



AIDWATCH 2018

SECURITY AID



**Fostering development,
or serving European donors’
national interest?**

CONTENTS

Introduction	2
1. Opportunities and threats of increasing aid to security	4
2. EU donors signaling new era of aid as a tool serving foreign and security objectives	6
2.1 Recent examples of the EU linking aid to national security agendas	6
2.2 Emergence of security-linked aid conditionality	7
2.3 EU security agenda features strongly in development cooperation policy	7
3. Risk that the EU’s security agenda will have damaging impacts on development and humanitarian response	8
4. Current EU spending on peace and security	9
5. Risk new aid rules will increase aid link to donor security objectives	10
6. Conclusion and recommendations	11
7. Endnotes	12

INTRODUCTION



Investing in the security of our partner countries is in the EU's and our partners' interests. We all face common challenges of terrorism, conflicts and extremism.”

Federica Mogherini, EU High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, July 2016¹

Aid spending figures² show that peace and security has not traditionally been a priority sector for donor spending in developing countries. Yet, strengthening state security in developing countries has emerged as a new policy priority for some European Union (EU) donors. Federica Mogherini's proposals³ for security and development in partner countries are a recent example. At first sight, this attention to strengthening security and development is welcome. Security that safeguards personal safety and protects from physical threat or fear of physical threat is vital for everyone, including people living in developing countries.⁴

This is acknowledged in Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16,⁵ which is dedicated to promoting peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development. People in developing countries have every right to security, and development aid that is spent on security should be directly targeted at their security needs. To do this effectively, aid needs to be spent on the right kind of security-focused programmes; those that prioritise support to partner governments and local civil society organisations (CSOs) to promote human rights, as well as accountability to civilian populations. This approach is necessary to improve security in all countries, but it is critical for cooperation with fragile and unstable states.

Yet donors are taking a different approach. EU donors are using aid as a tool to counter threats to Europe; in public communications and activities on the ground, donors are increasingly committing aid to the purposes of preventing extremism or terrorism, or controlling insurgency and migration. It is true that clamping



Military boots

down on such realities may help protect people in developing countries from fear or harm; however, donors should align their aid efforts with development effectiveness principles to ensure positive and sustainable development outcomes for people in partner countries. Excessive emphasis on achieving donors' domestic security goals may in fact undermine long term development strategies, which are instrumental in creating the preconditions for peaceful, just and inclusive societies.

Many EU donors, both at the multilateral and bilateral levels, are explicitly signalling their intention to further align aid spending with their foreign and security objectives.⁶ For aid spending, this means allocating more funds to strengthening military capacity, and security and policy forces in partner countries. It also means investing aid in programmes to prevent violent terrorism. Until February 2016, the eligibility criteria for official development assistance (ODA) administered by the Organisation for Economic Development and Cooperation's (OECD's) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) only permitted peace and security expenditure to be counted as ODA under limited circumstances. However, the DAC and its donor members revamped the rules on security-related activities. The DAC wanted to improve the reporting and tracking of spending on military and security-related sectors – under the old system, it was too easy for donors to circumvent rules, and the DAC was not always able to detect ineligible spending. Donors saw this as an opportunity to widen the scope of the ODA eligibility criteria, allowing them to legitimately use their aid budgets for spending on security activities in developing countries under DAC rules. Despite more flexibility in the new DAC rules, these continue to stipulate that spending on security and military must be used for development purposes.

It is too soon to measure or judge the *full extent* of the influence of the new DAC rules on aid figures. The implications of donors aligning aid policy more closely to their domestic security agendas

are also not yet fully borne out. However, this paper attempts to examine EU donors' policies on aid and security, and highlights the risks and opportunities the new security agenda poses to development principles and effectiveness. Of the risks, there is particular concern about how the new aid and security agenda might undermine donors' commitment to fighting poverty in developing countries. The primary objectives of EU development cooperation under the EU Lisbon treaty⁷ remain fighting poverty and enhancing sustainable development, particularly in the poorest countries. EU's commitment to these objectives is essential in order to make progress towards the SDGs.

Already, EU donors' aid is skewed towards spending in countries based on their own strategic priorities, rather than the countries' poverty needs. One consequence of spending scarce aid resources on military and security might be reduced funding for donor-supported programmes that help people escape poverty. Meanwhile, aid that contributes to enhancing military presence may not be the most effective approach to improving people's security. The London School of Economic states in its Berlin Report of the Human Security Study Group, "In the twenty-first century, the use of military force in places like Syria tends to exacerbate the everyday insecurity of individuals and their communities. Second generation human security is civilian-led".⁸

Donor attention to security in developing countries provides an opportunity to help protect people from fear or harm, while improving security for everyone; CSOs need to scrutinise aid spending on security to ensure it is used for genuine development purposes and will not divert aid away from, or undermine, fighting poverty and other development priorities. Donors need to make sure ODA spending on security provides support to partner governments and local CSOs to promote human rights, as well as accountability, to civilian populations. Without these guarantees, the integrity of aid will be diminished.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Author: Claire Godfrey

With substantial input by CONCORD Hub 2 members and especially Hub 2 Steering Group members Luca di Fraia (Action Aid Italy) and Amy Dodd (UK Aid Network) as well as members of other CONCORD structures.

With valuable contributions from Polly Meeks (Eurodad) and Ben Moore (EPL0).

