On the other hand, Malta is supportive of EU efforts to address the refugee crisis and has agreed to a refugee quota with the EU. Private sources also contribute significantly to development projects in other countries. Malta is also attempting to take the lead in development education and has introduced a master's degree in humanitarian action, which targets field workers in the Middle East, north Africa and the gulf region.

Malta's development policy attaches special importance to countries in the Horn of Africa and Sub-Saharan Africa, the main source of asylum-seekers and clandestine immigrants to Malta. Malta's development policy seeks to assist with development in Mediterranean states, notably North Africa and the Palestinian territories, providing scholarships and other forms of aid. Malta also 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.

:

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

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

Official Development Assistance Policy and a Framework for Humanitarian Assistance 2014 – 2020 p.8

Council Conclusions on the Annual Report 2015 to the European Council on EU Development Aid Targets p.9 26/05/2015

Address | Contact

Bertelsmann Stiftung
Carl-Bertelsmann-Straße 256
33311 Gütersloh
Germany
Phone +49 5241 81-0

Dr. Daniel Schraad-Tischler
Phone +49 5241 81-81240
daniel.schraad-tischler@bertelsmann-stiftung.de

Dr. Christian Kroll
Phone +49 5241 81-81471
christian.kroll@bertelsmann-stiftung.de

Dr. Christof Schiller
Phone +49 5241 81-81470
christof.schiller@bertelsmann-stiftung.de

Pia Paulini
Phone +49 5241 81-81468
pia.paulini@bertelsmann-stiftung.de

www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de
www.sgi-network.org