



Council of the
European Union

006512/EU XXVI. GP
Eingelangt am 20/12/17

Brussels, 20 December 2017
(OR. en)

15922/17

RELEX 1133
CADREFIN 134
FIN 860
DEVGEN 298
ACP 148
COEST 360
MAMA 216
MOG 90
COHOM 166

COASI 203
ASIE 64
COLAC 149
ELARG 94
COWEB 148
CFSP/PESC 1168
CODUN 57
ATO 58
GROENLAND 1

COVER NOTE

From: Secretary-General of the European Commission,
signed by Mr Jordi AYET PUIGARNAU, Director

date of receipt: 15 December 2017

To: Mr Jeppe TRANHOLM-MIKKELSEN, Secretary-General of the Council of
the European Union

No. Cion doc.: COM(2017) 720 final

Subject: REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT
AND THE COUNCIL
Mid-term review report of the External Financing Instruments

Delegations will find attached document COM(2017) 720 final.

Encl.: COM(2017) 720 final



Brussels, 15.12.2017
COM(2017) 720 final

**REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND
THE COUNCIL**

Mid-term review report of the External Financing Instruments

{SWD(2017) 463 final} - {SWD(2017) 600 final} - {SWD(2017) 601 final} -
{SWD(2017) 602 final} - {SWD(2017) 604 final} - {SWD(2017) 605 final} -
{SWD(2017) 606 final} - {SWD(2017) 607 final} - {SWD(2017) 608 final} -
{SWD(2017) 609 final}

Contents

Executive summary	2
1. Introduction	3
Purpose	3
Scope	3
2. Background	4
3. Financial breakdown	6
4. Achievement of objectives	6
Relevance of the objectives	8
Effectiveness	10
Efficiency	12
Internal coherence, external coherence, complementarity and synergies between external financing instruments	13
Added-value	14
Leverage effect	15
Scope for simplification	16
Contribution to a consistent EU external action	16
Contribution to EU priorities for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth	18
Long-term impact	18
5. Conclusions	19
Annexes	21
List of acronyms	27

Executive summary

This report responds to the Regulation (EU) 236/2014 of 11 March 2014 laying down common rules and procedures for the implementation of the European Union's (EU) instruments for financing external action¹ ('the Common Implementing Regulation') which requires a mid-term review report on several EU external financing instruments ('the instruments').

This report assesses whether these instruments are still fit for purpose, so as to ensure the effective implementation of the EU's assistance. It will inform decisions on the renewal, amendment or suspension of the types of actions implemented under the set of instruments.

The report analyses whether the objectives have been met, focusing on the results, their efficiency, added-value, the scope for simplification, internal and external coherence including complementarity and synergies, the continued relevance of all objectives, their contribution to a consistent EU external action and where relevant to the EU priorities for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth, and the leverage effect achieved.

The report is based on the findings from a set of 10 evaluation staff working documents (one per external financing instrument) which are annexed to this report. These staff working documents are themselves based on 10 external evaluations of the instruments that took place in 2016-2017 and an overarching report (the 'coherence report') that drew lessons and key messages from across the set of these instruments.

The evaluation staff working documents show that the instruments are at this time, generally fit for purpose and positive trends are emerging in relation to the instruments' objectives. In conclusion, there is no need to amend the instruments through legislative amendments or delegated acts.

Since the adoption of the instruments, the international and EU policy framework has changed with the adoption of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Global Strategy for the European Union's Foreign and Security Policy and the new European Consensus on Development. Nevertheless, the broad nature of the instruments' objectives covers partner country needs and global and EU priorities without any major gaps. Furthermore, in their first years of implementation, they have in part enabled the EU to respond to new crises and evolving needs. However, limited resources and financial flexibility, combined with a multiplication of crises, have stretched the instruments to their limits.

The main findings of the evaluation point to a need to adapt the way the instruments are implemented, notably through a more strategic and overarching programming and ensuring coherent interactions at operational level in the renewed international context.

Looking towards the future, the next generation of instruments will need to take into account the level of financial and other forms of flexibility needed for external action in order to respond to the challenges faced by the EU on the world stage.

¹ See the Common Implementing Regulation:

<https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/43f92a44-af94-11e3-86f9-01aa75ed71a1/language-en>

1. Introduction

Purpose

This report responds to Article 17 of the Common Implementing Regulation which requires a mid-term review report of the EU's external financing instruments ("the instruments") by the end of 2017. This report assesses whether these instruments remain fit for purpose, with a view to ensuring the effective implementation of the EU's assistance. It will inform decisions on the renewal, amendment or suspension of the types of actions implemented under the instruments.

Scope

The Common Implementing Regulation applies to the following:

- Development Cooperation Instrument²;
- European Instrument for Human Rights and Democracy³;
- European Neighbourhood Instrument⁴;
- Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace⁵;
- Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance;⁶ and
- Partnership Instrument for Cooperation with third countries⁷.

Other instruments that follow the requirements set out in the Common Implementing Regulation and have therefore been included in this report are:

- Instrument for Nuclear Safety Cooperation⁸; and
- Greenland Decision⁹.

Since this report provides an overview of the instruments, it also includes the 11th European Development Fund (EDF). The 11th EDF refers to a performance review¹⁰ that needs to be carried out by the end of 2018. The performance review is similar to the mid-term review provided in the Common Implementing Regulation. The Decision on the association of the

² Regulation (EU) 233/2014 of 11 March 2014, OJ L77 of 15 March 2014, p. 44 https://eeas.europa.eu/sites/eeas/files/regulation_eu_no_2332014_of_the_ep_and_the_council_establishing_a_financing_instrument_for_development_cooperation_2014-2020_0.pdf

³ Regulation 235/2014 of 11 March 2014, OJ L77 of 15 March 2014, p. 85 <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2014:077:0085:0094:EN:PDF>

⁴ Regulation 232/2014 of 11 March 2014, OJ L77 of 15 March 2014, p. 27 <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32014R0232&from=EN>

⁵ Regulation 230/2014 of 11 March 2014, OJ L77 of 15 March 2014, p. 01 <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32014R0230&from=EN>

⁶ Regulation 231/2014 of 11 March 2014, OJ L77 of 15 March 2014, p. 11 https://ec.europa.eu/neighbourhood-enlargement/sites/near/files/pdf/financial_assistance/ipa/2014/231-2014_ipa-2-reg.pdf

⁷ Regulation 234/2014 of 11 March 2014, OJ L77 of 15 March 2014, p. 77 <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32014R0234&from=EN>

⁸ Regulation 237/2014 of 11 March 2014, OJ L77 of 15 March 2014, p. 109 <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32014R0237&from=EN>

⁹ Council Decision 2014/137/EU of 14 March 2014 on relations between the European Union on one hand, and Greenland and the Kingdom of Denmark on the other, OJ L 76 of 15 March 2014 <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32014D0137&from=HU>

¹⁰ Article 18 of Regulation 2015/322 of 02 March 2015 on the implementation of the 11th EDF, OJ L 58 of 03 March 2015 <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32015R0322&from=EN>

overseas countries and territories was included in the performance review of the 11th EDF. This mid-term review report therefore covers nine instruments as well as the Common Implementation Review itself.

In line with the requirements of the Common Implementation Regulation, this report covers the period from 1 January 2014 to 30 June 2017. It analyses the achievement of the objectives of each of the instruments mentioned above, focusing on their results, efficiency, added-value, the scope for simplification, internal and external coherence including complementarity and synergies between the instruments, the continued relevance of all objectives, the contribution of the instruments to a consistent EU external action and where relevant to the EU's priorities for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth, and the leverage effect achieved by the funds.

A series of external evaluations took place in 2016-2017 on all the instruments¹¹ to inform this report. The evaluation staff working documents linked to this report are also largely based on these external evaluations.

2. Background

The EU remains the world's biggest provider of external assistance. Through this assistance it aims to reduce poverty, promote global and EU interests and fundamental values (such as democracy, human rights, peace, stability, solidarity, and prosperity)¹² and support the safeguarding of global public goods.

The instruments make up a major part of the 2014-2020 Multi-annual Financial Framework's (MFF)¹³ Heading IV "Global Europe"¹⁴. The initial total amount of Heading IV was EUR 66.2 billion (i.e. 6 % of the MFF). The EU budget instruments falling under this report¹⁵ represent a total of EUR 51.8 billion. In addition, the 11th EDF which is outside the EU budget has an allocation of EUR 30.5 billion.

¹¹ The external reports are annexed to the staff working documents that are linked to this report. The external evaluations are also available at:

https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/public-consultation-external-financing-instruments-european-union_en

¹² See Article 3 (5), 21 of the Treaty on the European Union. The EU's interests, principles and fundamental values are further defined in international agreements and EU external relation policies such as: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (<https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/post2015/transformingourworld>); the Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development (<https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/index.php?page=view&type=400&nr=2051&menu=35>); the Paris Agreement under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (http://unfccc.int/paris_agreement/items/9485.php); the European Consensus on Development

(https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/policies/european-development-policy/european-consensus-development_en); the

Partnership Framework with Third Countries under the European Agenda on Migration

(https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/policies/european-agenda-migration/proposal-implementation-package/docs/20160607/communication_external_aspects_eam_towards_new_migration_ompact_en.pdf);

and the Global Strategy for the European Union on Foreign and Security Policy (<https://europa.eu/globalstrategy>)

¹³ Council Regulation (EU, EURATOM) No 1311/2013 of 2 December 2013 laying down the Multi-annual Financial Framework for the years 2014-2020, OJ L 347/884, p. 884.

¹⁴ The Multi-annual Financial Framework is divided into six broad groups of expenditure called "Headings".

¹⁵ See instruments mentioned in the section on "Scope" and also listed under 1-10 in Table 1.

Table 1: Main Heading IV instruments and EDF¹⁶

Instruments	Amounts, € millions
1. Instrument for Pre-accession assistance (IPA II)	12.138,63
2. European Neighbourhood Instrument (ENI)	16.496,26
3. Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI)	19.947,59
4. Partnership Instrument (PI)	958,53
5. European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights (EIDHR)	1.306,56
6. Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace (IcSP)	2.365,85
7. Instrument for Nuclear Safety Cooperation (INSC)	325,321
8. Greenland Decision (GD)	217,8
<i>Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP)</i>	2.121,24
<i>Macro-financial Assistance (MFA)</i>	294,843
<i>Guarantee Fund for External Actions</i>	1.627,67
<i>Humanitarian aid</i>	8.2909,02
<i>EU Civil Protection Mechanism</i>	122,827
<i>EU Aid Volunteers initiative (EUAV)</i>	126,02
<i>European Fund for Sustainable Development (EFSD)</i>	350
<i>Margin 4</i>	-672,572
9. 11th European Development Fund, including the Overseas Countries and Territories Decision	30.506,00
10. Common Implementing Regulation (not a financing instrument but a Regulation for the implementation of some of the above instruments)	N/A

Most instruments have been under financial pressure since their creation because of:

- an increase in the number of crises;
- instability in the Neighbourhood and beyond;
- terrorist threats;
- unprecedented refugee flows; and
- a sharp increase in irregular migration¹⁷ and trafficking of human beings.

Innovative and ad hoc mechanisms had to be set up to help enhance the EU's responsiveness in the face of new pressures, such as trust funds and the Facility for Refugees in Turkey¹⁸. The recently adopted European Fund for Sustainable Development (September 2017) has also been established to provide further leverage capacity¹⁹.