Coordination: Alexandra Rosen, CONCORD Europe

1. OPPORTUNITIES AND THREATS OF INCREASING AID TO SECURITY



Soldier in sunset

Donors have the capacity and the knowledge to design programmes that build resilience and contribute to conflict prevention. The EU, for example, is a signatory to the ‘New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States’. Brokered in 2011 by the International Dialogue for Peace-building and Statebuilding,⁹ the New Deal highlights the importance of country leadership and ownership in peace and statebuilding. It also warns of risks of donors imposing operations that serve their short-term interests, without taking account of national and local contexts. Programmes that build peace, that help strengthen constructive state–civilian relations, or that develop the resilience of local populations have suffered from underfunding, particularly in many conflict-affected and fragile countries over many years.¹⁰ More aid to build peace and security, if done right and aligned with the priorities of local communities, is welcome and would provide a real opportunity to improve security in developing countries.

CSOs have found that improvements in the peace and security sector activities often lie less in funding top-down security sector capacity building, and rather more in fostering CSOs, local reconciliation or political and legal environments in which active citizens can promote access to security and justice. In Afghanistan, for example, support to the police and judiciary alone cannot deliver security and justice to women while women’s rights, security from violence and access to justice are forestalled by deep discrimination reflected in illiteracy, lack of income, legal discrimination, lack of legal representation,

and long-standing social and cultural attitudes. Tackling these more complex obstacles to security and justice should involve supporting civil society, and reforming security and justice institutions, at the local rather than the national level.

However, priorities for aid spending are often determined by EU political leaders, with knee jerk reactions that focus on quick and short-term solutions to perceived threats; poorly designed objectives result when decisions are made by politicians who have little knowledge of the local realities. Aid spending on security has fallen victim to this approach: urgent action in response to terror attacks at home, or to stem the flows of people fleeing from neighbourhood countries to Europe to escape fear, instability or economic deprivation, are shaping the EU external policy to defend ‘fortress Europe’. Donors place emphasis on aid as a tool to serve foreign and national interests – rather than policy that fosters development in insecure countries – as a political expedient when the effects of global insecurity are evident on their home territory.

In addition, development and domestic security agendas collide and intertwine more today because humanitarian and global security crises tend to be situated in the same geographical locations (e.g. the Middle East). The communication revolution means also that messages – for example, about radical Islam or migration – spread in an unprecedented way creating an expectation for an urgent crisis response targeting the ‘source of the threat’. Aid used as part of a donor government’s security

response to a crisis is increasingly considered a legitimate use of aid, particularly within a context of overall cuts in national budgets. Donors aligning aid to national foreign policy and security objectives is not a new phenomenon,¹¹ as donor geographical aid allocations have always strongly reflected their national foreign policy objectives, or where donors are militarily engaged. The striking difference today is that donors are more explicit in public policy and discourse about using aid to pursue domestic objectives, while paying less attention to the role of aid in reducing poverty, or the contribution people-centred development programmes can make in achieving global security objectives.

DAC rules have an important role to play in keeping the focus of aid spending on development outcomes rather than on donors' own national security interests; only by realising development goals driven by our partner countries, we can create the preconditions for long lasting peaceful societies. Addressing the underlying causes of vulnerabilities requires long-term approaches that are firmly rooted in context analysis and knowledge and that are aligned with development effectiveness principles. In 2016, the DAC updated the reporting guidance on peace and security expenditure¹² to clarify unclear or ambiguous

wording and thereby prevent the abuse and misuse of aid. While the 2016 revisions did bring much needed clarity compared with the previous rules, they also resulted in new eligible costs (i.e. expansion of eligibility). Many CSOs were concerned because they explicitly allowed for activities that were not included previously: in particular, certain training for partner country military personnel, and supporting activities to "prevent violent extremism". The impact of these new rules on ODA reporting should start showing in final 2016 data (published in December 2017). At this stage, it is difficult to anticipate to what extent these changes will affect aid allocation. Close monitoring and analysis of aid data in the coming years will be critical to i) identify changes in donors' spending, and ii) ensure donors are not abusing existing rules. The DAC has updated its 'ODA Casebook on Conflict, Peace and Security Activities', which will provide guidance on ODA eligibility of expenditure in this field, and will provide illustrative examples that can help assess whether a donor's programme is in line with DAC rules or not.¹³

Section 2 reviews recent examples where EU donors have linked aid and national security objectives, and examines the potential implications for the future of development cooperation.

2. EU DONORS SIGNALLING NEW ERA OF AID AS A TOOL SERVING FOREIGN AND SECURITY OBJECTIVES

There are several recent examples of donors including objectives in development policy such as strengthening military capacity, state security reforms and border control, and preventing violent extremism. The regularity of linking aid to respond to urgent security events is no longer the exception, but rather the norm for many EU donors. This embeds the notion in the public mind that this kind of security is a key purpose of aid, making it easier for donors to deprioritise aid's poverty focus, and institute policies that could permanently transform its objectives and principles. Fortunately, moves by donors to exploit their aid budgets to benefit domestic priorities, rather than supporting the interests of people in developing countries, has however been met with some resistance.

2.1 RECENT EXAMPLES OF THE EU LINKING AID TO NATIONAL SECURITY AGENDAS

At the Foreign Affairs Council in April 2016, EU foreign and defence ministers met to discuss the security–development nexus. The focus of its discussion was to seek “a sustainable solution regarding the defence sector and the financing of equipment and infrastructure in third countries”. Federica Mogherini told ministers of funding options and plans to support security sector reforms in developing countries.¹⁴ This discussion was informed by a paper entitled ‘Food for Thought’ issued in April 2016,¹⁵ backed by ten member states (Belgium, Czech Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal and Spain). These member states had instructed the European Commission (EC) to show “leadership to help clarify the pertinent provisions in the Treaty of the European Union, in particular article 41 para 2”. This paragraph states that expenditure arising from operations having military or defence implications cannot be charged from the Union’s budget.¹⁶ The EC was therefore heavily pressured by some member states to find ways to use aid to fund military spending in partner countries.

