

# THE EUROPEANIZATION OF THE DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION POLICIES: FROM PUBLIC OPINION TO PUBLIC POLICIES

Victor Negrescu<sup>23</sup>

National School of Political and Administrative Studies – Romania  
victor.negrescu@gmail.com

**Abstract:** *In the context of the growing importance of the cooperation for development in the European Union and the appearance of a common growing public opinion agreement supporting this kind of initiatives, it is necessary to understand if we can talk today about a true common European policy. Still covered on intergovernmental level and considered to be a part of the national foreign policies, EU development aid is still far from reaching the maximum of its efficiency. In this paper we try to introduce a new evaluation method of the cooperation for development policies and interpretation of the degree of Europeanization of the national policies, starting from the case studies of France, the Czech Republic and Romania, that will enable us to appreciate the stages that have to be completed by the member countries but also by the EU to realize a completely uniform European foreign assistance strategy. The understanding of the European development aid environment is also necessary for the elaboration and the implementation of the Romanian development cooperation policy which is just taking its first steps as an international donor.*

**Keywords:** *Developing countries, development cooperation, Europeanization, public opinion, foreign aid.*

**JEL Classification:** F35, F52, F59, I30, O19

## INTRODUCTION

Development aid has become in the last few years a key issue in the EU foreign policy being pushed forward by the increasingly constructed awareness of the Europeans on their role in the world. Even if ten years ago it would have been difficult to think about a common European policy on the developing countries because of the different perspectives and interests, it becomes more and more

---

<sup>23</sup> Beneficiary of the project “Doctoral scholarships supporting research: Competitiveness, quality, and cooperation in the European Higher Education Area”, co-funded by the European Union through the European Social Fund, Sectorial Operational Programme Human Resources Development 2007-2013

necessary for the EU states and institutions to try to build a common cooperation for development policy.

This new reality is in fact determined by the increasing support that development aid benefits all over Europe even if the economical and social struggles of the common European citizen should have made him more self-centered. In fact if we look at the European opinion polls we see almost the same levels of supports independent of the economical development of the EU states: for example 89% of the Slovaks and 82% of the French and Romanians believe that development aid is a very important issue.

Furthermore we see building all over Europe more and more NGOs supporting development cooperation that are building national and European wide networks to try to promote even more the aid issues. Today some are even talking about a development civil society with their own media, objectives, meetings and perspective on the social role of NGOs. Our paper will try to have a European wide perspective on the construction of the development aid issue and show the common as well as the different features existing in Europe. The objective is to see if we can talk about a common European agenda-setting campaign and determine the structural framework on which it has been built.

The promotion of democracy, the respect for human rights, the rule of law and the international laws constitute, without any means, the principle guidelines of the European Union and one of the main basic elements of the identity of the European society mentioned even at the beginning of the Treaty of the European Union (articles 6 and 7).

Moreover the existence of expressed sanctions indicate the logical desire of the European Union to export its values after the Cold War, by pushing more and more of its partners to follow the democratic path. In the domain of foreign affairs, article 11 mentions the fact that “development and the consolidation of democracy and the rule of law, as well as the respect of the human rights and the fundamental liberties constitute objectives of the European Common Foreign and Security Policy”.

Several disposals of the constitutive treaties sustain this objective inside the different pillars. Therefore, articles 177 and 181 (Title XX Cooperation for development) place the promotion of the respect of the human rights and the fundamental liberties as objectives of development aid and any other form of cooperation with third party states. The articles 179 and 308 give a legal frame for all external actions in terms of human rights and democratization. The Lisbon treaty consolidates even more this trend, by confirming the desire of the Union to develop in the next few years its own individual action in favor of the promotion of its values in the world.

Nevertheless, in front of the proliferation of these instruments, several authors didn't miss the chance to question its efficiency and often arriving to mixed conclusions (Helly, 2005). The Commission has realized the same thing, presenting even a communication about the role of the European Union in the promotion of the human rights and democracy in third party states, by underlining the necessity of the redefinition of a new coherent strategy in the field designed to include the preoccupation of the human rights in all the components of the external actions (COM, 2001).

