



21.2.2018

# OPINION

of the Committee on Development

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(\*): Linda McAvan

(\* ) Associated committee – Rule 54 of the Rules of Procedure

PA\_NonLeg

## SUGGESTIONS

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

- having regard to Regulation (EU) No 233/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 March 2014 establishing a financing instrument for development cooperation for the period 2014-2020<sup>1</sup> (DCI Regulation),
  - having regard to Regulation (EU) No 236/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 March 2014 laying down common rules and procedures for the implementation of the Union's instruments for financing external action<sup>2</sup>,
  - having regard to the Council conclusions of 19 June 2017 on EU engagement with civil society in external relations,
  - having regard to its resolution of 22 October 2013 on local authorities and civil society: Europe's engagement in support of sustainable development<sup>3</sup>,
  - having regard to the report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council of 15 December 2017 on the mid-term review of the External Financing Instruments (COM(2017)0720),
  - having regard to the European Court of Auditors Special Report 18/2014 on EuropeAid's evaluation and results-oriented monitoring systems,
  - having regard to Regulation (EU) No 182/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 February 2011 laying down the rules and general principles concerning mechanisms for control by Member States of the Commission's exercise of implementing powers<sup>4</sup>,
  - having regard to the Rules of Procedure of the Development Cooperation Instrument Committee (DCI Committee),
- A. whereas the DCI Regulation provides that implementing powers be granted to the Commission in accordance with Regulation (EU) No 182/2011, and whereas this Regulation also provides that the Commission will be assisted in this by the DCI Committee;
- B. whereas the drafting of implementing acts entails a preparatory phase internal to the Commission – including inter-service consultation – of significant length, which usually spans several months;
- C. whereas draft implementing acts must be sent to the Council and Parliament at the same time as they are sent to the DCI committee members, and whereas Article 3 of the Rules of Procedure of the DCI Committee provides that draft implementing acts must be sent

---

<sup>1</sup> OJ L 77, 15.3.2014, p. 44.

<sup>2</sup> OJ L 77, 15.3.2014, p. 95.

<sup>3</sup> OJ C 208, 10.6.2016, p. 25.

<sup>4</sup> OJ L 55, 28.2.2011, p. 13.

to DCI committee members at least 20 calendar days before the relevant committee meeting;

- D. whereas draft implementing acts should therefore be sent to Parliament at least 20 calendar days before the meeting of the DCI Committee, and whereas written procedures for the adoption of draft implementing acts are an exception to this rule in duly justified cases;
  - E. whereas the Commission considers in its mid-term review report that the current external instrument architecture is generally fit for purpose;
  - F. whereas the Commission states in its mid-term review that it is difficult to measure the overall effectiveness of the instruments in meeting their objectives, partly because of the difficulty in defining appropriate monitoring and evaluation systems at the instrument-level (p.10); recalls that the Court of Auditors pointed to serious deficiencies in EuropeAid's evaluation system in its Special Report 18/2014;
  - G. whereas the Common Implementing Regulation (CIR) contains key provisions on development and aid effectiveness principles such as untying of aid and the use of partner countries' own institutions, systems and procedures;
  - H. whereas the EU has recognised the importance of partnerships with civil society organisations (CSOs) in external relations; whereas this includes the involvement of CSOs in programming and implementing external instruments; whereas this form of more strategic engagement has not yet been implemented;
1. Recalls that the EU's external financing instruments (EFIs) are a complex set of tools for the EU to support and enhance its action on the international scene, and that their complexity is coordinated by the Common Implementing Rules Regulation, which ensures a smooth and complementary approach to the implementation of all instruments;
  2. Notes the Commission's difficulties in measuring the achievement of objectives; recalls in this context the observations made by the European Court of Auditors in its Special Report 18/2014 on EuropeAid's evaluation and results-oriented monitoring systems; calls on the Commission to take this opportunity to improve its evaluation and monitoring system in line with the recommendations made by the Court; points to the largely positive results of the Court of Auditors' special reports on EU development programmes;
  3. Recalls the key importance of development and aid effectiveness principles in external action as highlighted in the Common Implementing Regulation, and calls on the Commission to maintain these principles throughout all the measures it will take following the mid-term review report;
  4. Regrets that the issue of the lack of CSO participation in programming and implementing external instruments has not been raised in the Commission's mid-term review report; calls on the Commission to mainstream a more strategic involvement of CSOs in all external instruments and programmes, as requested by both the Council and Parliament;