Following this, the EC proposed¹⁷ increasing the ‘Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace’ (IcSP) budget by €100 million to 2020 in order to cover military ‘capacity building’ (non-lethal equipment and training) in partner countries; the proposition was to reallocate funding under the EC’s aid budget to cover part of this increase.¹⁸ Critics have however pointed out that this shift is not only inconsistent with the EU’s Consensus on Development’s stated objective of ending poverty, but also that – according to the legal opinion sought by the European Parliament – the legal bases of the IcSP are not appropriate for capacity building in support of security and development (CBSD).¹⁹ They also worry it represents the thin end of the wedge and that further reallocations will follow post 2020.²⁰ Legal opinion from the EC’s own legal services agreed that using EU funds to support the

military in third countries is illegal. The EU, under pressure from some member states, fudged the rules by emphasising the development nature overturning efforts to block this initiative.²¹

The German Government was one of the driving forces behind the plan to channel aid into the IcSP. It was Germany’s own bilateral initiative in 2015 to set up a national budget line to ‘enhance the capabilities’ of partner countries’ armed forces. Sweden, however, raised concerns about the proposal for the IcSP because of the blurring boundaries of development cooperation and security-related activities, stating, “... we risk undermining the development agenda as well as the effectiveness of capacity building for security and development”.²² The European Parliament’s Committee on Foreign Affairs (AFET) eventually agreed to a subsequent EC proposal stipulating that the new IcSP funds would not come from the EU’s development cooperation budget. EC ODA would not be used to extend the IcSP mandate to include capacity building for security and development; however, this still needs to be agreed by EU governments.²³

In terms of Germany’s bilateral programme, the government’s commitment to spending more aid on security and defence-related activities in partner countries appears unrelenting. In September 2017, during the election campaign in Germany, the major political parties have declared they want to more closely align development and defence. The increases in the aid budget seem to justify more spending for the military rather than spending on people’s development needs – security or otherwise – in partner countries.

Similarly, the UK Parliament’s Joint Committee on the National Security Strategy initiated an enquiry in May 2016 into spending of the UK’s Conflict, Security and Stability Fund, following criticism that aid was being used to support suspect security initiatives in partner countries. For example, its Conflict, Security and Stability Fund has been investigated²⁴ following criticism²⁵ over funding for the training of Bahraini police in crowd control techniques. Similar concerns have been raised on the UK’s apparent funding links to Ethiopia’s security forces, despite their role in potential human rights abuses.²⁶ More recently, the Fund has been under the spotlight²⁷ again for poor transparency after almost £2 million (€2.16 million) in aid and defence funding was given to security projects in Egypt, including support for policing, the criminal justice system and the treatment of juvenile detainees. This is in spite of Human Rights Watch²⁸ calling on the international community to intervene because of Egyptian forces’ role in disappearances of members of human rights groups, torture of detainees, and jailing of political opponents and journalists.

2.2 EMERGENCE OF SECURITY-LINKED AID CONDITIONALITY

A further worrying development is the imposition of security-linked conditions on the recipients of EU aid. Recent EU cooperation agreements with Afghanistan, for example, were ‘migration sensitive’. This meant that some aid programmes were linked to implementing EU–Afghan policies on return and readmission. This was in spite of worsening security in Afghanistan.²⁹ This is just one example within a broader EU strategy³⁰ of making aid to poor countries conditional on them accepting deported migrants. This is not to argue that aid to curb migration is the same as aid to contain security threats. These issues overlap in the sense that migration source countries are often also the countries where more aid security spending takes place. Also, donors are keen to use aid to contain threats, but migration policy priorities for aid spending (border controls, readmission etc.) are different to recent security aid priorities (more military spending, police forces and preventing violent extremism). Recent EU development cooperation initiatives, such as the EU Trust Funds, are a good illustration of where the EU is aiming to stem perceived threats to fortress Europe, like migrant containment to the EU (see box 1).

2.3 EU SECURITY AGENDA FEATURES STRONGLY IN DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION POLICY

The new European Consensus on Development, agreed by EU ministers in 2017,³³ includes new objectives for development cooperation, such as tackling migration and increasing state security. Member states insisted on these changes to the proposal the EC presented for the new Consensus in November 2016.³⁴ The ostensible purpose of the Consensus is to detail the EU’s policy framework for how it will implement the SDGs in all EU external policy. In line with previous EU development cooperation policy frameworks, it commits the EU to fulfilling its obligations towards fighting poverty and promoting sustainable development in developing countries. The new objectives relating to security and migration, which seek more to serve EU self-interest than solidarity with developing countries, however present risks. The concern is that too much focus on migration and advancing the EU’s security agenda will undermine the purpose, principles and effectiveness of development cooperation.