Unfortunately from the strategy to the implementation of the policies there is a huge gap due mostly to the fact that the cooperation for development is still a field dependent on the intergovernmental European decision making so therefore influenced by national interests. Nevertheless the EU has fixed some key principles that should be respected by the EU member states when establishing and fixing their own national cooperation for development policies: the cooperation for development should be preferentially accorded to the weakest and poorest states in the world with a special attention given to the Sub-Saharan Africa, the funds have to be conditioned by democracy principles and not by economic interests or products restrictions, the member states should present open policy strategies and evaluation papers for the beneficiary countries, the implication of the NGOs in the policy formation and implementation should rise, and finally the cooperation between the national agencies is considered to be highly desired and supported.

But can we really say today that the EU member states policies on the cooperation for development converge to a uniform interpretation of the domain and a true European common policy? To answer this basic question we have analyzed the elaboration and the implementation of the development aid policies in three member states of the EU: France, Slovakia and Romania. These countries have been chosen because the period during which they have belonged to the EU is representative of the different existing degrees of inclusion within the European structures and moreover their level of communitarisation of the legislation and practices in the field of development aid is different. Furthermore, the three states chosen for the study have a different experience in terms of cooperation for development, and these exact differences will enable us to illustrate the relation between the European policy and the national practice. This structural perspective will enable us to discover if the EU member states implement the European initiatives and recommendations in the field in the national measures plan and if we can considerate the cooperation for development policies as being communitarised.

## **1. COMMON EUROPEAN PUBLIC OPINION AND DEVELOPMENT AID POLICIES INFLUENCED BY THE NATIONAL INTERESTS**

If we start by putting in relation the evolution of the development aid funds allocated by the European Commission and the evolution of the public opinion we manage to establish clear tendencies and relations that point out the influence of the European public opinion in the development of the cooperation for development policies. Firstly, we notice the fact that the degree of information of the population regarding development aid has doubled from 2003 to 2009, and this thing has enabled the public support for this kind of policies to grow from a low 75% in 2003, to values close to 90% of the European population.

Moreover these rising tendencies are also influencing the dimension of the ODA funds that rise in similar terms during the same period. The ODA funds allocated by the European Commission have therefore raised from 7.173 millions in 2003, to almost double in 2009, more exactly 13.444 million dollars. The important role played by the European Union is also reflected in the support that the EU benefits from the population. In 2010, not less that 76% of the population consider that development aid has to be communautarized but, contrary to opinions, the EU is not seen or desired to be the main operator of development funds. More exactly, on European level, in the context of the economic crisis, but also of euroscepticism, more and more people that sustain the European cooperation see in the national control a mechanism through which their personal and national interests are kept.

**Table 1 - The European public opinion and development aid**

	1983	1987	1996	1999	2003	2005	2009	2010
1. Population support of development aid policies	82%	88%	82%	76%	75%	91%	88%	89%
2. The degree of information of the population regarding development cooperation	-	-	-	-	10%	12%	24%	-
3. Population support for the communitarisation of the development aid policies	-	-	-	-	-	56%	61%	76%
4. Support for the EU as main operator of development funds	9%	3%	7%	45%	45%	-	26%	17%
European Commission funds (ODA funds in millions of euro - source OCDE)	-	-	-	-	7173	9390	13444	-

Nevertheless a rigorous analysis of the national cooperation for development policies of the countries used in our study indicates the influence of the national interests in the implementation of the strategies in the field.

The first notable result is the way that the donor countries establish the list of main beneficiary countries. If we monitor the process of establishment of the priority beneficiary countries of the Romanian development aid policies we can observe that the defining criteria correspond to a clear national interest. More exactly, Romania's priority countries are the Republic of Moldavia, Ukraine and Serbia because of the important Romanian communities living in those countries. This desire to help Romanian abroad minority is explicitly mentioned in the Romanian ODA strategy which clearly differentiates the national Romanian policy from the true values of development aid.

In the same time, the presence on the axe of priority countries of states like Georgia, Afghanistan or Iraq in the Romanian strategy can be clearly classified on the level of the geo-strategic and military interests that Romania has as a NATO State member but mostly as a partner of the United States in the different conflicts emerged in the area. The importance given to Georgia and Ukraine can be considered as a result of the expressed interests of Romania in the Black Sea region, but this is still a

geopolitical interest. It's interesting to underline the fact that Romania justifies the implication in this area by the comparative advantages that the country has in the terms of democratization process, even if in practice, the majority of the funds are allocated through international institutions, the Romanian know-how not being transmitted directly.

