

ABSTRACT

A. Contents of the doctoral thesis

INTRODUCTION

CAP.1. THE CONTENT, CHARACTERISTICS AND PRINCIPLES OF THE BUDGETARY POLICY OF THE EUROPEAN UNION

- 1.1. The concept of budgetary policy. Particularities at European level
- 1.2. Retrospective analysis of the evolution of the EU budget system
- 1.3. The principles and rules of the European budgetary policy
- 1.4. Legal and institutional framework of budgetary policy in the European Union

CAP.2. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE EUROPEAN UNION'S BUDGETARY SYSTEM

- 2.1. Financial autonomy provided by the system of own resources
- 2.2. Multiannual financial framework and its implications
 - 2.2.1. *Expenditure ceilings set by the MFF*
 - 2.2.2. *Application of the multiannual financial framework*
 - 2.2.3. *Implications of the multiannual financial framework*
- 2.3. Annual budgetary procedure for the adoption of the EU budget
 - 2.3.1. *Stages of the budgetary procedure*
 - 2.3.2. *The amending budget*
 - 2.3.3. *Letters of amendments*
 - 2.3.4. *Budget rejection and its consequences*
- 2.4. Implementing the annual budget of the European Union
 - 2.4.1. *Methods of managing the resources of the EU budget*
 - 2.4.2. *The role of the various actors involved in budget implementation*
 - 2.4.3. *Stages of budget execution*
 - 2.4.4. *Grant, prize and procurement procedure*
 - 2.4.5. *Managing cash resources*
- 2.5. Highlighting and controlling the outcomes of the implementation of the EU budget
 - 2.5.1. *Content of financial statements*
 - 2.5.2. *Principles and rules governing accounts*
 - 2.5.3. *Accounting Policies*
 - 2.5.4. *Budget accounts*
 - 2.5.5. *Closure of budget execution accounts*
 - 2.5.6. *Internal control over the implementation of the EU budget*
 - 2.5.7. *External control of budget implementation*
 - 2.5.8. *The political control exercised by the European Parliament*

CAP.3. STRUCTURE AND DYNAMICS OF COMMUNITY INCOME AND EXPENDITURE 2007-2015

- 3.1. Community Income Analysis. Romania's contribution
 - 3.1.1. *Revenue from the EU budget. Overview*
 - 3.1.2. *The European Union's own resources*
 - 3.1.3. *Other incomes*
- 3.2. Distribution of EU budgetary funds over the period 2007-2015
 - 3.2.1. *Analysis of budgetary expenditures related to MFF 2007-2013*
 - 3.2.2. *Evolution of budget expenditures over 2014-2015*

CAP.4. BUDGET ALLOCATIONS FOR ROMANIA IN FINANCIAL YEARS 2007-2013 AND 2014-2020

- 4.1. Financial allocations from pre-accession funds

4.2. The programmatic documents and the institutional framework for the implementation of European funds in Romania

4.3. Funding of agriculture from EAGF and EAFRD

4.4. Financing structural actions on Romania's participation in the process of achieving economic, social and territorial cohesion

4.4.1. *The financial instruments of cohesion policy*

4.4.2. *Operational programs through which access to, absorption and reimbursement of Community funds was made in the financial year 2007-13*

4.4.3. *Financing Structural Actions through Operational Programs 2014-2020*

4.5. Analysis of the financial flows between Romania and the EU during 2007-2017

4.6. Proven deficiencies and actions to be taken to improve the absorption capacity of European funds in Romania

CONCLUSIONS AND PROPOSALS

BIBLIOGRAPHY

B. Keywords

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• financial policy• budget policy• fiscal policy• European budgetary policy• budget system• Budgetary tools• budget balance• budgetary discipline• budgetary procedure• interinstitutional agreement• financial perspective• Multiannual Financial Framework• Budgetary principles• commitment credits• payment credits• financial autonomy• correction mechanism• Amending budget• letter of amendment	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• indirect management• Authorizing officers• public accountant• internal auditor• Traditional own resources• VAT-based resource• the GNI-based resource• Sustainable growth• Expenses heading• pre-accession funds• Structural Funds• the common agricultural policy• Cohesion policy• absorption capacity• Intervention field• axis• net financial balance• Shared management• direct geese
---	--

C. Arguments to address the topic

The systematic and complex research of the budgetary policy (national and European) is based on the hypothesis that it plays an important and well defined role in regulating the evolution of the economic mechanism and ensuring the economic development of a state. Of the many arguments that advocate for the timeliness and importance of such a study, we consider the following to be worthwhile:

