Adaptability Report
Domestic Adaptability, International Cooperation

Sustainable Governance
Indicators 2017
Domestic Adaptability

To what extent does the government respond to international and supranational developments by adapting domestic government structures?

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 has appropriately and effectively adapted domestic government structures to international and supranational developments.
8-6 = In many cases, the government has adapted domestic government structures to international and supranational developments.
5-3 = In some cases, the government has adapted domestic government structures to international and supranational.
2-1 = The government has not adapted domestic government structures no matter how useful adaptation might be.

Sweden

Score 10

Following Sweden’s EU membership, which came into force in the mid-1990s, there has been a sustained effort to adapt government, policy and regulation to European Union standards. The bulk of this adaptation relates to changes in domestic regulatory frameworks and policies, a development that does not impact the structure of government.

Estimates suggest that some 75% of the regulations that pertain to Sweden are today EU rules, not domestic rules. This pattern is probably typical for all EU member states.

Most of the adaptation has taken place not at the policy level, but on the administrative level, for instance by integrating domestic regulatory agencies with EU agencies.
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Zannakis, M. (2010), Climate Policy as a Window of Opportunity: Sweden and Global Climate Change (Gothenburg: Department of Political Science).

Denmark

Score 9

Being a small and open economy, Denmark has a long tradition of adaptation to international developments. The most intrusive form of international/supranational cooperation Denmark takes part in is with the European Union. Since joining in
1973, an elaborate system of coordination within government administration has developed. It involves all affected ministries and agencies, and often also interest organizations. In parallel, the European Affairs Committee in the parliament (Folketinget) has become an efficient democratic control of Danish-EU policy. Denmark speaks with one voice in Brussels.
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**Estonia**

Score 9

The most important supranational organization affecting domestic policies is the European Union. The coordination of national interests with the EU has been Estonia’s main priority since it joined the union in 2004. After consultations with the parliament and advocacy groups, the government has typically adopted a framing-policy document (e.g., Estonian EU Policy 2015-2019). Generally, the formation and implementation of national EU policy is the responsibility of the government. An interministerial Coordination Council for EU Affairs is tasked with facilitating coordination of these national efforts. The Coordination Council plans and monitors the initiation and implementation of all EU-related policy activities. Each ministry bears the responsibility for developing draft legislation and enforcing government priorities in its domain.

The Secretariat for EU affairs within the GO provides administrative and legal support in preparing EU-related activities. It advises the prime minister on EU matters (including preparations for European Council meetings), manages EU affairs across all government bodies, and offers guidelines for permanent representations. To prepare for the 2017 Estonian Presidency of the Council of the EU, a special task force, GO Presidency Team, has been formed with 31 positions. For the time of the presidency, 335 temporary positions are planned with relevant previous training.

The national parliament’s European Union Affairs Committee issues political positions on draft European Union legislation, provides political opinions, and supervises the activities of the government as it implements EU policies.

Cooperation with other international organizations (e.g., WTO, OECD, NATO) is the responsibility of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The vice chancellor for European-transatlantic cooperation is a member of the Coordination Council for EU Affairs.
Finland

**Score 9**

Most recent adaptations have resulted from Finland’s membership in the European Union. Finland was among the first EU member states to adopt the euro, and government structures have in several instances adopted EU norms. The Parliamentary Grand Committee is tasked with preparing and adopting EU legislation. Furthermore, oversight of the EU secretariat, responsible for the coordination of EU affairs, has been transferred from the Ministry for Foreign Affairs to the Prime Minister’s Office. A coordination system exists to ensure that Finland maintains positions in line with its overall EU policy with regard to issues under consideration at the EU level. This system involves relevant ministries, a cabinet committee on EU affairs and various EU subcommittees. These subcommittees are sector-specific governmental organs, and constitute the foundation for the promotion of EU affairs within the state’s structures.

Ireland

**Score 9**

The key influence in this area is Ireland’s membership in the European Union and, in the financial area, of the euro zone. Over the 42 years since Ireland became a member of the European Economic Community, the country has adapted institutions at all levels of government to allow effective functioning in Europe. Having successfully implemented the 2010 bailout agreement with the Troika, Ireland is now committed to adhering to the EU rules of economic governance contained in the Treaty on Stability, Coordination and Governance and the fiscal procedures contained in the European Semester. The unexpectedly strong economic performance since 2013 has greatly facilitated compliance with these obligations.
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Latvia

**Score 9**

Latvia has adapted domestic government structures to fulfill the requirements of EU membership, revising policy-planning and decision-making processes. During the 2013 – 2015 period, Latvia adapted its domestic structures to comply with the demands of the 2015 EU presidency. Beginning in 2014, Latvia began adapting to the requirements associated with OECD membership. In 2016, Latvia joined the OECD.

In order to ensure efficient decision-making and meet the obligations of IMF and EU loan agreements, Latvia created a reform-management group for coordination on major policy reforms. In 2012, this included changes to the biofuels support system,
reforms in the civil service’s human-resources management, tax-policy changes and reforms in the management of state enterprises. The group proved to be a useful forum for the consolidation of support across sectors for major policy changes and structural reforms. The inclusion of non-governmental actors in the group serves to facilitate support for upcoming policy changes. Although the reform management group was considered successful, at the time of writing it had not met since 2013.

**Lithuania**

**Score 9**

Lithuania’s policymakers have over time significantly adapted domestic government structures to international and supranational developments. A network of semi-independent regulatory agencies was developed during the pre-accession period. After the completion of EU accession negotiations, Lithuania’s system of coordinating EU affairs was gradually moved from the core government to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and decentralized to line ministries in the case of specific sectoral matters.

Lithuania has managed to maintain a rather good record of transposition and implementation of EU law, as illustrated by the low transposition deficit and relatively small number of infringement cases initiated against the country. The absorption of EU funds takes place relatively quickly – indeed, with 83% of EU payments already disbursed by 31 June 2015, as compared to the EU total of 71%, the country was ranked 7th among all EU member states in terms of benefits gained from EU cohesion policy. This indicates that Lithuanian institutions and procedures have been quite adequately adapted to the implementation of EU-funded programs. However, adoption of EU policy has largely taken place on a formal basis, rather than indicating substantial policy learning. Institutional adjustment has not led to significant structural policy reforms, with the partial exception of the country’s higher-education reforms. The central bank’s capacities were strengthened as a result of preparations for the introduction of the euro in 2015, while the adoption of economic-governance rules for the euro zone resulted in an expansion in the role and capacities of the National Audit Office.

**Canada**

**Score 8**

Organizational change is constantly taking place within the federal government and some of this change reflects international developments. However, unlike countries in the European Union, Canada is not a member of a supranational organization that may directly require periodic adjustments in the organizational structure and reporting relationships of the government and its public services. One notable exception has been the many changes over time in agencies relating to international matters, which include the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), and the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT).
March 2013 federal budget, CIDA was merged with DFAIT. The rationale provided for this reorganization was that an enhanced alignment of foreign, development, trade and commercial policies and programs will allow the government to achieve greater policy coherence on top-priority issues, and will result in greater overall impact. Development advocates have expressed concern that the reorganization will lead to a less focused and effective foreign-assistance program.

France

Score 8

The French government has a good track record in adapting national institutions to European and international challenges. This can be attributed to the bureaucratic elite’s awareness of international issues. This contrasts vividly with the government parties’ weakened ability to adapt national policies to the challenges stemming from the globalization of the economy, as there is often fierce resistance from trade unions, most political parties and public opinion at large.

Italy

Score 8

In the medium term, the most significant impact that international, and particularly supranational (EU-related) developments have had upon the structure and working of the government concerns the role of the minister of finance and of the treasury. Because of budgetary requirements deriving from European integration and participation in the euro zone, the minister of finance has acquired increasing weight in the governmental decision-making process, exercising an effective gatekeeping role with respect to the proposals of line ministries. Another example of this development is the strict internal stability pact, designed to meet the EU’s stability and growth pact obligations across all administrative levels.

The prime minister and finance minister have been central to the development of the government program, guiding the most important decisions. Other ministers have had a secondary role.

Starting with the Monti government, the structure of the government has been further streamlined by keeping the number of ministers and undersecretaries smaller than in the past. The Renzi government has slightly increased their number. There are currently 13 ministers with portfolio, two ministers without portfolio, eight vice-ministers and 35 undersecretaries.

In view of the importance of the EU powers, the government has increasingly adopted a double strategy with Prime Minister Renzi publicly attacking to obtain more favorable policies from the European Union, especially with respect to fiscal issues, and the finance minister negotiating discreetly to build an agreeable compromise.
New Zealand

Score 8

New Zealand has ample experience in drastically restructuring its public sector and reforming policymaking to adapt to new challenges. Major reforms were accomplished from the mid-1980s to the mid-1990s. However, this was done under a majoritarian regime, based on a first-past-the-post electoral system. Part of the reform package involved the change to a proportional electoral system, a move that was initiated by the voting public rather than the governing elite. Today, given the existence of a multiparty system and minority government, radical reform is much more difficult to achieve. In retrospect, institutional reforms delivered somewhat less than was anticipated and have at times been disruptive. The government at the time of writing was concerned with driving efficiency and performance improvements into the system, and was seeking to accomplish this with relatively limited emphasis on a major restructuring of government agencies.

