



EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2009 - 2014

Committee on Budgets

2011/0177(APP)

26.9.2012

DRAFT INTERIM REPORT

in the interests of achieving a positive outcome of the Multiannual Financial Framework 2014-2020 approval procedure
(COM(2012)0388 – 2011/0177(APP))

Committee on Budgets

Co-rapporteurs: Reimer Böge, Ivailo Kalfin

PR_Consent_Interim

CONTENTS

	Page
MOTION FOR A EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT RESOLUTION	4

MOTION FOR A EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT RESOLUTION

in the interests of achieving a positive outcome of the Multiannual Financial Framework 2014-2020 approval procedure

(COM(2012)0388 – 2011/0177(APP))

The European Parliament,

- having regard to Articles 311 and 312 TFEU,
- having regard to the Commission proposal of 29 June 2011 and the amended Commission proposal of 6 July 2012 for a Council regulation laying down the multiannual financial framework for the years 2014-2020 (COM(2011)0398 and COM(2012)0388),
- having regard to the Commission’s proposal of 29 June 2011 for an Interinstitutional Agreement between the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission on cooperation in budgetary matters and sound financial management (COM(2011)0403),
- having regard to the communication from the Commission of 29 June 2011 on a Budget for Europe 2020 (COM(2011)0500),
- having regard to the Commission report of 27 April 2010 to the European Parliament and the Council on the functioning of the Interinstitutional Agreement on budgetary discipline and sound financial management (COM(2010)0185),
- having regard to its resolution of 29 March 2007 on the future of the European Union’s own resources¹,
- having regard to its resolution of 8 June 2011 entitled ‘Investing in the future: a new Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF) for a competitive, sustainable and inclusive Europe’²,
- having regard to its resolution of 13 June 2012 on the Multiannual Financial Framework and own resources³,
- having regard to Rule 81(3) of its Rules of Procedure,
- having regard to the interim report of the Committee on Budgets and the opinions of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Development, the Committee on International Trade, the Committee on Budgetary Control, the Committee on Employment and Social Affairs, the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety, the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy, the Committee on Internal market and Consumer Protection, the Committee on Transport and Tourism, the Committee on Regional Development, the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development, the

¹ OJ C 27 E, 31.1.2008, p. 214

² Texts adopted, P7_TA(2011)0266.

³ Texts adopted, P7_TA(2012)0245.

Committee on Fisheries, the Committee on Culture and Education, the Committee on Legal Affairs, the Committee Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs and the Committee on Women's Rights and Gender Equality (A7-0000/2012),

- A. whereas, pursuant to Article 312(2) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), the Council is required to adopt a regulation laying down the Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF), acting unanimously, after obtaining the consent of Parliament;
- B. whereas, in accordance with Article 295 TFEU, an Interinstitutional Agreement should be adopted to improve the functioning of the annual budgetary procedure and cooperation between the institutions on budgetary matters;
- C. whereas Article 312(5) TFEU calls on the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission to take any measure necessary to facilitate the adoption of the financial framework;
- D. whereas, pursuant to Article 311 TFEU, the Union must provide itself with the means necessary to attain its objectives and carry through its policies, and is to be financed wholly from own resources;
- E. whereas this will be the first time that an MFF regulation is adopted under the new provisions of the Treaty of Lisbon, and therefore entailing new cooperation arrangements between the institutions aimed at reconciling efficient decision-making with respect for Treaty prerogatives;
- F. whereas the Treaty of Lisbon confers significant new prerogatives on the European Union, in fields such as external action (Article 27(3) of the Treaty on European Union), sport (Article 165 TFEU), space (Article 189 TFEU), climate change (Article 191 TFEU), energy (Article 194 TFEU), tourism (Article 195 TFEU) and civil protection (Article 196 TFEU);
- G. whereas in its resolution of 8 June 2011 Parliament established its general political priorities for the next MFF, in both legislative and budgetary terms;
- H. whereas the relevant parliamentary committees have carried out a full in-depth analysis of needs in order to identify political priorities, as evidenced in their annexed opinions;
- I. whereas the Cypriot Presidency-in-Office intends to submit a 'negotiating box', including ceilings figures (but also policy choices falling within the ordinary legislative procedure) to an extraordinary European Council in November 2012;
- J. whereas it is necessary for the EU to have both a budget and a budgetary procedure which fully reflect the transparent and democratic essence of the parliamentary decision-making and control process, on a basis of respect for the principles of unity and universality, which require that all revenue and expenditure be entered in full with no adjustment against each other, and that there be a public debate and vote on both revenue and expenditure;