- Even under the current circumstances, the state plays an important role in the economy, a role which it exerts through the economic policy it promotes, and in particular through the financial policy, in which the budgetary policy plays a key role; the budget is the main

instrument of state intervention in the economy, being the "financial arm" of government intervention in economic and social life;

- At present, more than ever, it can be noticed the existence of an economic interdependence generated by the existence of a single European market and, more generally, of a world market as a result of the relations established between the national economies which determine the internationalization of the factors of production a deepening of the international labor division through exchange relations; Under these conditions, an imbalance produced within a national economy may generate a "domino effect" that spreads across the world economy;
- European construction is based on the conviction of the Member States that better results can be achieved in some areas of economic and social life at European level than at national level; on this basis and with the renunciation of some prerogatives of national sovereignty, certain "common policies" have been developed: common agricultural policy, cohesion policy, regional development policy, social and employment policy, competition policy, monetary policy , budgetary policy, etc. the existence of which demonstrates the unity of the will and action of the Member States to achieve common objectives;
- Implementing these policies necessarily implied the existence of adequate financial support; so the European budgetary system and European budgetary policy have emerged and consolidated, which, while strongly interfering with the national policies of the Member States, nevertheless has specific features and attributes;
- Romania's accession to the European Union on 1 January 2007 implied, among other things, the assumption of the obligation to contribute to the supply of the Community budget; At the same time, however, Romania has emerged as an opportunity to benefit from important non-reimbursable financial resources made available from the Community budget but whose access requires the fulfillment of certain conditionalities and procedures (not at all simple); the access to these funds has become a "national obsession" over time, unfortunately, many times, the finality of projects and actions funded, their economic and social impact.

D. Synthesis of the PhD thesis chapters

The main objective of the doctoral thesis was to analyze how the EU financial support to the member states (and first of all Romania) contributed to their economic and social emancipation. From this fundamental objective, a series of specific objectives have been elaborated regarding the emergence and evolution of the European budgetary system, its current characteristics, the structure and dynamics of the Community budget revenues and expenditures, the budget allocations destined for Romania and their degree of absorption, the econometric testing of the impact of European funds on economic growth.

To adequately cover this complex problem, we structured the thesis in four chapters, with weight proportions to the content, the first two of which have a more pronounced conceptual-methodological character, and the latter are mostly empirical and instrumental.

The first chapter "The content, characteristics and principles of the European Union's budgetary policy" begins with the definition of the budgetary policy consistency. Based on the opinions found in the literature (native and foreign), the European-Continental and Anglo-Saxon concepts are presented on this concept, but also the original Romanian version reached, the conclusion being that it is difficult to draw a line the demarcation between budgetary and

fiscal policy, in fact complementary. We have continued with the effort to delimit the national budgetary policies of the Community budgetary policy and to highlight some specific elements that differentiate the Community budget policy from the national ones.

In order to understand the current features of the Community budget system, we considered it necessary to briefly recall its main evolutionary stages over the 60 years of existence as a consequence of the evolution of the European communities themselves as well as of the institutions that lead them, the crises that have been crossed and, last but not least, the enlargement process carried out in several stages (seven to date). As a result of this, the European financial system is an original and innovative one. Its evolutionary tendency aimed at unifying budgetary instruments and gaining financial autonomy, strengthening and developing common policies, constantly seeking inter-institutional balance, improving financial intervention instruments. Although progress has been evident, I have speculated that the reform process should continue, taking into account the controversy over the VAT-based or correction mechanisms, the biceps system of the Budgetary Authority (Council of the EU and the European Parliament) or the consequences of the UK's withdrawal from the EU.

I then discussed the principles and rules of European budgetary policy. Starting from the fact that the European Union itself is an original creation (a union of states based on the rule of aggregation and not of the legal integration), we noticed the emergence of a new system of budgetary organization, which has certain connections with the national bureaucracy systems. I have emphasized in this context the (more pronounced) need for preset principles and rules. They are, moreover, only an adaptation at Community level of the principles enshrined in national budget law, but some of them (see the principle of budget balancing or the principle of sound financial management) acquire new valences and connotations at Community level.

The chapter concludes with the presentation of the specific legal and institutional framework in which the EU's budgetary activity takes place. It is, in our view, sufficiently well outlined, the only reserve being linked to the sharing of budgetary powers between the European Parliament and the European Council.

In chapter 2 "Characteristics of the current EU budget system", we tried to capture, as the title suggests, the current architecture of the EU budgetary system and its specific features, the result of evolution over the six decades of existence evoked in the previous chapter.

