

Družbena odgovornost na področju evropske kohezijske politike

Dr. Breda Mulec

Vodja Sektorja za pravne zadeve in vodenje javnih naročil Direktorat za evropske zadeve in investicije Ministrstvo za okolje in prostor	Head of Department Section of legal affairs European Affairs and Investments Directorate Ministry of Environment and Spatial Planning
--	--

Povzetek:

Evropska kohezijska politika, ki zajema črpanje evropskih strukturnih skladov in evropskega kohezijskega sklada, ni ekonomsko učinkovita. Delovanje strukturnih in kohezijskega sklada ni zastavljeno najoptimalnejše, temeljni cilj ustanovitve skladov, ki je povečati razvoj določene države, pa zato ni dosežen. Nekatere ekonomske študije so namreč pokazale, da Evropska kohezijska politika negativno vpliva na rast BDP (- 0,35%) ali pa je njen vpliv minimalen (+ 0,7%), kar kaže na to, da ima omejen vpliv na razvoj določene države.

Zakaj je tako in kakšna je povezava med Evropsko kohezijsko politiko in družbeno odgovornostjo?

1. Ključni dejavniki ne delujejo skladno z družbeno odgovornostjo že v fazi **načrtovanja in določanja evropske kohezijske politike**:

Zapleteni sistem kohezijske politike, ki temelji na različnih fazah črpanja, določa obsežna evropska zakonodaja. Zapletenejši je sistem, bolj se krepi evropska birokracija, več davkoplačevalskega denarja pa je namenjena kritju visokih administrativnih stroškov. Če bi bil sistem delovanja skladov enostavnejši, Evropska komisija v tem obsegu ne bi mogla opravičiti svojega obstoja.

2. Faza **programiranja evropskih pomoči** ni izvedena skladno z družbeno odgovornostjo, saj nacionalni operativni programi podpirajo tudi zasebne dobrine, ki niso javno dobro:

Evropski sklad za regionalni razvoj pogosto podpira z nepovratnimi sredstvi malim in srednjim podjetjem ekonomsko in podjetniško nezanimive projekte. Eden od primerov, kjer je izrazito prisoten zasebni interes, pa je financiranje bikoborb v Španiji in na Portugalskem. Res je, da gre za dejavnost, ki je utemeljena na tradiciji, vendar pa gre tudi za dejavnost, s katero si nekateri polnijo žepe. Javna sredstva tako niso porabljena skladno z družbeno odgovornostjo.

Večji del evropske kmetijske politike podpira bogatejše in uspešnejše kmetije, evropski sklad s področja kmetijstva, ki podpira strukturne akcije, pa naj bi podpiral področja v manj razvitih regijah, kar povzroča dodatna neravnovesja in neenakomeren regionalni razvoj. Ukrepi iz obeh naslovov pa so imeli zaradi podpiranja intenzivnega kmetijstva negativne učinke na okolje. Ker so skladno z interesi premožnejših kmetov podpirali presežno proizvodnjo (npr. z intervencijskimi cenami), so povzročili motnje na notranjem (EU) in zunanjem (svetovnem) trgu. Potrošniki pa še zmeraj kupujemo dražje izdelke, saj so v ceno vštete tudi subvencije. Ekološki izdelki, ki bi jih strukturni sklad lahko podprl tako, da bi zmanjšal njihovo visoko ceno, pa po drugi strani ostajajo dostopni ožjemu krogu potrošnikov.

Pa še nekaj, nihče ne odgovarja za učinkovitost opravljanja dejavnosti, za katero so mu bila sredstva namenjena. Živilsko predelovalni obrat, financiran z evropskim denarjem, lahko zaživi, ali pa tudi ne, brez sankcij za njegovega lastnika v primeru njegove odgovornosti za opustitev dejavnosti. Kje je potem tukaj javni interes?