The EU budget as a key tool to deliver smart, sustainable and inclusive growth for the entire EU

1. Is fully aware that the negotiations on the MFF 2014-2020 are taking place in a very difficult economic context, in which Member States are engaging in considerable efforts to make fiscal adjustments to their national budgets, with a view to the stability of the banking sector and the single currency; insists that the Union should not be seen as adding an extra fiscal burden on taxpayers; is, however, convinced that the EU budget is a part of the solution to enable Europe to emerge from the current crisis by helping Member States tackle, collectively and in concerted fashion, the present structural challenges, in particular loss of competitiveness, rising unemployment and poverty;
2. Considers, however, that balanced structural reforms at both national and EU level represent an essential precondition for the sound and efficient implementation of EU funding;
3. Recalls that the European Council has, on numerous occasions, insisted on the need for a strengthened European economic governance and has endorsed the objectives set out in the EU 2020 strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth, namely promoting employment, improving the conditions for –and public spending on– innovation, research and development, meeting our climate change and energy objectives, improving education levels and promoting social inclusion, in particular through the reduction of poverty;
4. Recalls that the European Council itself adopted, in June 2012, a ‘Growth and Jobs Compact’, which acknowledges the leverage effect of the EU budget and places major emphasis on its contribution to helping the entire Union overcome the current economic and financial crisis;
5. Recalls that all the macroeconomic financial stabilisation measures taken since 2008 have not yet proved sufficient to overcome the economic and financial crisis; believes, therefore, that in order to return to growth and generate employment in Europe, a well-targeted and sufficient EU budget is needed to further help coordinate and enhance the national efforts;
6. Notes that the EU budget represents only some 2 % of total government expenditure in the Union, and is hence more than 45 times smaller than the sum of government expenditure in the Member States;
7. Recalls that pursuant to Article 310 TFEU the revenue and expenditure shown in the EU budget must be in balance and, therefore, the budget cannot generate public debt;
8. Stresses that the EU budget is an investment budget and that 94 % of its total returns are invested in the Member States themselves or for external priorities of the Union; emphasises that, for the regions and Member States, public investment would be minimised or impossible without the contribution of the EU budget; believes that any decrease of the EU budget would inevitably hamper the growth and competitive strength of the entire Union economy;
9. Recalls that delivering on the Europe 2020 strategy’s seven flagship initiatives will

require a huge amount of future-oriented investment, estimated at no less than EUR 1 800 billion up to 2020¹; stresses that one of the main objectives of the Europe 2020 strategy, namely, to promote jobs and high-quality employment for all Europeans, will only be achieved if the necessary investment in education, in favour of a knowledge society, and in research and innovation, SMEs, and green and new technologies is made now and not delayed any longer; favours combining the reduction of public deficits and debt with the promotion of such investments;

10. Considers that the alarming youth-related problems, including an unprecedentedly high unemployment rate, increasing poverty and educational challenges, existing across the EU require a particular effort to keep the new generations bound to the EU values of peace, democracy and human rights, economic prosperity and social justice, among others, through EU programmes with an adequate budgetary support;
11. Strongly supports the Commission's proposal to mainstream measures to combat climate change across the whole EU budget; believes that the EU budget will be able to mobilise investment for a sustainable and prosperous low-carbon economy, provide adequate support for achieving the EU 2020 targets for climate, energy and biodiversity, and benefit the EU's citizens by ensuring a more healthy environment;
12. Calls, therefore, on the Member States to consider synergies between the national consolidation effort and the added value of a well-prioritised EU budget, allowing the implementation of the political commitments already made at the highest level;