Norway

Score 8

Government structures have remained fairly stable over time. There are some ongoing efforts to improve the institutional framework, although not primarily in response to international developments. It is common for new governments to reallocate tasks across ministries.

Examples of adaptation include the country’s early establishment of an Environment Ministry, the strengthening of the political leadership devoted to development cooperation, and the recent establishment of a Directorate of Integration and Diversity separate from the body dealing with immigration issues. In general, interdepartmental coordination has increased as a result of international activity, particularly so in relation to the handling of European affairs.

South Korea

Score 8

International and supranational developments that affect South Korea directly can trigger rapid and far-reaching change. For example, South Korea has reacted to the global financial and economic crisis with decisive action and massive government intervention. Global standards play a crucial role for the South Korean government. Reports and criticism issued by international organizations, such as the OECD or the IMF, or by partners, such as the United States or the European Union, are taken very seriously. The government has also declared its intention to increase its provision of overseas development aid in order to meet a global standard in the near future. However, the country’s degree of adaptability largely depends upon compatibility
with domestic political goals. For example, the government is relatively less responsive to global standards in areas such as labor rights or the reduction of non-tariff barriers. Yet in spite of quite a few “mock-compliance” practices, Korea is one of the most adaptive countries in the world. For example, the U.S.-Korea free-trade agreement has led to huge changes in a wide variety of legal arrangements. The fact that the South Korean economy is sensitive and vulnerable to shifts in the international market makes Korean government more adaptable to global developments.
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**United States**

Score 8

The United States has developed institutional structures that are able to respond to its international obligations. Climate-change negotiations, for example, have been firmly institutionalized in the Office of Global Affairs in the State Department. Similarly, the creation of the Department of Homeland Security was a domestic structural response to the challenges of international terrorism. Whether the policies of these units and agencies have been successful or have facilitated multilateral cooperation has depended on the policy choices of each administration and the disposition of Congress.

The Obama administration has continued to develop new institutional structures to adapt to policy challenges. The United States has been less prone to adapt domestic-policymaking structures to the requirements of the international-trade regime, in some cases resisting compliance with fully adjudicated obligations under the WTO and the North American Free Trade Agreement. Given the domestic political orientation of most members, Congress has placed low priority on compliance with international-trade agreements and regimes.

**Iceland**

Score 7

While not a member of the EU, Iceland has since 1994 been a member of the European Economic Area (EEA), and has integrated and adapted EU structures into domestic law to a considerable extent. Under the EEA agreement, Iceland is obliged to adopt around 80% of EU law. Iceland is also responsive to comments made by the Council of Europe, countries belonging to the Schengen Agreement, and UN institutions. As one of the five full members, Iceland is bound by every unanimous decision of the Nordic Council of Ministers. However, the council deals only with issues connected to Nordic cooperation. The structure and organization of Iceland’s government accords well with international practice, and seems to be under constant
review. The 2009-2013 cabinet attempted to streamline and rationalize the ministry structure in order to weaken the long-standing links between special-interest organizations and the ministries. Through a process of mergers, the number of ministries was reduced from 12 to 8. The Gunnlaugsson cabinet (2013-2016) partially reversed some of these mergers and has increased the number of ministers from 8 to 10.

**Israel**

**Score 7**

Following OECD and academic recommendations, the Israeli government advances various administrative reforms regarding regulatory burdens, decision making and long term planning. Periodic progress reports show gradual improvement in the dissemination of information as well as in decision-making. The government continues to adapt its domestic structures to international and supranational developments in an ongoing and constructive process. The Ministry of Economy and Industry produces an annual report reviewing progress on the implementation of the OECD’s recommendations. For example, the 2015 report presented progress made on effectively regulating labor laws. In 2016, the chief economist in the Ministry of Finance announced that Israel intends to sign the OECD’s Convention on Mutual Administrative Assistance in Tax Matters.
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**Luxembourg**

**Score 7**

Luxembourg has made progress in implementing European legislation. In terms of the transposition of EU directives, Luxembourg’s performance is moderate, yet it has improved in recent years. Given the size of the country, there is limited scope for improving the government administration’s human resources. A single civil servant is typically responsible for a number of tasks that would be assigned to an entire team in other EU member states. For example, European Social Fund (ESF) activities fall under the responsibility of only four civil servants who have other responsibilities in addition to European programs. Despite a lack of personnel, work expected by European and supranational institutions is completed. The government presented its national plan (Luxembourg 2020. Plan national pour une croissance
intelligente, durable et inclusive) in April 2013, in which budgetary mechanisms are adapted.

Luxembourg often responds to international requests by launching an ad hoc group. The country has also done well in conforming national law to EU directives, sometimes transposing laws verbatim. However, this does not guarantee that the law will be followed verbatim; differences between de jure and de facto interpretations have emerged.

Citation:


Malta

Score 7

The capacity of government structures to adapt to change improved during the period of EU accession and since membership. Malta’s preparations for assuming the EU Presidency have required further adaption to changing scenarios, especially at ministerial and bureaucratic levels. Consequently, there is greater awareness of the need to respond to international developments. Better coordination and more extensive training for the bureaucracy has also contributed to improvements. Parliament has demonstrated a greater willingness to engage with international
forums, which has increased the government’s capacity to address international issues, such as climate change, security policy and humanitarian issues. An increase in resources for research has improved the capacity of parliamentary committees. But with the part-time nature of parliament’s work, its impact remains marginal. This is reflected in the suboptimal performance of the parliamentary committee tasked with scrutinizing EU legislation.

Portugal

Score 7

The European Union is extremely important to Portugal in all respects. Since joining the European Economic Community (EEC) in 1986, Portugal has become an integral part of Europe with all the implications arising from integration into a huge variety of legal and organizational frameworks. While the government of Portugal has not yet applied all the EU laws and regulations, it is increasingly adopting EU policies. Obviously, since Portugal is part of the European Union, and dependent upon it for funds and trade, the country has had to adapt its structures accordingly.

Romania

Score 7

Romania’s capacity to adapt its domestic government structures in response to international developments improved under the Ciolos administration. The Ciolos government succeeded in increasing Romania’s absorption rate of European Union funds from 56.67% between 2007 and 2015 to 76.9% in 2016, resulting in European funds of 2.9 billion euros coming to Romania. This is a significant increase from previous years, and represents tangible improvements in an area where the country has historically faced difficulties. The increase was achieved by joint efforts by the Romanian authorities and the European Commission, including the restructuring of the Romania unit at the European Commission and better communication between Romanian authorities and the commission. With Romania’s Presidency of the Council of the European Union in 2019 in view, the Ciolos government paid more attention to EU affairs than its predecessor and started to think about how to adapt Romanian government structures to the requirements of the presidency. President Iohannis has emphasized Romania’s desire to be more deeply integrated into the EU.

Spain

Score 7

The Spanish government has largely adapted its domestic structures to agreements made at international and supranational level, although this adaptation has not always been implemented effectively. The most important impact has been produced by EU membership. The Spanish government’s coordination with and adaptation to the European Union is mainly the task of the Secretariat of State for the European
Union (within the Foreign Ministry). For obvious reasons, considering the economic significance of the EU agenda, the Prime Minister’s Economic Office (dealing with the structural reforms), the Ministry for Economy, and the Ministry for Finance also have important responsibilities in terms of coordinating cooperation between ministries on EU matters. More generally, all line ministries have to some extent Europeanized their organizations, although most ministries lack units dealing specifically with the European Union, and interministerial coordination is weak. Links with subnational levels of government (since the EU has a strong impact in many policy areas handled by the autonomous regions) are made through the network of intergovernmental councils or conferences (conferencias sectoriales), but this system has considerable room for improvement. The government has also responded to other international developments (such as NATO membership and the post-Kyoto climate-change regimes).

**United Kingdom**

The organization of ministries in the United Kingdom is a prerogative of the prime minister, and traditionally the precise division of tasks between ministries apart from the classic portfolios of foreign policy, defense, the Treasury, and the Home Office has been subject to considerable change. There is some evidence for international and supranational developments playing an important role in these decisions on UK government structures, a clear example being the creation of the Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC) with an explicit remit to engage in international action to mitigate climate change, although it has since been subsumed within new ministries following the change in prime minister in 2016. New cabinet committees have been set up, such as a committee on Syrian refugees in 2015. There have also been developments leading to new cross-departmental structures. The establishment of the National Security Council was a response to security-related issues, while the creation of a cross-governmental joint energy unit was motivated by the Ukraine crisis.

The United Kingdom has in some areas been an early, and sometimes enthusiastic, proponent of norms and practices that have been championed by international bodies, including those overseeing financial stability and transparency in government. The Open Data Charter and the Open Government Partnership (in which the United Kingdom plays an active role) were agreed under the United Kingdom’s G8 presidency. The UK is an acknowledged leader in open government and ranked 1 out of 92 countries in the 2015 Open Data Barometer.