The same phenomenon happens also in the case of Slovakia that has chosen from the beginning to give a special importance to the Slovakian minority living in Serbia and to supporting the democratization and Euro-Atlantic integration of this country. Slovakia goes even further by conditioning the funds given on the respect of the rights of minorities and associating therefore to the development aid, explicit national interests. The fact that recently Afghanistan has been included on the Slovakian list of priorities only underlines the same geo-strategic interests expressed by Romania, as they are both two countries of the "new Europe" clearly concentrated in supporting United States interests.

Another manifestation of the national interests can be noticed by the fact that one of the priority domains of Slovakia is the allocation for the states in the region of development assistance designed to help them integrate in international organization and the EU. This thing expresses the explicit desire of Slovakia to construct itself as a small EU states with good influence networks that will represent an important advantage for the country after the integration of those states in the European community. Nevertheless, we have to remark the fact that Slovakia clearly desires to comply with the EU line by including in the last years Kenya and other poor areas of Africa in the priority beneficiary countries of the Slovakian development aid strategy.

When we come to analyze the French development strategy we notice the massive presence between the beneficiary countries of the former French colonies and the Outre-Mer territories, illustrating by this the sources of the French development policies established since the decolonization process. It's interesting to mention as well the fact that the Secretary of State responsible for cooperation also deals with the French speaking community cooperation, associating in this sense the linguistic community to the assistance at least in organizational terms.

Moreover, the presence of some states like China and Turkey between the biggest beneficiaries of the French assistance indicates complementarities between the French foreign politics and the development aid policy. More exactly, the presence of France in China corresponds to the French intentions to develop a special partnership with this State in permanent expansion and benefit from their economic development. The relation with Turkey is also due to the fact that this State, as an EU

membership candidate, can represent after a possible integration one of the biggest states inside the European community, but also because Turkey represents a door of negotiation with the Muslim world for the West.

Besides the clear influence of the national interests in the French assistance policy, we remark nevertheless the high importance given by France to the poorest states in Africa and also the special partnership that the EU has with South Africa by offering to this State important funds. Contrary to Romania and Slovakia that concentrate on action sectors based on assistance for democratization and the consolidation of the rule of law, the French aid is based upon investment in development supporting the productive activities and the urban and infrastructure development.

It's important to note that, the French Agency for Development is conceived contrary to the Slovakian agency and the Romanian development structures, as an investment bank that registers each year profits from the investments realized in development. We can therefore consider that France favors the financing perspective on cooperation, instead of that humanitarian. Moreover, the French development strategy gives an increasing importance to bilateral assistance that confers more visibility to the Donor State. France gives no less than 55% of its assistance for development by bilateral means whereas Slovakia, that has fixed for itself the objective to increase the level of bilateral assistance, gives a little bit more than 10%, whereas Romania hasn't created yet its own bilateral assistance mechanisms, the amount given by these means being insignificant.

The absence of clear criteria for the establishment of the priority states places the development strategies in the wagon of the national foreign policies of the donor states. The absence of democratic conditioning for the assistance, like it has been defined by the EU, the reduced number of poorest states in the list of priority countries of the ODA policies, the priority given to the bilateral cooperation instead of the multinational or European aid, the specialization of assistance in domains other than those considered as being priority by the EU, the preponderance of the national criteria in establishing the beneficiary states, are only a few of the characteristics that indicate the strong incidence of national interests in the establishment of the national development aid policies. In this context, it is necessary to evaluate the degree of communitarisation of the EU national policies by establishing transparent evaluation criteria.

## **2. THE DEGREE OF COMMUNITARISATION OF THE NATIONAL COOPERATION FOR DEVELOPMENT POLICIES**

Starting from the analysis of the national cooperation for development policies indicating the important influence of the national interests in the elaboration of the national strategies, we considered necessary to concentrate on the quantification of the degree of communitarisation of the national assistance for development policies.

In order to realize this evaluation, we established a barometer of analysis which goes from -3 to 3 quantifying the intensity of the criteria established for the evaluation of the communitarisation, 3 indicating a positive attitude towards communitarisation and -3 a negative attitude. The criteria are based on three categories and the different notations given to each state are based upon our personal analysis of the national policies and by consulting experts working in the field of development aid in those countries. In total 7 French experts, 3 Slovaks and 5 Romanian specialists in cooperation for development have participated at our evaluation.

The first category concentrates on the conditions and the norms imposed by the EU in relations with the assisted partners: 1. The democratic conditionality in allocating funds; 2. The realization of analysis documents of the beneficiary countries (country-paper); 3. The share of the poorest countries in the total of allocated funds; 4. The respect the key sectors established by the EU and the UN Millennium Goals.

