

# TURN UP SAVE LIVES

## PROTECTING 0.7% IN LAW

### THE STORY SO FAR



The 0.7% aid target is a target for donor countries to contribute 0.7% of their national income on international aid.

The 0.7 per cent target was first agreed internationally in 1970 by the United Nations General Assembly.

All three main political parties have been committed for a

number of years to this international target.

In 2013, the Government reached this target for the first time.

The government has also promised to enshrine the 0.7% figure in law. This will make aid more effective, helping poorer countries plan for their long-term development, so that they can stand on their own two feet rather than relying on overseas aid.

After coming second in the Private Members' bill ballot Michael Moore MP chose to bring forward the legislation of Britain's 0.7% aid commitment. September 12th 2014 will see the second reading of Bill.

100 MPs must vote in favour of the bill to ensure it progresses to the next stage.

**#TurnUpSaveLives** is the campaign calling on political parties to honour their commitment and vote on 12 September to protect the UK's life-saving aid budget for good. [www.turnupsavelives.org.uk](http://www.turnupsavelives.org.uk)

### WHY AID

UK aid is an amazing success story. Every day it is transforming the lives of millions of the world's poorest children. Here's just some of the ways we've helped:

- British support for immunisation saves a child's life every two minutes. We can now vaccinate a child against some killer diseases for less than the cost of a cup of coffee.
- In the years 2011/12 and 2013/14 British aid helped 10.2 million children to go to school. That's 10.2 million children able to fulfil their potential.

- Even in some of the most difficult places on earth, British aid is helping. The British public have dug deep to help children caught up in Syria's civil war, and their generosity has been 'match-funded' by the British government, meaning that together we have reached more than one million children.
- We really are turning the tide. Since the year 2000 the number of children's lives lost to malaria has halved. Since 1990 we've halved the rate of child mortality overall. There are now only three countries in the world where polio is still endemic. Amidst so much bad news about things we can't change, it is time to celebrate the things we already have changed, together.

Watch our film '**What has Aid ever done for anyone?**'

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AiKaNJzHdF0> It's an answer for anyone wondering if aid really makes a difference

## **WHY LEGISLATE FOR 0.7%**

Legislation is better than simply having a policy commitment for two main reasons:

- 1) Increasing the predictability of aid to poor countries helps countries to plan their work better, and means that our government can make smart long-term investments, ensuring we get better value for money for every pound spent.
- 2) The amount of aid we give shouldn't be revisited every year when the really important debate is about how we spend the money. Putting our promises to the poorest beyond the day to day debates of party politics means policy-makers can focus on how we continue to improve the quality of aid, instead of having an annual debate on whether we intend to stick to our commitments.

Britain has already hit the 0.7% target, passing the bill would mean maintaining Britain's current commitment, not increasing it. Because this target is a percentage rather than a set figure, this legislation pegs our aid to the performance of the UK economy. When times are good, we give more, and when life is tough, we give a little less.

One of the reasons all three main parties committed to the legislation is because they recognised it took more than 40 years for Britain to meet our target from when it was first set. All three parties wanted to be accountable to parliament and the public for meeting this promise year on year.

The legislation enjoys expert consensus- here's a [list of experts backing British aid](#).

## TAKE ACTION: MEET YOUR MP

### **Setting up your meeting**

Call or email your MP's office and arrange to go to the next surgery in your area. If they don't have a surgery before the 12 September it is fine to ask if there is an alternative time to meet them. You can find their contact details on **theyworkforyou.com** or their own website.

If you want help with setting up these meetings, get in touch with the campaigns team: **campaigns@savethechildren.org.uk**

### **Before the meeting**

If this is your first meeting with your MP you might find it useful to do some background reading to find out who your MP is, what party they belong to and especially on how they have voted on international development issues in the past. The campaigns team can provide you with this information.

### **During the Meeting**

The idea of talking to your MP can feel quite daunting. But remember it's your MP's job to listen to your views. If they don't know what issues you are passionate about, then they can't champion this topic on your behalf in Parliament.

### **What to take with you:**

- Turn Up Save Lives MP Briefing  
[http://microsites.savethechildren.org.uk/sites/all/themes/turnupsavelives/pdf/turn\\_up\\_save\\_lives\\_mp\\_briefing\\_2014.pdf](http://microsites.savethechildren.org.uk/sites/all/themes/turnupsavelives/pdf/turn_up_save_lives_mp_briefing_2014.pdf)
- Camera
- Lifesaver Case Prop- contact [campaigns@savethechildren.org.uk](mailto:campaigns@savethechildren.org.uk) for yours!