3. Tudi dejavniki v **fazi implementacije oz. črpanja evropskih sredstev** ne delujejo skladno z družbeno odgovornostjo:

Tako npr. pri izvajanju projektov financiranih iz Kohezijskega sklada prihaja do konflikta zasebnega interesa z javnim interesom. Ker gre za cenovno drage projekte s področja prometne infrastrukture in okolja, je želja izvajalcev (podjetij) maksimiranje dobička. Med naročnikom (državo) in izvajalci prihaja zaradi konflikta interesov pogosto do spora, Evropska Komisija pa lahko v takih primerih prekliče celoten prispevek ali del prispevka Skupnosti operativnemu programu. Morebitni sodni stroški dodatno bremenijo davkoplačevalski denar. Stroški so tako nad koristmi, ki naj bi jih pridobili iz Bruslja in negativno vplivajo na razvoj države, ravnanje posameznih dejavnikov v procesu črpanja sredstev pa tako ni skladno z družbeno odgovornostjo.

Sistem delovanja evropskih skladov je takšen, da omogoča zaščito interesov posameznih skupin in ni utemeljen z družbeno odgovornostjo.

Summary

Social responsibility at the field of European Cohesion Policy

European cohesion policy, which comprises the implementation of European structural funds and European Cohesion fund, has not been economically efficient. The structural funds and the Cohesion fund system implementation were not efficiently designed, the main aim of the funds' establishment, which has been to increase state's development, therefore, has not been reached. Several economical analyses pointed out that European Cohesion policy has negative impact to the increasing of GDP (- 0, 35%) or the impact however has been minimal (+ 0, 7%); therefore it has limited influence to the development of the respective country.

What are the reasons for its inefficiency and in what respect the inefficiency of cohesion policy and social responsibility could be interrelated?

1. The main factors do not act accordingly to social responsibility as early as in **the phase of planning and determination** of European cohesion policy.

The complex implementing system, which has been founded at the various phases of financial support implementation, is defined by comprehensive European legislation. More the system is complex, more extensive is European bureaucracy, more tax - payers money, however, is intended for the payment of great administrative expenses. When the European funds system working is simple, European Commission could not justify its existence at abovementioned respect.

2. **The phase of programming of European support** has not been performed in reference with social responsibility, since national operational programmes support also private goods, which are not public goods: European Regional Development Fund usually supports economically and enterprisingly non attractive projects of small and medium size companies.

The example of the emphasis at private interest could be financing of bull - fights in Spain and Portugal. It has to be said that this has been an activity based at tradition, but it has been also an activity by which some individuals have full pockets. The use of public financial support in accordance with social responsibility can not be stated.

The mayor part of Common agricultural policy supports rich and successful farms, European fund at the field of agriculture, which has been supporting structural actions, however, should support less developed regions. Abovementioned situation brings about diverse regional development. The measures of both institutes, however, had due to the supporting of intensive agriculture, negative consequences for environment. Since the measures, due to interests of wealthy farmers, supported surplus production (for example by the intervention prices), the disturbances at the inner and external market appeared.

Consumers, however, still purchase expensive products, since the subventions have been included into the final price. Ecological products, which could be supported by the structural fund, however, still are reachable to limited groups of consumers.

It has to be said that final beneficiary has not been responsible for efficiently realized activities, for which he received financial support. Food industrial plant, supported by EU could start its activities; however, this is not obligatory, since the owner would not be punished in case he does not perform the activity. Where is there, afterwards, the public interest?

3. As well the factors in the **implementation phase**, respectively, in the phase of using of European financial support have not been acting accordingly to social responsibility:

By the project performing supported by the European Cohesion fund, the conflict between private interest and public interest has been obvious. Since the Cohesion fund supports costly projects at the field of traffic infrastructure and the environment, there is the interest of contractors (companies) to maximize the profit. The conflict of interests between the person placing an order (The state) and the contractors most often causes dispute, then the whole financial support to the national operational programme could be cancelled by the European Commission. Eventual trial expenses additionally are covered by tax payers' money. Expenses are above the advantages, which should be acquired from Brussels and have negative impact to state's development. Therefore, the handling of particular factors in the implementing process of financial support, however, is contrary to the rules of social responsibility.

The European funds implementing system has been such that enables the security of interests of the respective groups and, therefore, has not be founded on social responsibility principles.