Level of expenditure

13. Stresses that since 1988 national budgets have grown on average more rapidly than the EU budget; notes that even since the start of the crisis in 2008 total government expenditure in the Member States has risen at an annual nominal rate of 2 %; draws the conclusion that this shrinkage of the EU budget with respect to the national budgets is in flagrant contradiction with the extension of competences and tasks conferred on the Union by the Treaty and with major political decisions taken by the European Council itself, notably the development of a strengthened European economic governance;
14. Emphasises that since 2000 the gap between the EU own resources ceiling (1.29 % of GNI in commitment and 1.23 % in payment appropriations) and the MFF ceilings has grown dramatically; furthermore notes that the MFF only sets maximum levels of expenditure, while the EU budget has always remained far below those levels;
15. Considers that the Commission proposal, which represents a freeze of the MFF 2014-2020 ceilings at the level of the 2013 ceilings, will not be sufficient to finance existing policy priorities linked to the Europe 2020 strategy, the new tasks provided for by the Treaty of Lisbon, or unforeseen events, not to mention the political objectives and commitments set by the European Council itself;

¹ (COM(2010)0700)

16. Recalls its position, as stated on 8 June 2011, that without an adequate increase in the budget above the level of the 2013 ceilings, several EU priorities and policies will have to be revised downwards or even abandoned;
17. Strongly rejects, therefore, any attempt by the Council to reduce further the level of EU expenditure as proposed by the Commission; firmly opposes, in particular, any plea for linear, across-the-board cuts that would jeopardise the implementation and effectiveness of all EU policies, irrespective of their European added value, political weight or performance; instead, challenges the Council, in case it proposes cuts, to clearly and publicly identify which of its political priorities or projects should be dropped altogether;
18. Stresses the key role that the EU budget must play in achieving the jointly agreed EU 2020 Strategy objectives; strongly believes that EU funding, if well devised, can actually trigger and catalyse actions having clear Union added value which Member States are unable to carry out on their own, as well as creating synergies and complementarities with Member States' activities by helping them focus on key future-oriented investment;
19. Reaffirms, in this context, its position in favour of a significant increase - notably through the Connecting Europe Facility - in the funding available for the Union programmes in the fields of competitiveness, SMEs and infrastructures, which are at the heart of the Europe 2020 strategy; strongly believes that further cuts with respect to the Commission proposal will seriously jeopardise the EU's credibility and its political commitment in favour of growth and jobs;
20. Underlines the importance of research and innovation in accelerating the transition towards a sustainable, world-leading, knowledge-based economy; calls on the EU institutions and the Member States to agree on a specific roadmap for achieving the 3 % GDP target of investment in research; points to the massive economic commitment that this target would entail, in terms of additional expenditure totalling EUR 130 billion, annually and funded from all sources; stresses, consequently, the need to enhance, stimulate and secure the financing of research and innovation in the Union via a significant increase in expenditure, and notably in EU research and innovation funding;
21. Considers that EU cohesion policy is a strategic tool for investment, growth and competitiveness, with an undisputed EU added value; insists that, in order to effectively reduce macroeconomic imbalances within the EU and contribute to economic, social and territorial cohesion, it should be able to rely on a stable, solid and sustainable financial framework; reaffirms its position that cohesion policy funding should be maintained at least at the level of the 2007-2013 period;
22. Recalls its position that, given the wide array of tasks, challenges and objectives that the CAP is called on to respond to, the amounts allocated to the CAP in the budget year 2013 should be at least maintained during the next financial programming period; stresses, in this context, the important role played by the second pillar of the CAP, which makes a significant contribution to investment and job creation in rural areas and to enhancing the effectiveness and competitiveness of the farming industry;
23. Recognises the serious challenges that young people in the EU face with the economic crisis; considers that employment, education, training, mobility and the social inclusion of

young Europeans are issues of strategic importance for the development of the EU and European society; insists on mainstreaming and prioritising these issues in all relevant policies financed from the EU budget, alongside the concrete youth-related instruments proposed by the Commission;

24. Takes the view that the overall amount dedicated by the Commission to the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice does not adequately reflect the strengthening of this area with the Treaty of Lisbon and its growing tasks and challenges;
25. Recalls that the EU's education, youth, media and culture programmes are close to the citizens, enjoy high implementation rates, produce noticeable leverage and spillover effects including significant economic results, and generate clear and proven European added value by pooling resources, encouraging mobility and enhancing cooperation among different sectors and stakeholders;
26. Reiterates its position that the new responsibilities conferred on the EU by the Treaties will require appropriate additional funding compared to MFF 2007-2013, so as to allow the Union to fulfil its role as a global actor whilst upholding the undertakings it has already given, notably the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals by 2015; underlines the complementary nature of EU assistance to that provided by the Member States, and its catalyst effect in terms of intervening in regions where bilateral assistance is not delivered; is particularly supportive of joint programming between Member States and EU actions;

