



**COUNCIL OF  
THE EUROPEAN UNION**

**Brussels, 14 May 2012**

**9641/12**

**PE-RE 6**

**NOTE**

---

Subject: RESOLUTIONS, DECISIONS AND OPINIONS adopted by the European Parliament at its part-session in Brussels from 9 to 10 May 2012

---

At the above mentioned part-session, the European Parliament adopted 58 acts as follows:

- 5 legislative resolutions;
- 7 resolutions; and
- 46 other acts.

This note contains a summary of those acts which are relevant to the Council.

## 1. Ordinary legislative procedure

### First reading

- a) (i) Protection against dumped imports from countries not members of the European Community  
*European Parliament legislative resolution of 10 May 2012 on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Council Regulation (EC) No 1225/2009 of 30 November 2009 on protection against dumped imports from countries not members of the European Community*
- (ii) Restrictions on imports of certain steel products from Russia  
*European Parliament legislative resolution of 10 May 2012 on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 1342/2007 on administering certain restrictions on imports of certain steel products from the Russian Federation*

For each of these acts the European Parliament:

- adopted its position at first reading;
- called on the Commission to refer the matter to Parliament again if it intended to amend its proposal substantially or replace it with another text.

b) Roaming on public mobile communications networks within the Union

*European Parliament legislative resolution of 10 May 2012 on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on roaming on public mobile communications networks within the Union (recast)*

The European Parliament:

- adopted its position at first reading, taking into account the recommendations of the Consultative Working Party of the legal services of the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission.

c) Export and import of dangerous chemicals

*European Parliament legislative resolution of 10 May 2012 on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the export and import of dangerous chemicals (recast)*

The European Parliament:

- adopted its position at first reading, taking into account the recommendations of the Consultative Working Party of the legal services of the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission;

- called on the Commission to refer the matter to Parliament again if it intended to amend its proposal substantially or replace it with another text.

## **2. Consent procedure**

### a) Electronic publication of the Official Journal of the European Union

*European Parliament legislative resolution of 10 May 2012 on the draft Council regulation on the electronic publication of the Official Journal of the European Union*

The European Parliament:

- consented to the draft Council regulation;
- reminded the Council that, should the requirement for unanimity under Article 352 TFEU and the pending domestic parliamentary procedures in the United Kingdom lead to any change in the draft text, the consent of the European Parliament would have to be requested anew.

## **3. Other procedures**

### a) Future of regional airports and air services in the EU

*European Parliament resolution of 10 May 2012 on the future of regional airports and air services in the EU*

The European Parliament:

- urged the Council to adopt a position on aviation security charges, and believed that more stringent security measures should be paid out of general taxation by the Member State concerned, as aviation security was a matter of national security; stressed that similar rules should apply for all other transport modes in order to ensure fair competition (para 39).

### b) 2010 discharge: EU general budget, Section III, Commission

*European Parliament resolution of 10 May 2012 with observations forming an integral part of its Decision on discharge in respect of the implementation of the general budget of the European Union for the financial year 2010, Section III – Commission and executive agencies*

The European Parliament:

- criticised the fact that the Council used Article 122 of the TFEU in 2010 for setting up the European Stability Facility (EFSF) because that Article was only applicable for natural disasters and not for economic catastrophes; was concerned that the EFSF neither contained an element of democratic control by Parliament nor gave the Court of Auditors any audit rights; strongly criticised the fact that the EFSF had not even any provision on external public audit (para 76);
- reiterated its invitation to the Council and Member States to give due consideration to the following issues concerning the implementation of the ESM:
  - to ensure in the by-laws of the ESM appropriate arrangements for public external audit of legality, regularity as well as performance in line with internationally accepted auditing standards taking into account the following documents:
    - Resolution of the Contact Committee of the Supreme Audit Institutions (SAIs) of the European Union from 14 October 2011 on the Statement of SAIs of the euro area on the external audit of the ESM (CC-R-2011-01)<sup>1</sup>,
    - Statement of the Contact Committee of the SAIs of the European Union addressed to the European Parliament, the European Council, the European Commission and parliaments and governments of EU Member States from 14 October 2011 on the Impact of the European Semester and other recent developments in EU economic governance on the Supreme Audit Institutions of the Member States of the European Union and the European Court of Auditors<sup>2</sup>,
    - Letter from the President of the Dutch Court of Audit<sup>3</sup> on issues to be addressed in the by-laws of the ESM with regard to Article 30 of the ESM Treaty,
  - to establish appropriate arrangements for accountability and full transparency of the ESM,
  - to ensure the reliability of data and statistics,
  - to clarify the responsibility and reporting arrangements of all actors whose liabilities will be involved in the establishment of the mechanism,