Adopted in early 2014, the instruments were designed to be broad enough to adapt to an evolving policy framework. Their enabling nature has been tested as the lines between foreign and development policies and the

importance of the link between internal and external policies have evolved in the past few years²⁰. That said, no amendments were considered as needed since the instruments were

¹⁶ Figures include all transfers between instruments up to July 2017 and the mid-term review of the MFF: http://ec.europa.eu/budget/mff/figures/index_en.cfm

¹⁷ Irregular immigrants are third-country nationals who do not fulfil, or no longer fulfil, the conditions of entry as set out in Article 5 of the Schengen Borders Code or other conditions for entry, stay or residence in that Member State. In 2014 there was an almost three-fold increase compared with 2013 (source: European Parliament briefing):

[http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2015/554202/EPRS_BRI\(2015\)554202_EN.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2015/554202/EPRS_BRI(2015)554202_EN.pdf). On the whole, this trend has subsequently been confirmed.

¹⁸ The four EU trust funds created during January 2014-June 2017 are: 1) the European Trust Fund for the Central African Republic (i.e. the Békou Trust Fund, July 2014), 2) the EU regional Trust Fund in response to the Syrian crisis (i.e. the Madad Trust Fund, December 2014), 3) the European Emergency Trust Fund for stability and addressing root causes of irregular migration and displaced people in Africa (November 2015), and 4) the EU Trust Fund for Colombia (December 2016). Furthermore, the Facility for Refugees in Turkey was set up in February 2016 (.Commission Decision C/2016/855 of 10 February 2016 on the Facility for Refugees in Turkey amending Commission Decision C(2015) 9500 of 24 November 2015.

¹⁹ Regulation (EU) 2017/1601 of 27 September 2017, OJ L249 p. 1

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:L:2017:249:TOC> The External Fund for Sustainable Development will combine blending activities with a guarantee, to unblock bottlenecks to private investment by reducing the risks involved.

²⁰ See the external "Coherence Report: insights from the external evaluations of the external financing instruments" (July 2017),

https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/coherence-report-insights-external-evaluation-external-financing-instruments_en, paragraph 8.

established, except to cover new actions in capacity-building for security and development under the Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace²¹.

3. Financial breakdown

As required by the Common Implementing Regulation, the tables in the annexes display consolidated information on all funding included in the scope of this report: spending by country and region, and per instrument together with contributions to trust funds and external assigned revenues.

4. Achievement of objectives

The instruments pursue different, overall objectives:

EFI	Main objective
DCI	Reduce and in the long-term eradicate poverty in developing countries that do not benefit from funding under EDF, ENI or IPA. Provide thematic support for development-related global public goods and challenges (GPGC), and to civil society organisations and local authorities in partner countries (CSO/LAs). Support the strategic partnership between Africa and the EU.
ENI	Further advance towards an area of shared prosperity and good neighbourliness involving the EU and 16 countries and territories ²² .
IPA II	Support eight beneficiaries ²³ in adopting and implementing the reforms required for EU membership.
11 th EDF	Reduce and in the long-term eradicate poverty in African, Caribbean and Pacific States. Attain sustainable development of overseas countries and territories.
PI	Advance and promote EU and mutual interests and support partnership and alliance-building on global challenges and external aspects of EU internal policies.
EIDHR	Support democracy and enhance respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, and democracy in third countries.
IcSP	Provide crisis response and conflict prevention, support peace-building and address global, trans-regional and emerging threats.
INSC	Promote a high-level of nuclear safety, radiation protection, and the application of efficient and effective safeguards of nuclear material in third countries.
Greenland	Preserve the close and lasting links between Greenland, the EU and Denmark, while supporting the sustainable development of Greenland.

²¹ See also Section 4 "Contribution to a consistent Union external action". See proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council COM(2016)447:

https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/proposal-amending-regulation-eu-no-2302014-establishing-icsp-com2016-447_en

²² These 16 countries and territories are: Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Egypt, Georgia, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Moldova, Morocco, Occupied Palestinian Territory, Syria, Tunisia, and Ukraine.

²³ These 8 beneficiaries are: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iceland, Kosovo*, Montenegro, Serbia, Turkey, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. (* This designation is without prejudice to positions on status and is in line with the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1244/1999 and International Court of Justice opinion on the Kosovo declaration of independence). Iceland has decided not to continue the discussions related to the accession process.

The evaluation staff working documents show that positive trends are emerging in relation to these objectives²⁴. For example, most countries where the 11th EDF and DCI geographic programmes operate have experienced progress in poverty reduction and human and economic development over the last 10 years²⁵.

In the western Balkans, IPA II assistance contributed to the implementation of reforms in key areas, such as the judiciary, anti-corruption, public administration and social inclusion, and supported the progressive alignment with EU legislation and standards.

In the Neighbourhood, ENI assistance produced visible results in various sectors, such as regional development, agriculture, the labour market, border management and migration. At the same time, the instruments (ENI complemented by IcSP²⁶) demonstrated a capacity to respond to evolving needs and crisis situations.

The INSC raised levels of nuclear safety, for example by supporting follow-up to the joint comprehensive plan of action cooperation with Iran, and stress testing nuclear power plants in various countries.

The PI effectively influenced policy developments in partner countries in line with EU interests and contributed to development of mutual relationship with third countries,²⁷ complementing the larger thematic activities financed under the DCI, in particular the Global Public Goods and Challenges programme.

However, difficulties in measuring the achievement of objectives should be noted. As this is a mid-term review report and several of the instruments only recently started being implemented (following the drafting of strategy documents), it is too early to measure the achievement of high-level (and long-term) objectives at this stage. To help mitigate this situation, the external evaluations also collected data from previous instruments. That said, other limitations in measuring the achievement of objectives must be taken into consideration. Often EU support can only be seen as a contributing factor towards any results achieved. For example, the fight to eradicate poverty is a highly ambitious endeavour. Many factors, both internal and external, affect the development of the EU's partner countries and other objectives. Other major external relations actors play an active role, together with an increasing number of private donors including foundations. In addition, it is for the partner countries to adopt and implement the necessary reforms and policies that the instruments support.

²⁴ See Section 4 on "Effectiveness" for further examples of how the instruments are achieving their objectives.

²⁵ See indicators on poverty evolution in the last Millennium Development Goal Report (2015) [http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/2015_MDG_Report/pdf/MDG%202015%20rev%20\(July%201\).pdf](http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/2015_MDG_Report/pdf/MDG%202015%20rev%20(July%201).pdf)

²⁶ Source Commission staff working document on the evaluation of the IcSP, Section 5.

²⁷ Source: Commission staff working document on the evaluation of PI, Section 5.

Relevance of the objectives

The evaluation staff working documents have confirmed that the instruments' objectives were largely relevant to the policy priorities at the time of their design²⁸.

Compared to the 2007-2013 MFF, the strategic relevance has improved substantially, as lessons from the past were integrated in the new regulations:

- confirmation of global reach (IcSP, PI);
- promotion of EU interests worldwide (PI);
- increased focus on conflict prevention (IcSP);
- new common programming principles (DCI, EDF);
- greater differentiation (DCI, ENI, IPA);
- sharper focus on sector approaches (IPA);
- clear delineation of specific objectives (EIDHR);
- enhanced consistency and complementarity between the IcSP and the geographical cooperation instruments²⁹ and with CFSP operations;
- broader ambitions for the Greenland partnership (GD); and
- harmonisation of implementing procedures (CIR)

Furthermore, the external evaluations underline the strategic relevance of the thematic instruments³⁰, in particular their ability to act without the explicit consent of the partner country if required, such as engaging in crisis response, human rights and democratisation in a deteriorating context and promoting EU interests and global actions on public goods, including climate change.

²⁸ Examples: Communication COM(2011)637 final of 13 October 2011 'Increasing the impact of EU Development Policy: an Agenda for Change'

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX%3A52011DC0637&qid=1412922281378&from=EN>

Council Conclusions on "Increasing the Impact of EU Development Policy: an Agenda for Change" (3166th Foreign Affairs Council Meeting, Brussels), 14 May 2012), the European Consensus on Development (while the 'Joint statement by the Council, the European Parliament and the Commission on European Union Development Policy: the European Consensus' was adopted in 2005, it was published in the Official Journal C46 of 24 February 2006, p1):

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ%3AC%3A2006%3A046%3A0001%3A0019%3AEN%3APDF>

Neighbourhood Policy: Communication COM (2011)303 final, 24 May 2011 'A new response to a changing Neighbourhood';

the EU Strategic Partnerships: Strategic Partnership Agreements have been signed with 10 countries: Brazil, Canada, China, India, Japan, Mexico, the Republic of Korea, Republic of South Africa, the Russian Federation, and the United States of America ;

Strategy for Smart and sustainable Growth (Europe 2020): Communication COM (2010) of 3 March 2010 'Europe 2020: A strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth' ,

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A52010DC2020>

Policy on Trade, Growth and World Affairs: Communication COM(2010) 612 final of 9 November 2010 "Trade, Growth and World Affairs. Trade Policy as a core component of the EU's 2020 strategy"; and the European Security Strategy: "A secure Europe in a better world. European Security Strategy", adopted by the European Council, 12 December 2003.

²⁹ Source: Coherence Report, paragraph 10.

³⁰ Source: Coherence Report paragraph 13.

The set of broad, enabling instruments have been able to cover EU priorities without any major gaps³¹, except for capacity-building in support of security and development (CBSD)³².

However, on programming (where programming applies) and implementation of the instruments, this potential was not always fully exploited. In some countries actions under the instruments were strategically combined³³, whereas in others, the potential for strategically combining actions was not always used³⁴.

A major benefit of the instruments' relevance is the flexibility that they have built into them. Flexibility to respond to unforeseen events is required at different levels:

- (i) short-term crisis response³⁵;
- (ii) flexibility in choice of programming and implementation methods³⁶;
- (iii) financial flexibility³⁷ with reserve funds and reallocations within and between instruments;
- (iv) flexibility in the multi-annual programming with the possibility to adapt the duration of the programming to the situation on the ground and to swiftly redirect the funding in case of major changes; and
- (v) the use of special measures provided for by the Common Implementing Regulation³⁸.

The evaluation staff working documents found that the instruments, due to their enabling character and sufficiently broad objectives, facilitated the EU to respond to new crises and its evolving needs and policy objectives as well as those of partner countries. However, the ability to reallocate financial resources was fully exhausted with the emergence of new crises in countries surrounding the EU.

Internal resources and funds that were not earmarked were insufficient to deal with the crises. Consequently, Heading IV had to be increased during the mid-term review of the MFF, and the EU had to set up different crisis-related trust funds and coordination mechanisms such as a Facility for Refugees in Turkey (FRiT)³⁹. Through the trust funds and the FRiT, the EU was able to respond fairly rapidly to the crises and mobilise additional funds from EU Member States and other donors, even if the contributions from Member States were less than expected. The response also had to be facilitated by the use of special measures outside the regular programming decisions.

It is too early to conclude whether all the instruments are adequately designed to fully implement the Global Strategy for the EU's Foreign and Security Policy and the new European Consensus on Development, which focuses on the implementation of the

³¹ Source: Coherence Report, paragraph 14.

³² See Section 2 "Background" about the amendment to the IcSP.

³³ Source Commission staff working document on the evaluation of the IcSP, Section 5

³⁴ Source: Coherence Report, paragraph 16.

³⁵ Source: Coherence Report, Table 2, page 7.

³⁶ Source: Commission staff working document on the evaluation of PI, Section 5.

³⁷ The financial flexibility of the 11th EDF was particularly noted, with some 20 % of its funds being unallocated from the onset.

³⁸ Source: Commission staff working document on the evaluation of IPA II, Section 5.

³⁹ See annexes on the financial breakdown for further details on the EU trust funds and the Facility for Refugees in Turkey.

internationally agreed Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Although there is a clear alignment between the new SDGs and the objectives of several instruments.

Overall, it appears that the priorities and sectors of intervention defined in the regulations for the 11th EDF, EIDHR, ENI, DCI, IPA II, IcSP and the PI are still relevant and encompass current needs and priorities. This implies that no amendments to the regulations are needed at this stage⁴⁰. Nevertheless, the lessons-learned from the mid-term review of the MFF in terms of limited financial flexibility and complexity of the current architecture, thwarting enhanced complementarity on the ground, as well as to cover gaps in the area of security would need to be considered in the future architecture of the instruments⁴¹.