TEXT BOX 1: THE EU EMERGENCY TRUST FUND FOR AFRICA

The EU Emergency Trust Fund for Africa³¹ was set up hastily and adopted at the Valletta Summit in 2015. Its initial purpose was to fund African countries to cooperate with the EU on improving migration controls, returns and readmissions. However, critics warned about blurring lines between development aid and border controls, and about making aid to Africa conditional on cooperation on border control. The EU made clear that it is using all means necessary, including development aid, to incentivise African countries to cooperate on returning people from Europe to Africa. The Trust Fund has since shifted its focus to address the root causes of destabilisation, displacement and irregular migration in Africa, but continues to support activities that bolster efforts to contain threats to the EU. For example, support to Mali of €29 million under the improving governance theme aims at building effective security forces to combat terrorism and organised crime, and strengthen law enforcement. The EU’s external relations’ (EEAS) EUCAP (capacity-building mission) and EUTM (training mission) have designed the programme which will be implemented by France’s technical agency, Expertise France. EUCAP and EUTM include military officials in civilian roles, and their activities include training security forces (e.g. the police), and coordination with the military in partner countries.³²

3. RISK THAT THE EU'S SECURITY AGENDA WILL HAVE DAMAGING IMPACTS ON DEVELOPMENT AND HUMANITARIAN RESPONSE

A key impact of aligning development policy too closely with EU security objectives includes the risk of diverting existing aid budgets (whether by loosely interpreting aid rules, or shifting budgets to other government departments) to deliver short-term national foreign policy and security goals. Not only could this result in other development priorities losing crucial funding, but it undermines the vital role development has traditionally played in achieving foreign policy objectives. As Andrew Natsios, the former head of the US Agency for International Development (USAID), for example, said in response to the Trump Administration's plans to cut US spending on diplomacy and aid by 32% in the 2018 budget in favour of financing the military, 'We are going to have a pandemic crisis and there's no way to stop one at a border; it has to be at the source...while development regularly required long-term investments running for 20 years or more, it delivered lasting change'.³⁵

A further risk lies in the lines between security, development and humanitarian response becoming blurred, with objectives and mandates of the different policy areas becoming confused and contradictory, leading to wasteful, ineffective and even dangerous aid programmes.³⁶ The delivery of humanitarian aid, for example, is guided by humanitarian principles³⁷ and standards,³⁸ which safeguard the humanitarian imperative, protecting humanitarian space in conflicts, and setting civil–military boundaries. This does not, however, prevent humanitarian response from being closely associated with foreign policy objectives. Indeed, decision-making on allocation by the EC's Humanitarian Office (ECHO) is becoming increasingly politicised; for example, ECHO was heavily criticised at its annual Partners' Conference in December 2016 for not allocating humanitarian aid on a needs basis. Under the EU–Turkey deal, Turkey and Greece are today getting the largest share of ECHO funding following pressure from EU member states. While acknowledging that support to Greece and Turkey is essential, it is however disproportionate compared with humanitarian needs in other countries, such as South Sudan or Yemen. However, even where donors are providing substantial humanitarian assistance to countries suffering deeply, actions associated with the donor's national interests in the country can undermine its humanitarian response, as the Yemen examples in box 2 illustrate.

TEXT BOX 2: SPOTLIGHT ON THE UK

The UK's involvement in Yemen is a shining example of policy incoherence, and an illustration of blurred lines of engagement. The UK is a top humanitarian donor to Yemen, spending €100 million (US\$111 million) in 2015 and 2016, and supports the peace process seeking to end the conflict.³⁹ At the same time, the UK is also trading arms with Saudi Arabia, which is leading a regional military campaign, supported by the UK and others, against Houthi rebels in Yemen. The UK has come in for heavy criticism for this. It has been a major arms supplier to Saudi Arabia since the 1960s and is currently its second-largest supplier, accounting for 30% of the country's arms purchases.⁴⁰ The impact of the conflict on civilians, including an economic embargo and air attacks by Saudi-led coalition forces, has been devastating. Today, Yemen is the largest humanitarian crisis in the world, with an alarming 18.8 million people in need of humanitarian or protection assistance, including 10.3 million people who require immediate assistance to save or sustain their lives.⁴¹ Since March 2015, over 40,600 people have been killed and at least 3.1 million displaced.⁴²

4. CURRENT EU SPENDING ON PEACE AND SECURITY



Flight about to take off

The growth in reported ODA spending on conflict, peace and security (CPS)⁴³ has outpaced the growth of all aid over the last decade.⁴⁴ Despite this, the DAC's latest aid data⁴⁵ show that in 2015, EU donors spent a total of €1.06 billion (US\$1.78 billion) on CPS. This represents just 1.6%⁴⁶ of the EU28's total collective aid budget. These figures do not include spending on humanitarian response, nor data on military and security spending beyond aid in developing countries. The latter is limited and it is not possible to provide a breakdown of international military and security resource flows to different developing countries.⁴⁷

This data gap should be addressed to better align existing reporting systems, including the DAC's Creditor Reporting System, and the targets for SDG 16 (promoting peaceful and inclusive societies). Weaknesses in transparency and accountability in the aid reporting system can undermine data collection and make it liable to abuse. For example, more ODA may be spent on CPS-related activities and reported under other categories at the DAC's reporting system, and therefore not captured in these figures.³⁸ Accountability relies on donor self-policing and on an under-resourced oversight role played by the DAC. Transparency of aid spending also varies among DAC donors, particularly when ODA is not delivered by development ministries or departments.⁴⁹

Data suggests that spending on CPS does not match the level of priority donors are currently giving to security in development. The aid data does show EU donors tend to allocate a larger proportion of their aid to countries and regions that pose threats to – or are associated with – their own immediate security interests. Morocco, Turkey, Pakistan and Egypt, for example,

are commonly featured on a number of EU donors' lists of top aid recipients. Of the aid delivered by the EU's multilateral programme, most of the top ten recipients are countries of a geo-strategic priority, are located in Europe's near neighbourhood, or both. Turkey, Morocco, Serbia, Tunisia, West Bank and Gaza, Ukraine, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Afghanistan, Egypt and Niger together receive a third (36% in 2015) of the EU's multilateral aid budget.⁵⁰