5. Calls for an increase in the resources available for development aid, as the 0.7% of GNI for ODA is an EU commitment that has never yet been met and falls short of the financial resources needed to implement Agenda 2030;
6. Calls for a ‘lessons learned’ exercise to be conducted in order to identify shortcomings in, and to improve, the coordination of EU external financing instruments with the financing instruments of other international institutions, such as the World Bank, International Monetary Fund and other development/financing institutions, so as to create synergies and maximise the impact of the financing instruments in developing countries;
7. Considers that sufficient time is key to Parliament being able to properly and duly exercise its scrutiny powers with regard to draft implementing acts;
8. Considers that, given the amount of time that the draft implementing acts are in preparation before reaching the DCI Committee, non-compliance with the 20-day time limit for submission of documents to Parliament and the Council in the final phase of adoption of the implementing act cannot be justified;
9. Regrets, therefore, that the deadline of 20 calendar days is not always respected, and considers its right of scrutiny impaired;
10. Points to the importance, given the impending review of the Cotonou Agreement, of remaining strictly within the time-frames for the continental-scale projects provided for in the Pan-African Programme intended to underpin the strategic partnership between the EU and Africa;
11. Calls for submission of all draft implementing measures at least 20 days in advance, and calls on the Commission to amend the Rules of Procedure of the DCI Committee in order to extend this 20-day time limit for submission, thus facilitating Parliament’s scrutiny powers;
12. Calls, equally, for enhanced parliamentary scrutiny mechanisms for all EFIs, as well as for vehicles for their implementation such as trust funds, which enable Parliament to genuinely engage in the programming of funds and in the examination of their implementation;
13. Requires transparency, accountability, scrutiny, development additionality, respect for aid/development effectiveness principles and strong environmental, human rights and social safeguards when using development aid to leverage private sector investment;
14. Calls for trust funds, which are out of range of Parliament’s scrutiny, to be included in the EU budget;
15. Points out that transparency and accountability should be the cornerstone of the EU’s approach to private sector involvement in development, and that it is crucial to ensure that private entities which benefit from EU ODA – through blending or guarantees – respect human rights, social and labour standards and the environment;
16. Highlights that country aid allocations should not be dependent on migration deals with

the EU, and there should be no diversion of finance from poor countries and regions to migrants' countries of origin or of transit to Europe on the sole basis that these lie on the migration route.

## EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

The AFET implementation report *Implementation of the EU external financing instruments: mid-term review 2017 and the future post-2020 architecture* covers the five EU external financing instruments (EFIs) which fall under the AFET remit<sup>1</sup>, as well as the Common Implementing Rules (CIR) Regulation which sets out horizontal implementation provisions of these five instruments and of a sixth, Development Cooperation Instrument, which falls under DEVE's remit.

The DCI mid-term review as well as its post-2020 architecture is being dealt with in a separate, DEVE-lead implementation report<sup>2</sup> and are outside the scope of this draft opinion.

For the CIR provisions that concern all six EFIs or specifically the DCI, the Development Committee is drafting an opinion under Rule 54. The input contained in this draft opinion concerns exclusively these matters stemming from the CIR Regulation.

---

<sup>1</sup> The European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights; the European Neighbourhood Instrument; the Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance; the Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace; and the Partnership Instrument.

<sup>2</sup> Implementation of the Development Cooperation Instrument, the Humanitarian Aid Instrument and the European Development Fund

## INFORMATION ON ADOPTION IN COMMITTEE ASKED FOR OPINION

<b>Date adopted</b>	20.2.2018
<b>Result of final vote</b>	+: 21 -: 1 0: 0
<b>Members present for the final vote</b>	Ignazio Corrao, Mireille D'Ornano, Nirj Deva, Doru-Claudian Frunzuliță, Enrique Guerrero Salom, Maria Heubuch, György Hölvényi, Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio, Arne Lietz, Norbert Neuser, Vincent Peillon, Cristian Dan Preda, Lola Sánchez Caldentey, Eleftherios Synadinos, Eleni Theocharous, Paavo Väyrynen, Bogdan Brunon Wenta, Željana Zovko
<b>Substitutes present for the final vote</b>	Thierry Cornillet, Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra, Paul Rübig, Rainer Wieland

## FINAL VOTE BY ROLL CALL IN COMMITTEE ASKED FOR OPINION

21	+
ALDE	Thierry Cornillet, Paavo Väyrynen
ECR	Nirj Deva, Eleni Theocharous
EFDD	Ignazio Corrao, Mireille D'Ornano
GUE/NGL	Lola Sánchez Caldentey
PPE	Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra, György Hölvényi, Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio, Cristian Dan Preda, Paul Rübig, Bogdan Brunon Wenta, Rainer Wieland, Željana Zovko
S&D	Doru-Claudian Frunzuliță, Enrique Guerrero Salom, Arne Lietz, Norbert Neuser, Vincent Peillon
Verts/ALE	Maria Heubuch

1	-
NI	Eleftherios Synadinos

0	0

**Key to symbols:**

+ : in favour

- : against

0 : abstention