Large-scale projects

27. Underlines the strategic importance of large-scale infrastructure projects such as ITER, Galileo, and GMES for the future of the EU's competitiveness; rejects, consequently, any attempt to transform GMES into an intergovernmental programme;
28. Is of the firm opinion that the financing of these large-scale projects should be secured in the EU budget but, at the same time, ring-fenced, so as to ensure that possible cost overruns do not threaten the funding and successful implementation of other Union policies;
29. Welcomes the Commission's proposal to fix a maximum amount for Galileo in the MFF regulation, thereby ring-fencing the budgetary allocation for this project; believes, likewise, that the maximum amounts for ITER and GMES should also be fixed in the regulation; considers that the financial envelopes for these three projects should be allocated over and above the MFF ceilings, so as to enable the provision of additional funding by Member States;

Better spending

30. Reiterates that achieving European added value and ensuring sound financial management - efficiency, effectiveness, economy - should be, now more than ever, guiding principles of the EU budget; welcomes, in this respect, the Commission's set of legislative proposals on the new generation of multiannual programmes to be adopted under the ordinary legislative procedure; insists that synergies among EU support programmes and national

investments must be maximised;

31. Believes that in the present context of public budgetary constraints, the leverage of other sources of funding is absolutely necessary in order to realise the long-term investments that are needed to achieve the goals of the EU 2020 strategy; strongly believes that Union added value is to be found notably in long-term investments that are beyond the reach of individual Member States; highlights, in this respect, the conclusions and recommendations of its resolution on innovative financial instruments in the context of the next Multiannual Financial Framework¹;
32. Stresses the need to ensure coherence between sector-specific rules and the overall framework of the Financial Regulation and to strike a balance between simplification and sound financial management; welcomes the simplification scoreboard issued by the Commission, and confirms its determination to support the simplification agenda; is convinced of the need to further reduce the administrative burdens on beneficiaries, and calls for the implementation of ‘bureaucracy checks’ before the adoption of binding EU rules;
33. Believes that the effectiveness of EU expenditure depends on sound policy, regulatory and institutional frameworks at all levels; insists that, in accordance with Article 317 TFEU Member States, must shoulder their share of responsibility in making EU funding more effective; recalls that 90 % of the errors detected by the European Court of Auditors have been in Member States, and that the majority of those errors could have been avoided; calls on all Member States to issue national management declarations signed at the appropriate political level;
34. Supports the introduction of (ex ante and ex post) conditionality provisions to ensure that EU funding, particularly in respect of the Cohesion Fund, the Structural Funds and the rural and fisheries funds, are better targeted to the achievement of the Europe 2020 objectives; believes that if their implementation is based on a reinforced partnership principle through the stronger involvement of local and regional authorities, these conditionality provisions could improve the legitimacy and effectiveness of EU support;
35. Stresses, however, that there is no direct relation between the regional policy performance and the macroeconomic performance of a Member State, and that the regions should not be punished for the failure of the national level to comply with procedures related to economic governance; believes that imposing additional penalties could thus exacerbate the problems of Member States already facing macroeconomic difficulties, and, therefore, that macroeconomic conditionalities are not acceptable;
36. Underlines the crucial work of the decentralised EU agencies in supporting the Union’s objectives and the need to match their responsibilities with adequate budgetary resources;
37. Believes, at the same time, that the work of the decentralised EU agencies should result in significantly higher savings at national level; urges the Member States to assess the efficiency gains generated by these agencies at national level and to make full use of them, thus rationalising their national expenditure; calls, also, on the Member States to

¹P7_TA-PROV(2012)XXXX

identify possible areas of duplication of work or reduced added value in relation to the agencies, with a view to streamlining their functioning;

38. Agrees with the Commission's view on the need to rationalise administrative expenditure; stresses, however, that it is vital to strike a balance between making further savings and ensuring that the institutions can perform their tasks and duties in accordance with their obligations and powers under the Treaties, taking account of the difficult challenges posed by the current economic crisis;
39. Profoundly disagrees with the application of a linear staff reduction to all institutions, bodies and agencies, as their roles and responsibilities under the Treaties differ widely; stresses that it should be left to each of them to decide where cuts can be introduced, and which cuts, so as to not hamper their proper functioning;