All these countries do have problems of insecurity, conflict and poverty, but with the exceptions of Afghanistan and Niger, they do not have the deep levels of poverty experienced by many other countries. For example, in the countries experiencing the most neglected displacement crises, such as the Central African Republic, or the Democratic Republic of Congo⁵¹, and indeed in all of the world's least developed countries, aid fell by 3.9% in 2016 in real terms.⁵² This spending bias suggests donor policy here is not driven by poverty or humanitarian concerns, but rather by the ambition to achieve EU national or shared geo-strategic objectives. A number of EU donors, such as France, Italy and the UK, have recently prioritised conflict-affected and fragile states in their development cooperation. This commitment can enhance the poverty focus of donor aid, since it is in conflict and fragile contexts that poverty is often more intractable, and extreme poverty tends to be concentrated. However, the priority conflict-affected and fragile states are also often countries of origin and transit of migrants and refugees, or linked to terrorism through activities like border control and security reform. Given current policy priorities of EU donors, terrorism prevention is likely to attract more funding than countries where there are deeper levels of poverty but are neglected by donors as they pose no security threat.

5. RISK NEW AID RULES WILL INCREASE AID LINK TO DONOR SECURITY OBJECTIVES

One of the objectives of the DAC's modernisation of its ODA rules was to tighten rules with clear definitions so they are not open to misinterpretation and abuse. Some members of the DAC have, however, seen the modernisation process as an opportunity to expand the rules to allow for more areas of military and security activity eligible for ODA spending. The DAC, backed by members like Sweden,⁵³ prevented the changes being too radical. The DAC maintains that all ODA must continue to have a development purpose. Overall, the revised rules agreed in February 2016 clarified ambiguous and loose language from the old rules. However, the revision resulted in an expansion of ODA eligibility to new areas (see key points in box 3).

Many CSOs are also concerned that the broadening of the rules could encourage donors to further strengthen the links between development aid and security, and that the new rules are not clear enough to prevent ODA being used for activities that harm human rights. In May 2017, the UK government said it wanted to update the rules again, to make the range of ODA-eligible activities even wider. The DAC is not currently considering reopening the rules. CSOs will however continue to monitor these developments closely. The DAC has currently published a

new 'ODA Casebook on Conflict, Peace and Security Activities', which should help CSOs assess whether donor spending on the new areas recently included in DAC rules are eligible or not. The DAC is also discussing revising the Peacekeeping Operation (PKO) coefficient, in collaboration with the UN Department of PKO. The current guidelines only include activities conducted by civilians, and provide no detail on those conducted by the police and the military. The OECD DAC High Level meeting in October 2017 confirmed the move from a 7% coefficient (delivered by civilians) to a 15% coefficient (8% delivered by civilians, 3% by military, 3% by police). It is estimated that this could increase the volume of PKO reported as ODA by US\$500 million (twice the current amount of PKO reported as ODA).⁵⁵

Most activities under DAC rules have dedicated purpose codes to which spending is reported, but the 'new' areas related to military, security and prevention of violent extremism still lack their own codes. They can be reported under other existing codes, such as 'governance' (within security sector reform code), 'education', or 'women's equality and empowerment'. This has created a loophole in the reporting system because spending on the new areas could be hidden, making it difficult to track.⁵⁶

TEXT BOX 3: DAC eligibility criteria for reporting spending on peace and security-related activities – key points

OLD RULES	NEW RULES
Activities combating terrorism: are not reportable as ODA, as they generally target perceived threats to the donor, as much as to recipient countries, rather than focusing on the economic and social development of the recipient.	Preventing violent extremism: Financing activities combating terrorism is generally excluded from ODA, but activities that are now eligible include partner-country-led educational activities that seek to prevent radicalisation and foster reintegration; or building the capacity of security and justice systems in specific skills needed for preventing extremist or terrorist threats.
Military aid excluded: The supply of military equipment and services, and the forgiveness of debts incurred for military purposes, are not reportable as ODA. On the other hand, additional costs incurred for the use of the donor's military forces to deliver humanitarian aid or perform development services are ODA eligible.	Financing of military equipment or services is generally excluded from ODA reporting. The additional costs incurred with the use of military personnel or existing equipment provided by the donor, when used exclusively to a) deliver humanitarian aid in accordance with the humanitarian principles of humanity, neutrality, impartiality and independence or b) perform development services, are included in ODA if and only if a specific capability or asset requirement that cannot be met effectively and on time with available civilian assets has been identified.
	Development-related training of military personnel: Training (under civilian oversight, with a clear developmental purpose for the benefit of civilians), in areas such as human rights, preventing sexual violence, and training that contributes to fighting capacity. Training should be preferably by civilian actors, jointly by civilian and military actors or, by way of last resort, by military actors.
	Inclusion of donor military to deliver aid if a specific capability or asset requirement that cannot be met effectively and on time with available civilian assets has been identified. ⁵⁴
Expenditure on police training in routine civil policing functions: is reportable as ODA. Police training is reportable as security related when it is primarily aimed at supporting security system reform or undertaken in connection with peacekeeping activities.	Costs related to policing: Financing for routine civil policing functions such as preventing and addressing criminal activities and promoting public safety, and providing related non-lethal equipment or training. Training in the governance and management of police equipment is eligible including the safety, security and storage of equipment intended to convey a threat of, or deliver, lethal force.

6. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Over recent years, EU donors have made a succession of announcements that commit aid to supporting their own national security objectives. They have rightly recognised that support to improve security and development is needed. But, in their discourse they justify using aid in response to EU security threats as urgent and exceptional, and focus their policy objectives on short-term activities to contain security threats such as strengthening the military or security forces in developing countries. In so doing, fighting poverty and promoting sustainable development are less prominent in their narrative. Their objectives also concentrate less on putting good peacebuilding, development and humanitarian practice at the heart of efforts to meet needs and build stability. It is too early to examine the impact of aid spending linked to new security objectives, or changes to the DAC eligibility criteria for spending on security-related activities. The concern is though that scarce aid resources will in time be diverted from other development priorities, and fighting poverty. Moreover, there is a risk that the key principles of development will be undermined. Aid is intended to be a soft external policy tool, held at arm's length from national external priorities, providing long-term investments in country's development priorities. Its value cannot be overlooked or lost. Especially in the context of the upcoming negotiations on the next Multi-Annual Financial Framework, EU leaders will have a key opportunity to better tailor the synergies between development and security by letting partner country priorities guide EU development cooperation.

The development community will therefore have to closely monitor donors' spending on security-linked programmes, and call for donors to:

- Ensure that the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development – particularly ending extreme poverty, not national security priorities – guides EU development cooperation, and that existing commitments to development and aid effectiveness, as well as principled humanitarian action, are met.
- Invest in the development of active citizenship and civil society's ability to hold state institutions to account, particularly in conflict-affected and fragile states.
- Ensure that aid is not conditional on donors' security objectives, but is aligned with national development priorities that respond to the needs of the communities, including empowering women. Donors must ensure that aid does not contribute to violations of international human rights and humanitarian law.
- Report data that is sufficiently detailed to ensure that OECD DAC rules are being respected (including developing specific purpose codes reflecting changes in the revised directives).
- Ensure that *all* aid spending by government departments in member states implements transparent public reporting and is open to the same levels of scrutiny as development departments and agencies.



Fences

7. ENDNOTES

- 1 European Commission (2016) *New proposals to improve the EU's support for security and development in partner countries*, http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_IP-16-2405_en.htm
- 2 Aid refers to official development assistance (ODA) throughout the paper unless stated. Aid figures are those reported to the OECD DAC Creditor Reporting System. See <https://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=CRS1>
- 3 European Commission (2015) *Joint communication to the European Parliament and the Council. Capacity building in support of security and development - Enabling partners to prevent and manage crises*, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52015JC0017&from=EN>
- 4 'Security' in this paper limits its focus on *personal safety from physical threat and the fear of physical threat*. This approach to security is human-centred, informed by human security and critical security studies, but is more limited in the scope of threats it considers, i.e. not protection from lack of basic health services. See ODI (2014) *Security in post-conflict contexts: what counts as progress and what drives it*, <https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/8915.pdf>
- 5 UN SDGs, <http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/peace-justice/>
- 6 For example, the UK's 2015 Aid Strategy foreword, states, "With this new strategy, Britain can be proud to be a country that not only meets its responsibilities to the world's poorest, but in doing so best serves and protects its own security and interests", https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/478834/ODA_strategy_final_web_0905.pdf
- 7 The Lisbon Treaty, Article 208, <http://www.lisbon-treaty.org/wcm/the-lisbon-treaty/treaty-on-the-functioning-of-the-european-union-and-comments/part-5-external-action-by-the-union/title-3-cooperation-with-third-countries-and-humanitarian-aid/chapter-1-development-cooperation/496-article-208.html>
- 8 Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung EU (2016) *From Hybrid Peace to Human Security: Rethinking EU Strategy towards Conflict*, <http://www.fes-europe.eu/news-list/e/from-hybrid-peace-to-human-security-rethinking-eu-strategy-towards-conflict/>
- 9 International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding (2011) *A New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States*, https://www.pbsdialogue.org/media/filer_public/07/69/07692de0-3557-494e-918e-18df00e9ef73/the_new_deal.pdf
- 10 Ibid
- 11 Often referred to as aid securitisation, i.e. donors increasingly attaching a (typically national) security value to a field that was previously not directly related to those security concerns, allowing for aid to be used on urgent priorities as justification for bypassing regular procedures (see *The Securitization of Foreign Aid* (2016) Eds. Stephen Brown, Jörn Grävingholt). The militarisation of aid has a similar definition although refers to aid spending specifically on military services or equipment expenditure.
- 12 OECD DAC (2016) *High Level Meeting Communiqué*, <http://www.oecd.org/dac/DAC-HLM-Communique-2016.pdf>
- 13 OECD DAC (2017) *ODA Casebook on Conflict, Peace and Security Activities*, [http://www.oecd.org/officialdocuments/publicdisplaydocumentpdf/?cote=DCD/DAC\(2017\)22/FINAL&docLanguage=En](http://www.oecd.org/officialdocuments/publicdisplaydocumentpdf/?cote=DCD/DAC(2017)22/FINAL&docLanguage=En)
- 14 <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/media/22904/st08022en16v2.pdf>
- 15 Food for thought paper by Belgium, the Czech Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, Portugal and Spain (2016) *Implementation of the CBSD initiative - EEAS and Commission must step up efforts to fulfill the mandate of the European Council*.
- 16 See Heidi Hautala MEP's article: EURACTIV (2017) *Europe's legal U-turn on militarising development policy*, <https://www.euractiv.com/section/development-policy/opinion/europes-legal-u-turn-on-militarising-development-policy/>
- 17 In its submission to amend the relevant regulations: Brot für die Welt (2016) (in German) *Entwicklungsgelder für militärische Ertüchtigung*, <https://info.brot-fuer-die-welt.de/blog/entwicklungsgelder-militaerische-ertuechtigung>
- 18 The proposal aimed to mobilise the funds by diverting 25% from each of the following: the Development Cooperation Instrument, the Multiannual Financial Framework – Heading IV, the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument (ENPI) and the Common Foreign and Security Policy budget.
- 19 For example, see the Greens/EFA Group Dissenting note for legal basis from Ms Heidi Hautala, European Parliament (2017) , <https://www.greens-efa.eu/files/doc/docs/f63a8e2b7eb3018a23b091744d6ddb9.pdf>