A first remark is related to the evolution of the EU financial system from a lack of autonomy (or more precisely from a "declarative" autonomy through the establishment of its own resource system) to the establishment of a system (that of the residual resource based on GNP / GNI) to ensure "effective" autonomy, so that the annual budgeting procedure achieves the balancing of the Community budget, respecting the limits defined by the multiannual financial framework. In this context, we highlighted the fact that, by antithesis with national practice, budget programming at European level starts with expenditure forecasts, depending on political decisions on priority areas of intervention, and is then followed by the size of the revenue needed to cover the expenditure, and implicitly the contribution of each Member State to the EU budget.

The second specific point is the existence of the multiannual financial framework as an innovative element of financial programming designed to ensure that a rigorous budgetary discipline is respected at European level. We have tried to accredit the idea that the existence of this multi-annual financial programming instrument is not a violation of the principle of

annuality of the budget as long as there is an annual budgetary procedure which has the purpose of approving the EU's annual budget but respecting the limits set by the MFF.

I then described the annual budgetary procedure showing the stages that are going on, their timetable, the bodies involved and their attributions, the mechanism for examining and voting the budget, etc. We have concluded that the whole procedure is carried out in a well-defined legal and institutional framework. Although there is a clear tendency of simplification and de-bureaucracy (proof being the abandonment of the system with two budget readings, the replacement of the unanimity rule with the qualified majority rule, the establishment of trilogues and others), the annual budgetary procedure at Community level remains complicated and, this will remain as long as the Bucephal system remains in the area of the budgetary authority.

We continued with the presentation of the budget implementation mechanisms presenting the three methods of managing the funds (direct, shared and indirect), the role of the various actors involved in the budget execution (credit ordinarators, accountants, auditors), the stages that are going through, etc. The conclusion is that although the existence of the budget ultimately lies with the Commission, it shares this responsibility with the Member States as long as more than three quarters of the European funds are managed in a shared system. As at national level, at European level, the principle of the separation of competences in budgetary matters between the authorizing officers and the public accountants operates, with particular attributions to the inter-auditor.

The chapter concludes with the presentation of aspects related to highlighting and controlling budget execution results. I have emphasized on this occasion the dual nature of the current EU accounting system, signifying on the one hand "cash accounting" and "accrual accounting". Beyond the many specific aspects of consolidation, conversion, treatment and balance sheet recognition of patrimonial items, we noticed the complexity of the process of closing the budget execution accounts and exercising control (internal and external) on the outputs budget. Particular attention was paid to the political scrutiny exercised by Parliament, with the aim of granting (or not) discharge, following a procedure (not at all) that we were trying to capture graphically.

In chapter 3 "Structure and Dynamics of Community Income and Expenditure in the Period 2007-2015" we have followed and analyzed the results of budget execution at European level. We first analyzed the evolution of revenue that fed the EU budget during the reference period. An overview has highlighted, on the one hand, a general upward trend (in absolute terms) of revenues mobilized to the EU budget. Although the ceiling on the European GNI has not increased (but has slightly decreased), the increase in the calculation base has made the amounts mobilized to the EU budget increase. On the other hand, it should be noted that, as stated by European rules, the EU budget mainly counts on own resources (almost 93%) and only on the other hand on other revenue (about 5.7%) and accidentally on budget surplus (1.4%).

Entering into the intimacy of our own resources, we find that, in their entirety, the GNI-based resource accounts for 74% of the proceeds of the analyzed period. Long-distance revenues from traditional own resources and revenues from the VAT-based resource account for about 13% of the total. If the revenues from traditional own resources are relatively stable over the period under review, with slight fluctuations around 16 billion euros per year, the same can not be said of the other two resources. Thus, the VAT-based resource is declining

sharply in times of crisis due to compression of consumption. Towards the end of the period, it resumed growth but remained below the 2007 level, and the stated willingness of European bodies to reduce the contribution of this resource due to the inequities it presents. Instead, the GNI-based resource is on an upward trend, with 2013 accounting for 79% of total revenue. In the case of revenues from traditional own resources, customs duties are by far the share (over 97%), especially since, following the Uruguay Round, agricultural duties were assimilated to customs duties.

The study continued with the analysis of the budgetary expenditure related to the 2007-2013 financial framework, which identified three priorities for this programming period:

- integrating the single market into the wider objective of sustainable growth with a focus on competitiveness, cohesion and the conservation and management of natural resources;
- giving greater importance to the concept of European citizenship by joining the area of freedom, justice and security and ensuring access to basic public goods and services;
- establishing a coherent role for Europe as a global actor and assuming regional responsibilities, promoting sustainable development and contributing to civilian and strategic security.