If we refer to the democratic conditionality, we remark that all three states register a lack of explicit democratic conditions in allocating funds. Knowing that Romania's funds are given through international organisms, we consider that Romania doesn't really impose any democratic criteria on its own, but the organisms do impose the majority of these norms, therefore we can give a 0 in this case for Romania. France and Slovakia don't have explicit conditions but impose by the realization of country-papers the respect of democratic norms. In the case of Slovakia we can consider the respect of minorities as a democratic norm imposed for the signature of the assistance partnership. France has on the other hand a very differentiated perspective, by ending any kind of cooperation with Haiti when the country was facing political problems that contravened to the democratic principles, but developing in the same time relations with communist countries like China or Vietnam, or non democratic regimes like Libya, that openly disrespects the human rights.

Another custom, imposed by the EU, is the realization of analysis and impact documents on the development aid in beneficiary countries to quantify the effectiveness of the cooperation projects and the progresses made by those states. France has a long tradition in realizing documentations by doing this since the beginning and stipulating the existence of these documents in the juridical functioning norms of the ODA policies. Slovakia has imposed recently this system but it's still in adaptation process with the EU demands, whereas Romania has realized preliminary analysis documents without taking into account the criteria prevailed by the European custom.

Regarding the share level of the poorest countries in the total funds allocated, a norm specifically mentioned in the European initiatives, we remark that the country which has given the biggest interest was France, with important funds given to Sub-Saharan Africa, followed by Slovakia that has made efforts to get involved in African countries like Kenya. Romania has neglected this aspect, not even a single Romanian priority country being from Africa, and the only one classified as being poor is Afghanistan, the others being considered intermediary.

The priority sectors of the European Union are concentrated on the Millennium for Development Goals that France has assumed and wants to respect in totality even if it has a certain preference for the renewable investments. Slovakia has also assumed explicitly these objectives and wants to realize them through its assistance policies, whereas Romania even if it assumes these principles in declaration, tends to realize them in a weaker proportion.

The second category concentrates on criteria of funds allocation because in these sense we can perceive if the resources are integrated in a European context. The elements of classification are: 1. funds allocated by collaborating with other European partners; 2. the dimension of funds allocated bilaterally; 3. if at the level of funds allocation we find subjective criteria like the presence of certain important national minorities or linguistic communities in beneficiary states; 4. in what extent the funds are more allocated through international organization than through the EU; 5. the existence of a profitability objective in the funds allocation; 6. the implication of NGOs, of local collectivities and of companies in the cooperation for development policy.

Referring to the allocation of funds by collaboration with European partners, we can say that the EU stimulates the project creation and common programs of development agencies in EU member countries and supports the intra-European collaboration seen as a method of expression of the Union itself. At this chapter the French Development Agency excels with important partnerships with the agencies from Germany, England, Spain or Italy. Slovakia has also managed to realize a series of

partnerships with agencies from Austria and Holland but this process is still at a formation stage. Romania hasn't presented yet any other contract or important financial association in ODA projects with other EU member states.

Also at the level of funds allocation, we remark the fact that France excels in granting bilateral funds, and Slovakia tends towards this objective, whereas Romania hesitates in following this direction by lack of capacities and resources. Bilateral funds are evaluated with a negative appreciation because this aspect signifies a nationalization of assistance policies and a distance from the ODA financial mechanisms of the EU.

But when it comes to appreciate the funds allocation, it's also important to evaluate the incidence of certain interests in their distribution. Therefore Romania and Slovakia grants more of their funds based on the criteria of the presence of the national minorities in the beneficiary states, whereas France even if it allocates a greater importance to the French speaking countries or to former colonies, doesn't privileges them in relations to others.

On the level of allocation of funds threw international organizations more than threw the EU, Romania is negatively quoted because it grants without any control the majority of the funds threw international organizations like the UN Program for Development, in detrimental of other projects with European partners. On the other hand, France and Slovakia, even know they work with international partners keep the control on these resources or even influence the allocation ways so it corresponds to the EU or national objectives.

In relation to the funds allocation, the profit desire is visible only in the case of France, whose Development Agency realizes financial reports, business plans and distributes dividends to the State from the funds earned. Slovakia and Romania doesn't impose this kind of condition even if an analysis of the economic advantages indicates a winning in terms of prestige and commercial and economic relations with beneficiary states.