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://eca.europa.eu/portal/pls/portal/docs/1/9406723.PDF>

<sup>2</sup> <http://eca.europa.eu/portal/pls/portal/docs/1/9504723.PDF>

<sup>3</sup> Available on the website of the Netherlands Court of Audit

[http://www.courtfaudit.com/english/News/2012/02/Letter\\_of\\_president\\_Netherlands\\_Court\\_of\\_Audit\\_on\\_ESM\\_Board\\_of\\_Auditors](http://www.courtfaudit.com/english/News/2012/02/Letter_of_president_Netherlands_Court_of_Audit_on_ESM_Board_of_Auditors)

- to urge the Commission to report to Parliament and the Council twice a year on the risk that is incurred on the Union's budget by its guarantee to the EFSM and to ask the Commission how in case of a default this money would be transferred into the Union budget and then to the EFSM (para 78);
- invited the Council and the Member States to define Parliament's political scrutiny over any euro-bond issue, in general, and of the permanent crisis mechanism in particular; shared the view that Parliament should be involved at an equal basis in the mechanism (para 79).

c) ECA special reports in the context of the 2010 Commission discharge

*European Parliament resolution of 10 May 2012 on the Court of Auditors' special reports in the context of the 2010 Commission discharge*

The European Parliament:

- was of the opinion that the SPS insufficiently contributes to the Treaty objectives of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP); called on the Commission, therefore, to propose the necessary changes in the legislation so that the SPS really made an optimal contribution to the CAP objectives; was of the opinion that the SPS should be improved towards better targeting the aid towards real farmers; urged the Council to support Parliament and the Commission in their efforts to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the single largest European support scheme, thereby helping to better direct Union taxpayers' money (para 60).

d) Discharge 2010: 8th, 9th and 10th European Development Funds

*European Parliament resolution of 10 May 2012 with observations forming an integral part of its Decision on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the Eighth, Ninth and Tenth European Development Funds for the financial year 2010*

The European Parliament:

- urged the Council and the Member States to respond positively to the Commission's proposal and to agree that the EDF would be fully incorporated into the Union's budget from 2020 onwards; believed this measure to be long overdue; expected the Commission to honour this commitment and to take all necessary measures to start preparing for EDF budgetisation (para 6);

- further stressed that long-term social and economic development required sustainable sources of income other than aid; in this regard considered that sound and well-functioning trade relations in line with WTO principles was key for developing countries and therefore urged the Commission, the Council and the ACP states to find solutions to the outstanding issues concerning the proposed Economic Partnership Agreements and free trade between Europe and the ACP region (para 64).

e) Discharge 2010: EU general budget – Council

- (i) *European Parliament decision of 10 May 2012 on the discharge for implementation of the European Union general budget for the financial year 2010, Section II – Council*

The European Parliament:

- postponed its decision on granting the Secretary-General of the Council discharge for implementation of the Council's budget for the financial year 2010;
- set out its observations and reservations in the resolution below.

- (ii) *European Parliament resolution of 10 May 2012 with observations forming an integral part of the decision on the discharge for implementation of the European Union general budget for the financial year 2010, Section II – Council*

The European Parliament:

- in keeping with its power to make use of the two deadlines in the discharge timetable in order, in this case, to explore the possibility of reaching an agreement with the Presidency-in-Office, postponed its decision on granting the Secretary-General of the Council discharge for implementation of the Council's budget for the financial year 2010;
- took note of the fact that, in its annual report for 2010, the Court of Auditors concluded, based on its audit work, that the payments as a whole for the year ended 31 December 2010 for the administrative and other expenses of the institutions and bodies were free from material error; pointed out that the most likely error rate as regards administrative expenditure in general was estimated at 0,4 % (paragraphs 7.9 and 7.10);
- acknowledged receipt of a series of documents for the 2010 discharge procedure (final financial statements for 2010, including the accounts, the financial activity report and the summary of the 2010 internal audits); was still awaiting all necessary documents for a discharge (including the full 2010 internal audit);