Effectiveness

Many of the partner countries and themes addressed by the instruments have experienced positive progress over the last years. Recent annual reports on the implementation of the EU instruments for financing external actions⁴² present numerous positive examples for all the objectives concerned, despite the sometimes difficult contexts (e.g. in the case of the Neighbourhood and sub-Saharan Africa). For example:

- the public administration reform in Georgia;
- the 90% reduction in poverty in Vietnam over the last decade;
- the stabilisation of Colombia after the peace agreement (by short and longer-term actions⁴³); and
- supporting the training of nuclear power plant staff in Ukraine to improve safety.

However, the overall effectiveness of the instruments in meeting their objectives is difficult to measure, partly because of the difficulty in defining appropriate monitoring and evaluation systems at the instrument-level. Also a number of results can only be measured at country and/or sector level and cannot be aggregated at instrument-level, partly because of the variety of countries and themes concerned. In a few cases (e.g. EDF and DCI) high-level indicators linked to the Millennium Development Goals (until 2015) and the Sustainable Development Goals (since 2015) were included in the legal base and are used to measure global progress⁴⁴ but these are:

- (i) not directly attributable to the actions of the instruments;
- (ii) influenced by many external factors (e.g. government policies, interventions from other donors and the international context) and
- (iii) unable to assess the instruments' characteristics such as flexibility.

⁴⁰ With the exception of the CBSD proposal, see Section 2 "Background"

⁴¹ See "Conclusions" in Section 5 and Coherence Report paragraph 65.

⁴² For example see the '2016 Annual Report on the implementation of the European Union's instruments for financing external actions in 2015', SWD (2016) 456 final of 19 December 2016.

⁴³ Source: Commission staff working document on the evaluation of the IcSP, Section 5

⁴⁴ See Annex 4 of part 2/2 of the 19 December 2016 Commission staff working document accompanying the document '2016 Annual Report on the implementation of the European Union's instruments for financing external actions in 2015', SWD(2016) 456 final of 19 December 2016. https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/annual-report-swd-part-2-2016-456-20161221_en.pdf

Since the establishment of the instruments, the Commission has invested efforts and improved reporting on the results of projects and programmes. For example with the launch of the EU-International cooperation and development results framework⁴⁵ in 2015 which produced its first report on selected results in July 2016⁴⁶. Other, similar performance frameworks with strategic and operational indicators have also been created specifically for IPA II and the PI⁴⁷. Despite these improvements further efforts are needed at instrument level to ensure a clear monitoring and evaluation system is in place to explain how the EU will measure change.

The range of implementation arrangements available plays a major role in the instruments' effectiveness⁴⁸. The simplifications introduced in the Common Implementation Regulation such as the possibility of sub-granting or awarding grants to entities without legal personality, have reinforced the EIDHR's effectiveness⁴⁹. Benefiting from exceptions, crisis response under the IcSP can be as rapid as humanitarian aid⁵⁰.

The introduction of the budget support modality and the related policy dialogue under the IPA II have played an important role in improving policy dialogue in support of furthering real reforms and stabilisation programmes in beneficiary countries. This was particularly the case in the western Balkans where this was introduced for the first time⁵¹. Similarly in Greenland budget support arrangements resulted in stronger public financial management systems and improvements in the national administration's ability to plan and implement policies⁵². However, EU procedures (originating from the Financial Regulation) are still perceived by interested parties as lengthy and burdensome⁵³.

In terms of mainstreaming EU priorities, significant progress has been noted in some programmes in the areas of climate change and environment.⁵⁴ However, more remains to be done to integrate these areas across all sectors in view of the scale of the challenges⁵⁵. Mainstreaming human rights issues including gender equality and women's empowerment is

⁴⁵ See further information on the EU international cooperation and development results framework: https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/devcos-results-framework_en

⁴⁶ This report presents selected results achieved from EU funded development cooperation projects and programmes completed in mid-2013 - mid-2014 in EU partner countries. See: https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/eu-international-cooperation-and-development-first-report-selected-results-july-2013-june-2014_en

⁴⁷ Source: Commission staff working document on the evaluation of PI, Section 3 and the Commission staff working document on the evaluation of IPA II, Section 5

⁴⁸ Source: Commission staff working document on the evaluation of PI, Section 5. Annual programmes for Electoral Observation Missions allow for fast updating in line with evolving election calendars in partner countries.

⁴⁹ Source: Commission staff working document on the evaluation of the EIDHR, Section 5.

⁵⁰ Source: Commission staff working document on the evaluation of the IcSP Section 5.

⁵¹ Source: Commission staff working document on the evaluation of IPA II, Section 5.

⁵² Source: Commission staff working document on the evaluation of the Council Decision on relations between the European Union, on the one hand, and Greenland and the Kingdom of Denmark on the other (Greenland Decision), section 6.

⁵³ Source: for example see Commission staff working document on the evaluation of the EIDHR, Section on Conclusions.

⁵⁴ 11th EDF climate contributions increased from 3.3% in 2014 to 23.3% in 2016 and DCI climate change contributions increased from 17.7% in 2014 to 24.9% in 2016. Source: Indicator 12b, EU international cooperation and development results framework with input from the OECD DAC Creditor Reporting System.

⁵⁵ Source: for example see Commission staff working document on the evaluation of the DCI, Section 5; Commission staff working document on the evaluation of the EDF, Section 5.

still a work-in-progress although some positive messages have emerged from the study⁵⁶ on the implementation of the EU gender action plan II⁵⁷, in particular for the IcSP. Overall, the external evaluations have shown partner governments' lack of interest or resistance to working in support of human rights often presents a major challenge in implementation.

Efficiency

The level of administrative expenditure points to an efficient management of the instruments' respective budgets⁵⁸.

While overall organisational performance may be efficient, some interested parties consider the implementation of the instruments in some cases as administratively burdensome. The Commission is perceived by some stakeholders as being more focused on process rather than on policy objectives and results. Requirements such as mainstreaming different policies and fulfilling international commitments such as ownership and partnership imply heavy processes. Other regulations (such as the Comitology Regulation⁵⁹) add to the complexity and length of time needed to implement the instruments.

Modest efficiency gains were made in comparison to the instruments from the 2007-2013 MFF. For example by reducing the number of DCI thematic programmes from five to two, although rigidities remains within the Global Public Goods and Challenges programme since five different budget lines were created⁶⁰. Some efficiency gains resulting from the simplification processes (such as the use of national strategies rather than EU country strategies and that joint programming documents can replace multi-annual indicative programmes if quality criteria are met) were introduced for DCI, EDF, ENI and IPA II programming processes.

On geographic instruments, a lengthy programming process is in place to safeguard principles of ownership and partnership. In the case of the EDF, the procedures also include involvement of the National/Regional Authorising Officers whose function is often seen as hampering effectiveness and efficiency, in particular at regional level. An explanation often given relates to capacity issues despite regular support in capacity-building⁶¹.

⁵⁶ Source: EU gender action plan 2016-2020 at year one: European implementation assessment by the European Parliament:

http://www.europarl.europa.eu/thinktank/en/document.html?reference=EPRS_STU%282017%29603256

⁵⁷ The gender action plan 2016-2020 is the EU's framework for promoting gender equality and women and girls' empowerment in external relations in external relations. The above-mentioned European implementation assessment by the European Parliament states that the EU has mainstreamed the notion of gender equality and women's empowerment in partner countries and has taken on board a number of lessons identified from the previous Gender Action Plan (2010-2015). The IcSP was particularly commended on results to date in terms of engagement with women's NGOs/CSOs on the "whole of society" approach.

⁵⁸ See Commission staff working document accompanying the document '2016 Annual Report on the implementation of the European Union's instruments for financing external actions in 2015', SWD(2016)456 final of 19 December 2016.

⁵⁹ Comitology refers to a process by which committees made of representatives from Member States assist in the making, adoption and implementation of EU laws. See Comitology Regulation: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=celex%3A32011R0182>

⁶⁰ Source: Commission staff working document on the evaluation of the DCI, Section 5.

⁶¹ Source: Commission staff working document on the evaluation of the 11th EDF Section 5.

The establishment of the Common Implementation Regulation was a new, simplifying feature of the 2014-2020 MFF for the EU-budget instruments covered by this report, which was largely replicated in the 11th EDF implementation regulation. By harmonising rules and limiting differences of interpretation across the external financing instruments, the external evaluations point to efficiency gains thanks to the Common Implementation Regulation, albeit on a modest scale. Under, for example, the EIDHR (in specific cases) and especially the IcSP, direct award of funding speeds up implementation in situations of crisis or urgent need.

Internal coherence, external coherence, complementarity and synergies between external financing instruments

Each external financing instrument has its own specific scope either based on the issues of substance it addresses (the EIDHR, INSC, IcSP, and PI have a potential worldwide application) or in terms of geographical focus (the DCI, EDF, ENI, GD, and IPA II accompanied by specific themes).

Three instruments are clearly designed to complement others through their distinct implementation modalities:

- 1) EIDHR (independent and flexible actions);
- 2) IcSP (for quick response with short and long-term actions); and
- 3) PI (actions in the EU and/or mutual interest that are not possible to fund under the DCI, ENI or IPA II)⁶².

The internal coherence within the instruments is largely satisfactory because of revised geographic programming instructions, sector concentration, appropriate decision-making processes and improved quality review systems. However significant variations can be observed at the level of EU delegations.

The evaluation staff working documents provide some examples of complementarities between the instruments. For example, the EIDHR and the PI support certain actions that other geographic instruments are not able to finance, such as direct cooperation with civil society organisations on human rights issues or cooperation with industrialised countries⁶³.

Effective synergies between the IcSP (with its ability to provide short-term reactions without programming) and the geographic instruments were also found. Although effective follow-up is hampered by the lack of flexibility in procedures of most other instruments which are bound by long programming periods⁶⁴.

Nevertheless, overall coherence between instruments could be further improved, in particular by streamlining the instruments to reduce the boundaries between geographic (the 11th EDF, ENI, DCI, and IPA II) and thematic instruments/programmes (thematic programmes within the DCI, IcSP and PI) which can both intervene in the same areas⁶⁵. The specific scope of the

⁶² Source: Commission staff working document on the evaluation of the PI for cooperation with third countries, Section 2.

⁶³ Including with some strategic partner countries such as: Brazil, China, India and Mexico.

⁶⁴ Source: Commission staff working document on the evaluation of IcSP, Section 5.

⁶⁵ Source: Coherence Report, paragraph 33

geographic instruments has made it difficult to engage strategically and coherently with some partner countries. Three geographical instruments are used to engage with Africa (the EDF, DCI and ENI) and cooperation at continental level is funded both from the DCI (the Pan-African programme) and with a slightly reduced scope from the 11th EDF (intra-ACP programme)⁶⁶. Similarly, it has proven difficult to build bridges between regions as, for example, EU relations with the Caribbean and Latin America are covered both by the DCI and the EDF.

Policy Coherence for Development⁶⁷ has gained momentum. The analysis of trade policy support to development in regional cooperation shows an increasing attention to the trade/development nexus⁶⁸. The nexuses between security/development/humanitarian aid also gained political momentum.

On geographic instruments (the DCI, ENI and 11th EDF), in terms of coherence between partner country and EU priorities, some external evaluations mention tendencies towards predominantly EU driven agendas during the programming. This was despite the extensive consultation of interested parties during programming and project implementation, and, in particular in the EDF, the co-signature of the multi-annual programming documents and annual actions. This apparent trade-off between EU interests/international values and partnership principles should be seen within the new policy context of the universally agreed 2030 Agenda/SDGs⁶⁹.

