

Basic information	
2023/2029(INI)	Procedure completed
INI - Own-initiative procedure	
The Implementation of the Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation Instrument – Global Europe	
Subject	
6.30 Development cooperation	
6.40.15 European neighbourhood policy	

Key players			
European Parliament	Joint committee responsible	Rapporteur	Appointed
	AFET Foreign Affairs	GAHLER Michael (EPP) MARQUES Pedro (S&D)	23/03/2023 23/03/2023
	DEVE Development	TOBÉ Tomas (EPP) GOERENS Charles (Renew)	23/03/2023 23/03/2023
		Shadow rapporteur LUCKE Karsten (S&D) KYRTSOS Georgios (Renew) MARQUARDT Erik (Greens /EFA) URTASUN Ernest (Greens /EFA) FOTYGA Anna (ECR) KEMPA Beata (ECR) ZIMNIOK Bernhard (ID) DEMIREL Özlem (The Left)	
Committee for opinion		Rapporteur for opinion	Appointed
BUDG Budgets (Associated committee)		GARDIAZABAL RUBIAL Eider (S&D)	01/03/2023

European Commission	Commission DG	Commissioner
	Maritime Affairs and Fisheries	-- --
	Foreign Policy Instruments	-- --

--	--

Key events			
Date	Event	Reference	Summary
16/03/2023	Committee referral announced in Parliament		
16/03/2023	Referral to joint committee announced in Parliament		
20/04/2023	Referral to associated committees announced in Parliament		
16/11/2023	Vote in committee		
23/11/2023	Committee report tabled for plenary	A9-0374/2023	Summary
12/12/2023	Decision by Parliament	T9-0458/2023	Summary
12/12/2023	Results of vote in Parliament		

Technical information	
Procedure reference	2023/2029(INI)
Procedure type	INI - Own-initiative procedure
Procedure subtype	Implementation
Legal basis	Rules of Procedure EP 57_o Rules of Procedure EP 59 Rules of Procedure EP 55
Stage reached in procedure	Procedure completed
Committee dossier	CJ19/9/11482

Documentation gateway				
European Parliament				
Document type	Committee	Reference	Date	Summary
Committee draft report		PE749.124	14/07/2023	
Committee opinion	BUDG	PE746.968	19/07/2023	
Committee report tabled for plenary, single reading		A9-0374/2023	23/11/2023	Summary
Text adopted by Parliament, single reading		T9-0458/2023	12/12/2023	Summary
European Commission				
Document type	Reference	Date	Summary	
Commission response to text adopted in plenary	SP(2024)177	21/05/2024		

Meetings with interest representatives published in line with the Rules of Procedure

Rapporteurs, Shadow Rapporteurs and Committee Chairs

Transparency				
Name	Role	Committee	Date	Interest representatives
GOERENS Charles	Rapporteur	DEVE	12/12/2023	Friends of the Global Fund Europe
GOERENS Charles	Rapporteur	DEVE	29/11/2023	OMA

The Implementation of the Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation Instrument – Global Europe

2023/2029(INI) - 12/12/2023 - Text adopted by Parliament, single reading

The European Parliament adopted by 449 to 81 with 91 abstentions, a resolution on the implementation of the Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation Instrument – Global Europe.

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 EU's 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 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.

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 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.

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 EU's 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 Parliament's 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.

The Implementation of the Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation Instrument – Global Europe

2023/2029(INI) - 23/11/2023 - Committee report tabled for plenary, single reading

The Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Development jointly adopted the own-initiative report by Michael GAHLER (EPP, DE), Charles GOERENS (Renew, LU), Pedro MARQUES (S&D, PT) and Tomas TOBÉ (EPP, SE) on the implementation of the Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation Instrument – Global Europe.

General considerations

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 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 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 Instrument's 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 Instrument's 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 Instrument's 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 proposal on establishing the Ukraine Facility, which should ensure sustainable long-term financing for Ukraine while preserving the Instrument's 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 Instrument's 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 EU's 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 Instrument's 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 DFIs 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 Parliament's 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.