However, from a financial perspective, it is clear from the fact that the effort was focused on achieving the first objective, the overwhelming part of the resources being allocated to the heading "Sustainable growth" (41.7% of the total) and the heading "Conservation and management of natural resources" (44.8%), these two high cost expenditures receiving 86.5% of the resources.

Then, noting the increase of the budget expenditures over this financial exercise by about 30%, we tried to explain this growth and to identify at the level of each year the context in which the budget, the constraints and the challenges that existed, without losing sight of the crisis that the European and world economy has traversed. The analysis continued at the level of each heading showing the main programs and initiatives financed, the objectives, the allocated resources, the structure and the dynamics of the expenditures, the results obtained. A similar analysis was carried out on expenditure funded during the first two years of the 2014-2020 programming period. The bottom line highlights the strengthening of the heading 1 "Intelligent and inclusive growth", which, in its two sub-headings, accounts for almost half (47.1%) of resources, subheading 1b which focuses on cohesion policy being the most important. Heading 2 "Sustainable Growth: Natural Resources" continues to hold an important place, although the share of allocated funds has fallen over the previous programming period (from 44.8% to 38%), while the funds allocated to "Global Europe" represent 6.1%, slightly overtaken by the Administration. Compensation has declined significantly (around 1%) and concerns only Croatia.

Chapter 4 "Budget allocations for Romania in financial years 2007-2013 and 2014-2020" presents for the first time the financial allocations from the pre-accession funds of our country, together with the other candidate countries through the three specific financial instruments: PHARE, ISPA and SAPARD. The conclusion was that, through the pre-accession instruments, Romania, in comparison with the other candidate countries, was given the most consistent funds (this as a consequence of the missed wave of enlargement in 2004). However, it is worth highlighting the high absorption rate noted by representatives of the European Commission in Romania, although further efforts are needed to improve the administrative capacity for absorption, as will be the case.

We then presented the efforts made by Romania after the accession to the EU on 1 June 2007, on two levels:

□ on the one hand, in the elaboration of the programmatic documents that predict Romania's strategic development directions (correlated with those developed at European level); I presented in this context NDP 2007-2013, NSRF 2007-2013, the Operational Programs and their implementation framework documents (including the related financial programming);

□ on the other hand, we presented the efforts made to achieve the institutional framework for managing the structural instruments in our country, presenting the architecture of this system and the main attributions of the institutions that make up it.

Starting from the finding that the Common Agricultural Policy is one of the first policies adopted by the EU ever since its inception, we have presented this concept, its motivation and objectives, the repeated reforms it has undergone to describe the current features of the CAP with its two pillars) and financial instruments for intervention in agriculture (EAGF and EAFRD). We have analyzed in this context the allocations Romania benefited, on the axes and measures, as they are provided in the NRDP, as well as the absorption level and the amounts actually spent separately for the 2007-2013 programming period and for the first two years of the period programming period 2014-2020.

Another policy, the same or even more important than the CAP, is the EU's Economic, Social and Territorial Cohesion Policy. That is why we have allocated a generous space to the analysis of the implementation of this European policy in Romania. We have first defined the concept of cohesion that we have analyzed from an economic, social, political, cultural and territorial perspective, then marking the main evolving moments of cohesion policy at EU level. Once we reached the 2007-2013 programming period, we presented the three major objectives of the cohesion policy, the regions concerned, the eligibility criteria, funding sources and financial allocations at European level for these objectives. On this occasion, we presented a presentation of the financial instruments available to tighten the cohesion policy objectives, making the necessary demarcation between them in terms of the areas of intervention, the objectives, the priorities and the actions to be addressed.

As access to these funds is possible only on the basis of operational programs (programmatic documents submitted by the Member States, negotiated and approved by the EC) we have extensively presented these approved programs for the two analyzed programming periods, focusing on the financial allocations obtained and an analysis critical rates of absorption.

An important moment of the analysis was considered to be the comparative analysis of the financial flows between Romania and the EU, which related to the fact that in the 11 years of belonging to the European community, Romania has always had the status of "net beneficiary" (over 30 billion euro). Beyond purely financial aspects, however, we have identified a number of other non-financial aspects that need to be considered.

Finally, analyzing the concept of "absorption capacity" and its components (macroeconomic, financial and administrative capacity), we tried to identify the main problems and factors of influence that limited the absorption capacity of our country and suggest some measures that we consider could improve absorption capacity.