Added-value

A combination of several factors explains the added-value of the EU's instruments⁷⁰:

- (i) the EU's competence or expertise⁷¹;
- (ii) the EU's nature as a supranational entity, and the relative neutrality, political influence and leverage this potentially entails⁷²;
- (iii) geographical spread of some instruments⁷³ including the presence in fragile contexts where there are fewer development partners and the significant volume of funds available⁷⁴,

⁶⁶ In addition, the IcSP crisis response component devoted 33% of its funds to Africa during the period under review.

⁶⁷ Through Policy Coherence for Development the EU seeks to take account of development objectives in all of its policies that are likely to affect developing countries. It aims at minimising contradictions and building synergies between different EU policies to benefit developing countries and increase the effectiveness of development cooperation. Policy coherence in support of development objectives was first integrated in EU fundamental law in 1992 and further reinforced in the Treaty of Lisbon (Art. 208 Treaty on the Functioning of the EU) making the EU a forerunner on the international stage in this area.

⁶⁸ See 5th EU Policy Coherence for Development report, 2015: https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/policies/policy-coherence-development_en

⁶⁹ Source: Coherence Report, paragraph 51-53.

⁷⁰ Source: Coherence Report, paragraph 37 and Section 5 of the staff working documents annexed to this report.

⁷¹ See for example the Centres of Thematic Expertise created by the Commission. Source: Commission Staff working document on the evaluation of IPA II, Section 5. Or under the PI, for example the EU's expertise in technical standards, Source: Commission staff working document on the evaluation of PI, Annex 3.

⁷² The EU is largely perceived by dialogue partners as an actor not defending or advancing the interest of a particular country, which is important for the EU as a peace and security actor under IcSP crisis response and for Election Observation Missions under EIDHR.

- (iv) the scope of the instruments and modalities (such as budget support, grants, indirect management, blending facilities and rapid decision-making for crisis response); and
- (v) the ability of the EU to lead on joint actions (i.e. joint programming and joint implementation), especially with Member States.

Additional factors are that the instruments can be used to intervene at various levels (i.e. national regional, continental), the predictability of funds (especially the EDF which is not subject to the annuality rule of the EU budget⁷⁵), the emphasis placed on regional cooperation⁷⁶ and the unique position of the EU to prepare accession countries for EU membership through the IPA.

More specialised instruments have specific added-value linked to their scope. For example, the IcSP's speed, flexibility and capacity to adapt to evolving contexts, and presence in zones where other actors are absent⁷⁷, and the EIDHR actions in sensitive human rights situations without needing partner governments' consent.

Leverage effect

Conditions are in place for the instruments to enable a strengthened policy dialogue at country level, in particular when programmes are implemented through budget support⁷⁸. The PI substantiates policy dialogues/partnerships with third countries through support of specific cooperation activities (based on mutual interest) which help to promote EU interests and create a unique political leverage⁷⁹.

Another important leverage effect stems from the donor coordination role the EU Delegations play: fostering complementarity and coherence between different EU actors and increasing the visibility of the EU. This is particularly true where joint programming processes have been launched⁸⁰.

The specialised instruments also engage in targeted policy dialogue, for example through the INSC or the EIDHR on election observation. The IcSP contributed to leverage the EU's policy dialogue in increasing donor funds spent in a conflict-sensitive manner⁸¹. The evaluations also point to some drawbacks for the political leverage exerted in terms of enhanced policy dialogue on human rights and fundamental values. The drawbacks were linked in particular to

⁷³ EIDHR's worldwide scope, including Election Observation Missions and the PI (albeit focused on strategic partners).

⁷⁴ Especially the EDF and the thematic component of the DCI.

⁷⁵ Annuity is the budgetary principle according to which expenditure and revenue are programmed and authorised for one year, starting on 1 January and ending on 31 December. Source: Article 9 of Regulation 966/2012 on the financial rules applicable to the general budget of the Union: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32012R0966&from=EN>

⁷⁶ Source: Commission staff working document on the evaluation of IPA II, Section 5.

⁷⁷ Source Commission staff working document on the evaluation of the IcSP, Section 2.

⁷⁸ Sources: Commission staff working document on ENI, Section 5, and Commission staff working document for IPA II, Section 5.

⁷⁹ Source: Commission staff working document on the evaluation of PI, Section 5.

⁸⁰ See external evaluation on Joint Programming:

https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/evaluation-eu-joint-programming-process-development-cooperation-2011-2015_en

⁸¹ Source: Commission staff working document on the IcSP, Section 5.

a decreasing acceptance of the liberal democratic model of development, the diminishing importance of official development assistance and the emergence of new actors⁸².

The instruments' financial leverage is reasonably high, thanks mainly to blending facilities (i.e. for DCI, EDF, ENI and IPA).⁸³ The creation of trust funds has also resulted in financial leverage⁸⁴, even if not always at the expected level.

Scope for simplification

Cost-efficient and effective delivery mechanisms are essential to improve the instruments' performance. The Commission has embarked on a simplification process through the revision of the multi-annual programming guidelines and annual decision procedures. Nevertheless, the overall number of instruments as well as some instruments in particular was still viewed by interested parties as complex, administratively burdensome and lacking financial flexibility. The detailed budget distribution included in the DCI both for geographic and thematic programmes adds to the complexity and rigidity of the instrument, making the possibilities to transfer funds between objectives and for changing priorities within the instrument difficult, in particular when there is a need to face emergencies and crises.

Before the 2014-2020 MFF, each instrument had its own implementing rules which led to divergences in their implementation covering the 2007-2013 MFF. The Common Implementing Regulation, to which the EDF implementing regulation⁸⁵ is largely aligned, contributed to the simplification agenda in that it prevented divergences and problems in interpretation⁸⁶. Since 2014, the continued simplification efforts in external relations have been focused on eliminating unnecessary burdens, increasing flexibility and reducing complexity for external partners at implementation level. Other simplifications are also in sight, but first require amendments to the Financial Regulation by the Council and the European Parliament, for which a revision⁸⁷ was proposed by the Commission.

Contribution to a consistent EU external action

The EU ensures the security and prosperity for Europeans by actively engaging on the world stage, to promote its interests and uphold the values of democracy, the rule of law and protection of human rights. EU external action policies⁸⁸ include international commitments such as the 2030 Agenda and the Paris Agreement on climate change, together with the Global Strategy for the EU's Foreign and Security Policy, the new European Consensus on Development, the renewed EU-Africa partnership, the reviewed European Neighbourhood

⁸² Source: Coherence Report, box 1, page 5.

⁸³ Sources: for example, Commission staff working document on the evaluation of the DCI, Section 5 and the staff working document on the evaluation of the EDF, Section 5.

⁸⁴ See Table 3 in annex for financial breakdown.

⁸⁵ Council Regulation (EU) 2015/323 on the financial regulation applicable to the 11th European Development Fund of 2 March 2015, OJ L58, p 17

⁸⁶ Source: Commission staff working document on the evaluation of the Common Implementing Regulation, page 8.

⁸⁷ Commission's proposal COM(2016) 605 final of 14 September 2016,

⁸⁸ See Article 3 (5), 21 of the Treaty on the European Union

policy, the Enlargement policy and the Consensus on Humanitarian Aid, among others, which taken together provides the necessary framework for the EU to achieve its objectives.

To meet these objectives, the EU toolbox for external policies encompasses development cooperation, diplomacy, peace, security and defence actions, economic cooperation, enlargement, humanitarian aid and civil protection, enhanced neighbourhood relations, macro-financial assistance, partnership on global challenges and trade. The instruments' part of this toolbox accounts for more than three quarters of the available funding under the present MFF, and have contributed to the EU's external action since 2014, as mentioned in the evaluation staff working documents.

Furthermore, to improve the EU's effectiveness in supporting stability, security and sustainable development in partner countries the Commission adopted a proposal to amend the IcSP Regulation⁸⁹. The amendment closes the gap identified in the EU's ability to provide support when building EU partners' capacities in the security sector and would enable the EU to support military actors, under exceptional and clearly defined circumstances.

Through the use of joint programming with Member States and other donors, a more coherent and visible EU response to partner countries' development has been created. A specific evaluation⁹⁰ published in March 2017 found progress on joint programming with Member States showing that, despite still being in its early stages, it is valuable for the EU and its Member States. Challenges linked to ensuring ownership of the process and results by partner countries would need to be further addressed.

On civil society in partner countries, although the geographical instruments work mainly with their authorities, cooperation with civil society organisations remains a constant feature across the instruments with a view to contributing to reinforcing the organisations' capacity and to a civil society that is able to promote reforms and hold governments to account. Some instruments and programmes, such as the EIDHR and the DCI CSO/LA are primarily intended to support civil society.

The close interconnection between internal and external policies is self-evident, for instance, with the migration crisis where the coordination and complementarity between instruments was necessary. EU internal policy priorities have been integrated, to the extent possible, in external actions in a coherent and consistent way, in order to safeguard EU interests and promote mutual interest solutions and also benefited from the specialist focus of PI on the internal/external policy nexus.

To properly address external interest and achieve global objectives stronger collaboration between EU internal and external services have been pursued⁹¹ to ensure coherent approaches and to avoid duplication and overlaps. To help reinforce coherence, to ensure that EU actions are mutually reinforcing and to avoid contradictory approaches, external services need to have a more complete picture of the activities that take place outside the EU, in particular on global challenges such as climate change, biodiversity or the fight against terrorism. The current

⁸⁹ See Section 2 "Background" for more information.

⁹⁰ See external evaluation of EU Joint Programming Process of Development Cooperation (March 2017) http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/evaluation-eu-joint-programming-process-development-cooperation-2011-2015_en

⁹¹ Source: Commission staff working document on the evaluation of PI, Section 5.

multiple programming documents covering a given country/region/continent make it difficult to have a clear overview of external actions⁹².

Contribution to EU priorities for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth

Smart, sustainable and inclusive growth is at the heart of the EU's external assistance. The instruments contribute to smart growth through support to trade-related projects and the development of collective approaches on climate change and environment.

In line with the Agenda for Change⁹³ that aims to significantly increase the impact and effectiveness of the EU's external assistance, EU assistance at country level has to focus on three or fewer sectors of concentration in most partner countries. EU support has since been more focused on the two priority areas of the Agenda for Change, one of those being inclusive and sustainable growth for human development⁹⁴.

IPA II has a clear objective of enhancing its beneficiary countries' economic and social development with a view to attaining the targets set in the Europe 2020 strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth. The development instruments have a strong focus on smart, sustainable and inclusive growth as reflected in the actions adopted in the various Annual Action Programmes⁹⁵. The PI also contributes to these EU priorities as does the Greenland Decision. On the PI, one of its specific objectives is the promotion of the international dimension of the Europe 2020 strategy in all its aspects (e.g. jobs, growth, and investments, SMEs).

Since 2008 the Commission has been setting up blending facilities in different regions of the world, resulting in the leveraging of investments, to promote sustainable economic development. These blending operations have covered different areas of intervention (infrastructure projects, Micro, Small and Medium Enterprise financing, etc.) and the value added they generate varies according to the specific additionality objective they are meant to address, as well as to the economic conditions in the given country of operations (e.g. macroeconomic framework, conducive business environment, investment climate).

Long-term impact

The external evaluations have highlighted that there are obvious difficulties in measuring the long-term impact of the instruments at the mid-point of their implementation, as some of them have only recently started implementing a significant number of projects and programmes and baselines have, in many cases, not yet been established.

Nevertheless, some evaluations were able to look at achievements under previous instruments to show positive trends in key indicators. For example, the DCI supported the drafting of 50

⁹² See for example the description of the instruments active in Africa under Section 4 on 'Internal coherence, external coherence, complementarity and synergies between external financing instruments'.

⁹³ COM (2011) 637, 13 October 2011.

⁹⁴ Source: Commission staff working document accompanying the document '2016 Annual Report on the implementation of the European Union's instruments for financing external actions in 2015', SWD(2016)456 final of 19 December 2016..