Perhaps reflecting the prevailing UK attitude to “Brussels” before the decision to leave the European Union, there has been some resistance to policy recommendations from the European Commission, including the country-specific recommendations associated with EU semester process, unless they accord with government priorities like tax avoidance and establishing trade links. There is less
resistance to recommendations from, for example, the IMF, even when the recommendations of the IMF and EU are similar. European integration has led to procedural changes allowing central government to intervene early in the European policy-formulation process.

**Austria**

The Austrian government has adapted domestic structures to international developments, but with reservations. While the EU political agenda is generally accepted, the government has proved reluctant to implement specific policies, for example by defending the principle of bank secrecy. Contributing to this hesitancy is the fact that the government is often internally divided, for reasons both constitutional and political: First, the cabinet consists of autonomous ministers who cannot be forced to accept a general agenda. The position of the chancellor as first among equals means there is no clearly defined leadership by a head of government. Second, governments since 1983 have been coalitions. Coalition parties tend to work on a specific party agenda, and have limited interest in the agenda of the government as such.

In many cases, one governing party tends to favor implementation of international and especially supranational (EU) policies more than the other. Alternately, some parties seek to mobilize populist sentiments against the international or supranational level, identifying their own party as the defender of Austrian interests against foreign encroachment. It is especially the Freedom Party (FPÖ) – allied on the EU-level with parties like the French Front National – which plays the patriotic card against what the party identifies as “Brussels”.

Austria’s hesitancy in participating in an all-European policy regarding the Russian-Ukrainian conflict reflects a lack of adaptability. Austrian political actors tend to use the country’s neutrality status as a pretext for staying aloof. And Austria’s permanent neutrality, enshrined in the constitution, creates problems for Austria’s willingness to cooperate in a more strict common European defense policy.

**Belgium**

Belgium is one of the founding states of the European Union and an active member of many international agreements. In some instances, Belgium has even played a leading role in international agreements (such as banning the production of land mines).

However, this apparent enthusiasm for international and supranational coordination comes with significant caveats, as Belgium is today regularly criticized for not fully
complying with rules agreed upon at the European Union, United Nations or NATO. For instance, critics have taken aim at Belgium’s failures to respect the Geneva Convention, its failure to ratify the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, and its slower-than-average progress in abiding by EU environmental norms. This can again be partially explained by the persistent political tension between the country’s Dutch- and French-speaking camps, its complex and still-evolving institutional structure, and the fact that, due to decentralization, all governmental entities maintain (and tend to further develop) their own international relations in the area of their (sometimes overlapping) competences.
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Bulgaria

Score 6

The process of accession and membership in the EU did bring about significant changes in national, regional and municipal levels of governance structures, which demonstrated certain capacity to adapt. The EU process also meant that new channels for coordination and common decision-making had to be created in order to enable ministries to develop national positions on the various EU policies being discussed. Notwithstanding these changes, the primary governmental structures and their methods of operation have remained largely unchanged. One area in which organizational changes related to supranational developments seem to be leading to an improvement is the implementation of EU funded programs, especially in some spheres such as transportation and environmental protection infrastructure. Other areas, such as education, healthcare and social policy have proven much less capable of adaptation.

Croatia

Score 6

Croatia’s accession to the European Union and NATO has been accompanied by substantial changes in domestic-government structures, ranging from the reintroduction of RIA to the passage of the Societal Consultation Codex and the strengthening of capacities for policy coordination. The reshuffling of competencies following accession, for example with the shift in responsibility for EU coordination to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the integration of the former Central Office for Development Strategy and Coordination of EU Funds (CODEF) into the Ministry of Regional Development and EU, has not always gone smoothly. The ability of the Croatian administration to absorb the newly available EU funds has remained limited. The Milanović government’s long-awaited Strategy for Public Administration was passed only in June 2015 and addressed these concerns only partially. Dubravka Jurlina Alibegović, Minister of Public Administration in the Orešković government, presented her own plan for a reform of public administration at the beginning of 2016. Announced as the nucleus of a comprehensive law to be
adopted at the end of the year, it included comprehensive measures to improve the computerization of the Croatian administration, professionalize its human resources management and rationalize the organization of the various tiers of government. Due to strong resistance from within the administration and the collapse of the Orešković government, the plan was never implemented.

**Germany**

**Score 6**

As in other EU countries, EU regulations have a significant impact on German legislation. The country’s legal system is heavily influenced by EU law, but the federal government does not have a central policy unit specifically coordinating and managing EU affairs. Each federal ministry is responsible for all matters within its sectoral purview related to the adoption, implementation and coordination of proposals by the European Commission. Federal structures present specific problems in terms of policy learning and adaptability to international and supranational developments. In general, Germany did not seriously attempt to adopt government structures to the changing national, inter- and transnational context.

**Japan**

**Score 6**

Japan’s reform processes are usually driven by domestic developments and interests, but international models or perceived best practices do play a role at times. Actors interested in reform have frequently appealed to international standards and trends to support their position. However, in many cases it is doubtful whether substantial reform is truly enacted or whether Japan follows international standards in a formal sense only, with underlying informal institutional mechanisms changing much more slowly.

**Mexico**

**Score 6**

The Mexican governing elite have traditionally been very interested in adopting international standards and had a high degree of contact with international organizations and policy institutes. The major motivation for this is that multilateralism provides a strategic avenue for counterbalancing the country’s dependence on its northern neighbor. Moreover, many members of the policy elite have studied and/or worked abroad, mostly in English-speaking countries. Mexico’s presidential system, with its directing authority at the center of the administration, also allows the country to make swift changes. However, while adaptability of the Mexican government is comparatively high in formal terms, implementation of new approaches and policies is much weaker, particularly when it involves subnational entities, heavily unionized sectors or counters economic interests in society. In this
regard, one of the most challenging tasks for the Mexican government is currently to transfer the ambitious UN Global Goals (Sustainable Development Goals) agenda into domestic policies. In addition, while Mexico has signaled commitment to human rights in international arenas, within the country the protection of human rights and respect for the rule of law remain low.

Poland

Score 6

In the past, government structures in Poland have been gradually adapted to international and supranational developments, most notably NATO and EU membership. Poland’s good reputation and its growing influence in the European Union showed that adaptation had been successful, as the relatively high and increasing rate of absorption of EU funds underlines. The PiS government has been more inward-looking and has paid much less attention to the compatibility of domestic government structures with international and EU requirements in particular.

Slovenia

Score 6

Upon EU accession, Slovenia developed a complex system for coordinating European affairs, with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs serving as the central coordinator. The Cerar government left this system largely unchanged. In order to increase the absorption of EU funds, it created a new ministry without portfolio with responsibility for development, strategic projects and cohesion and changed procedures. As a result, the absorption rate has substantially increased.


Switzerland

Score 6

Switzerland directly implements international treaties which today account for about half of the federal legislation. Whenever Switzerland agrees to cooperate with other countries or international organizations, it attempts to meet all the requirements of the agreement, including implementation of the necessary administrative reforms.

With regard to the European Union, however, the adaptation is idiosyncratic. On the one hand, the government cannot develop institutional mechanisms with Brussels, as most Swiss do not want to join the EU and have expressed in several referenda their preference for limiting the number of bilateral treaties with the EU. On the other
hand, adaptations to EU law reach beyond these treaties and comprise also large parts of (domestic) economic law. However, the strategy of bilateral treaties has now been placed in jeopardy following the passage of the popular initiative capping mass immigration. Moreover, there are serious concerns as to whether the “strategy of bilaterals” is sufficient or sustainable. Conflicts between the EU and Switzerland have escalated since 2012, with the EU demanding that institutional solutions be developed to address the bilateral system’s weaknesses. Specifically, the EU has called for self-executing rules enabling bilateral treaties to be updated as well as independent institutions for the settlement of conflicts arising from the bilateral treaties. Switzerland has opposed these proposals. There is strong domestic opposition against any such institutional framework agreement, while the EU is not willing to continue the previous case-by-case updating of bilateral agreements nor the limited adjudication of conflicts by a joint committee of the EU and Switzerland. In addition, the uncertainty regarding the implementation of a constitutional rule capping immigration – which violates treaties between the EU and Switzerland – is preventing a swift development of new institutional rules. By fall 2016, this led to a standstill in the negotiations, with the EU insisting on such new rules. At the time of writing, this disagreement has prevented the signing of further bilateral treaties, on which Switzerland is economically dependent.

Australia

Score 5

Most government structures are essentially driven by domestic imperatives and are largely insensitive to international and supranational developments. The key government structures of Australia have not changed since the federation of the colonies. Indeed, only a few international events have been persuaded Australian governments in recent times to adapt domestic structures. The major exception is in relation to the treaties and conventions to which Australia is a signatory, particularly in the areas of human rights, anti-discrimination and transnational crime, where Australia has been a regional leader. Australian society has been reluctant to support a change in political structures and has resisted doing so when asked in referendums, for example with regard to proposed constitutional changes.