- hoped that Parliament would receive the complete annual activity report; insisted that the annual activity report also provides a comprehensive overview of all human resources available to the Council, broken down by category, grade, gender, participation in vocational training and nationality;
- pointed out that in its 2010 annual report the Court of Auditors criticised the financing of the Residence Palace building project because of the advance payments (paragraph 7.19); noted that the Court of Auditors made the observation that during the period 2008-2010 advance payments made by the Council totalled EUR 235 000 000; noted that the amounts paid came from under-utilised budget lines; pointed out that 'under-utilised' was the politically correct term for 'over-budgeted'; pointed out that in 2010 the Council increased the budget line for 'Acquisition of immovable property' by EUR 40 000 000;
- noted the Council's explanation concerning the fact that the appropriations were made available by budget transfers authorised by the budget authority in accordance with the procedures laid down in Articles 22 and 24 of the Financial Regulation;
- shared the Court of Auditors' view that such a procedure did not comply with the principle of budget accuracy, despite the savings made in paying rent;
- noted the Council's reply that the amounts for the budget lines for interpretation and delegations' travel expenses should be more in line with the real consumption and called for a better budgetary planning in order to avoid current practices in the future;
- reminded the Court of Auditors of Parliament's request to carry out an in-depth assessment of supervisory and control systems in the Council, similar to the assessments it carried out in relation to the Court of Justice, the European Ombudsman and the European Data Protection Supervisor in the course of preparation of the Court of Auditors' annual report concerning the financial year 2010;
- regretted the difficulties encountered in the discharge procedures for the 2007, 2008 and 2009 financial years, which were due to the unwillingness of the Council to engage in an open and formal dialogue with the Committee on Budgetary Control as well as to answer the questions of the Committee; pointed out that Parliament refused to grant the Secretary-General of the Council discharge for the implementation of the Council budget for the financial year 2009 for the reasons set out in its resolutions of 10 May 2011<sup>1</sup> and 25 October 2011<sup>2</sup>;

---

<sup>1</sup> OJ L 250, 27.9.2011, p. 25.

<sup>2</sup> OJ L 313, 26.11.2011, p. 13.

- reiterated its view that the European taxpayers had every right to expect that the entirety of the Union budget, including all the funds managed autonomously by its separate institutions and agencies, should be subject to full public scrutiny;
- deplored the fact that, unlike the other Union institutions, the Council did not consider itself responsible for the use of the funds made available to it;
- noted the flaw in the Council's argument that granting discharge to the Commission should be interpreted as granting discharge to the entirety of the Union budget, including parts of the budget used by the Council, was demonstrated by its inconsistent adherence to the position that the Commission should not have the power to oversee and manage its budget; believed that the only logical resolution of this conflict was for Council either to invite the Commission to take control of its finances or to participate fully in a standard discharge procedure which had to necessarily follow mutatis mutandis the full procedures followed for all the other institutions of the European Union;
- reiterated that the Parliament was still waiting for the reply of the Council on the actions and request for documents set out in the two above mentioned resolutions; called on the Secretary-General of the Council to provide Parliament's committee responsible for the discharge procedure with comprehensive written answers to the following questions:

- "(a) with regard to previous Council discharge debates in Parliament's committee responsible for the discharge procedure, the Council did not attend these meetings regularly, however, it is considered of utmost importance that the Council attends in order to reply to committee members' questions referring to the Council discharge. Does the Council agree to attend future debates on the Council discharge in Parliament's committee responsible for the discharge procedure?
- (b) why does the Council change the presentation/the format of the internal audit every year? Why is the internal audit so short, generic and unclear every year? Will the Council for the 2010 discharge onwards please present the internal audit in (a) language(s) other than French?
- (c) has an external audit been carried out? If so, may Parliament's committee responsible for the discharge procedure see it? If an external audit does not exist, why has the Council chosen not to make one?



