

CONCORD's analysis of DEVE amendments to the EP's own-initiative report "Next MFF: preparing the Parliament's position on the MFF post-2020"

CONCORD Europe, the European NGO confederation for relief and development, through which 51 members represent more than 2,600 European NGOs has analysed the DEVE opinion and the proposed amendments based on the [CONCORD position: Making the case for strong EU development cooperation budget in the next Multiannual Financial Framework](#). The outcomes of the analysis of amendments we support and do not support will hopefully be used for your discussion on the compromised amendments.

Amendments we support are:

- Those that reiterate that EU development aid should focus on long term development objectives, which is crucial in a context in which aid risks being diverted from its original focus, in contradiction with the Lisbon Treaty (Art. 21 and 208). Putting safeguards to prevent the diversion of aid is one of Concord's priorities. This includes AM 1, 4, 5, 6. In the same line, we support amendments which are meant to preserve the integrity of the mandates of development and humanitarian aid (AM 14, 105, 111 for instance), and those which reiterate the EP's long-standing support for development effectiveness principles, which have been weakened in the past two years (AM 14, 15, 17, 38, 57, 62). We also support keeping development and humanitarian aid instruments separate (AM 64).
- Those that reject the conditionality of aid to migration outcomes and support a needs and human-rights based approach to development (AM 61, as well as 76 for its support to EIDHR).
- Those which call for an increase of development and humanitarian aid budgets, above the current levels, as additional funding is needed not only for the EU to meet its commitment to allocate 0.7% of its GNI to ODA, but also to make available sufficient resources to meet the EU's political commitments for the realization of SDGs by 2030, respecting the Paris Agreement, and to address increasing emergencies and crisis (AM 21, 22, 96, 109).

The budget of humanitarian aid in particular needs to be increased given that, under the current MFF, its allocated budget - and the aid emergency reserve - was systematically drained (more specifically AM 63 which refers to disaster risk reduction and drivers of humanitarian crises, as well as amendments 94 and 95).

When it comes to the budgetization of the EDF, we believe that it should be done only if it does not lead to an overall decrease of development aid in comparison to the current levels (AM 83, 85, 88, 91).

- Those which support the inclusion of the EU's commitment to allocate 20% of its ODA to social inclusion and human development, as provided for by the European Consensus on Development (AM21, 22, 41), that support social protection (AM 37) and support the target of allocating 0.2% of ODA/GNI to least developed countries, in line with the Addis Ababa Action Agenda (AM 47, 48 and 49).
- Those which reiterate EU's support to policy coherence for development (AM 36, 38, 44, 45),
- Those which aim at ensuring that blending and the use of guarantees in the context of development respect aid/development effectiveness principles, demonstrates development

additionality, assesses human rights, social and environmental impact or provides support to social dialogue and involves the communities and actors concerned (elements of language can be found in AM 49, 53, 79, 118). In the same line, we support AM 58 in relation to the EFSD.

- Those which reiterate the EU commitments on gender and gender mainstreaming (AM 28, 44), support the political, social and economic empowerment of women and young people (AM 39) and call for measures to combat violence against women and girls (AM 43).
- Those that reiterate the EU commitments to address climate change and environment issues (in particular AM 35, 81, 113).
- Those that recognize, and provide support, to the crucial role of CSOs in development (AM 55, 90, 119).
- Those that recognize that support to middle income countries remains necessary given the high level of inequalities that they face, and the need to ensure that country differentiation takes into account more criteria than the GDP alone, such as human development and the level of inequalities (AM 56).
- Those that aim at ensuring that greater flexibility will not come at the expense of predictability, transparency and accountability; and that flexibility should first and foremost be geared towards enhancing development outcomes in full respect of development effectiveness principles (AM 62, 109, 115).
- Those that support the creation of a separate instrument dedicated to security in order to ensure that aid and development instruments and financing are not “securitized” (AM 112).

Amendments that we do not support are:

- Those which do not foresee development or human rights safeguards in blending or the use of guarantees, for instance AM 46, 50, 51, 60. We however do support the inclusion of the language on combating tax evasion and illicit financial flows that is reflected in AM 51.
- AM 72 and 77, which foresees measures that aim at “controlling migration” or facilitating repatriation. Controlling migration has nothing to do with poverty eradication, is not, and should not be a goal of development aid.
- The reference in paragraph 6 to “an incentive-based approach with partner countries”, which is very problematic as it paves the way for the “more for more” rationale in development aid, and suggests that aid can be conditioned upon cooperation on various issues. Aid should exclusively be needs-driven.

CONCORD

European NGO confederation for relief and development