- 20 Brot für die Welt (2016) (in German) *Entwicklungsgelder für militärische Ertüchtigung*, <https://info.brot-fuer-die-welt.de/blog/entwicklungsgelder-militaerische-ertuechtigung>
- 21 Heidi Hautala in EURACTIV (2017) *Europe's legal U-turn on militarising development policy*, <https://www.euractiv.com/section/development-policy/opinion/europes-legal-u-turn-on-militarising-development-policy>
- 22 *ibid*
- 23 Politico (2017) *EU's plans to militarize aid face legal scrutiny in Parliament*, <http://www.politico.eu/article/eu-stability-and-peace-plans-to-militarize-aid-face-legal-scrutiny-in-parliament/>
- 24 UK Parliament Joint Select Committee (2016) *Conflict, Stability and Security Fund inquiry launched*, <https://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/joint-select/national-security-strategy/news-parliament-2015/cssf-launch-16-17/>
- 25 The Guardian (2017) *Human rights abuses in Bahrain cast shadow over £2m UK aid support*, <https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2017/jan/13/human-rights-abuses-bahrain-cast-shadow-over-2m-uk-aid-support> and *Secrecy around £1bn aid and security fund raises 'significant concern', say MPs*, <https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2017/feb/07/secrecy-around-1bn-aid-and-security-fund-raises-significant-concern-say-mps>
- 26 Joint Committee on the National Security Strategy - Inquiry into the Conflict, Stability and Security Fund (CSSF) (2016) *Written evidence submitted by Reprieve*, <http://data.parliament.uk/writtenevidence/committeeevidence.svc/evidencedocument/national-security-strategy-committee/conflict-stability-and-security-fund/written/38225.html>
- 27 The Guardian (2017) *UK's £2m support for Egypt security projects branded 'deeply disturbing'*, <https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2017/aug/18/uk-2-million-pounds-aid-support-egypt-security-projects-deeply-disturbing>
- 28 Human Rights Watch (2017) *Egypt: Consolidating Repression Under al-Sisi*, <https://www.hrw.org/news/2017/01/12/egypt-consolidating-repression-under-al-sisi>
- 29 European Council (2016) *Joint Commission-EEAS non-paper on enhancing cooperation on migration, mobility and readmission with Afghanistan*, <http://statewatch.org/news/2016/mar/eu-council-afghanistan-6738-16.pdf>
- 30 The best-known example is the €6.0 billion deal (US\$6.8 billion) offered to Turkey in exchange for taking back asylum seekers and improving border controls. Other targeted countries include Niger, Ethiopia, Nigeria, Lebanon and Libya. The EU has also considered similar deals with Eritrea and Sudan, the governments of which are accused of crimes against humanity and war crimes.
- 31 European Commission (2017) *EU Emergency Trust Fund For Africa*, http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/factsheet-eu-emergency-trust-fund-africa-2017-update-0606_en.pdf (update) and https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/factsheet-emergency-trust-fund-africa-2017_en.pdf
- 32 In November 2017, Concord released the paper "*European Union Emergency Trust Fund for Africa: Partnership or conditionality?*" exploring key themes of the EU Emergency Trust Funds for Africa and highlighting several CSO concerns, https://concordeurope.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/CONCORD_EUTF_Monitoring_short.pdf?1fdb40&1fdb40
- 33 European Council (2017) *The Council adopts a new European consensus on development*, <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2017/05/19-european-consensus-on-development/>
- 34 Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions (2016) *Proposal for a new European Consensus on Development Our World, our Dignity, our Future*, https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/communication-proposal-new-consensus-development-20161122_en.pdf
- 35 Financial Times (2017) *State department funding to take a hit from Trump cuts*, <https://www.ft.com/content/20a4d298-3fd4-11e7-9d56-25f963e998b2>
- 36 Oxfam (2011) *Whose Aid is it Anyway? Politicizing aid in conflicts and crises*, <http://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/publications/whose-aid-is-it-anyway-politicizing-aid-in-conflicts-and-crises-121669>
- 37 Humanity, neutrality, impartiality and independence, see OCHA (2012) *What are Humanitarian Principles?* https://docs.unocha.org/sites/dms/Documents/OOM-humanitarianprinciples_eng_June12.pdf