- (d) until now, the activity of the Council implied co-financing with the Commission, which has experienced an increase after the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon. What audit and control systems have been put in place to ensure full transparency? Given that the Treaty of Lisbon increased the co-financing with the Commission, what is the Council's understanding of 'respond to the appropriate enquiries'?
- (e) the Court of Auditors, in its annual report 2009, found that in two out of six procurement procedures audited, the Council did not respect the rules of the Financial Regulation for the publication of the outcome of the procedure. Has the Council scrutinised more samples of similar procurements? Has the internal procedure been streamlined in order to avoid similar cases in the future?
- (f) staff of European Union Special Representatives (EUSRs): Please indicate the staff (all staff, establishment plan and others) — number of posts, grade — for the EUSRs in the Council for 2009. In which way and when will the EUSRs-staff posts be allocated between the Council and the European External Action Service (EEAS)? What was the travel budget for each of the EUSRs? How many of the EUSRs' staff were transferred on 1 January 2011 to the EEAS? How many will remain with the Council and why?
- (g) the Council highlights budgetary questions concerning the consequences of the Treaty of Lisbon in point 2.2 in the financial activity report (11327/2010, FIN 278). Has the Council solved the problems concerning Mr Solana's expenditures? What part of the expenditures falls under the Council budget and what part falls under the Commission budget?
- (h) what were the operational expenditures, administrative expenditures, staff, buildings, etc. envisaged by the Council for 2009 in order to set up the High Representative/Vice President of the Commission (HR/VP)?
- (i) the HR/VP came into office on 1 December 2009. How was the cost distributed between the Council and the Commission (for staff, travel, etc.)? How did the Council prepare the budget for the HR/VP for 2010? Which budget lines and sums were reserved for her activities?
- (j) how will office space released in the process of staff transfer to the EEAS influence Council's plans on buildings? Have arrangements been made for the subsequent use of such office space? What is the anticipated cost for the removals? When were calls for tenders for the removals (if any) published?

- (k) what was the administrative and operational expenditure related to the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP)/Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) tasks, which were at least part- financed from the Union budget in 2009? What was the total amount of CFSP expenditure in 2009? Could the Council identify at least the main missions and their cost in 2009?
- (l) what was the cost of meetings for Council working groups on CFSP/CSDP in Brussels and elsewhere and where did these meetings take place?
- (m) what was the administrative expenditure relating to the implementation of the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP)/CSDP military operations? What share of the total amount of expenditures arising from military operations has been charged to the Union budget?
- (n) what was the administrative expenditure implemented for the operation of the 'ATHENA' mechanism, how many posts were needed for that mechanism, will any of the posts in question be transferred to the EEAS? To whom will the postholders report?
- (o) there is a low occupation rate of posts in the Council's establishment plan (91 % in 2009, 90 % in 2008). Does this consistently low rate cause any repercussions on how the Council's General Secretariat (CGS) functions? Can the CGS perform all its functions with the current occupation rate? Are lower occupation rates specific to any particular services? What are the reasons for the persistent discrepancy?
- (p) what is the total number of posts assigned to the task of 'policy coordination' and administrative support (as defined in the Commission's annual staff screening reports)? What percentage of the overall number of posts do these represent?
- (q) to achieve the administrative objectives in 2009 the Council added teleworking to its working procedures. How does the Council prove the efficiency of this working procedure? In addition, the Council is asked to report on further measures taken in this respect and in particular those to improve the quality of financial management as well as their impact;
- (r) the Council increased its posts by 15 (8 AD and 7 AST) to cover the staffing requirements of the Irish language unit. How many staff members deal with other languages (staff per language)? Are there already staff employed for and from the applicant countries? If the answer is in the affirmative — how many posts are concerned (separated per country and language)?

- (s) the 'Reflection Group' was established on 14 December 2007, and its members appointed on 15-16 October 2008. What were the reasons why the necessary financing could not have been envisaged and included in Budget 2009? Is a transfer in Budget 2009 from the contingency reserve to a budget position financing a structure conceived in 2007 strictly budget neutral? The Council earmarked EUR 1 060 000 for the 'Reflection Group'. How many posts can be allocated to this group?
- (t) the expenditures concerning travel delegations still seem to be problematic (cf. Council note 15 June 2010, SGS10 8254, II bullet, page 4). Why do these expenditures appear in so many different budget lines?
- (u) why does the internal audit still find it necessary to add 'les frais de voyage des délégués et les frais d'interprétation' (delegates' travelling expenses and interpretation expenses) after strong criticism in the last two resolutions from Parliament on the Council discharge?
- (v) the Council again has used underspending on interpretation to provide extra financing for delegations' travel expenses; as a result, actual 2009 commitments for travel expenses amounted to considerably less than the initial budget, and less than half of the amount available after the transfer (EUR 36 100 000 initial and EUR 48 100 000 available after transfer against EUR 22 700 000 committed). What were the reasons for this EUR 12 000 000 transfer (cf. the financial activity report — 11327/2010, FIN 278 - point 3.3.2-VI bullet)? Why is the transfer from interpretation to delegates' travelling expenses estimated at EUR 12 000 000 by the Council at page 12 and at EUR 10 558 362 at page 13? What has the remaining amount transferred from interpretation been spent on (the total amount transferred from interpretation is EUR 17 798 362)? In addition, the Council is asked to explain the large amount of recovery orders made before 2009 and carried over to 2009 (EUR 12 300 000) as well as recoveries made from declarations relating to 2007 (EUR 6 300 000);
- (w) in 2009 the Council, as it did in 2008, reallocated a considerable amount of its budget to buildings, in particular, more than doubling the initial allocations to the acquisition of the Residence Palace (reallocated EUR 17 800 000 in addition to EUR 15 000 000 earmarked in Budget 2009). What are the reasons for this? Can the CGS provide concrete figures of the savings achieved as a result of this? What was the initially projected cost of the Residence Palace Building? Does the Council think the initially projected cost will be accurate or could the cost be higher than estimated? What steps are envisaged to finance the building?