The European Union supports the implication efforts of nongovernmental organizations, of the local collectivities and of companies in the assistance for development policies. France has the highest implication level of the local collectivities in the assistance policy, a good level of implication of the companies but has some deficiencies at the level of NGOs. On the contrary, Slovakia has extremely positive results at the NGO level for a newly integrated country in the EU, by accessing already more European funds in the field, but remaining deficient on the level of local collectivities and companies not used with the domain. In exchange Romania doesn't have firm and direct collaborations on ODA

projects with the local civil society, by preferring foreign partnerships, clearly preferred also by the public opinion.

The third category of information for appreciating the degree of communitarisation is the public perception and the support given to the development assistance. The components in the analysis of the perception in relation with the communitarisation are: 1. the support of the assistance policies by the population; 2. the degree of information of the population regarding the assistance; 3. the support of the local communities to the communitarisation and the perspective on the role of the EU in the field; 4. the support of the EU as main operator of the assistance funds. We based our results on the conclusions of the EU barometer from June 2009 by comparing the results of these states to the European average (European barometer, 2009).

The support of the assistance policies represents an advantage in the process of understanding this domain promoted by the EU. Therefore the EU barometer indicates the fact that 89% of the Slovaks consider that the assistance for development is very important or sufficiently important, placing this country on the first places in the European rankings. The Romanians and the French with 82%, respectively 86% of support, find themselves at an intermediary level of support, under the average of 88%. We can also mention that in France the total favorability share is bigger than that of Romania.

On the level of the information degree we studied the knowledge of the Millennium for Development Goals, the European average being of 24% of the respondents. Surprisingly only 13% of the French and 17% of Romanians have heard of the objectives against 37% of the Slovaks.

The public support for the communitarisation and the EU implication in the development cooperation policy are an important index to illustrate the tendency towards the Europeanization of the domain. 60% of the French consider that the European perspective represents an added value to the international development assistance, 52% of Romanians sustain the European perspective, whereas 66% of the Slovaks consider that the EU implication is positive. We mention that the European average has 61% of favorability.

To better understand the way that the EU role is perceived, it is necessary to comparatively analyze the support that the Union benefits from in relation with other international actors and with assistance policies conducted on national level. We observe that Romania, with 47%, finds itself between the first supporters of the EU role as main assistance operators. Only 1% considers that this has to develop on national level. Over the European average of support of the EU as main actor of

26%, we also find France with 27% of support level in comparison to only 5% of support given to the national initiative. The Slovakian support for the role of the EU is also above the average (27%), the Slovaks considering nevertheless that the United Nations should be the main assistance operator with 52% of support. The Slovaks reject the implication of the national State in the ODA policy, only 1% supporting its implication.

It's interesting to see how these statistics contravene to the realities of the policies and the national strategies of these countries, because in Romania the majority of the funds are allocated through UNDP, in Slovakia the EU is given an important attention whereas in France the national policy is priority in development assistance.

**Table 2 - The analysis of the degree of communitarisation of national cooperation for development policies**

<b>DEGREE OF COMMUNITARISATION OF NATIONAL POLICIES</b>	<b>FRANCE</b>	<b>SLOVAKIA</b>	<b>ROMANIA</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>I. CONDITIONS AND NORMS IMPOSED BY THE EU IN RELATIONS TO ASSISTED PARTNERS</b>				
1. Democratic conditionality in funds allocation	1	1	0	0,66
2. Country-paper: analysis documents of the beneficiary countries	3	2	0	1,66
3. The share of the poorest countries in the total of the allocated funds	2	1	- 2	0,33
4. The respect of the key sectors established by the EU – Millennium Goals	3	2	1	2
<b>TOTAL I</b>	<b>2,25</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>- 0,33</b>	<b>1,16</b>
<b>II. FUNDS ALLOCATION CRITERIA</b>				
1. Funds allocated through the collaboration with European partners	2	1	- 2	0,33
2. Funds allocated through bilateral aid	- 2	- 1	3	0
3. Important national minorities or linguistic communities in beneficiary states	0	- 2	- 2	0
4. The funds allocated through other international organizations than the EU	2	2	- 2	0,66