### **Key discussion points for your meeting:**

- Say hello and introduce yourself.
- Let them know what you have come to talk about and tell them why this concerns you personally.
- Give the MP our Turn Up Save Lives Briefing and let them know that why they should turn up on the day.
- Make your ask. Be clear what you are asking your MP to do and try to get a commitment from them.

**Ask:** will you commit to attending the Second Reading of the International development bill on September 12<sup>th</sup> and vote in favour of the bill?

- If they are supportive ask them to email a photo to xxxx so we can publicise their pledge to the poorest on at [www.turnupsavelives.org.uk](http://www.turnupsavelives.org.uk) and on social media using #turnupsavelives.
- What else can your MP do?
  - Get a picture taken with our 'Lifesavers Case'
  - Take a colleague: encourage as many other MPs possible to turn up and save lives on September 12<sup>th</sup>.

### **Top Tops for your meeting:**

- **Keep to time:** It's worth confirming at the start how much time you have available. Make sure you keep to it, MPs are always short on time and they will appreciate a meeting that is to the point yet beneficial.
- **Be friendly and polite.** Let your passion for the issue shine through. Often people feel they need to be confrontational with their MP to get their message across but if you explain why your MP needs to champion 0.7 calmly and reasonably this will open a good conversation between you and your MP, maybe even a partnership that they will be grateful for.
- **If you're asked a difficult question, don't worry.** Offer to come back to them once you've had chance to go and find out the answer. Our FAQ's should also help you.
- Start or end (depending on the atmosphere) with an **informal question.** MPs are asked political questions all the time; so if you ask them something about their hobbies it may even relax them – and you!

### **After your meeting**

**Follow Up-** Write to them to say thank you and use the opportunity to reinstate your ask. You could also send the photo from your meeting. If you are on Twitter, why not tweet them the picture.

#### **Example tweet**

.@[MPNAME] thanks so much for meeting with me today. Great to hear that you are going to #turnupsavelives on 12 September. [link to picture]

**Let us know how your meeting went!** We can give you some advice on the next steps to take.

**Publicise your success.** Let the local media know about it. Contact [campaigns@savethechildren.org.uk](mailto:campaigns@savethechildren.org.uk) for a template press release.

## FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

### ON AID

- **Isn't a lot of aid wasted?**

British aid is among the most transparent in the world - and it is now easier than ever before, through something called the International Aid Transparency Initiative, for people here at home as well as people in poor countries to see what money is going where. And the results of this aid are amazing. A child's life is saved every two minutes thanks to Britain's investment in immunisation. I don't think anybody could call that a waste.

- **Isn't a lot of money lost through corruption?**

Corruption kills people, as simple as that. Britain gives money to save lives and if any of it is lost through corruption that is a crime and the perpetrators should be brought to justice, as they now can be through new laws like the EU's new rules on money laundering. There are great initiatives which help communities track where the money goes - like pinning notices to school doors which say which donors have given cash for teachers and how much, so communities themselves can track if they are getting what has been promised.

- **Why should we keep our promise to 0.7 if other countries keep breaking their promises?**

Britain isn't the only country to give 0.7% in aid, but it is true that we are the first country in the G8 to do so. But I think we can be proud of the edge that gives us in international discussions - Britain is now thought of as an 'aid superpower', a country that still has great influence around the world because other countries know we will keep our promises.

- **How can you say aid is making Africa more stable when even booming countries like Nigeria and Kenya aren't safe?**

What is happening with terrorism in Africa is a tragedy, and the thoughts of everyone in Britain are with those families who have lost loved ones to these terrible crimes. But despite the challenges, the overall picture in Africa is a good one, with 43 MILLION more kids in school in Africa compared to the year 2000. We need to stand together to defeat terrorism, but we shouldn't give in to extremists by letting them crowd out the good news which African teachers, doctors, entrepreneurs, activists and politicians are delivering together.

- **Aren't we giving money to countries like Rwanda and Ethiopia where human rights are abused? Why are we giving money to countries with homophobic laws?**

We agree that the human rights record of a government is one of the things our government should take in to account when deciding whether to channel money through that particular government. But there are plenty of ways to get help to those people that need it which bypass the government completely. For example should we withdraw medicines from children if we can get them to them in rural areas, just because politicians in the capital have policies we oppose? I think we

should condemn the decisions of politicians when they are wrong, but not punish the poor for the mistakes of their rulers.