⁹⁵ Source: Commission 2016 Annual Report on the implementation of the European Union's instruments for financing external actions in 2015, SWD (2016) 456 final of 19 December 2016

national and regional climate strategies over the last years; in Neighbourhood countries, and despite difficult circumstances (e.g. the global economic crisis, regional crises, civil wars, terrorism, and the migration crisis), some countries showed significant progress in certain governance areas (e.g. Georgia in the area of public administration). For the PI the mid-term evaluation concludes that the support deployed is on track to deliver the expected impacts⁹⁶.

Performance against the current set of objectives contained in the instruments is dependent on various external factors outside the control of the instruments, such as national ownership, political will and a country's administrative capacity. The cost of non-action or late action in external relations would be catastrophic if instability, conflict and war were to increase, in particular in the EU's Neighbourhood, with potential spill-over effects for the EU itself.

5. Conclusions

In conclusion, the current set of instruments is still relevant and has proved to be sufficiently enabling. At this stage there is therefore no need to amend them through legislative proposals or delegated acts.

However, the staff working documents linked to this report point to some aspects deserving attention in the future, with a view to improving the implementation of the EU's external action and drawing lessons for the next generation of instruments.

Issues addressed in the different external evaluations will be taken into account within the remaining period of implementation of the instruments and during the preparation of the next generation of the instruments. In particular:

- The 2030 Agenda is key as it sets out ambitious universal Sustainable Development Goals and is based on multi-stakeholder partnerships, highlighting the importance of "non-aid" agenda and interlinkages between goals, including the security-development nexus. The Sustainable Development Goals must be consistently and coherently taken into account in the EU's external action. In line with the 2030 Agenda, the Global Strategy and the new European Consensus on Development provide a new vision for the EU's external action⁹⁷.
- The importance of promoting fundamental values and human rights is at the core of the instruments, but external evaluations point to an increased difficulty to promote and take this agenda forward in many countries, and to the shrinking space for civil society organisation in many countries as well. This makes it difficult for the EU to work on these important dimensions and highlights another possible tension between some fundamental elements of EU external action and the partnership and ownership principles.
- In the current context of multiple crises and conflicts, the EU's multi-annual financial framework needs to be able to adjust swiftly to changing priorities and unforeseen events, and to deliver rapidly on the ground.⁹⁸ The instruments similarly need sufficient financial

⁹⁶ Source: Commission Staff working document on the evaluation of PI, Section 5.

⁹⁷ See also the Rome Declaration of 25 March 2017.

⁹⁸ Source: Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council 'Mid-term review/revision of the multiannual financial framework 2014-2020, and EU budget focused on results', COM (2016) 603 final of 14 September 2016.

and other kinds of flexibility for external action to respond to the many challenges for the EU on the world stage. This flexibility needs to be built up at different levels. This means starting from the budget, which should include more substantial reserves, through to multi-annual programming, and greater simplification at implementation level to increase efficiency and effectiveness.

- The balance between long-term commitments to support reforms in partner countries and short-term actions should be reassessed. This points to a tension between predictability, linked to aid effectiveness commitments and the flexibility of the EU's external assistance.
- Overall, consideration needs to be given to the future level of ambition for peace and security in external actions⁹⁹. Also, based on recent experience, a rapid and flexible capacity for crisis response will continue to be needed.
- While there is evidence of coherence among instruments, this could be enhanced by streamlining their number. This would help to ensure better interactions at the operational level, in particular between geographic and thematic instruments and programmes that can intervene in the same areas.
- Mainstreaming of EU priorities, while overall a success e.g. for climate change and environmental protection, has proved challenging in some contexts, in particular due to resistance from partner countries, and a possible tension between furthering the EU agenda, e.g. regarding the promotion of action to address global challenges and public goods or regarding migration and security, and the ownership and partnership principles.
- The nexus between internal and external policy objectives needs to be better articulated. Alternative approaches to this cooperation would need to be developed building on the experience of the DCI Global Public Goods and Challenges programme and the PI, which has a global scope.
- The principle of graduation in the DCI intentionally limited the EU's ability to cooperate with Upper Middle Income Countries through bilateral cooperation. The EU must pursue cooperation with all countries including more advanced developing countries and strategic partners, in line with the 2030 Agenda and the European Consensus on Development.
- The potential for cooperation with EU Member States, notably through joint programming, would need to be further strengthened. This however would require more commitment from both partner country governments and Member States in certain countries.

⁹⁹ Commission COM (2017)2025 of 1 March 2017 - White Paper on the Future of Europe; COM(2017) 315 of 7 June 2017 - Reflection Paper on the Future of European Defence; COM(2017) 358 of 28 June 2017 - Reflection Paper on the future of EU Finances.

Annexes

Table 1 Spending by beneficiary country and region and per instrument / in EUR

DCI Total Benefitting Zone	Committed Amount					Paid Amount				
	2014	2015	2016	2017	TOTAL	2014	2015	2016	2017	TOTAL
ACP Countries	50.000				50.000		50.000			50.000
Afghanistan		202.117.199	246.915.514	80.012.500	529.045.213		5.455.034	82.784.018	68.499.400	156.738.452
Africa		25.000.000	45.389.112	0	70.389.112			18.454.143	17.704.909	36.159.052
All Countries	354.363.692	477.729.883	460.030.436	255.364.877	1.547.488.888		28.808.414	193.239.844	116.665.509	338.713.766
Asia	74.707.123	76.373.104	97.237.355	27.917.210	276.234.792	50.000	11.450.597	27.610.794	24.289.944	63.401.334
Asia & the Pacific / South		5.000.000			5.000.000			1.537.420	1.151.777	2.689.197
Bangladesh	25.000.000	99.050.000	136.771.841	1.678.159	262.500.000			6.438.475	23.747.197	30.185.672
Bhutan			44.000.000		44.000.000					1.500.000
Bolivia	102.633.200	20.000.000	7.000.000		129.633.200		2.298.641	35.753.173	173.539	38.225.353
Brazil		4.000.000			4.000.000					12.855
Cambodia	50.000.000	40.000.000	30.000.000	40.000.000	160.000.000		6.315.150	21.679.488	9.229.926	37.224.565
Cape Verde		1.250.000	5.000.000		6.250.000		1.250.000			1.250.000
Central Africa Region	5.000.000				5.000.000			2.000.000		2.000.000
Central America Region		34.000.000	21.000.000		55.000.000			15.001.365	162.030	15.163.395
Central Asia Region	10.000.000	76.300.000	20.000.000	297.320	106.597.320		574.447	22.402.408	10.535.038	33.511.892
Colombia		67.000.000	30.680.000	40.000.000	137.680.000			10.447.404	21.345.700	31.793.104
Cuba		7.700.000	1.850.000		9.550.000			43.500	2.058.504	2.102.004
Ecuador			13.400.000	6.400.000	19.800.000					3.364.374
El Salvador		5.000.000	50.000.000		55.000.000			418.410	32.035	450.445
EU Europe	36.000.000	250.000			36.250.000		12.125.543	12.315.458	2.216.354	26.657.354
Guatemala	25.000.000	5.000.000	10.300.000	15.000.000	55.300.000			116.367	5.322.191	5.438.558
Guinea-Bissau		4.000.000			4.000.000			1.265.880		1.265.880
Haiti	5.000.000				5.000.000		419.202	1.316.856	122.474	1.858.531
Honduras	51.600.000	30.000.000	5.668.320	12.231.680	99.500.000		2.827.150	13.520.342	3.538.567	19.886.059
Iraq		50.011.154	43.400.000		93.411.154			4.010.759	14.335.231	18.345.990
Kyrgyzstan	30.000.000	49.130.000	23.000.000		102.130.000		45.530	20.586.377	2.342.538	22.974.445
Laos		44.500.000	31.000.000		75.500.000			6.120.161	6.362.441	12.482.602
Latin America and Caribbean	10.000.000	20.500.000	10.000.000		40.500.000			6.524.544	4.905.002	11.429.546
Latin America Countries	59.572.759	63.493.537	137.977.263	70.210.000	331.253.559		900.198	31.347.360	34.876.313	67.123.871
Liberia			6.000.000		6.000.000					0
Madagascar		8.000.000			8.000.000			1.830.902		1.830.902
Mali	270.000		6.000.000		6.270.000			147.825		147.825
Mauritius			3.000.000		3.000.000					0
Miscellaneous Countries	329.576.970	198.422.948	299.720.551	43.037.840	870.758.309		133.340.070	166.690.507	101.002.434	401.033.011
Mongolia	8.200.000				8.200.000			1.482.119	164.062	1.646.181
Myanmar	60.000.000	70.000.000	-1.783.574		128.216.426		15.228.889	24.241.879	1.750.005	41.220.772
Near and Middle East	0		20.000.000		20.000.000					0
Nepal	22.650.000	125.000.000	81.400.000	1.650.000	230.700.000			56.470.775	3.635.183	60.105.958
Nicaragua	8.000.000	20.000.000	20.000.000		48.000.000			6.640.797	1.461.447	8.102.244
Niger	11.000.000		663.143		11.663.143			4.001.025		4.001.025
Pacific Region	1.900.000				1.900.000			1.509.920		1.509.920
Pakistan	97.500.000	128.000.000	45.520.000	60.000.000	331.020.000		601.625	21.661.085	10.167.752	32.430.461
Pan-African region	97.577.288	101.404.040	81.382.007	88.280.888	368.644.223		19.549.037	51.074.376	38.590.783	109.214.197
Paraguay	1.984.000	2.000.000	57.660.000	1.650.000	63.294.000		457.625	1.048.324	2.493.386	3.999.334
Peru	5.000.000	43.300.000		-8.895	48.291.105	4.650.000		12.494.428	697.594	17.842.022
Philippines	76.000.000		6.100.000		82.100.000			14.699.345	579.009	15.278.354
Rwanda	4.000.000				4.000.000			2.006.600		2.006.600
Samoa		3.000.000			3.000.000					0
Seychelles	3.000.000				3.000.000			246.560	422.650	669.210
South Africa		27.795.000	64.245.800	-120.920	91.919.880		5.141.312	7.549.795	2.206.878	14.897.985
South East Asia Region	35.000.000	30.000.000	40.000.000		105.000.000		1.309.455	1.560.413	6.977.070	9.846.938
Sri Lanka	14.000.000	38.000.000	12.000.000	30.000.000	94.000.000			4.467.653	6.235.206	10.702.860
Sudan			8.500.000		8.500.000					0
Suriname		3.000.000			3.000.000			1.050.000		1.050.000
Tajikistan	35.000.000	15.000.000			50.000.000			4.454.772	2.326.027	6.780.799
Territories to the east of Jordan	2.500.000		-1.256.580	-73.277	1.170.143		379.113	588.908	28.523	996.544
Thailand		13.700.000			13.700.000			4.312.625	1.073.705	5.386.330
Togo			10.000.000		10.000.000					0
Turkmenistan			9.530.000		9.530.000					0
Non-country allocated	313.489.148	171.967.039	200.886.050	13.349.529	699.691.765	3.089.560	81.204.489	199.293.054	94.974.110	378.561.212
Uzbekistan	20.000.000		21.500.000	600.000	42.100.000			3.169.260	4.278.861	7.448.121
Vietnam	14.000.000	1.100.000	108.000.000		123.100.000					0
West Africa Region			5.200.000		5.200.000					0
Yemen	51.000.000		23.104.914	8.895.086	83.000.000			23.677.436	17.498.708	41.176.144
TOTAL	2.050.574.180	2.407.093.903	2.597.992.151	796.371.997	7.852.032.231	7.789.560	329.879.344	1.151.157.103	671.057.239	2.159.883.246