5. Profitability objectives in funds allocation	- 2	1	1	0
6. NGO implication / local collectivities / assistance companies	2	1	- 2	0,33
<b>TOTAL II</b>	<b>0,33</b>	<b>0,33</b>	<b>- 0,66</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>III. PUBLIC SUPPORT FOR ASSISTANCE POLICIES</b>				
1. The support for the development assistance policies by the population	0	2	- 1	0,33
2. Information degree of the population regarding the assistance for development	- 1	2	- 1	0
3. Support of the local population of the communitarisation of the development assistance policies	1	2	- 1	0,66
4. EU support as main operation of assistance funds	1	- 1	2	0,66
<b>TOTAL III</b>	<b>0,25</b>	<b>1,25</b>	<b>- 0,25</b>	<b>0,41</b>
<b>Degree of communitarisation</b>	<b>1,02</b> <b>34%</b>	<b>1,19</b> <b>39,6%</b>	<b>- 0,41</b> <b>- 13,6%</b>	<b>0,52</b> <b>17,33%</b>

The final results of the quantification process of the communitarisation degree of assistance policies for development from France, Slovakia and Romania illustrates the different level of Europeanization of national policies, deficiencies and similarities between national and European policies.

More exactly, when we refer to the respect by the national policies of the conditions and norms imposed by the European Union in relations with assisted partners, we remark the fact that France, with an average score of 2.25, respects the most the European principles, followed by Slovakia with an average score of 2 points. Romania, nevertheless, has deficiencies of operating with the European norms even if with some effort it can achieve without problems the necessary level.

When we examine the allocation of assistance funds we observe that France and Slovakia respects the European provisions, even if the process is still far from perfection with an average score of only 0.33 points. In the case of funds allocation, Romania doesn't respect the European principles being deficient at several chapters with an average score of -0.66 points.


Finally, when we analyze the public support for assistance for development projects and the EU implication in these projects, Slovakia proves to be a true promoter of these domains and the European

role in the field, with a 1.25 point average. France registers some visible deficiencies in the case of the EU barometer with only 0.25 points. Romania doesn't manage to reach the average and has deficiencies at this chapter also with an average score of -0.25 points.

In conclusion, the degree of communitarisation of the European policies from the three countries studied is 0.52 points from the 3 points possible, more exactly a positive degree of communitarisation of only 17.33%. Individually, Slovakia has the most communitarised assistance for development policy with a score of 1.19 points, equivalent to 39.6% positive communitarisation, followed by France with 1.02 points, equivalent to 34% positive communitarisation. Romania has a negative score with -0.41 points, with a negative communitarisation of -13.6%.

The graphic representation illustrates how the communitarisation of the national policies has been performed in the studied countries.

**Figure 1 - The pyramid of the communitarisation of the national cooperation for development policies**



From these results we conclude that the Europeanization process of the development assistance policies is far from being achieved by the three countries and consequently we can consider that the communitarisation of the cooperation for development has still several stages to achieve. Furthermore, the degree of communitarisation doesn't correspond to the time spent by the country in the European space. The results indicate that a new EU member State, like Slovakia, can have a more Europeanized

assistance policy than France, and old EU member State. We can't nevertheless ignore that the slowness of the European mechanisms, especially when it comes to making foreign policy decision, can represent set-back for a country like France that considers itself as being a medium sized power and a promoter of democracy and humanitarianism on international level.

### **3. PERSPECTIVES FOR THE COOPERATION FOR DEVELOPMENT POLICIES**

The evolution of European cooperation for development policies in the last fifty years has represented the desire to give an answer to the development problems but nevertheless there is still a big gap between the political and institutional capacities of European and the tasks that it has to realize.

Based on specific intergovernmental mechanisms, the European assistance for development policy has passed from escorting the decolonization to the concept of association based on the European model, by integrating successively new methods like the project based aid, the preferential commercial policy, the promotion of human rights and democracy policy (1990), the support to the regional integration process, the crisis management generated by debt and budgetary support, the political dialogue between the State leaders (Cairo Summit in April 2000) and finally the conflict prevention (2001), going to the military crisis management (2003) (Debrat, 2006).

If the financing objectives fixed by the Council of Europe in 2005 will be respected, the development aid will pass from 10 to not less than 20 billion euros, and afterwards to 46 billion euros. The year 2005 has also represented the elaboration of two fundamental papers, the proposition for a common declaration of the Commission, Council and the European Parliament referring to the development aid policy of the EU, and the communication realized by the Commission regarding the EU strategy for Africa.