- (x) implementation of the Council budget — appropriations carried over: Could the Council present the estimated amount and subject of the invoices which were not received by June 2010 for the year 2009 and therefore carried over?
- (y) the carry-over to 2010 of the appropriations of assigned revenues accrued in 2009 amounted to EUR 31 800 000. This is about 70 % of the assigned revenue for 2009. What are the reasons for this high carry-over ratio? What will happen/has happened to this revenue in 2010?
- (z) what does 'technical provision of EUR 25 000 000 for the launch of the European Council 2010' mean? (cf. the financial activity report — 11327/2010, FIN 278 — point 3.1, IV bullet);
- (aa) what is the level of confidentiality of the Council budget specified by the different budget lines?
- (ab) can the Council point out the specific measures taken to improve the quality of the Council's financial management, in particular as regards the points raised in paragraph 5 of Parliament's resolution of 25 November 2009<sup>1</sup> accompanying its decision on discharge to the Council for the financial year 2007?
- (ac) Calls on the Secretary-General of the Council to provide Parliament's Committee responsible for the discharge procedure with the following documents:
  - the full list of budgetary transfers concerning the 2009 Council budget;
  - a written statement on the Council's mission expenses as carried out by the EUSRs;
  - the Members States' declaration for 2007 (cf. the financial activity report — 11327/2010, FIN 278 — point 3.2.2, II bullet); and
  - the report of the 'Reflection Group' in order to understand why such a report costs EUR 1 060 000 (cf. the financial activity report — 11327/2010, FIN 278 — point 2;"
- noted the Commission's reply of 25 November 2011 to the letter from the Chair of the Committee on Budgetary Control, in which the Commission said it was desirable for Parliament to continue to give, postpone or refuse discharge to the other institutions as had been the case up until now;

---

<sup>1</sup> OJ L 19, 23.1.2010, p. 9.

- pointed out that on 31 January 2012 the Chair of the Committee on Budgetary Control sent a letter to the Presidency-in-Office of the Council, stating his wish to establish political dialogue and forwarding supplementary questions from the Committee on Budgetary Control on the discharge to the Council; hoped therefore that the Council would provide to the competent committee for the discharge procedure a reply to the questionnaire -attached to the Chair's letter- before the plenary debate;
- regretted, however, that the Council refused to attend any official meeting of the Committee on Budgetary Control related to its discharge;
- emphasised the right of Parliament, on the Council's recommendation, to grant discharge in accordance with the procedure laid down in the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, which had to be interpreted in the light of its context and purpose, which was to submit the implementation of the entire budget of the European Union to parliamentary control and scrutiny without exception, and to grant discharge autonomously, not only in respect of the section of the budget implemented by the Commission, but also in respect of the sections of the budget implemented by the other institutions, as referred to in Article 1 of the Financial Regulation;
- noted that the Council ought to be transparent and fully accountable to the European citizens for the funds entrusted to it as a Union institution; insisted that this means the Council had to participate fully and in good faith in the annual discharge process:
  - by responding in detail to the annual questionnaire prepared by the relevant parliamentary Committee;
  - by participating in any public hearing organised by the Committee as requested;
  - by being represented at all relevant meetings of the Committee when the discharge was under discussion;
- believed the inter-institutional cooperation between Parliament and the Council to be of outmost importance in supervising the implementation of the Union budget; in this respect, asked the Council to provide the answers to the pending questionnaire submitted by Parliament;
- called on the Council to discuss the annual discharge for the general budget of the Union in a public part of the Council meeting.

