



**2016/2047(BUD)**

1.9.2016

# **OPINION**

of the Committee on International Trade

for the Committee on Budgets

on the draft general budget of the European Union for the financial year 2017  
(2016/2047(BUD))

Rapporteur: Reimer Böge

PA\_NonLeg

## SUGGESTIONS

The Committee on International Trade calls on the Committee on Budgets, as the committee responsible, to incorporate the following suggestions into its motion for a resolution:

1. Notes that the Union has an increasingly ambitious trade agenda, as outlined in the ‘Trade for all’ strategy, leading to an increased workload for DG Trade; emphasises the need for additional efforts to boost the ex ante, interim and ex post monitoring (including by civil society) of the application and repercussions of trade agreements signed by the Union, as well as the need for appropriate public communication and dissemination of information in respect thereof, to ensure the implementation and enforcement of the obligations of the Union and its trading partners, in particular with regard to the fight against poverty, sustainable development and the respect for human rights; acknowledges the negative impact of the planned CETA and TTIP on the level of own-resources; stresses, however, that the funding for Aid for Trade initiatives should be increased and sufficient resources allocated to ensure that DG Trade is adequately staffed to carry out the increasing number of simultaneous negotiations and monitoring activities; 2. Underlines the urgent need for a thorough reorganisation of the Union budget and its structure in the context of the review of the MFF and with regard to the trade policy agenda, and calls on the Commission to take the initiative on this vis à vis the Council and Parliament;
3. Notes that the citizens of the Union are increasingly asking for more involvement and engagement in Union trade policy and that the Commission has made this citizens’ interest a priority; stresses in this regard that it is crucial that enough resources are allocated in order to actively involve citizens in Union trade policy-making, through active engagement, stakeholder meetings, online and offline communication initiatives and the translation of fact sheets, negotiation texts and position papers; calls on Member States to take a more active role in explaining the added value of Union trade policy, since it is them who formulate the negotiating mandates, and to allocate sufficient resources for such explanations in their own national budgets;
4. Stresses that international trade is an important tool throughout Union foreign policy which, if it is underpinned with the necessary funding and implemented by means of coherent political, economic, trade and development strategies, can contribute to sustainable development, particularly in developing countries, thus enabling the Union to play an active role in tackling migration causes;
5. Emphasises that the trade-related technical support and economic assistance provided by the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) to our close partners in the Eastern Partnership as well as to the post-Arab-Spring countries make an important contribution to stability in those regions; expresses concern therefore by the proposed funding cuts to the Mediterranean axis as well as the assistance to Palestine and UNRWA; reiterates that in partner countries, the objective must be, above all, tangible and sustainable improvements to the living conditions of ordinary people;
6. Deplores the proposed significant cuts to macro-financial assistance compared to its exceptionally high level in 2016, given that many partner countries continue to face severe economic difficulties; believes that a higher funding level than proposed will be

required to ensure that all future requests for loans can be accommodated; stresses that MFA loans and the corresponding repayment conditions should not create a fresh dependency for recipient countries;

7. Expresses concern about the increasing recourse to guarantees and financial instruments outside the Union budget to respond to multiple crises, financed in part from the Union budget through cuts of programmes under Heading IV; points to the failure of Member States to match the Union contributions to the two Trust Funds which limits their potential impact; insists that such funding instruments must adhere to the established criteria of aid effectiveness, such as ownership and alignments, and must remain an exception, since they do not require advance confirmation by the European Parliament and thus lack democratic legitimacy; reiterates that those instruments should eventually be included in the Union budget to allow for proper democratic control;
8. Welcomes the announcement by the Commission that it will present a proposal for an External Investment Plan as part of the New Migration Partnership Framework in autumn 2016; believes that the External Investment Plan will offer new investment opportunities for European business in developing third countries and contribute to the sustainable political and economic stabilisation of the European Neighbourhood; deplores that the forthcoming proposals are not reflected in the draft general budget 2017; stresses that the creation of the new fund should not go to the detriment of the already under-funded programmes in Heading IV but make use of the funds as well as the expertise and the management capacities of the European Investment Bank;
9. Notes the proposed increase in commitment appropriations and the significant reinforcement in payment appropriations for the Partnership Instrument; expresses concern that individual trade promotion projects implemented under this instrument are not complementary to existing local and regional programmes but pose unfair competition to them; asks the Commission to assess the existing tools aimed at promoting SME internationalisation regarding their coherence with other European SME support instruments such as COSME as well as regarding subsidiarity, non-duplication and complementarity in relation to Member State programmes; calls on the Commission to make timely proposals for the midterm review of those programmes with a view to improving their efficiency and effectiveness;

## RESULT OF FINAL VOTE IN COMMITTEE ASKED FOR OPINION

<b>Date adopted</b>	31.8.2016
<b>Result of final vote</b>	+: 27 -: 8 0: 1
<b>Members present for the final vote</b>	Maria Arena, David Campbell Bannerman, Daniel Caspary, Salvatore Cicu, Marielle de Sarnez, Santiago Fisas Aixelà, Karoline Graswander-Hainz, Yannick Jadot, Ska Keller, Jude Kirton-Darling, David Martin, Emmanuel Maurel, Emma McClarkin, Anne-Marie Mineur, Sorin Moisă, Alessia Maria Mosca, Franz Obermayr, Artis Pabriks, Franck Proust, Inmaculada Rodríguez-Piñero Fernández, Tokia Saïfi, Marietje Schaake, Helmut Scholz, Joachim Schuster, Joachim Starbatty, Adam Szejnfeld, Hannu Takkula, Iuliu Winkler
<b>Substitutes present for the final vote</b>	Reimer Böge, Edouard Ferrand, Seán Kelly, Stelios Kouloglou, Gabriel Mato, Georg Mayer, Bolesław G. Piecha, Jarosław Wałęsa