This European consensus indicates the desire from the member states to have a common vision on the development policies understood through the complementary perspective that associates to this concept the commercial, environmental and security dimensions as well as the programming and the adaptation by countries.

The desire for compromise has created minuses from the point of view of the clarities and the power of the common European decisions in the domain. The cooperation policy is on several aspects thought to be as a foreign policy proposed to the Southern partners starting from the global agenda for the fight against poverty. Financing growth is only the fourth priority objective and is perceived as a

form of reform imposed by the donor State to the beneficiary State. Furthermore the problems of the developing countries aren't hierarchically established.

The European values are forcedly diffused on unilateral level based on this partnership even if this kind of partnership should have meant after a European model a dialogue of cultures and principles. Even more, issues like migration or the fragile states governance are managed in a defensive way by concentrating on the problem perspective that this supposes for Europe.

From the organization point of view, the document doesn't clarify the relations between European policies and the assistance for development national agencies, by promoting only on a rhetoric level a tight intra-European cooperation in this field. The EU doesn't seem adapted to the apparition on the development aid scene of other states like Brazil, China or India, and seems incapable of using the resources of some of the European states with an international ODA policy and strategy (Germany, Great Britain, France or Holland). Even if it gives priority to the cooperation with Africa, the EU doesn't manage to establish a hierarchy of the different regions of the world.

Furthermore, the Millennium Development Goals are considered a priority for the European finances ignoring in this sense the necessity for an economic development that can give a complementary support to the realization of these objectives. This is just one of the series of deficiencies existing on the level of the European cooperation institutional device operation. For example, on the level of the international decision instances each EU member State can express its position separately, and the Union is not even represented most often as an entity, maintaining in this sense the competence on national level. Even more, from an administrative point of view, the process is getting more difficult because of the different responsibilities of the General Directions on the different assistance aspects. This thing is also happening on the decision level, the Council, the Commission and the High Official for Foreign Affairs of the Union share the authority on the development issues. To this we add the fact that three commissioners are sharing the attributions on development and each State, on the Council's level, supports its own geographic and sartorial interests.


The administrative problems also affect the funds allocation, the access modalities of the funds based on strict European rules being very difficult for the operators in the developing States. This dispersal is also visible on the level of research, Europe being overcome by the American universities, that financed by the World Bank and several companies and foundations, have developed several new research domains and have imposed their own definitions and interpretations on development.

The lack of complementarity or specification regarding development aid in other complementarity domains, like the commercial, agricultural, migration, formation and work policies, makes difficult to realize many of the European objectives. For example, it's difficult to imagine a development of the exports of the countries in development if the EU maintains the commercial barriers for the Southern products.

The European Union has to arrive to a new consensus to establish a geopolitical sense, a regional strategy and a doctrine of the aid to coordinate on European level the development activity. The experience of the Marshall plan has shown that it's needed a massive and concentrated effort to achieve the economic rise of certain geographic areas. An intra-European network can also be created composed of actors and European development agencies that will coordinate on themes and action areas. A solution can be the creation of a consultative council on development issues that will include national and civil society actors and will also deal with the financing given by the Commission to projects also supported by the other European national partners. In this sense, for a better efficiency of the cooperation it is necessary to have a better dialogue with the beneficiary countries and a bigger concentration of the activities on the creation of local capacities and the development of financing methods on European level.

These difficulties and the limits of the European cooperation for development policies in relations to the national interests and also the efficiency problems of the EU conduct us to sustain the point of view expressed by a report of the Overseas Development Institute that presents four possible development scenarios of the cooperation for development policies in the direction either of segmentation, integration, inclusion or individualization (Maxwell, 2009).

**Figure 2 - The cooperation for development at the horizon of the year 2010: four scenarios**



This table indicates two axes that direct us to four scenarios or hypothesis for the future:

- The right wing superior quadrant: a scenario in which the foreign policy of the EU are better coordinated and more coherent and where the engagement towards poverty reduction is bigger (in fact). In this graph, the scenario is entitled Integration
- The right wing inferior quadrant: a bigger engagement towards poverty reduction associated to a smaller engagement towards European coordination and policy coherence. This thing conducts the member states to accentuate the bilateral ad-hoc actions. This is what we call Partitioning.
- The left wing superior quadrant: a bigger engagement towards the European coordination and foreign policy coherence associated to a weaker engagement towards poverty reduction. This is called Segmentation, because of the effects on the consensus regarding the global development policies.
- The left wing inferior quadrant, illustrates the situation in which a weaker engagement towards European coordination and foreign policy coherence associates to a weak engagement towards the global development objectives and poverty reduction. We arrive to bilateral amateurism, what is called Individualization.

