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Committee for opinion | Rapporteur for opinion | Appointed
The Implementation of the Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation Instrument ? Global Europe

The Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Development jointly adopted the own-initiative report by Michael GAHLER (EPP,
Two years since the beginning of the Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF) 2021-2027 and the entry into force of the NDICI-Global Europe, in a challenging global context marked, among others, by the consequences of the Covid-19 pandemic and of Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine, this report aims to provide recommendations ahead of the mid-term evaluation (MTE) of the Global Europe instrument, which the Commission shall conclude by the end of 2024.

Members welcomed the Commission's proposal for a revision of the MFF 2021-2027 with additional funding for Heading 6, since the current financial programming is insufficient for the Instrument, which is underfunded, and should better reflect the geopolitical ambitions of the EU and its global commitments.

Members took note of the additional funds proposed by the Commission for Heading 6, of which EUR 10.5 billion would be allocated to responding to the external dimension of migration, including external challenges, EUR 3 billion to the Instruments Emerging challenges and priorities cushion and EUR 2.5 billion to the Solidarity and Emergency Aid Reserve. They also underlined the need to review the EU's external and development policies in light of the funding gap, the increasing inequalities between and within countries and global food insecurity. The report called for a thorough evaluation of the Instruments resources and for it to be ensured that they continue to be relevant in the context of ongoing geopolitical challenges, allow the EU to be seen as a trustworthy partner and counteract the influence of other global powers.

While welcoming the consolidation of most of the EU's external action in a single Instrument, gradually streamlining and harmonising the numerous previous instruments, Members are of the opinion that although this simplification has enhanced flexibility and efficiency, it has not been accompanied by sufficient levels of effective accountability and transparency. They underlined in this regard that measures can only be considered effective when this can be proven by clear and comparable monitoring and evaluation mechanisms.

The report expressed deep concern about the escalation of geopolitical turmoil, authoritarian trends and recent attacks globally on the foundations of democracy and the rule of law. It called for the mid-term evaluation of the Global Europe instrument to evaluate in depth the Instruments capacity to achieve the EU's overall external policy goals, and particularly the objective of contributing to the promotion of multilateralism and sustainable development and of protecting, promoting and advancing democracy, the rule of law and human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Members are concerned that the financing of assistance for Ukraine through the mobilisation of the Instruments cushion, rather than through the appropriate budgetary instrument, has exhausted much of the cushion, leaving the Instrument with limited ability to respond to unforeseen challenges. In this regard, Members welcomed the Commission's proposal on establishing the Ukraine Facility, which should ensure sustainable long-term financing for Ukraine while preserving the Instruments ability to cope with future challenges.

Securing the necessary resources and mobilising investments

Members stressed that under no circumstances should the 2024 mid-term revision of the MFF result in the Instruments funds being cut or reallocated between the long-term thematic and geographic programmes dedicated to sustainable development. According to the report, the lack of funds creates a dangerous gap between the EUs ambition and its ability to deliver on its promises.

The committee called for the EFSD+ not to finance investments that have a negative impact on the achievement of the SDGs, particularly as regards combating climate change.

Noting the EIB's potential to mobilise additional funding that contribute to the Instruments objectives, Members called:

- for an increase in the guarantees granted to the EIB by the EU budget in order to allow the EIB to continue to deliver vital public- and private-sector operations in Ukraine and expand its activities in the Global South;
- on the EIB to use its position to mobilise investments for sustainable development in line with the purpose and criteria established by the EFSD+;
- on the EIB to prioritise a sustainable development agenda.

The report underlined the importance of more efficiently utilising synergies and better harmonising the financing initiatives that are undertaken by the EIB, the EBRD and other DFI's and target European neighbourhood countries, with particular importance being given to EU candidate countries.

Parliamentary scrutiny

Members called on the Commission to:

- provide a consistent interinstitutional information flow, with Parliament being kept informed of investment projects, including Global Gateway projects, and to make the Result Management Framework fully available. They reiterated that Parliaments positions need to be fully taken into consideration and that its resolutions constitute part of the overall policy framework for the implementation of the Instrument;
- provide, following consultations with Parliament, a comprehensible, clear and complete overview, in a single document, of the financial instruments, their relationship with each other and the different actors involved, as well as a complete and precise overview of grants and guarantees and how they are covered.

It is expected that Parliament be fully involved in the programming exercise for the second half of the MFF and for multiannual indicative programmes for 2025-2027.

Lastly, the report noted that pilot projects and preparatory actions are new initiatives that might turn into EU funding programmes should they turn out to be successful. These are an opportunity for Parliament to introduce programmes that would not otherwise have been financed. Members stated that the Instrument, when interpreted broadly, theoretically constitutes a legal basis for all initiatives, thus preventing eligibility and making de facto initiatives by Parliament impossible. The Commission is called on to present a legislative proposal that enables Parliament to propose pilot projects and preparatory actions on the condition that the proposals are considered useful by the EU delegations and provide additional benefits, as they would not otherwise have been financed in practice.
General considerations

Parliament welcomed the Commission's proposal for a revision of the MFF 2021-2027 with additional funding for Heading 6, since the current financial programming is insufficient for the Instrument, which is underfunded, and should better reflect the geopolitical ambitions of the EU and its global commitments.