Duration

40. Takes the view that the next MFF, a 7-year period set until 2020, should be considered a transitional solution as it makes a clear link with the Europe 2020 strategy; believes, however, that a 5-year period would better align the MFF's duration with that of the institutions' terms of office, thereby enhancing democratic accountability and responsibility;

Mid-term revision

41. Stresses the need for an obligatory mid-term revision to be enshrined in the MFF regulation, with a specific procedure including a binding calendar ensuring the full involvement of the next Parliament; considers that the Commission should table a legislative proposal enabling the revised MFF to be adopted in time for the 2018 budgetary procedure;

The need for a more flexible MFF

42. Is convinced as a matter of principle that changing political and economic circumstances, as well as unforeseen events, will require adjustments of the MFF over the 7-year period; insists that the next MFF must provide enhanced budgetary flexibility both within and across headings, as well as between financial years within the MFF, in order to ensure that the available budgetary resources can be used to the full;
43. Believes that a certain degree of flexibility (5 %) is indispensable as regards the ceilings for the (sub)headings, to make it possible to adapt to new circumstances without increasing the overall amount and without requiring revision of the MFF;
44. Welcomes the Commission's proposal to increase the level of legislative flexibility (possibility of departing from a given amount for the entire duration of the programme concerned) from 5 % to 10 %;
45. Emphasises the need to make the best use of the ceilings set by the MFF; proposes to this end that the margins left under the commitment appropriations ceilings in one year's budget should be carried over to the next year and seen as constituting a global MFF

margin, to be attributed in future years to the different headings in line with their estimated needs and mobilised in the framework of the annual budgetary procedure;

46. Stresses, equally, the need to introduce a global MFF margin for payment appropriations, enabling the carry-over of margins left under the payment appropriations ceiling to following years and mobilised in the framework of the annual budgetary procedure;
47. Recalls the commitment made by the institutions to revise the Financial Regulation in order to allow the carry-over of unused appropriations and of the budgetary balance;
48. Supports firmly the continuation of the contingency margin, but emphasises that in order to be effective its mobilisation should not entail compulsory offsetting of ceilings, and should be adopted by qualified majority voting in Council;
49. Welcomes the Commission's proposal to increase the envelope of the Flexibility instrument and the utilisation of the annual amounts up to year $n+3$;
50. Agrees with the Commission that the Emergency Aid Reserve, the European Union Solidarity Fund, the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund and the reserve for crises in the agriculture sector, given their non-programmable nature, should be entered in the budget over and above the ceilings for the relevant headings;

Unity of the budget

51. Recalls that the EU budget covers all revenue and expenditure resulting from decisions taken by the EU institutions within the framework of their competences, and that it takes into account separately the Union's financial operations in the form of lending, borrowing and guarantees;
52. Urges the Commission and Council to list in a separate annex the budgetary or financial commitments made by a number of Member States in the framework of reinforced cooperation or of a specific treaty aimed at reinforcing solidarity within the EU;
53. Strongly requests the Member States to make a firm commitment to the incorporation of the European Development Fund into the EU budget as of 2021;
54. Confirms its intention in the future to organise a specific public debate and hold a vote on the revenue side of the budget, as part of its examination of the annual draft budget; strongly believes that in this way a permanent debate on the financing system of the Union will be maintained, while fully acknowledging that the budgetary authority does not at present have any competence to propose changes to this part of the budget;

Own resources

55. Believes that the negotiations on the next MFF, which started more than a year ago, clearly demonstrate the stalemate created by the lack of a genuine own resources system: these negotiations are organised in Council around two opposing camps, led by the net contributor countries on the one hand and by the net beneficiary countries on the other, in a system which creates a purely accounting-based vision of 'fair return' which, in the end,

makes any agreement on the MFF conditional on an agreement on a long list of exceptions and compensations, negotiated behind closed doors and incomprehensible to the European citizen;