DCI ACP Benefitting Zone	Committed Amount					Paid Amount				
	2014	2015	2016	2017	TOTAL	2014	2015	2016	2017	TOTAL
Pan-African region	97.577.288	101.404.040	81.382.007	88.280.888	368.644.223		19.549.037	51.074.376	38.590.783	109.214.197
South Africa		27.795.000	64.245.800	-120.920	91.919.880		5.141.312	7.549.795	2.206.878	14.897.985
All countries			10.000.000		10.000.000				40.210	40.210
TOTAL	97.577.288	129.199.040	155.627.807	88.159.968	470.564.102	0	24.690.349	58.624.171	40.837.871	124.152.391

DCI ALA	Committed Amount					Paid Amount					
	Benefitting Zone	2014	2015	2016	2017	Totals	2014	2015	2016	2017	Totals
Bolivia	102.633.200	20.000.000				122.633.200		2.298.641	35.753.173	173.539	38.225.353
Central America Region		34.000.000	21.000.000			55.000.000		15.001.365	162.030	15.163.395	
Colombia		67.000.000	30.680.000	40.000.000		137.680.000		10.447.404	21.345.700	31.793.104	
Cuba		7.700.000	1.850.000			9.550.000		43.500	2.058.504	2.102.004	
Ecuador			13.400.000	6.400.000		19.800.000			3.364.374	3.364.374	
El Salvador		5.000.000	50.000.000			55.000.000		418.410	32.035	450.445	
Guatemala	25.664.313	5.000.000	10.300.000	15.000.000		55.964.313	527.891	116.367	5.322.191	5.966.449	
Honduras	51.600.000	30.000.000	5.668.320	12.231.680		99.500.000	2.827.150	13.520.342	3.538.567	19.886.059	
Latin America and Caribbean	10.000.000	12.000.000				22.000.000		5.076.743	3.552.168	8.628.910	
Latin America Countries	59.572.759	63.493.537	137.977.263	70.210.000		331.253.559	900.198	31.347.360	34.876.313	67.123.871	
Nicaragua	8.000.000	20.000.000	20.000.000			48.000.000		6.640.797	1.461.447	8.102.244	
Paraguay	1.984.000	2.000.000	57.660.000	1.650.000		63.294.000	457.625	1.048.324	2.493.386	3.999.334	
Peru		43.300.000				43.300.000		12.153.323	697.594	12.850.917	
Totals	259.804.272	309.493.537	348.535.583	145.141.680	1.062.975.072		7.011.504	131.567.108	79.077.847	217.656.459	

DCI Asia	Committed Amount					Paid Amount				
	Benefitting Zone	2014	2015	2016	2017	Totals	2014	2015	2016	2017
Afghanistan	182.500.000	202.117.199	246.915.514	80.012.500	711.545.213		5.455.034	82.784.018	68.499.400	156.738.452
All Asia	94.707.123	96.373.104	167.237.355	27.917.210	386.234.792	50.000	11.450.597	27.617.966	38.689.050	77.805.612
Bangladesh	31.000.000	91.050.000	136.771.841	1.678.159	260.500.000			8.564.529	23.747.197	32.311.726
Bhutan			39.000.000		39.000.000				1.500.000	1.500.000
Cambodia	50.000.000	40.000.000	30.000.000	40.000.000	160.000.000		6.315.150	21.679.488	9.229.926	37.224.565
Central Asia Region	10.000.000	76.300.000	20.000.000	297.320	106.597.320		574.447	22.402.408	10.535.038	33.511.892
Iraq		50.011.154	43.400.000		93.411.154		4.010.759	14.335.231	18.345.990	
Kyrgyzstan	30.000.000	49.130.000	23.000.000		102.130.000		45.530	20.586.377	2.342.538	22.974.445
Laos		44.500.000	31.000.000		75.500.000			6.120.161	6.362.441	12.482.602
Mongolia	8.200.000				8.200.000			1.482.119	164.062	1.646.181
Myanmar	120.000.000	70.000.000	-1.783.574		188.216.426		15.228.889	50.044.302	1.750.005	67.023.195
Nepal	22.650.000	127.000.000	81.400.000	1.691.644	232.741.644			57.939.659	3.688.132	61.627.790
Pakistan	97.500.000	124.000.000	45.520.000	60.000.000	327.020.000		601.625	21.661.085	9.491.689	31.754.398
Philippines	76.000.000		6.100.000		82.100.000			14.699.345	579.009	15.278.354
South Asia Region	10.000.000				10.000.000		4.000.000			4.000.000
Sri Lanka	14.000.000	38.000.000	12.000.000	30.000.000	94.000.000			4.467.653	6.235.206	10.702.860
Tajikistan	35.031.914	15.000.000			50.031.914	31.914		4.454.772	2.326.027	6.812.713
Territories to the east of Jordan	2.500.000		-1.256.580	-73.277	1.170.143		379.113	588.908	28.523	996.544
Thailand		10.000.000			10.000.000			3.063.048	1.073.705	4.136.752
Turkmenistan			9.530.000		9.530.000			0	0	0
Uzbekistan	20.000.000		26.500.000	600.000	47.100.000			6.169.260	4.278.861	10.448.121
Vietnam	14.000.000	1.100.000	108.000.000		123.100.000			0	0	0
Yemen	51.000.000		23.104.914	8.895.086	83.000.000			23.677.436	17.498.708	41.176.144
Totals	869.089.037	1.034.581.457	1.046.439.469	251.018.642	3.201.128.605	81.914	44.050.385	382.013.292	222.352.747	648.498.338

DCI CSO-LA	Committed Amount					Paid Amount				
	Benefitting Zone	2014	2015	2016	2017	TOTAL	2014	2015	2016	2017
All Countries	212.764.950	226.381.335	246.680.952	255.803.719	941.630.956	0	17.442.547	111.678.828	73.795.397	202.916.772
EU Europe	36.000.000	250.000	0	0	36.250.000	0	12.125.543	12.315.458	2.216.354	26.657.354
TOTAL	248.764.950	226.632.045	246.685.178	255.803.719	977.885.892	0	29.568.799	123.997.915	76.011.750	229.578.465

DCI ENER	Committed Amount					Paid Amount				
	Benefitting Zone	2014	2015	2016	2017	TOTAL	2014	2015	2016	2017
All Countries	82.851.742	67.875.236	86.191.412	0	236.918.390	0	4.169.082	37.000.000	5.416.647	46.585.729
TOTAL	82.851.742	67.875.236	86.191.412	0	236.918.390	0	4.169.082	37.000.000	5.416.647	46.585.729

INSC	Committed Amount					Paid Amount				
	Benefitting Zone	2014	2015	2016	2017	TOTAL	2014	2015	2016	2017
Armenia	0	1.000.000	3.700.000	0	4.700.000	0	0	0	239.726	239.726
Belarus	0	1.000.000	3.500.000	0	4.500.000	0	0	0	0	0
Central Asia Region	11.600.000	8.000.000	0	0	19.600.000	0	12.764.449	3.685.551	0	16.450.000
China	0	3.000.000	0	0	3.000.000	0	0	0	579.899	579.899
Iran	0	0	5.000.000	0	5.000.000	0	0	0	419.126	419.126
Iraq	1.500.000	0	0	0	1.500.000	0	0	0	0	0
Miscellaneous Countries	4.046.872	10.386.786	7.669.456	37.984.131	60.087.245	0	126.333	4.336.829	1.965.696	6.428.859
Morocco	0	2.000.000	0	0	2.000.000	0	0	0	0	0
South East Asia Region	0	0	1.000.000	0	1.000.000	0	0	0	0	0
Tanzania	4.000.000	0	0	0	4.000.000	0	0	1.201.200	0	1.201.200
Turkey	0	0	3.000.000	0	3.000.000	0	0	0	0	0
Ukraine	8.200.000	34.500.000	46.500.000	0	89.200.000	0	0	63.580.092	8.794.908	72.375.000
TOTAL	29.346.872	59.886.786	70.369.456	37.984.131	197.587.245	0	12.890.782	72.803.673	11.999.355	97.693.810

DCI ENV	Committed Amount					Paid Amount				
	2014	2015	2016	2017	TOTAL	2014	2015	2016	2017	TOTAL
Benefitting Zone										
ACP Countries	50.000	0	0	0	50.000	0	50.000	0	0	50.000
Africa	0	10.000.000	20.000.000	0	30.000.000	0	0	5.168.333	13.125	5.181.458
All Countries	45.628.310	23.059.016	18.985.271	0	87.672.597	0	2.199.416	13.836.582	9.980.059	26.016.057
Asia & the Pacific / South	0	5.000.000	0	0	5.000.000	0	0	1.537.420	1.151.777	2.689.197
Bangladesh	0	8.000.000	0	0	8.000.000	0	0	1.474.002	0	1.474.002
Bhutan	0	0	5.000.000	0	5.000.000	0	0	0	0	0
Cape Verde	0	0	5.000.000	0	5.000.000	0	0	0	0	0
Central Africa Region	5.000.000	0	0	0	5.000.000	0	0	2.000.000	0	2.000.000
Guinea-Bissau	0	4.000.000	0	0	4.000.000	0	0	1.265.880	0	1.265.880
Latin America and Caribbean	0	8.500.000	10.000.000	0	18.500.000	0	0	1.447.801	1.352.834	2.800.636
Liberia	0	0	6.000.000	0	6.000.000	0	0	0	0	0
Madagascar	0	8.000.000	0	0	8.000.000	0	0	1.830.902	0	1.830.902
Mali	270.000	0	6.000.000	0	6.270.000	0	147.825	0	0	147.825
Mauritius	0	0	3.000.000	0	3.000.000	0	0	0	0	0
Miscellaneous Countries	41.500.000	60.000.000	46.300.000	0	147.800.000	0	2.696.440	25.113.281	9.142.878	36.952.600
Niger	11.000.000	0	663.143	0	11.663.143	0	0	4.001.025	0	4.001.025
Pacific Region	1.900.000	0	0	0	1.900.000	0	0	1.509.920	0	1.509.920
Peru	5.000.000	0	0	-8.895	4.991.105	4.650.000	0	341.105	0	4.991.105
Rwanda	4.000.000	0	0	0	4.000.000	0	0	2.006.600	0	2.006.600
Samoa	0	3.000.000	0	0	3.000.000	0	0	0	0	0
Seychelles	3.000.000	0	0	0	3.000.000	0	0	246.560	422.650	669.210
South East Asia Region	0	10.000.000	0	0	10.000.000	0	0	0	1.508.584	1.508.584
Sudan	0	0	8.500.000	0	8.500.000	0	0	0	0	0
Suriname	0	3.000.000	0	0	3.000.000	0	0	1.050.000	0	1.050.000
Togo	0	0	10.000.000	0	10.000.000	0	0	0	0	0
Non-country allocated	46.700.000	34.082.704	31.020.000	0	111.802.704	2.550.000	23.958.804	24.121.209	22.014.150	72.644.162
West Africa Region	0	0	5.200.000	0	5.200.000	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	164.048.310	176.641.720	175.668.414	-8.895	516.349.548	7.200.000	29.052.485	86.950.621	45.586.057	168.789.162

DCI ERASM	Committed Amount					Paid Amount				
	2014	2015	2016	2017	TOTAL	2014	2015	2016	2017	TOTAL
Benefitting Zone										
All countries	100.356.946	96.212.671	111.672.639	13.657.885	321.900.141	507.646	43.156.741	86.867.447	45.170.650	175.702.485
TOTAL	100.356.946	96.212.671	111.672.639	13.657.885	321.900.141	507.646	43.156.741	86.867.447	45.170.650	175.702.485