f) Discharge 2010: performance, financial management and control of EU agencies

*European Parliament resolution of 10 May 2012 on discharge in respect of the implementation of the budget of the European Union Agencies for the financial year 2010: performance, financial management and control of European Union Agencies*

The European Parliament:

- urged the Commission and the Council to take into account the real necessity of each Agency and the need to save Union tax-payers' money in this time of financial and economic crisis, and not take into account some Member States' interests to have an Agency in their particular country for reasons other than the public interest of the Union (para 96).

g) EU Trade and Investment Strategy for the Southern Mediterranean following the Arab Spring revolutions

*European Parliament resolution of 10 May 2012 on Trade for Change: The EU Trade and Investment Strategy for the Southern Mediterranean following the Arab Spring revolutions*

The European Parliament:

- welcomed, in this context, the launch of the EU-Tunisia Task Force, the first task force established in conjunction with a southern Mediterranean country with a view to ensuring better coordination of EU and international support for the country's transition; welcomed the fact that Parliament was involved in the first meeting; asked the VP/HR and the Commission to continue to involve Parliament in this and future initiatives; welcomed the creation within Parliament of a monitoring group on the Southern Mediterranean to monitor the EU's response to the crises in the Mediterranean countries (para 4);
- welcomed the recent involvement of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) in the Mediterranean region, and the extra funds pledged by the EU and several individual Member States for the Bank's activities; urged the European Council and the European Parliament to speedily ratify the amendments to the EBRD Agreement which would help the bank to be fully operational in the Mediterranean region; considered that the total funding available for EBRD investment in the region should be increased, and that SMEs should be major beneficiaries of these investments; encouraged the SMCs to demonstrate their commitment by applying the principles of democracy, pluralism and market economics so that they may have access to investment in accordance with the bank's Statute (para 39);

- encouraged the Member States to play a more ambitious role in the EU’s strategy for the Southern Neighbourhood, by providing major programmes of fellowships for SMC students of both genders and from all socio-economic and ethnic backgrounds, particularly in the fields of economics, business, IT, communications and trade; called on the Commission and the Vice-President/High Representative to immediately propose the establishment of the Euromed Erasmus and Da Vinci programmes; observed that other players in the region, such as the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) countries, had been more effective in providing this support to SMCs; believed that such exchanges could create lasting connections with future business partners in the SMCs (para 49).

h) Facing effectively the challenge of maritime piracy

*European Parliament resolution of 10 May 2012 on maritime piracy*

The European Parliament:

- called on the High Representative and the Member States to urgently consider ways of liberating the 191 seafarers currently being held hostage so as to end their extended and appalling imprisonment at the hands of their captors and allow these seafarers to return to their homes, and, at the same time, secure the release of the seven hijacked vessels (para 2);
- strongly urged the High Representative to call for increased coordination and cooperation among all international actors in Somalia and the wider Horn of Africa, namely the EU, NATO, the US, the UN and relevant countries, as means of achieving a real and purposeful comprehensive approach to the fight against piracy and, most important, addressing its root causes and consequences at all levels (para 7);
- urged the Member States, in cooperation with Europol and INTERPOL, to investigate and trace money flows and confiscate the money which was paid as ransom to pirates, as there were indications that this money might be being transferred to bank accounts worldwide, including banks in Europe, as well as to identify and dismantle the organised criminal networks that reap the profits of such acts; called on the Council to facilitate further cooperation between EU NAVFOR on the one hand and Europol and Interpol on the other (para 13);

- urged the Council and the Commission, in collaboration with the UN and the African Union and following repeated requests by Somalia’s Transitional Federal Government (TFG) for international assistance to protect humanitarian aid vessels and counter piracy off its coast, to continue to cooperate and support Somalia’s TFG in the fight against piracy, bring the perpetrators to justice and help Somalia and the region strengthen its capacities (para 17);
  - welcomed the decision by the Foreign Affairs Council on 12 December 2011 to launch the Regional Maritime Capacity Building (RMCB) ‘EUCAP Nestor’ mission, which would aim to strengthen maritime and judicial capabilities and the training of a coastal police force and judges in eight countries in the Horn of Africa and the western Indian Ocean; called on the Council and the EEAS to make every effort to ensure that the RMCB is deployed to this region next summer (para 18).
-