Australian society has demonstrated a willingness to ignore international pressure, such as international criticism of its migration policy or high levels of carbon emissions.
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Chile

Score 5

The modernization of Chile’s state is still under way, but national institutions have already become quite solid. In general terms, the reform of domestic governing structures tends to be driven by national fiscal-policy concerns, which implies that any innovations that might imply financial changes (such as a budget augmentation for a certain ministry or for a department within a ministry) are very difficult or even impossible to realize. Changes concerning topics that might be of future interest and do not directly affect current political challenges – for example, the expansion of a department’s staff or the creation of a new unit dedicated to topics of possible future interest – are driven more by fiscal or political reasons and political cycles rather than international or supranational developments. Law No. 20,600 of 2012 established environmental tribunals (Tribunales Ambientales) in three regions of the country (north, central and south), two of these had already been established, as well as a Supervisory Board for the Environment (Superintendencia del Medio Ambiente, SMA). This can be seen as a domestic adaptation responding to international and supranational developments. Chile’s membership in the OECD might create incentives for more substantial adaptation in the near future.
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Cyprus

Score 5

Comprehensive and inclusive plans for improving the country’s administrative structures have been adopted, while others are before the parliament for approval. Reform plans have been necessary because changes prompted by EU accession led to the creation of new institutions, but failed to touch the overall state structures. The 1960 constitutional order remains an obstacle. With Cyprus constituting a single region under EU’s Cohesion Policy, European policies aimed at strengthening the role of regions has been very limited. The implementation of reforms has so far focused on fiscal issues, and strategically engaging all administrative levels and units in policy design and implementation.

Greece

Score 5

No other country surveyed by the SGI has been subject to such intense or extensive scrutiny as Greece has under the Troika and the EU Taskforce. Loan conditionality has obliged the country to respond to an external agenda.
Government instability in 2015 took a heavy toll on domestic government structures which continued to operate under pressure from the country’s lenders to adapt to international standards, but in fact, the government delayed doing so. During the period under review, the Greek government passed legislation to change the grade scale and the wage grid of civil servants and the composition of the higher-ranking group of administrative officials, but it did very little to subject Greek civil servants to any kind of assessment or evaluation. In parallel, the government took steps to strengthen the coordination of government activities, through strengthening the PMO and establishing a Council of Administrative Reform, but such moves were rather the result of deliberation among the prime minister’s closest associates rather than an effort to adapt to international standards of government organization.

Netherlands

Score 5

Government reform has been on (and off) the agenda for at least 40 years. In this time there has been no substantial reform of the original government structure, which dates back to the 1848 constitution, “Thorbecke’s house.” Although several departments have been switched back and forth between different ministries, the system of ministries itself has not been substantially reformed (although the Ministry of Agriculture was definitively abolished and is now part of the Ministry of Economic Affairs). The Council of State, which is the highest court of appeal in administrative law, is still part of the executive, not the judiciary. The Netherlands is one of the last countries in Europe in which mayors are not locally elected but are instead appointed by the national government. In spring 2013, the Rutte II government largely withdrew its drastic plans to further reduce the number of local and municipal governments from just over 400 to between 100 and 150 with 100,000 or more inhabitants per district, as well as its intentions to merge a number of provinces (Regeerkakkoord).

In response to EU-level developments, the oversight role of the Dutch parliament has been strengthened. Information about EU policies and decisions reach the Dutch parliament through a large number of special channels. Although the number of civil servants with legal, economic and administrative expertise at the EU level has undoubtedly increased, no new structural adjustments in policy and legislative preparation have been implemented.
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Slovakia

Score 5

In the past, Slovakia’s ability to adapt domestic government structures to international and supranational developments, most notably at the EU level, has been weak. Despite several attempts at reform, the rate of absorption of EU funds has remained low, as the absorption of EU funds has been hindered by dysfunctional planning procedures, poor project design and selection, and the failure to comply with the requirements of environmental impact assessments.

Turkey

Score 5

So far, the EU accession process has been the main driving force behind changes or adaptations in Turkey’s domestic government structures. Almost all public entities maintain a unit for EU affairs; strategic-planning units can be found in all ministries. The European Union and Turkey have developed several projects aimed at harmonizing legislation with the body of EU law and increasing Turkey’s human resources capacity. Particularly, the EU Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA) and EU twinning programs are major mechanisms aimed at adapting central and local governmental structures to supranational developments, addressing issues of primary and secondary legislation, public administrative reform, education, justice and home affairs, health care, the environment, public works and so on. In the context of EU accession, the government was able to reform the National Security Council and limit the political role of the military. With respect to judicial reforms, the government created the Higher Council of Judges and Prosecutors (HSYK), modeling it on similar criteria found in other EU member states.

Turkey is a signatory of several international conventions that include binding provisions, and the Turkish government has attempted to comply with these international responsibilities. However, the government has fallen short on many requirements, either legally or institutionally. On issues such as child labor, gender issues, general working conditions and environmental standards, Turkey still falls below international standards.

In contrast to former tendencies of adopting international standards and practices, centralizing power and control have become the major drivers for restructuring governance during the review period. In January 2015, a new restructuring plan for the Turkish Public Administration was announced. According to this plan, the Armed Forces (TSK), the National Intelligent Service (MIT), the Gendarmarie and the General Directorate of Security (Turkish Police) will be organized under the Ministry of Security. Moreover, the major economic and financial sector institutions, such as the central bank, the treasury, the Capital Market Board, the Saving Deposit Insurance Fund and the Istanbul Stock Exchange (Borsa İstanbul) shall also be included in a similar reorganization process. Many observers have argued that the central bank’s responsibilities should be redefined.
The changes in the security sector have been revamped by governmental decree no. 669 on 25 July 2016 during the state of emergency following the 15 July coup attempt, subordinating the general staff of the Armed Forces to the presidency, the TSK to the Ministry of National Defense, the Gendarmerie and the Turkish Police to the Ministry of Interior.
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Czech Republic

Score 4

Since the mid-1990s, government activities have adapted to, and are strongly influenced by, the EU’s legislative framework. However, the main structures of government and methods of functioning are changing only slowly. The disjuncture between domestic structures and EU provisions and requirements is demonstrated by recurrent issues accompanying the use of EU structural funds on the national and regional level, the lack of effective control of the use of funds and the questionable sustainability efforts surrounding EU-funded infrastructures.

Hungary

Score 4

The Orbán governments have paid little attention to the adaptation of domestic government structures to international and supranational developments. In public, Orbán has stressed Hungarian independence, and has argued that his government is waging a freedom fight for national sovereignty against the European Union, the IMF, and most recently the US government. Major institutional reforms have even reduced the fit of domestic government structures with international and supranational developments. The radical reduction in the number of ministries, for instance, has created huge problems with regard to EU affairs, as the ministries’ organization no longer matches that of other EU countries or the structure of the European Union’s Council of Ministers. Nonetheless, the administration ensures more or less that the acquis is implemented. The absorption rates in EU structural funds application are relatively good. Due to the high systemic corruption in the EU transfers by the Fidesz oligarchs, however, some transfers were suspended in the late 2016.
International Coordination

To what extent is the government able to collaborate effectively in international efforts to foster global public goods?

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 can take a leading role in shaping and implementing collective efforts to provide global public goods. It is able to ensure coherence in national policies affecting progress.

8-6 = The government is largely able to shape and implement collective efforts to provide global public goods. Existing processes enabling the government to ensure coherence in national policies affecting progress are, for the most part, effective.

5-3 = The government is partially able to shape and implement collective efforts to provide global public goods. Processes designed to ensure coherence in national policies affecting progress show deficiencies.

2-1 = The government does not have sufficient institutional capacities to shape and implement collective efforts to provide global public goods. It does not have effective processes to ensure coherence in national policies affecting progress.

Denmark

Score 9

For a small country, Denmark has a strong role in the provision of the global public good. Climate change and development aid are high on the domestic agenda and the government tries to play an active international role in these areas. Denmark also has a long tradition of working to strengthen the United Nations, often cooperating with other Nordic countries to do so. This policy is relatively uncontroversial, unlike European integration.

As an EU member state, Denmark’s possibilities increasingly depend on the EU. Since the EU in recent years has adopted a relatively “progressive” environmental policy and has tried to exercise international leadership, there is no conflict in this area. When it comes to development aid Denmark, is among the countries that contribute the highest percentage of GDP to development aid, higher than most EU members. Even with the new Liberal Party government’s September 2015 decision to cut development aid, Denmark remains among the top five global contributors of official development assistance.

Denmark is also a global actor in other economic areas, including trade. Danish politicians are proud of projecting Danish values internationally.

There is a long tradition for Nordic cooperation within various policy areas. The Nordic Council of Ministers is the official inter-governmental body for cooperation
in the Nordic region. The council takes various initiatives on Nordic cooperation and there are regular council meetings where representatives of the Nordic governments meet to draft Nordic conventions and other agreements.


Germany

Score 9

The German government actively collaborates in various reform efforts promoted by the EU and other transnational and international organizations. In the context of the still ongoing euro zone debt crisis, the German government has played a leading role in organizing and creating stabilization mechanisms. The government strongly cooperated with European partners, particularly France, other countries, such as the United States, and international organizations in addressing the Crimea crisis and civil war in eastern Ukraine. Moreover, Germany had a significant role in achieving a consensus at the Paris Climate Summit in November 2015.