56. Firmly believes that the financing of the Union budget should return to a genuine system of own resources, as provided for in the Treaty of Rome and all successive EU treaties; deeply regrets the fact that the current system, whereby the vast majority of the financing comes from national contributions, is non-transparent and unfair and is not subject to parliamentary control at either European or national level; stresses that such a system violates, in essence, the letter and spirit of the Treaty;
57. Points out that the restructuring of the system of own resources as such does not concern the size of the EU budget, but is aimed at finding a more effective mix of resources to fund agreed EU policies and objectives; stresses that the introduction of a new system would not increase the overall tax burden for citizens, but would, instead, reduce the burden on national treasuries;
58. Reaffirms its basic position, as stated in its resolution of 13 June 2012, that it is not prepared to give its consent to the next MFF regulation without political agreement on reform of the own resources system, in line with the Commission's proposals of 29 June 2011; believes that such a reform should aim at reducing the share of Member States' GNI-based contributions to the EU budget to 40 % by 2020, thereby contributing to the consolidation efforts of Member States;
59. Strongly believes that the necessary political agreement should comprise the following elements:
 - 1) there must be an in-depth reform of the financing of the EU budget, to return to a system of genuine, clear, simple and fair own resources, offering the guarantees over decision making and democratic control inherent in all public budgets;
 - 2) this reform must enter into effect during the 2014-2020 MFF, as proposed by the Commission;
 - 3) those Member States willing to introduce a financial transaction tax must now proceed with a formal request to the Commission for a proposal on enhanced cooperation in this field; the Commission will then have to react immediately with the publication of such a proposal together with a set of revised proposals on the own resources package, in order to ensure that revenues from this tax are wholly or partly allocated to the EU Budget as an own resource, thus reducing the national contributions of those Member States introducing this tax;
 - 4) an agreement on the reform of VAT as own resource, as well as its implementing modalities, must be concluded together with the agreement on the MFF;
 - 5) the new system must put an end to the existing rebates and other correction mechanisms; any eventual compensation can only be accepted on the basis of the Commission proposal, as temporary by nature and justified by indisputable and objective economic criteria;

- 6) in the event that implementation of the new own resources does not result in a significant decrease in Member States' GNI-based contributions to the EU budget, the Commission will come forward with additional proposals on new own resources.

Interinstitutional negotiations

60. Stresses that a stringent majority is required in both Parliament and Council to adopt the MFF, and points to the importance of exploiting to the full the provisions of Article 312(5), which imposes on the institutions the duty to carry out negotiations in order to reach agreement on a text to which Parliament can give its consent;
61. Emphasises that this will be the first time an MFF regulation is adopted under the new provisions of the Treaty of Lisbon, which entail new cooperation arrangements among the institutions combining efficient decision-making and respect for the respective prerogatives; welcomes, in this respect, the steps taken by the Hungarian, Polish, Danish and Cypriot Council Presidencies-in-office to establish a structured dialogue and regular information exchange with Parliament;
62. Expresses its readiness to enter into substantial discussions with the Council on both the MFF regulation and the IIA, and asks the Council to intensify contacts at all levels with a view to the 22-23 November European Council;
63. Notes that any political agreement reached at European Council level constitutes no more than a negotiating mandate for the Council; insists that after the European Council has reached a political agreement, fully-fledged negotiations between Parliament and the Council need to take place before the Council formally submits for Parliament's consent its proposals on the MFF regulation;
64. Reiterates that, according to the TFEU, Parliament and the Council are the legislative bodies and the European Council does not have the role of legislator; stresses that the negotiations on the legislative proposals relating to the multiannual programmes will be pursued under the ordinary legislative procedure;
65. Insists on a qualitative approach to the MFF Regulation and related multiannual programmes negotiations; stresses that they are to be considered as a package, and reaffirms the principle that 'nothing is agreed until everything is agreed';
66. Stresses that the annexed opinions of the EP committees should provide valuable guidance during the MFF negotiations; recalls that specific legislative issues should be addressed in the context of the relevant legislative procedures;
67. Points out, finally, that if no MFF has been adopted by the end of 2013, the ceilings and other provisions corresponding to 2013 will be extended until such time as a new MFF is adopted; signals that, in this eventuality, Parliament would be ready to reach a swift agreement with the Council and Commission to adapt the internal structure of the MFF to reflect the new political priorities;

68. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the European Council, the Council, the Commission, the Governments and Parliaments of the Member States, and the other institutions and bodies concerned.