DCI FOOD	Committed Amount					Paid Amount				
	2014	2015	2016	2017	TOTAL	2014	2015	2016	2017	TOTAL
Benefitting Zone										
All Countries	1.000.000	123.824.295	106.172.802	-438.842	230.558.255	0	173.703	20.637.577	25.042.857	45.854.137
Bolivia	0	0	7.000.000	0	7.000.000	0	0	0	0	0
Brazil	0	4.000.000	0	0	4.000.000	0	0	0	12.855	12.855
Cape Verde	0	1.250.000	0	0	1.250.000	0	1.250.000	0	0	1.250.000
Haiti	5.000.000	0	0	0	5.000.000	0	419.202	1.316.856	122.474	1.858.531
Miscellaneous Countries	153.782.990	37.897.010	91.906.730	-523.612	283.063.118	0	22.684.458	52.554.537	34.302.969	109.541.964
Pakistan	0	4.000.000	0	0	4.000.000	0	0	0	676.063	676.063
South East Asia Region	15.000.000	0	0	0	15.000.000	0	1.309.455	1.560.413	1.650.894	4.520.762
Non-country allocated	26.200.000	548.774	189.185	0	26.937.959	0	7.537.469	5.570.806	4.310.318	17.418.593
TOTAL	200.982.990	171.520.079	205.268.717	-962.454	576.809.333	0	33.374.287	81.640.188	66.118.431	181.132.906

DCI HUMA	Committed Amount					Paid Amount				
	2014	2015	2016	2017	TOTAL	2014	2015	2016	2017	TOTAL
Benefitting Zone										
All Countries	11.200.000	36.590.000	2.000.000	0	49.790.000	0	4.669.554	9.929.369	2.430.550	17.029.472
Multicountry Countries	101.893.980	74.920.558	148.633.821	42.516.179	367.964.538	0	101.893.980	77.297.603	50.743.108	229.934.691
Non-country allocated	50.000.000	41.730.142	38.030.142	38.030.142	167.830.426	38.030.142	38.030.142	39.279.720	38.030.142	153.369.146
TOTAL	163.093.980	153.240.700	163.633.821	42.516.179	522.484.680	0	106.593.676	135.466.550	61.066.955	303.127.180

DCI IMIGR	Committed Amount					Paid Amount				
	2014	2015	2016	2017	TOTAL	2014	2015	2016	2017	TOTAL
Benefitting Zone										
Africa	0	15.000.000	25.389.112	0	40.389.112	0	0	13.285.810	17.691.784	30.977.594
All Countries	918.690	0	0	0	918.690	0	154.112	157.488	0	311.600
Miscellaneous Countries	32.400.000	25.605.380	12.880.000	1.045.273	71.930.653	0	6.065.192	11.725.085	6.813.478	24.603.755
Near and Middle East	0	0	20.000.000	0	20.000.000	0	0	0	0	0
Non-country allocated	13.185.975	1.092.038	0	0	14.278.013	0	1.992.733	1.861.427	4.913.023	8.767.183
TOTAL	46.504.665	41.697.418	58.269.112	1.045.273	147.516.468	0	8.212.037	27.029.810	29.418.285	64.660.132

EIDHR	Committed Amount					Paid Amount				
	2014	2015	2016	2017	TOTAL	2014	2015	2016	2017	TOTAL
Benefitting Zone										
All Countries	132.782.020	131.003.323	131.138.879	134.054.486	528.978.708	7.946.252	37.294.004	83.201.149	59.659.542	188.100.947
TOTAL	132.782.020	131.006.878	131.138.879	134.054.486	528.982.263	7.946.252	37.297.559	83.201.149	59.659.542	188.104.502

GRLD	Committed Amount					Paid Amount				
	2014	2015	2016	2017	TOTAL	2014	2015	2016	2017	TOTAL
Benefitting Zone										
Greenland	24.569.471	30.698.715	31.130.000	31.630.000	118.028.186	10.529.894	30.273.589	37.087.557	0	77.891.040
TOTAL	24.569.471	30.698.715	31.130.000	31.630.000	118.028.186	10.529.894	30.273.589	37.087.557	0	77.891.040

ICSP	Committed Amount					Paid Amount				
	2014	2015	2016	2017	TOTAL	2014	2015	2016	2017	TOTAL
Benefitting Zone										
Afghanistan	0	0	8,000,000	0	8,000,000	0	0	0	3,539,122	3,539,122
Africa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
All Countries	19,000,000	25,000,000	27,000,000	0	71,000,000	1,339,757	5,433,241	12,531,499	5,395,184	24,699,681
Bosnia and Herzegovina	767,000	0	2,800,000	0	3,567,000	0	0	750,394	1,537,685	2,288,079
Burkina Faso	0	5,500,000	5,200,000	0	10,700,000	0	3,476,566	5,648,434	218,193	9,343,193
Burundi	0	4,000,000	0	0	4,000,000	0	0	2,756,902	383,098	3,140,000
Cameroon	0	4,000,000	0	0	4,000,000	0	3,364,355	0	0	3,364,355
Caribbean	0	0	7,000,000	0	7,000,000	0	0	5,432,684	0	5,432,684
Central African Republic	10,650,000	13,800,000	8,100,000	0	32,550,000	0	14,447,565	3,815,686	2,662,258	20,925,509
Central America Region	0	1,400,000	0	0	1,400,000	0	810,604	450,042	0	1,260,646
Chad	14,000,000	8,000,000	0	0	22,000,000	0	8,391,948	7,339,452	0	15,731,400
Colombia	0	5,000,000	20,600,000	0	25,600,000	0	2,811,195	10,093,981	3,655,059	16,560,235
Congo (Democratic Republic of the)	14,000,000	0	4,000,000	0	18,000,000	0	1,030,748	4,964,887	3,609,273	9,604,908
Ethiopia	0	0	18,000,000	0	18,000,000	0	0	14,286,193	0	14,286,193
Gabon	0	0	0	800,000	800,000	0	0	0	0	0
Gambia	0	0	0	500,000	500,000	0	0	0	405,743	405,743
Georgia	0	7,500,000	0	0	7,500,000	0	0	3,124,784	2,329,336	5,454,120
Guatemala	0	0	0	1,250,000	1,250,000	0	0	0	0	0
Guinea (Conakry)	0	3,900,000	0	0	3,900,000	0	0	2,875,239	0	2,875,239
Horn of Africa	0	0	1,700,000	0	1,700,000	0	0	0	0	0
India	0	1,600,000	1,500,000	0	3,100,000	0	1,019,575	1,370,096	0	2,389,671
Iraq	6,000,000	15,000,000	5,800,000	7,700,000	34,500,000	4,800,000	3,362,314	11,102,443	3,228,805	22,493,562
Ivory Coast	0	0	8,500,000	0	8,500,000	0	0	0	0	0
Jordan	0	10,000,000	5,280,000	0	15,280,000	0	0	4,990,713	3,760,192	8,750,904
Kenya	0	0	7,300,000	0	7,300,000	0	0	0	1,000,000	1,000,000
Kosovo (under UNSCR 1244/99)	0	1,560,000	0	0	1,560,000	0	0	1,404,546	0	1,404,546
Kyrgyzstan	0	3,000,000	0	0	3,000,000	0	150,000	1,968,128	64,166	2,182,294
Lebanon	0	10,000,000	22,000,000	0	32,000,000	0	6,811,839	5,409,945	2,470,449	14,692,233
Libya	4,500,000	10,500,000	16,900,000	0	31,900,000	0	6,986,053	5,957,719	5,790,940	18,734,712
Mali	0	12,000,000	0	0	12,000,000	0	400,000	4,347,590	5,717,289	10,464,879
Miscellaneous Countries	82,255,223	72,128,831	65,593,076	0	219,977,130	0	9,328,616	42,408,567	13,819,335	65,556,518
Mozambique	0	0	1,200,000	0	1,200,000	0	0	0	0	0
Myanmar	0	0	2,320,000	0	2,320,000	0	0	1,333,173	0	1,333,173
Nepal	0	7,000,000	0	0	7,000,000	0	5,903,871	600,000	600,000	6,503,871
Niger	2,580,000	15,500,000	800,000	0	18,880,000	0	4,248,211	10,669,496	498,918	15,416,625
Nigeria	0	9,000,000	0	5,000,000	14,000,000	0	2,811,957	3,627,295	451,896	6,891,148
Pakistan	0	7,300,000	10,000,000	0	17,300,000	0	0	7,730,930	0	7,730,930
Philippines	0	5,500,000	1,092,177	3,107,823	9,700,000	0	2,802,531	1,712,599	3,679,842	8,194,972
Region Eastern Europe and Central Asia	0	1,500,000	0	0	1,500,000	0	0	1,280,082	0	1,280,082
Senegal	0	2,000,000	0	0	2,000,000	0	0	1,489,529	301,059	1,790,588
Somalia	7,000,000	6,500,000	450,000	0	13,950,000	0	3,300,000	7,613,446	352,688	11,266,134
South Sudan	10,000,000	0	5,000,000	0	15,000,000	3,509,872	2,614,385	570,504	0	6,694,761
Sri Lanka	0	1,200,000	8,100,000	0	9,300,000	0	1,080,000	0	5,913,674	6,993,674
Sudan	13,500,000	0	0	0	13,500,000	3,633,814	4,874,035	2,626,565	45,302	11,179,715
Syria	21,987,033	7,200,000	15,470,000	10,000,000	54,657,033	0	7,310,892	14,954,418	5,246,496	27,511,806
Tanzania	0	1,000,000	0	0	1,000,000	0	799,474	0	175,284	974,759
Thailand	0	600,000	0	0	600,000	0	0	406,413	0	406,413
Tunisia	0	4,000,000	0	0	4,000,000	0	0	1,237,696	0	1,237,696
Turkey	17,000,000	0	28,500,000	0	45,500,000	0	8,917,621	16,663,931	1,043,941	26,625,493
Ukraine	16,500,000	30,506,000	24,418,642	3,000,000	74,424,642	10,332,090	12,162,531	23,572,155	14,199,042	60,265,818
Uzbekistan	0	2,500,000	0	0	2,500,000	0	2,000,000	500,000	0	2,500,000
West Africa Region	16,500,000	0	0	0	16,500,000	0	12,417,276	468,689	451,888	13,337,852
West Bank and Gaza Strip	11,000,000	8,000,000	2,000,000	0	21,000,000	0	8,532,955	4,803,744	5,272,604	18,609,303
Yemen	3,000,000	0	0	0	3,000,000	0	209,064	1,817,877	0	2,026,941
TOTAL	270,239,256	323,194,831	334,630,759	31,360,449	959,425,294	23,615,533	141,905,551	262,018,500	97,819,461	525,359,046

Partnership Instrument	Committed Amount					Paid Amount				
	2014	2015	2016	2017	TOTAL	2014	2015	2016	2017	TOTAL
Benefitting Zone										
All Countries	102,058,730	98,210,000	101,952,000	83,550,000	385,770,730	0	12,839,876	33,408,432	22,559,313	68,807,620
Miscellaneous Countries	1,000,000	1,000,000	0	0	2,000,000	0	216,748	558,137	91,003	865,888
Strategic partners	3,500,000	0	-39,744	0	3,460,256	0	2,422,179	0	28,169	2,450,348
Non-country allocated	9,369,259	15,555,366	22,796,614	7,259,138	54,980,378	221,427	11,383,784	18,747,162	11,515,771	41,868,144
TOTAL	115,927,989	114,765,366	124,708,870	90,809,138	446,211,364	221,427	26,862,586	52,713,730	34,194,255	113,992,000