According to some observers, the great exception is the migration crisis, which Germany handled unilaterally. Only after Germany had opened its borders to the refugees coming from Hungary and other European states did the government start negotiating with other EU countries and the EU to develop refugee quotas. Proponents argue that Germany’s policy was well justified given its legal and humanitarian obligations. According to this view, Germany was ready to pay a high fiscal and political price for shouldering this humanitarian crisis. Based on this interpretation, the refugee crisis is an example where Germany is heavily involved in providing global public goods and acts in a non-selfish manner in-line with its international obligations.

Generally, Germany is clearly a constructive partner in international reform initiatives and is ready to accept substantial costs and risks in order to realize global and European public goods.

Norway

Score 9

Norway is very diligent in adopting legislation passed on the level of the European Union. The country is not an EU member, but still participates in most forms of EU policy coordination through membership in the European Economic Area (EEA), with certain exceptions in the areas of agriculture and fisheries. This relationship
does not give it a role in EU decision-making or policy formulation, however.

Norway has been an active participant in and promoter of various international conventions, forums and activities. Areas of particular interest have been human rights, development and peace. Relative to its size, Norway is a large contributor to U.N. and NATO peacekeeping operations, as well as to international organizations such as the IMF, the United Nations and the World Bank. The country participates in the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) and the Kimberley Initiative on so-called blood diamonds. Norway actively encourages developing countries to join the EITI, and is one of four contributors to the World Bank Special Trust Fund tasked with assisting in this program’s implementation.

**Sweden**

Score 9

Sweden has maintained a rather high international profile on a number of issues requiring international collective action. These issues have traditionally included disarmament, human rights, international solidarity and more recently, climate change and a feminist approach to international relations and peacekeeping.

Sweden tends to look at itself as an international broker and coordinator, though it may exaggerate its capacity in this regard. Certainly, Sweden, together with several other smaller nations, exerts some degree of international influence.
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**Finland**

Score 8

Typically, global public goods are best addressed collectively, on a multilateral basis, with cooperation in the form of international laws, agreements and protocols. Finland is a partner to several such modes of cooperation and contributes actively to the implementation of global frameworks. Finland is committed to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Kyoto Protocol, and EU legislation in its climate policy. The Ministry of the Environment is responsible for coordinating climate negotiations, and specifically, within the framework of the EU, Finland is committed to bringing down its national annual average carbon emissions. While the EU has set the obligation of a 10% share of renewable energy in transport fuels for 2020, Finland has set a higher national target of 20% and has employed legislation to ensure the achievement of this goal. Additionally, the Sipilä government program sets a goal of 40% by 2030.

In 2012, the government signed a Memorandum of Understanding in which Finland and the United States agreed to continue their cooperation in preventing the
proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Yet Finland cannot be regarded as a dominant actor concerning the protection of global public goals. Given its relatively high level of knowledge, research capacities, and the existence of frameworks for policy coordination and monitoring, Finland does have the institutional capacities to participate in global governance. However, the capacities are not utilized to their fullest extent.
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France

Score 8

France plays an active role in the international coordination of joint reform initiatives. The country contributes to the provision of global public goods. It has a long tradition of acting on an international level to take part in security/military missions, combat climate change (for instance hosting the 2015 United Nations Climate Change Conference in Paris (COP 21)), provide humanitarian and development aid, and promote health, education programs, and fiscal cooperation. This being said, the French government, as other governments, often takes positions that advance French (economic) interests. Concerning the European Monetary Union, French proposals contribute to defining European policies and often serve as a basis for compromise. However, the credibility of these initiatives may be damaged by the government’s inability to respect common rules France has signed, such as the stability rules of the EMU. This limits the government’s success in steering or influencing decision-making at the European level. Other striking examples include the French government’s attitude toward free trade discussions, in particular those concerning agricultural products, and environmental issues such as air and water pollution, where France has failed to implement on the national level measures deriving from supranational recommendations. On development assistance, there is still a big gap between official commitments and actual spending (0.37% instead of 0.70% of National Product)

Luxembourg

Score 8

Luxembourg is mainly involved in international reform initiatives in cooperation with the European Union. The legal framework for the launch of the European Citizens’ Initiative was passed by the parliament in 2012.

Luxembourg is ranked high within the European Union for the inclusiveness of its welfare benefits, as its programs are both generous and wide-ranging. However, with a Gini index coefficient of 28.5 in 2015, Luxembourg is a middling performer within the EU-28 (which has an average Gini index coefficient of 31). The generous social
transfers and the high share of social transfers in relation to total income, not only reduce poverty risks, but also sustainably strengthen social cohesion.

The country’s Gini index score highlights the positive effects of government transfer policies. However, Luxembourg also retains a number of labor-market protection measures and unsustainable pension policies; both provide incentives to leave the labor market early and opt instead for replacement revenues. Attitudes of the insured – mainly residents and nationals – are partly still those of consumers of welfare provisions. The system’s main weakness is the “early exit” attitude which is expressed by many residents.
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New Zealand

Score 8

Given the isolated geopolitical position of New Zealand, the country participates proactively in many international organizations and in the international coordination of joint reform initiatives. Major areas include issues regarding the Antarctic region, disarmament and proliferation, environmental protection, and human rights. New Zealand is a member of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum, the Commonwealth, the OECD, the United Nations, and the World Trade Organization. Free trade is a central preoccupation within foreign relations, especially in the Asian region. Having signed the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN)-Australia-New Zealand agreement and a bilateral agreement with Malaysia and Korea in recent years, current efforts are directed at deepening its “comprehensive strategic partnership” with China and continuing negotiations with India and Russia. New Zealand has been an enthusiastic supporter of the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) Agreement. Negotiations on a Partnership Agreement on Relations and Cooperation (PARC) between New Zealand and the European Union (EU) were concluded in July 2014. The agreement is a platform for pursuing New Zealand’s ambitions for a free-trade agreement with the EU. New Zealand is a member of the United Nations Security Council during the 2015 to 2016 term. It has been very active in campaigning for a humanitarian response to the situation in Syria.
Portugal

Score 8

Although Portugal is small, relatively poor, and not very influential as a nation, it is a member of the European Union, the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, the Council of Europe, NATO, OECD, the World Trade Organization, the Community of Portuguese Language Countries (Comunidade dos Países de Língua Portuguesa, CPLP), among other groups. It works with other nations through these organizations to develop policies. Given the country’s size and importance, it collaborates quite effectively in shaping and implementing collective efforts to provide global public goods.

Portugal punches well above its weight in military diplomacy through participation in peacekeeping and humanitarian relief programs under the auspices of the European Union, the United Nations and NATO. The last president of the European Commission and the incoming Secretary General of the United Nations are former prime ministers of Portugal. Between 1995 and 1996, Dr. Freitas do Amaral was president of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

United States

Score 8

The United States sometimes leads international efforts to pursue collective goods – sometimes, indeed, effectively controlling those efforts – while sometimes preferring unilateral approaches that withhold support from international forums. Its institutional structures and political traditions – especially the role of presidential leadership – accommodate all of these approaches. But the United States often cannot act effectively unless a national consensus or single-party control of the government enables the president and Congress to agree on a strategy.

President Obama’s strategy in the Middle East, for example, has been hampered by conflict with Congress over support for Israel. Most often, the United States not only collaborates in reform initiatives promoted by international forums, but actively works to shape their agenda. The United States is also an effective participant in the G-7/8 process. The most notable change under the Obama administration has been the move toward participation in broader international forums such as the G-20 that include emerging-market countries such as China, Brazil and India. This trend is also visible in the Major Economies Forum for Climate Change. Altogether, this signals a
departure from the focus on Europe and the transatlantic arena, and may also imply a reduced reliance on NATO.

Australia

Australia’s comparatively small population and economy, isolated geographic location and status as a South Pacific regional power has tended to work against the country’s ability to influence global reform efforts. Nonetheless, there is a governmental culture of seeking to participate in international forums or organizations, including those focused on reform. Primary emphasis tends to be on the Asia-Pacific region, although Australia is also a strong advocate of reducing trade barriers for agricultural products worldwide.

Australia’s international reputation has suffered considerably in the last two decades. Both the Howard and the Abbott governments failed to provide constructive inputs within the context of international forums. For example, the Abbott government permitted the G-20 summit in November 2014 to become an anti-Putin event. By contrast, Labor governments, Kevin Rudd’s in particular, have been overly ambitious. Rudd’s plans for an Asia-Pacific Community were hastily developed and criticized by his own government’s adviser. Prime Minister Turnbull has steered a much more cooperative course in his first months in office.
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Belgium

Belgium hosts various supranational institutions, including the majority of the offices of the European Union. The country has always displayed enthusiasm toward joint-reform initiatives. This can be illustrated by the large number of Belgian politicians involved in the highest levels of such organizations (e.g., Herman Van Rompuy, who was the President of the European Council; Guy Verhofstadt, leader of the liberal group in the European Parliament). Moreover, the country’s small size makes it heavily dependent on international coordination. It therefore supports international reform efforts in areas such as tax systems, carbon-dioxide regulation, and as of 2015, on the European equivalent of the American Foreign Account Tax Compliance Act. However, with regard to implementation, Belgium does not always fulfill its commitments.
Chile

Score 7

The government is endowed with the institutional capacity to contribute actively to international efforts to foster the provision of global public goods. The government actively participates in the international coordination of joint reform initiatives. This is underlined by the fact that Chile represents one of the most active countries in Latin America with regard to international policymaking initiatives. However, the impacts of national policies on these global challenges are not always systematically assessed and then incorporated into the formulation, coordination and monitoring of policies across government.