- **If aid works, why are we still giving it 30 years after the Ethiopian famine?**

The problems of global poverty were never going to be solved overnight, but what is important is whether we are making progress. Just think about this: the number of children we lose every year before their fifth birthday has fallen by half since 1990. We're halfway there! Now it is time to finish the job.

- **Why are you obsessed with aid when the biggest things we can do to lift people out of poverty are to do with tax / trade/ conflict / immigration/ climate?**

I completely agree - giving aid is not the *most* important thing we can do, but it is an essential part of the solution, and one of the reasons we want to pass this law is precisely so we can all stop talking about the areas where we agree and move on to these areas which are even bigger. But let's not forget, aid itself is having amazing results. Just last year our Development Ministry, DFID, helped nearly 20 MILLION people to get clean water.

- **0.7% is completely arbitrary - why aren't we setting a budget on the basis of what is needed rather than an ancient target?**

0.7 isn't arbitrary - it is an internationally agreed baseline, set by the UN, and it is a target we've been promising to hit for more than 40 years.

It's also a fairer way to judge a country's commitment to development. For example in terms of money, the USA gives more to development than any other country, but the 0.7 target allows us to see the amount countries contribute in relation to the size of their economy – from that lens you see the UK gives more generously, and we are contributing a fairer share.

All three main parties have signed up to the target precisely because they think it is important to have a standard measurement across countries and across time for the kind of commitment we're willing to make to the poor.

- **Shouldn't we be spending money in defence of Britain's interests? Shouldn't we prioritise British exports and building the foreign policy alliances we need, like everybody else?**

The simple fact is aid can do amazing things in relieving poverty, but it delivers the best value for money when we are clear on what we expect for it. If we give money to immunise children we should measure how many children are immunised - not whether that money promotes other interests at the same time. Of course we all want a world where Britain is safe and prosperous, and aid can make a contribution to combatting terrorism and creating new markets for British goods, but the main purpose of aid should be helping our fellow human beings who need help.

- **Doesn't this just create dependence in poor countries?**

We all want to see the end of aid. The greatest thing that could happen to me is if organisations like Save the Children went out of business and wasn't needed any more. But we're not at that stage yet, even though some of the signs are

encouraging. I think it is great news that some countries, like South Korea, used to need a lot of aid and are now booming. Hopefully we will see the same in a lot of the African countries that are getting richer. Because all the evidence shows that countries would rather not rely on aid - they want to stand on their own two feet, just like we do.

- **Why should we spend aid in countries where the elites won't pay tax or the government isn't funding public services?**

I agree that the wealthiest in every country should be doing their fair share. So politicians in developing countries should pay tax, but big companies in Britain should pay their taxes too. Everybody paying their dues would mean we could eliminate a lot of the problems at home and abroad. You won't find anybody angrier about elites ducking out of doing their bit than those of us who fight poverty. And British aid in some places is actually making tax systems work better, by helping to build up inspectorates - meaning we won't always have to be there.

- **Why are we giving money to countries like India when they have a space programme?**

Let's look at the question another way: more poor people live in India than in all of sub-Saharan Africa combined. Should we turn our backs on them when there is still too much to be done?

## ON LEGISLATION

- **Why should aid be treated differently to every other kind of spending? Isn't deciding spending priorities what we have elections for?**

Of course governments should have the flexibility to implement new policies. But the real political argument here is about how we spend it, not about whether we should do it. No mainstream party is saying we should cut aid, so let's just bank that consensus and free up parliamentary time to have the really big debates the public want to hear.

- **If your argument is that aid is really important, are you really going to be happy if it goes down as well as up? Isn't focussing on a percentage rather than an amount just spin?**

Of course we would always welcome an increase in life-saving aid. But at the very least we expect politicians to stick to their promises, and if they pledged 0.7% then it is 0.7% they should deliver.

- **Won't this just create an incentive to shovel money out the door instead of getting real value for money?**

Britain's development department, DFID, is regarded around the world as the best in the business. It has a real focus on value for money and measurable results - there's no evidence it ever spends money for the sake of it, but instead spends money delivering real change, like saving a child's life every two minutes through its immunisation programme.

- **If British people are as committed to helping those abroad as you say, won't they give voluntarily to charity? Why do you assume you know better than they do how to spend their money?**

The British people are among the most generous in the world - with Red Nose Night smashing records every time and a tremendous response to the recent Unicef appeal as part of the Commonwealth Games. But the reality is charity alone will not be enough. If we want poor countries to make the really big changes that will transform lives for good - changes like abolishing school fees - then we need to make predictable, long term investments. That's how we get the best value for money for every pound spent.