IPA 2	Committed Amount					Paid Amount				
	2014	2015	2016	2017	TOTAL	2014	2015	2016	2017	TOTAL
Benefitting Zone										
Albania	68,700,000	88,900,000	82,440,000	0	240,040,000	-	1,355,521	34,375,410	5,624,164	41,355,096
Bosnia and Herzegovina	65,700,000	39,700,000	50,000,000	2,896,631	158,296,631	2,825,982	10,107,113	8,938,529	8,012,136	29,883,760
Facility for Refugees in Turkey	0	0	37,000,000	110,390,000	147,390,000	-	-	-	-	-
Kosovo (under UNSCR 1244/99)	66,050,000	82,100,000	73,860,000	0	222,010,000	-	1,515,322	10,772,576	12,371,492	24,659,390
Montenegro	39,505,000	36,385,000	35,398,000	0	111,288,000	-	665,349	9,036,878	12,579,549	22,281,776
IPA Regional, horizontal and other multi-country programmes	348,010,000	364,200,000	418,620,000	105,513,464	1,236,343,464	3,715,636	98,359,312	151,432,286	81,171,933	334,679,167
Serbia	179,010,000	216,100,000	189,400,000	0	584,510,000	-	7,906,665	35,528,210	4,465,242	47,900,117
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	81,700,000	67,200,000	64,500,000	0	213,400,000	-	-	11,752,773	7,887,256	19,640,029
Turkey	620,380,000	626,710,000	631,140,000	0	1,878,230,000	-	100,839,124	105,806,235	12,775,640	219,421,000
TOTAL Enlargement countries	1,469,055,000	1,521,295,000	1,582,358,000	218,800,095	4,791,508,095	6,541,618	220,748,405	367,642,898	144,887,413	739,820,335

Neighbourhood Instrument (ENI)	Committed Amount				TOTAL	Paid Amount				TOTAL
	2014	2015	2016	2017		2014	2015	2016	2017	
Benefiting Zone										
Algeria	26.300.000	25.000.000	30.000.000	10.000.000	91.300.000	-	433.577	4.862.317	1.588.917	6.884.811
Armenia	34.000.000	30.000.000	25.000.000	-	89.000.000	-	268.358	7.773.279	3.524.643	11.566.280
Azerbaijan	16.730.053	14.500.000	13.500.000	-	44.730.053	-	249.258	2.225.533	515.288	2.990.079
Belarus	19.000.000	14.500.000	29.000.000	-	62.500.000	-	100.627	3.884.818	2.543.170	6.528.614
ENI East Regional and other multi-country programmes (RAP, TAIEK, NIF, SIGMA)	152.385.359	150.096.000	181.301.565	5.000.000	488.782.924	800.000	19.289.981	113.793.460	33.829.957	167.713.398
Egypt	115.000.000	105.000.000	100.000.000	-	320.000.000	-	657.835	14.377.596	2.053.864	17.089.295
Facility for Refugees in Turkey	-	-	18.000.000	-	18.000.000	-	-	-	-	-
Georgia	131.000.000	100.000.000	109.500.000	-	340.500.000	-	10.759.548	45.657.152	9.622.524	66.039.224
Israel	-	2.000.000	1.800.000	-	3.800.000	-	37.909	1.803.479	1.657.522	3.498.910
Jordan	174.500.000	100.000.000	140.000.000	30.000.000	444.500.000	-	27.636.252	98.853.118	23.272.779	149.762.149
Lebanon	140.575.452	40.000.000	40.000.000	-	220.575.452	-	46.107.057	21.084.350	3.401.692	70.593.099
Libya	8.000.000	3.000.000	10.000.000	1.500.000	22.500.000	-	-	2.750.632	2.859.972	5.610.604
ENI South Regional and other multi-country programmes (RAP, TAIEK, NIF, SIGMA)	229.116.262	196.046.490	181.633.000	5.000.000	611.795.752	-	23.107.176	139.994.624	99.246.637	262.348.437
EU Regional Trust Fund in Response to the Syrian Crisis	20.000.000	361.000.000	142.500.000	-	523.500.000	-	-	-	-	-
EU Emergency Trust Fund for Africa (North Africa Window)	-	-	55.000.000	120.000.000	175.000.000	-	-	-	-	-
Moldova	131.000.000	90.000.000	89.000.000	-	310.000.000	16.000.000	8.720.777	27.843.267	10.196.274	62.760.319
Morocco	218.000.000	210.000.000	165.000.000	-	593.000.000	-	389.549	89.813.171	15.720.067	105.922.787
ENI Cross-border cooperation (CBC) and Erasmus+	106.987.000	172.080.771	180.448.300	200.000.000	659.516.071	1.636.260	57.124.902	93.650.438	70.299.705	222.711.306
Syria	41.250.000	48.000.000	59.965.435	10.000.000	159.215.435	-	18.979.829	74.005.096	4.810.665	97.795.590
Tunisia	141.886.586	155.800.000	213.500.000	-	511.186.586	-	76.179.613	58.226.141	9.187.142	143.592.897
Ukraine	242.000.000	200.000.000	200.000.000	37.000.000	679.000.000	127.000.000	2.066.207	95.077.306	20.886.160	245.029.672
West Bank and Gaza Strip	307.000.000	320.000.000	310.100.000	220.000.000	1.157.100.000	250.750.000	285.880.239	279.301.973	87.905.507	903.837.718
TOTAL ENI	2.254.730.712	2.337.023.261	2.295.248.300	638.500.000	7.525.502.273	396.186.260	577.988.695	1.174.977.747	403.122.485	2.552.275.188

Table 2 Contributions to Facility for Refugees in Turkey in '000 EUR

in '000 euro

Name	Cumulative Amount made available for Commitments	Committed Amount	Implementat. Rate Commitments	Contracted Amount	Implementa-tion Rate Contracted Amount	Cumulative Amount made available for Payments	Paid Amount	Overall Implement. Rate
	(1)	(2)	(3)=(2)/(1)	(4)	(5)=(4)/(1)	(6)	(7)	(8)=(7)/(1)
The Facility for Refugees in Turkey	2 916 233	2 793 231	96%	1 591 535	55%	1 011 387	769 301	26%

The difference between the pledge of EUR 3 billion and the cumulative amount available for commitments is due to amounts not yet being reserved on the relevant position in the Commission's accounting system. (All Member States have duly provided their signed contribution certificates).

in '000 euro

Name	Origin of funds	Total Pledge	Cumulative Amount made available for Commitments	Cumulative Amount made available for Payments
The Facility for Refugees in Turkey	EU Budget appropriations	1 000 000	940 025	251 078
	Member States Contributions	2 000 000	1 976 209	760 309
	Sum:	3 000 000	2 916 233	1 011 387

The difference between the pledge of EUR 3 billion and the cumulative amount available for commitments is due to amounts not yet being reserved on the relevant position in the Commission's accounting system. (All Member States have duly provided their signed contribution certificates).

in '000 euro

Program	Description	Cumulative Amount made available for Commitments	Committed Amount	Contracted Amount	Cumulative Amount made available for Payments	Paid Amount	%
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)=(5)/(1)
4.0.1	Instrument for Pre-accession assistance (IPA II)	1 560 383	1 440 182	971 182	325 612	292 884	18.8%
4.0.3	Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI)	10 000	10 000				
4.0.6	Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace (IcSP)	20 000	20 000	20 000	7 240	7 240	36.2%
4.0.7	Humanitarian aid	1 325 850	1 323 049	600 353	678 535	469 176	35.4%
		2 916 233	2 793 231	1 591 535	1 011 387	769 301	26.4%

The commitments to be considered for the Facility are EUR 5 million lower, due to a 2015 global commitment of EUR 40 million under Humanitarian Aid of which only EUR 35 million were for the Facility.

in '000 euro

Program	Description	Financial Year	Committed Amount	Contracted Amount	Paid Amount	%
			(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)=(3)/(1)
4.0.7	Humanitarian aid	2015	40 000			
4.0.1	Instrument for Pre-accession assistance (IPA II)	2016	939 047	915 047	290 000	30.9%
4.0.3	Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI)	2016	10 000			
4.0.6	Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace (IcSP)	2016	20 000	20 000	7 240	36.2%
4.0.7	Humanitarian aid	2016	562 853	522 203	413 349	73.4%
4.0.1	Instrument for Pre-accession assistance (IPA II)	2017	501 136	56 136	2 884	0.6%
4.0.3	Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI)	2017				
4.0.6	Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace (IcSP)	2017				
4.0.7	Humanitarian aid	2017	720 195	78 150	55 826	7.8%
		Sum:	2 793 231	1 591 535	769 301	27.5%

An amount of EUR 35 million out of a global commitment of EUR 40 million was frontloaded for the Facility under Humanitarian Aid in 2015. See also footnote under the previous table.

Table 3 Contributions to Trust Funds (disbursements from contributors / in EUR millions) ¹⁰⁰

Name	Cumulative Amount made Available for Commitments	Committed Amount	Implement. Rate Commitm.	Contracted Amount	Implement. Rate Contracted Amount	Cumulative Amount made Available for Payments	Paid Amount	Overall Implementation Rate
	(1)	(2)	(3)=(2)/(1)	(4)	(5)=(4)/(1)	(6)	(7)	(8)=(7)/(1)
EUTF AFRICA	2 228 699	1 775 188	80%	1 152 721	52%	416 153	386 904	17%
EUTF BEKOU	119 407	99 128	83%	81 262	68%	86 074	50 144	42%
EUTF MADAD	918 716	778 574	85%	452 658	49%	311 569	217 616	24%
EUTF COLOMBIA	79 324	11 000	14%	11 000	14%	19 324	3 839	5%
Total	3 346 145	2 663 889	80%	1 697 641	51%	833 120	658 503	20%

¹⁰⁰ Source: European Commission Service for International Cooperation and Development, July 2017. Figures as of 30 September 2017 based on the reporting package: Overview of all EU Trust Funds published by DG Budget

in '000 euro

Name	Origin of funds	Total Pledge	Cumulative Amount made Available for Commitments	Cumulative Amount made Available for Payments
EUTF AFRICA	Contribution from EU Budget	358 500	219 459	68 399
	Contribution from Member States and other donors	202 385	89 340	89 340
	Contribution from the EDF	2 289 900	1 919 900	258 414
EUTF AFRICA		2 850 785	2 228 699	416 153
EUTF BEKOU	Contribution from EU Budget	54 833	40 333	12 000
	Contribution from Member States and other donors	64 925	35 074	35 074
	Contribution from the EDF	113 000	44 000	39 000
EUTF BEKOU		232 758	119 407	86 074
EUTF MADAD	Contribution from EU Budget	1 181 260	808 066	200 919
	Contribution from Member States and other donors	118 450	110 650	110 650
EUTF MADAD		1 299 710	918 716	311 569
EUTF COLOMBIA	Contribution from EU Budget	72 000	70 000	10 000
	Contribution from Member States and other donors	22 976	9 324	9 324
EUTF COLOMBIA		94 976	79 324	19 324

in '000 euro

Origin of funds - All EUTFs	Financial Year	Cumulative Amount made Available for Commitments	Cumulative Amount made Available for Payments
Contribution from EU Budget	2015	598 985	22 122
Contribution from EU Budget	2016	144 994	221 196
Contribution from EU Budget	2017	393 879	48 000
Contribution from Member States and other donors	2015	50 316	50 316
Contribution from Member States and other donors	2016	145 131	145 131
Contribution from Member States and other donors	2017	48 940	48 940
Contribution from the EDF	2014	39 000	39 000
Contribution from the EDF	2015	1 200 000	
Contribution from the EDF	2016	595 000	128 514
Contribution from the EDF	2017	129 900	129 900
Grand Total:		3 346 145	833 120

List of acronyms

ACP	Africa, Caribbean, Pacific
DAC	OECD Development Assistance Committee
DCI	Development Cooperation Instrument
DG DEVCO	Commission service for international cooperation and development
DG NEAR	Commission service for Neighbourhood and Enlargement Negotiations
EDF	European Development Fund
EIDHR	European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights
EFI	External Financing Instrument
ENI	European Neighbourhood Instrument
EU	European Union
FPI	Commission service for Foreign Policy Instruments
GD	Greenland Decision
IPA	Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance
INSC	Instrument for Nuclear Safety and Cooperation
IcSP	Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace
MTR	Mid-Term Review
OCTs	Overseas Countries and Territories
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PI	Partnership Instrument