Ireland

Score 7

The country contributes to international efforts to foster the provision of global public goods primarily through its active participation in European policymaking institutions. Irish government structures have been progressively altered to support this capacity.

Ireland has continued to maintain a relatively high level of overseas development assistance since the onset of the economic crisis. It also continues to play an active part in the development of the European response to climate change. The Irish and Kenyan ambassadors co-facilitated the final intergovernmental negotiations that led to the adoption of the UN’s Global Goals (Sustainable Development Goals) in 2015.
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Italy

Score 7

The ability of Italian governments to take a leading role in international efforts is generally limited. This is in part due to the country’s relatively small size, but also because Italian politics tends to focus on internal matters. Moreover, frequent changes in political leadership have made it difficult to provide a strong and clear position in international efforts. There have been occasional exceptions when the government has been more active on a specific issue (such as the abolition of death penalty, or in the promotion of peace talks in the Middle East). The Renzi government has mainly focused on the EU level, with the executive actively engaged in EU policy discussions promoting the need for economic growth over simple fiscal balance. With regard to the immigration crisis, the Italian government is also engaged in promoting solidarity among EU member states. Through its presidency of the European Council in 2014, the government secured some agreements. These
included the implementation of the EU’s Frontex Triton operation, which replaced Italy’s Mare Nostrum mission and aims to tackle the issue of migrants crossing the Mediterranean Sea in the hope of entering the EU.

In general, the government has increased domestic awareness of Italy’s international responsibilities and consistently worked toward increasing Italy’s influence in EU decision-making processes.

Japan

Score 7

In recent years, Japan has been actively involved in the G-20 mechanism designed to meet the challenges of global financial turmoil. It held the 2016 G-7 meeting, giving it a chance to influence global agendas. However, concrete results from the 2016 G-7 are scarce. A collective commitment to expansionary fiscal policy among the G-7, as desired by Japan, could not be achieved. Japan is less visible in international or global settings than might be expected in view of its substantial global economic role. Since Abe’s election in late 2012, there is some more continuity and international visibility, though not in terms of spearheading multilateral initiatives.

The Japanese constitution makes it difficult for Japan to engage in international missions that include the use of force, although it can legally contribute funds. In 2015, despite considerable public opposition, new security laws were passed that allow military intervention overseas in defense of allies. Also in 2015, Japan and the United States overhauled their Mutual Defense Guidelines to allow for deeper cooperation and emphasize the global nature of the bilateral alliance.

Japan has actively supported and contributed to regional Asia-Pacific initiatives, for instance financial cooperation under the Chiang Mai Initiative (CMI). More recently, China has emerged as increasingly influential actor shaping regional initiatives such as the recently established Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB), which Japan has not yet joined. In response to China’s One Belt One Road initiative, Japan has started a Partnership for Quality Infrastructure, for which Prime Minister Abe in 2016 announced $200 billion to be spent globally until 2020.

Japan has not played a leading role in global environmental-policy efforts, particularly in the post-Kyoto Protocol negotiations.
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Lithuania

Score 7

Lithuania actively engages in international policy cooperation on behalf of democracy and market-economic systems, in particular by providing encouragement to its eastern neighbors (the Eastern Partnership countries) to reform, by providing technical and financial assistance, and by serving as an advocate for their interests within the EU institutional framework. Lithuania has been part of the International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan since 2005. The country’s policymakers have managed to coordinate their involvement in these international fields quite effectively. In 2012, Lithuania joined the OECD forum for transparency and the exchange of information for tax purposes, and completed a first compliance assessment. In 2015, Lithuania was invited to start its accession process to the OECD. In the second half of 2013, Lithuania took over the rotating presidency of the European Council, and was afterward assessed by other EU institutions and member states as performing effective work. Furthermore, Lithuania became a non-permanent member of the U.N. Security Council for the 2014 to 2015 term. The inter-party agreement, which includes a commitment to progressively increase defense spending to 2% of GDP by 2018, is further evidence of a willingness to support NATO. However, the government has been less willing or able to contribute to such global challenges as climate change or trade liberalization (except in the context of its presidency of the European Council presidency).
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Netherlands

Score 7

The Netherlands has been an avid protagonist in all forms of international cooperation since the Second World War. However, research has shown that since the late 1970s, 60% of EU directives have been delayed (sometimes by years) before being transposed into Dutch law. The present-day popular attitude to international affairs is marked by reluctance, indifference or rejection. This has had an impact on internal and foreign policy, as indicated by the Dutch shift toward assimilationism in integration and immigration policies; the decline in popular support and subsequent lowering of the 1%-of-government-spending-norm for development aid; the shift in the government’s attitude toward being a net contributor to EU finances; and the rejection of the EU referendum and the recent rejection of the EU treaty with Ukraine in a non-binding referendum. The change in attitudes has also negatively affected government participation and influence in international coordination of policy and other reforms. Since 2003, the Dutch States General have been more involved in preparing EU-related policy, but largely through the lens of subsidiarity and proportionality – that is, in the role of guarding Dutch sovereignty. However, Dutch ministers do play important roles in the coordination of financial policies at the EU level. Indeed, it is only since the beginning of the banking and financial crisis
that the need for better coordination of international policymaking by the Dutch government has led to reforms in the architecture of policy formulation. The sheer number of EU top-level meetings between national leaders forces the Dutch prime minister to act as minister of general and European affairs, with heavy support from the minister of finance. In the first months of 2016, Prime Minister Rutte has acted as chair of the European Union’s Council of Ministers, where he played a leading role in the negotiations with Turkey over stopping the influx of refugees from the Middle East. Immediately after the United Kingdom’s Brexit referendum, Prime Minister Rutte explicitly stressed the need for the Netherlands to part of a well-functioning European Union.
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South Korea

Score 7

Compared to the Lee Myung-bak administration, the Park administration was far less global in its orientation. Under the Lee administration, the government took a considerably more active role in international organizations. During this period, South Korea increased its contribution to the World Bank and the IMF, and was an active participant in the G-20. South Korea has also increased its development-cooperation efforts, and became a member of the OECD Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC) in 2009. In 2011, South Korea hosted the OECD High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan. However, the Park administration was much more oriented toward the traditional “four-country diplomacy” that focuses on relations with the United States, Japan, China and Russia, with the primary goal of achieving unification with North Korea. The Park administration also if somewhat less enthusiastically continued to increase Korean development cooperation, and signed the Paris agreement on reducing greenhouse-gas emissions.
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Spain

Score 7

In 2016, Spain completed its second year as a non-permanent member of the United Nations Security Council (UNSC). In addition to a general UNSC role, Spain chaired the Iran and North Korea sanctions committees, as well as the Committee on the
Non-proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction. Spain has manifested a clear commitment to promoting human rights, respect for international law, a proactive agenda on terrorism and greater attention to gender issues (this latter issue expressed in particular through Resolution 2242 on Women and Peace, adopted in October 2015). Apart from its UNSC membership, Spain continues to participate in other international efforts to provide global public goods (financial stability, economic development, security, environment, education, governance, etc.) as one of the leading EU member states, and as a permanent guest at the G-20 summits. It has also contributed to international forums and actions responding to challenges such as climate change (Paris summit), energy supply, illegal migration (in part through bilateral agreements in Northern Africa), global terrorism, and peacekeeping (with Spanish troops deployed as a part of U.N., NATO and EU missions in Lebanon, Sahel, the Horn of Africa waters and the Baltic region). However, Prime Minister Rajoy and other government leaders have done little to ensure that the impact of national policies on these global issues has been systematically assessed and incorporated into the formulation, coordination and monitoring of internal policies across governments. Spain’s government has also played only a small role in addressing the refugee crisis, despite parliamentary and civil-society criticism.


Austria

Score 6

Within the European Union, the government is obliged to collaborate with EU institutions. This collaboration is rarely controversial. In other matters (e.g., within the framework of the WTO, the Bretton Woods institutions, and the United Nations), the Austrian government tends to play a rather low-key role, usually trying to follow a general EU policy if such a policy exists. In some fields (e.g., environmental protection), the government tends to promise more on the international level than it is willing or able to implement at home. During the debate about CETA, some members of the Austrian government (from the Social Democratic Party) attempted to improve some details even after the European Commission and the Canadian government had reached an agreement. In the end, the Austrian government, represented by the social democratic chancellor, signed CETA.

Canada

Score 6

Canada’s government definitely has the institutional capacity to contribute actively to international efforts to foster the provision of global public goods. Indeed, it has made many contributions in this area throughout its history. However, the political will and the desire for Canada to be seen as a model global citizen was lacking under
the previous Conservative government. For example, it quietly pulled out of the U.N. anti-drought convention in 2013, making Canada the only country in the world not to be taking part in the convention. At the first-ever U.N. World Conference on Indigenous Peoples in 2014, Canada was the only U.N. member country to reject a landmark indigenous-rights document.