- 38 Directives must remain consistent with existing UN rules to protect humanitarian space, including the Guidelines on the Use of Foreign Military and Civil Defence Assets In Disaster Relief (“Oslo Guidelines”) and the Guidelines on the Use of Military and Civil Defence Assets to Support UN Humanitarian Activities in Complex Emergencies (MCDA Guidelines)
- 39 The UK was 4th and 3rd largest donor in 2015 and 2016 respectively (UN OCHA Financial Tracking Service, 2017).
- 40 Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (2016) *Trends in International Arms Transfers*, 2015, <https://www.sipri.org/publications/2016/sipri-fact-sheets/trends-international-arms-transfers-2015>
- 41 OCHA (2017) *High-level Pledging Event for the Humanitarian Crisis in Yemen - Geneva*, 25 April 2017, <http://www.unocha.org/yemen/high-level-pledging-event>
- 42 OCHA (2016) *Yemen Humanitarian Bulletin Issue 15*, <http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/Yemen%20Humanitarian%20Bulletin%20Issue%2015.pdf>
- 43 Reported by DAC members to DAC’s Creditor Reporting System category conflict, peace and security sector.
- 44 Development Initiatives (2016) *Investments in peace and security*, <http://devinit.org/post/investments-in-peace-and-security/>
- 45 According to DAC 2015 preliminary figures. Using DAC purpose codes under the conflict, peace and security sector classification.
- 46 The total ODA of EU28 member states in 2015 was €66.51 billion (in 2015 constant prices).
- 47 See Development Initiatives (2016) *Investments in Peace and Security*, <http://devinit.org/post/investments-in-peace-and-security/>
- 48 Development Initiatives (2016) *Aid spending on conflict prevention and resolution, peace and security*, http://devinit.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/Aid-spending-on-conflict-peace-and-security_factsheet.pdf
- 49 For example, see the UK’s Independent Commission for Aid Impact review of ODA spending by other government departments in the UK <https://icai.independent.gov.uk/report/a-preliminary-investigation-of-official-development-assistance-spent-by-departments-other-than-dfid/>. This is likely to be the case for many DAC donors.
- 50 DAC members aid at a glance, https://public.tableau.com/views/AidAtAGlance/DACmembers?:embed=y&:display_count=no?&:showVizHome=no#1
- 51 Norwegian Refugee Council (2017) *The world’s most neglected displacement crises*, <https://www.nrc.no/the-worlds-most-neglected-displacement-crises/>
- 52 OECD (2017) *Development aid rises again in 2016 but flows to poorest countries dip*, <http://www.oecd.org/dac/development-aid-rises-again-in-2016-but-flows-to-poorest-countries-dip.htm>
- 53 euobserver (2016) *How to ensure development aid is effective*, <https://euobserver.com/opinion/135805>
- 54 It is the obligation of members to undertake and make available, on request of the Secretariat, evidence that demonstrates that such an assessment was made on an objective basis.
- 55 OECD (2017) *The ODA Coefficient for UN Peacekeeping Operations Explained*, <http://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-development/development-finance-standards/ODA-Coefficient-for-UN-Peacekeeping-Operations.pdf>
- 56 Based on an analysis made by Julie Seghers, OECD Policy and Advocacy Advisor, Oxfam.

OUR MEMBERS

 NATIONAL PLATFORMS	 Global Responsibility	 BELGISCH PLATFORM PLATE-FORME BELGE CONCORD CNCD-11.11.11 11.11.11 ACODEV ngo-federatie	 BPID Bulgarian Platform for International Development	 Platforma za međunarodnu građansku solidarnost Hrvatske Croatian Platform for International Citizen Solidarity CROSOL	 CYINDEP Cyprus Island wide NGO Development Platform	 FORS České fórum pro rozvojovou spolupráci Czech Forum for Development Co-operation
 GLOBAL FOCUS Diverse CSOs for Development Cooperation		 KEHYSRY	 Coordination SUD Solidarité Urgence Développement	 VENRO ASSOCIATION OF GERMAN DEVELOPMENT AND HUMANITARIAN AID NGOs	 Hellenic Platform for Development	 HAND
 Dochas The Irish Association of Non-Governmental Development Organisations	 Network delle ONG in Europa per lo sviluppo e l'emergenza CONCORD ITALIA	 LAPAS WWW.LAPAS.LV	 LITDEA Lithuanian National Non-Governmental Development Organisation Platform	 Cercle de Coopération des ONG de développement	 SKOP Solidarjetät u Koperazzioni	 PARTOS
 CZLPA ZAGRANICA	 ONGD PLATAFORMA PORTUGUESA	 FOND Federální Organizace nevládních organizací v České republice	 MVRO Platforma nevládních organizací rozvoje v České republice Slovak NGO Platform	 SLOGA SLOVENIAN GLOBAL ACTION	 COORDINADORA ONG PARA EL DESARROLLO ESPAÑA	 CONCORD Swedish & European NGOs for development Sweden
 bond	 NETWORKS	 actalliance eu Formerly APODEV	 act:onaid	 ADRA	 care	 caritas europa
 cbm together we can do more	 ChildFund Alliance	 CIDSE together for global justice	 eucord European Crisis Organisations for Relief and Development	 GNDR Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction	 Habitat for Humanity Europe, Middle East and Africa	 HANDICAP INTERNATIONAL
 IPPF International Planned Parenthood Federation European Network	 ISLAMIC RELIEF	 OXFAM International	 PLAN INTERNATIONAL	 Save the Children	 solidar	 SOS CHILDREN'S VILLAGES INTERNATIONAL
 Terre des Hommes International Federation	 World Vision	 ASSOCIATE MEMBERS	 ALDA European Association for Local Democracy	 ea EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE EDUCATION OF ADULTS	 WWF	