In the case of the integration scenario we can consider that Europe will have a more coherent voice on the foreign policy and development policies level. A bigger part of the assistance budgets will pass through the EU and a bigger complementarity is searched between the international development programs of the EU and the member states. The external relations differentiate on the regions and the aid is explicitly dedicated to the poorest countries and regions.

The partition supposes a passage to a lighter and less enthusiastic foreign policy. Advances from the point of view of assistance centralization and of the commercial negotiation exist, but they aren't very important. The segmentation supposes that important national interests still exist and the aid flows go in their large majority towards countries with an average income. The commercial negotiations turn off and the agreements turn regional. The individualization supposes only a shown interest for European development cooperation and the finances don't follow the way to the EU. The member states discuss about a renationalization of the humanitarian assistance and the commercial negotiations are replaced by bilateral agreements.

An adaptation of these results to the degree of communitarisation would indicate that there is a tendency towards integration expressed mainly in the final results of France and Slovakia but to confirm this trend we need to do a European wide analysis of all the national ODA policies and reclassify the communitarisation indexes on the axes proposed by this analysis.

## CONCLUSIONS

The European Union has realized important advancements in the domain of development cooperation, from its origins appeared in the middle of the decolonization process to the existence of policies and coherent objectives for the social and economic development of beneficiary countries. Today, the effort and the desire of the public opinion to find a way to support the poorest countries, has found a part of its answer in the manifested desire of member countries to establish an European consensus regarding development assistance.

Nevertheless, the decision making process remains intergovernmental and very difficult because of the excessive bureaucracy generated by the absence of a unique competent authority and by the lack of complementarity with the other policies of the EU. In this context, the EU member countries tend to maximize the benefits from the elaboration of the development cooperation policies. Some of the states that claim the position of medium sized powers, like France, Germany or Great Britain will continue to

search a way to develop their own global assistance system, whereas the new EU member states, still not very familiar with this field, like Slovakia or Romania, still explore for the opportunities offered by this field. The limited funds that they can direct to this field, conduct these countries to the European perspective because of the funds existing on the EU level. The reality is that the diversity and the specificity of the different forms given to the organization method of the ODA policies constitute not only the main difficulty but also a powerful advantage in developing coherent policies on European level.

The opportunity of an objective evaluation of the communitarisation degree of the national assistance policies for development becomes interesting in the context of the manifested desire of the European Commission to raise its implication in the foreign affairs of the member states. This kind of analysis will enable us in the future to appreciate the stages that have to be completed by the member countries but also by the EU to realize a completely uniform European assistance strategy and of the activities, so necessary for raising the efficiency of the funds allocated by the EU, but also in the perspective of achieving the Millennium Development Goals. In conclusion the strong public support pushed forward the development aid topic within the foreign policy priorities of the EU and the member countries but the diversity of the European population and the national interests limits the true Europeanization of the cooperation for development policies.

## REFERENCES

- Alesina, A. Dollar, D. (2000). "Who Gives Foreign Aid to Whom and Why?" *Journal of Economic Growth*, 5, pp. 33–63.
- COM (2004)373 final, *European Neighborhood Policy Country Report Moldova*, Brussels, 12.5.2004
- Cox, A., Healey, J. and Koning, A. (1997) *How European Aid Works: A Comparison of Management Systems and Effectiveness*, London: Chameleon
- Debrat, J-M. (2006). *Pour une politique européenne de développement*, Paris: Fondation pour l'Innovation politique
- European Barometer Special (May-June 2009). *Assistance for Development in the Crisis Period*, Brussels: European Commission

- Führer, H. (1996). The story of official development assistance - a history of the development assistance committee and the development co-operation directorate in dates, names and figures, Paris: OCDE
- Helly, D., Petiteville, F. (2005) L'Union européenne: acteur international, Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Hoebink, P. (2005). Coherence and development policy: an autopsy with some European examples. In: M. Obrovsky, (ed.). *Österreichische Entwicklungspolitik – Analysen, Informationen 2004. EU – Entwicklungspolitik – Quo Vadis?*. Viena: ÖFSE, pp. 37–50.
- Maxwell, S., Engel, P. (2009) *Coopération au développement de l'UE à l'horizon 2010*, London; ODI Working paper