The new Liberal government has stated that it seeks to return Canada to active participation in international bodies like the United Nations (UN). In September 2016, Prime Minister Trudeau spoke to the UN General Assembly and outlined Canada’s commitment to global affairs in an effort to win Canada a seat on the UN Security Council, a seat not held since 2000. Climate change is among Prime Minister Trudeau’s declared priorities, as demonstrated in Paris at the UN Climate Change Conference in 2015. In addition, to help ease the current refugee crisis, Canada has welcomed over 30,000 refugees as of October 2016.

Latvia

Latvia largely contributes to international actions through engaging in the development of EU policy positions.

Institutional arrangements for the formulation of Latvia’s positions on issues before the European Union are formalized. The system is managed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, with particular sectoral ministries developing the substance of Latvia’s various positions. The process requires that NGOs be consulted during the early policy-development phase. In practice, ministries implement this requirement to varying degrees. NGOs themselves often lack the capacity (human resources, financial resources, time) to engage substantively with the ministries on an accelerated calendar.

Draft positions are coordinated across ministries and approved in some cases by the sectoral minister, and in other cases by the Council of Ministers. Issues deemed to have a significant impact on Latvia’s national interests are presented to the parliament’s European Affairs Committee, whose decision is binding. The committee considers approximately 500 national positions per year.

During the first six months of 2015, Latvia held the presidency of the Council of the European Union. Latvia’s first experience with the presidency was considered a success, with the country providing appropriate leadership both on expected challenges, such as returning Europe to economic growth, and unexpected challenges, such as the rapidly escalating refugee crisis and terrorist activity in Europe.
Slovakia

Score 6

Because of its size, Slovakia’s capacity to shape strategic global frameworks is limited. For a long time, the country was eager to be seen as a reliable and trustworthy partner within NATO and EU. In recent years, however, this reputation and Slovakia’s standing in the EU has suffered from the Fico governments’ positions on the Greek debt crisis, relations to Russia and the refugee issue, where Slovakia has joined ranks with the other Visegrad countries. This stance made it difficult for Fico to be accepted as an “honest broker” during Slovakia’s first EU presidency in the second half of 2016. As Fico was very much willing to make the presidency a success, he faced a balancing act reconciling mainstream EU positions with his own views.

Turkey

Score 6

Concerning international security and foreign aid, Turkey’s presence in UN peacekeeping operations in Afghanistan, Kosovo, Lebanon, Somalia, Haiti and the Democratic Republic of Congo is noteworthy. The government has continued its efforts to mediate in the Balkans, the Middle East and the Black Sea/Caucasus region. The government’s doctrine of humanitarian diplomacy represents the foundations of its global activities, with the main actors being the Turkish Red Crescent (Kızılay), the Turkish Cooperation and Development Agency (TİKA) and the Disaster and Emergency Management Presidency (AFAD). Turkey hosted the first UN Humanitarian Summit in May 2016 in Istanbul. This was considered an important step and a missing item in the UN’s 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

As a result of the ongoing civil war in Syria, Turkey had hosted and assisted more than 2.5 million Syrian refugees as of November 2015, with only a limited share of this group living in state-run refugee camps. The flow of refugees through Turkey on their way to Europe has become an urgent international issue. EU-Turkey dialogue on the refugee issue, beginning with a late-November 2015 summit, quickly became a bargaining dialogue over the EU’s financial contribution to Turkey’s attempts to stem the flow of migrants and Turkey’s membership negotiation process.

The emergence of the Islamic State (IS) terrorist group has represented a new threat to Turkey as well as others. It challenges established state frontiers, exacerbates sectarianism and refugee pressures, and claims ideological hegemony with its fundamentalist interpretation of Islam. Moreover, IS’s sudden advance into the Kurdish regions in Syria and Iraq has imposed new challenges for the Kurds in the region and to the Turkish government’s “solution process.” Turkey’s initial, rather unilateral policy toward IS was criticized by opposition parties, media outlets, and the international community. Later, in July 2015 and after the Suruç bombing, the
Turkish Armed Forces began to strike IS as well as PKK targets. The government subsequently realized that both the refugee and the international terrorist crises require an effective and coordinated action plan with the participation of all relevant parties. In addition to the consultative, coordinative and cooperative structures within NATO and the EU, Turkey also participated in the Vienna and Geneva talks as well as - after overcoming disputes with Russia - bilateral talks with Russia, Iran and other regional players in search of a diplomatic solution to the Syrian conflict.

Chairing the G-20 in 2015, Turkey effectively coordinated a wide range of policies and global issues including youth, refugees, climate change and transparency within the consultative framework of this multilateral body. In addition, Turkish politicians participate in World Economic Forum meetings and other regional and international organizations. The country is also one of the initiators and co-sponsors of the U.N.-affiliated Alliance of Civilizations initiative. Turkey hosted the 8th Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD) Summit Meeting “Migration and Human Mobility for Sustainable Development” in October 2015. In the final phase of the 2015 Paris summit on climate change, however, Turkey showed some reluctance with the agreement. In the end, Turkey signed the declaration, thus committing to decreasing greenhouse gasses by 21% before 2030.
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United Kingdom

The United Kingdom has long played a leading role in coordinating international initiatives and the country’s imperial legacy has contributed to its active stance on international commitments. It has led global responses in recent years, for example, in efforts to eradicate poverty in Africa, coordinate the EU response to the Ebola outbreak, promote reform in the financial sector, and combat climate change and corruption.

As a permanent member of the U.N. Security Council, the United Kingdom is very active in the United Nations in security matters and also plays a prominent, but sometimes polarizing, role in NATO. Government structures, such as the National Security Council, ensure consistency.

However, following the decision to leave the European Union, the United Kingdom will have to rethink its role in the world, especially among its European neighbors.
There is a risk that the demands on governance capacity of dealing with the various levels of negotiation will distract attention from wider global concerns. To this extent, domestic politics may be inhibiting international coordination.

**Croatia**

**Score 5**

Croatia has supported major global reform initiatives, especially in environmental affairs. However, the Milanović government did not pay particular attention to improving the country’s capacity to engage in global affairs or to assessing the global repercussions of national policies. Unlike her predecessor, President Kolinda Grabar Kitarović has not been very active in improving cooperation with the other successor states of the former Yugoslavia.

**Estonia**

**Score 5**

Engagement in international development is mainly the responsibility of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. There is an interministerial coordination group tasked with coordinating foreign-policy issues, which includes cabinet ministers. As in other areas, Estonia is good at adhering to international commitments but rarely takes the lead. Likewise, Estonia is not very good at assessing the impact of national policies on the global challenge of human development. Assessment takes place in some policy areas (e.g., environment, energy, IT), but integrated coordination and monitoring across policy fields is nonexistent. Given that policy collaboration is still in its infancy, one cannot speak about systematic communication between the government and other stakeholders. Yet in some specific areas such as development aid or combatting HIV/AIDS, various interest groups do serve as active government partners.

**Iceland**

**Score 5**

Iceland is an active participant in international forums, but seldom initiates measures. Iceland was a founding member of the UN, the IMF, the World Bank, and NATO. In 2008, Iceland sought a UN Security Council seat, but eventually lost out to Austria and Turkey. Largely, Iceland has worked cooperatively within international frameworks, but has not led any significant process of international coordination. Iceland did participate in peacekeeping efforts in Iraq and modestly participates in the work of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. In 2009, Iceland applied for EU membership. Those negotiations were postponed at the beginning of 2013 due to dissent between the coalition partners. The 2013-2016 cabinet did not renew negotiations and finally withdrew Iceland’s application for membership in 2015. As a result, the EU no longer includes Iceland on its official list.
of applicant countries. Even so, the EU may continue to view Iceland as an applicant country on the grounds that that the minister of foreign affairs was not authorized to withdraw an application approved by parliament without parliament’s approval.

This question remains unsettled. It remains to be seen if a national referendum will be held on whether Iceland should resume its membership negotiations with the EU. The cabinet of 2013-2016 rejected that option, producing a split within the Independence Party and leading to the establishment of a splinter party, Regeneration. Others ask why anyone should pay attention to a new referendum as long as parliament continues to disrespect the result of the 2012 constitutional referendum.
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Israel

As part of OECD accession in 2010, Israel pursued the creation of government agencies designed to coordinate, enforce and monitor administrative changes. Reforms aiming to improve interministerial cooperation and reinforce policy monitoring are still in the early stages of implementation, and have not yet stood the test of an international policy aimed at a global public good. In 2015, an OECD report examined Israel’s global cooperation in research and development (R&D), looking at the country’s administrative and economic capabilities. It found that while Israel is considered to be a leading R&D actor worldwide, advancement of coordination, accessible information and standardization capabilities is warranted. In 2016, despite the high investments Israel has made in R&D, the Israel Innovation Authority announced that it would stop providing grants to high-tech companies due to budget cuts.
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Mexico

The Mexican government is increasingly confident of its role in the broader world. Mexico has traditionally been supportive of international initiatives, in the hope of reducing the bilateralism imposed by Mexico’s close and asymmetrical relationship with the United States. Mexico continues to play an active role in the UN, OECD
and other intergovernmental organizations. It also remains an enthusiastic participant in multilateral organizations, including international financial organizations such as the World Bank, the Organization of American States (OAS) and the Inter-American Development Bank. Mexico has been playing an important role in the UN Global Goals (Sustainable Development Goals) process and participated in the Third International Conference on Financing for Development in 2015. In 2016, the government was also active in global demining initiatives and in the global compact for safe and orderly migration. Numerous policy and organizational recommendations made by international bodies have been adopted in the Mexican policymaking process. Thus, it has a supportive role in many international attempts oriented toward the provision of global public goods. Whether this engagement in international affairs is sufficient to shape international efforts is questionable given the country’s reduced level of international leverage in economic and security affairs. However, within its capacities, Mexico has contributed to strengthening multilateralism. In this regard, governments in recent years have also attempted to take a mediating role in international fora between the interests of developed and developing countries, which is a change compared to the traditional aspirations of Mexico to become a speaker for the developing world. Against the backdrop of political changes in the United States, the Mexican government can be seen as a fervent promoter of multilateralism in a time often perceived as an international crisis for multilateralism.