Members took note of the additional funds proposed by the Commission for Heading 6, of which EUR 10.5 billion would be allocated to responding to the external dimension of migration, including external challenges, EUR 3 billion to the Instrument's Emerging challenges and priorities cushion and EUR 2.5 billion to the Solidarity and Emergency Aid Reserve. They also underlined the need to review the EUs external and development policies in light of the funding gap, the increasing inequalities between and within countries and global food insecurity.

Parliament reaffirmed, in the face of the ongoing Russian war of aggression, its unwavering support for Ukraine, in all its dimensions, including humanitarian assistance, recovery, reconstruction and modernisation, in the face of the ongoing Russian war of aggression.

It stressed, however, that this support should not come at the expense of ODA, other partners and third countries who are adversely affected by the Russian war of aggression and whose EU funding should not be cut.

Parliament also called for a thorough evaluation of the Instrument's resources which should also determine whether they are sufficient to achieve the objectives set under it.

While welcoming the consolidation of most of the EUs external action in a single Instrument, gradually streamlining and harmonising the numerous previous instruments, Members are of the opinion that although this simplification has enhanced flexibility and efficiency, it has not been accompanied by sufficient levels of effective accountability and transparency. They underlined in this regard that measures can only be considered effective when this can be proven by clear and comparable monitoring and evaluation mechanisms.

Parliament expressed deep concern about the escalation of geopolitical turmoil, authoritarian trends and recent attacks globally on the foundations of democracy and the rule of law. It called for the mid-term evaluation of the Global Europe instrument to evaluate in depth the Instrument's capacity to achieve the EUs overall external policy goals, and particularly the objective of contributing to the promotion of multilateralism and sustainable development and of protecting, promoting and advancing democracy, the rule of law and human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Parliament strongly reaffirmed the commitment set out in the Instrument to eradicate poverty, fight climate change and food insecurity, fight inequalities and discrimination and promote sustainable human development; recalls the commitment made by the EU and the Member States to increase their ODA to 0.7 % of gross national income by 2030, including contributing at least 20 % of the ODA funded under the Instrument to social inclusion and human development, such as health, education, nutrition and social protection, and providing 0.2 % of the EUs gross national income as ODA to the least developed countries. It underlined that the EFSD+ should aim to support investments as a means of contributing to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Securing the necessary resources and mobilising investments

Parliament stressed that under no circumstances should the mid-term review of the MFF for 2024 lead to a reduction or reallocation of the instrument's funds between long-term thematic and geographical programmes devoted to sustainable development. According to the resolution, the lack of funds creates a dangerous gap between the EU's ambition and its ability to deliver on its promises.

Members recalled that private sector support complements but does not replace public investment, particularly in essential services such as health, education and social protection, which offer crucial long-term prospects for lifting people out of poverty. They called for the EFSD+ not to finance investments that have a negative impact on the achievement of the SDGs, in particular with regard to the fight against climate change.

Parliament welcomed the creation of EIB Global, which has been operational since 1 January 2022. Since the new development arm was set up, EIB Global has provided more than EUR 10 billion in 2022, including for Ukraine and the Global Gateway strategy. Members reiterated the importance of the EU budget as the sole guarantor of the EIB's lending activity outside the Union in support of EU policies. They called for an increase in the guarantees granted to the EIB from the EU budget, to enable it to continue its vital operations in the public and private sectors in Ukraine and to expand its activities in the Global South.

The Commission was also asked to clarify the roles within the Team Europe strategy and to propose a mechanism to increase the transparency and democratic scrutiny of initiatives.

Parliamentary scrutiny

Members called on the Commission to:

- provide a consistent interinstitutional information flow, with Parliament being kept informed of investment projects, including Global Gateway projects, and to make the Result Management Framework fully available;
- significantly improve the timely provision of documentation to Parliament in advance of the high-level geopolitical dialogue, as well as the way in which it takes into account Parliaments recommendations;
- provide, following consultations with Parliament, a comprehensible, clear and complete overview, in a single document, of the financial instruments, their relationship with each other and the different actors involved, as well as a complete and precise overview of grants and guarantees and how they are covered.

Parliament should be fully involved in the programming exercise for the second half of the MFF and for multiannual indicative programmes for 2025-2027.
Way forward

Parliament believes that the mid-term review should include the necessary legislative changes to the Instrument and to IPA III, so that the related regulations take account of the new status of Ukraine and Moldova as candidate countries for EU membership. It also considered that the geopolitical challenges that have arisen as a result of the Russian war of aggression against Ukraine and the malign influence and growing firmness of the People's Republic of China call for a considerable increase in the instrument's budget.

Lastly, Parliament noted that pilot projects and preparatory actions are new initiatives that could be transformed into EU funding programmes if they prove successful. It stressed that they represent an opportunity for Parliament to present programmes that would not otherwise have been funded.
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