



Committee on Budgets

2017/2280(INI)

22.2.2018

OPINION

of the Committee on Budgets

for the Committee on Foreign Affairs

on implementation of the EU external financing instruments: mid-term review
2017 and the future post-2020 architecture
(2017/2280(INI))

Rapporteur: Jean Arthuis

PA_NonLeg

SUGGESTIONS

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

1. Regrets that the quantity and lack of flexibility and coherence of the EU funding under Heading 4 of the current multiannual financial framework (MFF) have been indicative of the EU's limited ambition to act as a genuine global player; notes, however, that many of the partner countries and themes addressed by the EU external financing instruments (EFIs) have seen positive progress, which is testament to the relevance and importance of the EFIs;
2. Stresses that the EU has created the Trust Funds and a specific Facility for Refugees in Turkey to tackle multiple challenges and crises in its immediate neighbourhood and beyond, including the migration and refugee crisis; regrets that the contributions from the EU budget to the EU Trust Funds and the Facility for Refugees in Turkey have reduced the overall coherence, long-term vision and impact of the Union's action; stresses once again that new priorities must be financed with new appropriations;
3. Is convinced that the post-2020 generation of External Financing Instruments (EFIs) must:
 - be at the service of an ambitious and overarching EU global strategy based on EU values; match the EU's political ambitions in size, flexibility between and within the EFIs, and overall political coherence, including when it comes to the EU being a key actor in post-war and post-conflict reconstruction in its wider neighbourhood;
 - allow for clear synergies between the budget and the EU's political influence within genuine partnerships with third countries;
 - allow for increased EU responsiveness to the changing environment, while respecting the global commitments taken up to that point;
 - bring real EU added value and ensure better coordination and a more outcome-driven approach, including with regard to reporting and communication – EU funding must not duplicate or overlap with Member States' funding and should be more synergistic;
 - respect the budgetary principles of sincerity and unity;
 - strengthen Parliament's role of democratic scrutiny;
4. Is of the opinion that EFI architecture could be simplified and should reflect clear political objectives; stresses that results should not only be measured at country and sector level but also aggregated at instrument level; calls for an increase in efficiency, flexibility, accountability and the coherence and visibility of Union action; warns, however, that an excessively radical simplification of the structure would not be without risks;

5. Recalls the unprecedented need for humanitarian aid that has arisen as a result of natural and man-made disasters caused, inter alia, by climate change, human insecurity, conflicts and forced displacement; calls, in particular, for a separate instrument for humanitarian aid with its own legal basis, budget and long-term funding strategy to be maintained in order to guarantee the four humanitarian principles of humanity, neutrality, impartiality and independence; calls, in addition, for a substantial humanitarian aid reserve;
6. Calls for better integration of the EU Trust Funds and facilities into the budget in order to increase the transparency and democratic scrutiny of the EFIs; recalls the agreement, as part of the latest revision of the Financial Regulation¹, to consult with Parliament and the Council prior to setting up a new Trust Fund for thematic actions; calls, in addition, on the Commission to provide Parliament with detailed information about any significant autonomous transfer or decommitment under Heading 4;
7. Takes the view that mid-term review and budgetary control processes should be sufficiently rigorous and transparent to ensure the maximum absorption of funds possible and to enable appropriate modifications to increase absorption capacity where needed.

¹ OJ L 298, 26.10.2012, p. 1.

INFORMATION ON ADOPTION IN COMMITTEE ASKED FOR OPINION

Date adopted	22.2.2018
Result of final vote	+: 28 -: 4 0: 0
Members present for the final vote	Nedzhmi Ali, Lefteris Christoforou, Gérard Deprez, Manuel dos Santos, André Elissen, José Manuel Fernandes, Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, Jens Geier, Esteban González Pons, John Howarth, Zbigniew Kuźmiuk, Vladimír Maňka, Siegfried Mureşan, Jan Olbrycht, Urmas Paet, Paul Rübig, Petri Sarvamaa, Jordi Solé, Patricija Šulin, Eleftherios Synadinos, Indrek Tarand, Isabelle Thomas, Inese Vaidere, Daniele Viotti, Tiemo Wölken, Marco Zanni
Substitutes present for the final vote	Xabier Benito Ziluaga, Jean-Paul Denanot, Janusz Lewandowski, Ivana Maletić, Pavel Poc, Tomáš Zdechovský

FINAL VOTE BY ROLL CALL IN COMMITTEE ASKED FOR OPINION

28	+
ALDE	Nedzhmi Ali, Gérard Deprez, Urmas Paet
ECR	Zbigniew Kuźmiuk
PPE	Lefteris Christoforou, José Manuel Fernandes, Esteban González Pons, Janusz Lewandowski, Ivana Maletić, Siegfried Mureşan, Jan Olbrycht, Paul Rübig, Petri Sarvamaa, Patricija Šulin, Inese Vaidere, Tomáš Zdechovský
S&D	Jean-Paul Denanot, Eider Gardiazabal Rubial, Jens Geier, John Howarth, Vladimír Maňka, Pavel Poc, Manuel dos Santos, Isabelle Thomas, Daniele Viotti, Tiemo Wölken
VERTS/ALE	Jordi Solé, Indrek Tarand

4	-
ENF	André Elissen, Marco Zanni
GUE/NGL	Xabier Benito Ziluaga
NI	Eleftherios Synadinos

0	0

Key to symbols:

+ : in favour

- : against

0 : abstention