Poland

Score 5

With the new government, Poland’s international orientation has changed. Although Prime Minister Szydło and her cabinet members do not reject cooperation within the EU per se, they detest all steps towards a deeper integration and are more critical of the German role in the EU. Because of the PiS government’s intransigence, Poland’s reputation and standing within the EU have clearly suffered. At the same time, however, Poland has played quite an active role within NATO and the Visegrad group. At the July 2016 NATO summit in Warsaw, the PiS government reinforced its commitment to NATO. Poland has also intensified its cooperation with the other Visegrad countries (Hungary, Czech Republic, Slovakia). While the four countries agree on the refugee issue and climate policy, they hold different attitudes towards Russia. Unlike the other countries, Poland has strongly supported the sanctions imposed on Russia by the EU.

Romania

Score 5

Romania’s NATO and EU accessions were celebrated as significant milestones and part of a reunification process with Western Europe following the collapse of
communism. Romanian governments have supported international efforts to provide global public goods. As of September of 2016, Romanian military forces were deployed in 10 ongoing United Nations peacekeeping missions, in addition to two special political missions. Romania ratified the Paris Agreement on the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. The country’s international ambitions are evident in its intention to seek a non-permanent seat on the UN Security Council from 2020-2021.

**Slovenia**

**Score 5**

Like its predecessors, Prime Minister Cerar’s government was preoccupied with domestic political and economic issues, and paid little attention to improving institutional capacity for shaping and implementing global initiatives. The country’s main international focus has been on shaping the European Union’s policy toward the western Balkans, where Slovenia sees its strategic interests. In the period under review, the arbitration case on the 25-year long territorial dispute continued between Croatia and Slovenia over the Gulf of Piran. It might be significant not only for Slovenia and Croatia, but also for the broader Western Balkan region, which could use the good practice as a model for solving many unresolved border disputes.

*Citation: Armed Politics (2016): Territorial dispute between Croatia and Slovenia continues. June 30 (https://www.armedpolitics.com/2671/territorial-dispute-croatia-slovenia-continues/).*

**Switzerland**

**Score 5**

Switzerland is a fairly active member of the United Nations, the IMF, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), the Council of Europe and most of the other important international organizations. Swiss foreign economic policy works actively to defend the interests of its export-oriented economy, as for instance in the context of the WTO.

The policy of neutrality and the objective of safeguarding national autonomy set clear limits to the country’s international engagement in the past, however, and direct democracy further reduced the scope of action in international affairs. During the growing polarization witnessed in Swiss politics over the past 15 years, together with the associated decline in consociational patterns of behavior, right-wing politicians have emphasized the notion of a small, neutral and independent nation-state surviving on the basis of smart strategies in a potentially hostile environment. Large portions of the population support these ideas. Popular skepticism toward European integration has mounted over the course of the last eight years. Nonetheless, it would be wrong to repeat the cliché of Switzerland as a solitary lone wolf, as there have been various attempts to contribute to international cooperative ventures. However,
the country concentrates its efforts in areas where it can realistically have some influence, such as economic matters or technical organizations dealing with issues such as transport, ecology or development. This said, there is a clear gap between the government’s stated goals in terms of international cooperation and the resources – institutional or otherwise – that it has at its disposal for these tasks.

**Bulgaria**

**Score 4**

While the capacity of Bulgarian government bodies to correspond with, coordinate and participate in international processes and initiatives has improved markedly over recent years, the fact remains that Bulgaria is still primarily reactive in terms of international efforts to foster the provision of global public goods. This is due both to a lack of capacity and a risk-minimizing strategy of avoiding the commitments involved in taking proactive positions. More often than not, Bulgaria tends to take part in international efforts but wait for the international community to formulate policies, set goals and benchmarks. It then does its best to implement those domestically. Inasmuch as there is coordination and assessment going on, it is for these reactive purposes. A recent example of this type of behavior has been Bulgaria’s dithering regarding the international sanctions against Russia. The country has taken on a more active role in shaping the EU’s response to the refugee issue.

**Cyprus**

**Score 4**

Cyprus’s focus on its own problem, has so far not allowed it to seize opportunities offered through its membership of the EU, UN and other instances to contribute to the global public welfare. Plans or mechanisms to ensure such contribution globally or in the region are largely absent. Rather, ministry officials typically provide isolated contributions through their participation in international organizations. The country’s potential for ambitious participation in global affairs is since 2012 absorbed by efforts to overcome the economic crisis. However, the discovery of hydrocarbons has led to initiatives aimed at coordinating with neighboring countries. Giving substance to relations in the region may allow Cyprus to expand its international role.

**Czech Republic**

**Score 4**

For a long time, the Czech government acted not as a leader, but as a trustworthy and reliable partner of the international community. Vis-à-vis the European Union, this has changed in the summer of 2015 in the context of the refugee crisis. Together with other Visegrad countries, the Czech Republic opposed EU quotas for the
relocation of refugees without having any constructive proposals for a global solution to the problem. In 2016, the Czech government maintained its support for strong EU borders and functioning hotspots, but strongly opposed any form of immigration quotas. The Czech public, driven by the opposition of the Czech elites and growing anti-Islamic rhetoric (in particular from President Zeman), is strongly opposed to any form of refugee resettlement quotas. This opposition has been further strengthened by a failure of a pilot project to resettle 25 Christian refugees from Iraq by a Czech Christian charity (Generation 21 Fund). In April 2016, after several months in the Czech Republic, the refugees flew to Germany. The lack of a credible plan to implement the euro, inconsistent attitudes toward the European integration process and numerous scandals associated with the use of EU funds, as well as the unwillingness of government ministers to attend high-level EU meetings, have resulted in the country’s marginalization in European structures.

**Greece**

Score 4

Greece, through its membership in the euro zone and through EU summits and meetings of ministers, has participated in international efforts to foster the provision of public goods. For instance, Greece has been vocal at international forums in pressuring for a global response to migration issues, emphasizing that migration from the developing world into Europe is not solely a Greek problem arising from its geographical position between Europe and Asia. However, given its own severe economic crisis, Greece has been unable to develop institutional capacities beyond its role as an EU member state in fostering the provision of public goods nor has it been able to devote resources to ensure that its own policies are in line with international policies. Still, credit must be given to Greece’s Prime Minister Alexis Tsipras, whose repeated criticisms, also in the period under review, against austerity policies and his easy electoral victories in Greece have incited worldwide discussions about the efficiency and fairness of providing public goods through orthodox economic policies.

**Malta**

Score 4

Malta does not have the institutional capacity to actively shape a wide range of international efforts. However, Malta has sought to do this within its immediate Mediterranean region and increasingly within the EU. Since 1975, Malta has been a rapporteur of the UN Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People. It continues to support good-governance efforts in Libya and Tunisia, and co-operates closely on refugee and migration issues with neighboring countries. Malta accepts more asylum-seekers per capital than almost all other countries. As such, it has invested heavily in support services since 2013. In 2015 Malta, hosted Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting and contributed
toward the setting up of a fund to assist small commonwealth island countries with climate change and the fight to eradicate polio. Preliminary discussions also took place in preparation for the Paris Climate Change Summit. Also in October 2015, Malta hosted the EU-Africa Migration Summit. It has been pressing for the implementation of agreements reached at the summit, and is planning a follow-up meeting in 2017. In December 2015, it facilitated talks between Libya’s rival factions in support of a UN peace plan. Malta’s program for its EU Presidency aims to achieve progress in these areas.
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**Hungary**

**Score 3**

Until early 2015, the Orbán government was largely self-centered and inward looking. Instead of engaging in collective global efforts, it was preoccupied with defending its autonomy against the EU and the IMF. Since the beginning of the EU refugee crisis, Prime Minister Orbán has looked for an international role for himself and has increasingly been elevated to one of Europe’s “strong men” in the Fidesz press. He has intensified cooperation within the Visegrád group, in particular with Poland, and has boasted about his good relationship with Putin. However, all these activities have further undermined his standing with other European leaders and with the faction of the European People’s Party in the European Parliament. Frequent changes in the personnel in the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Foreign Affairs have further reduced the government’s capacity for international coordination. Hungary’s international isolation become visible at the celebrations of its national holiday on October 23 in which no foreign politicians other than the Polish President Andrzej Duda took part.
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