Study on the implementation of Regulation 258/2012
(implementing Article 10 of the UN Firearms Protocol, and establishing export authorisation, and import and transit measures for firearms, their parts and components and ammunition)
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1. Summary

The purpose of the study is to provide the Commission with a qualitative and quantitative analysis of the implementation of the Regulation 258/2012 and, in light of the above analysis, make recommendations for possible improvements in the functioning of the Regulation.

Background information on the topic to be evaluated

The Parliament and Council adopted on 14 March 2012 the Regulation 258/2012 implementing Article 10 of the UN Firearms Protocol, and establishing export authorisation, and import and transit measures for firearms, their parts and components and ammunition.

The Regulation addresses the illicit manufacturing of and trafficking in firearms, their parts and components and ammunition. It applies only to firearms, their parts and essential components and ammunition for civilian use and not to those intended specifically for military purposes. Furthermore, it only addresses trade with third countries. It does not concern possession, acquisition or transfers within the Union, which are governed by Directive 91/477/EEC on control of the acquisition and possession of firearms in the internal market. As such, this study will focus on other aspects than the previous studies having led to a review of Directive 91/477/EEC.

The Regulation is based on the principle that firearms and related items should not be transferred between states without the knowledge and consent of all states involved. It lays down procedural rules for export, and import - as well as for transit of firearms, their parts and components and ammunition.

Exports of firearms will be subject to export authorisations, containing the necessary information to trace them, including the country of origin, the country of export, the final recipient and a description of the quantity of the firearms and related items.

Member States have the obligation to verify that the importing third country has issued an import authorisation. In the case of transit of weapons and related items through third countries, each transit country must give notice in writing that it has no objection. Member States must refuse to grant an export authorisation if the person applying has any previous record concerning illicit trafficking or other serious crime.
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The basic obligations of the Regulation include:

- The delivery of firearm export authorisations by each MS (where required) within 60 working days or, exceptionally, within 90 working days;
  - In doing so, Member States (MS) are required to ask for preliminary authorisation from importing or transit countries and verify relevant information;
  - In doing so, MS are to ensure appropriate administrative cooperation;
- The exporter is to provide the MS competent authority with necessary documentation, including due translation (where relevant);
- Simplified procedures may apply (where relevant);
- MS may refuse, annul, suspend, modify or revoke an export authorisation (where applicable);
- record keeping for no less than 20 years (where relevant);
- effective, proportionate and dissuasive penalties;
- MS to inform the Commission of any laws, regulations and administrative provisions adopted in implementation of the Regulation.

Firearms are found at the nexus of crime, terrorism and criminal markets. Firearms, rarely custom-made, are, for an important part, produced by States and State-controlled or private companies.

Firearms can be used effectively for decades. Once legally sold they can be smuggled from one theatre of conflict to another or diverted to organised crime and terrorism rings.

Improving firearms tracing - from manufacturer to last legal purchaser - is a key prevention objective. Even though evidence is scarce, it can be argued that the majority of firearms on the illegal market (or used in illegal activities) originate in the legal trade.

Preventing firearms trafficking includes monitoring legal transfers of firearms, stepping up controls and enhancing cooperation between EU national authorities.

2. Objectives and purpose

Article 21(3) of the Regulation provides that "the Commission shall review the implementation of this Regulation and present a report to the European Parliament and the Council on its application, which may include proposals for its amendment" by 19 April 2017.

To do so, the present evaluation study will provide the necessary input to the Commission, taking due account of the EU policy on security and firearms latest developments. This includes the regulatory developments linked to amending Directive 91/477/EEC, as well as the underlying studies.

Beyond, the study should lead to a common understanding of whether the current procedures and provisions put in place by the Regulation have been effective in delivering the intended results and effects, whether those have been achieved in the most efficient manner, and whether the Regulation is relevant in view of current needs and problems, coherent and complementary with other EU and national policies in this area and related areas, and if it has
brought added value. This should lead, as appropriate, the contractor to present a set of recommendations on the possible need for amendments.

In the context of the evaluation, the contractor will in particular:

- Assess the relevance, EU-added value, coherence, complementary, sustainability effectiveness and efficiency of the Regulation 258/2012 as applied in Members States in achieving its objectives of the efficient functioning of international firearms trade while ensuring a high level of security in the EU. This assessment should identify any administrative burden, existing barriers/obstacles, best practices and/or new challenges (i.e. related to Internet)
- Identify whether measures are necessary to improve its functioning.

3. Scope

The study shall evaluate all aspects of the Regulation from its entry into force on 30 September 2013 until mid-2016. This includes an overview of the implementation and application of the Regulation in every EU Member State and an evaluation of the criteria mentioned above.

The present evaluation study shall take due account of any findings relevant to the evaluation of the Regulation in order to ensure a coherent assessment in line with the recent policy developments. This covers inter alia the results of recent studies related to the firearms directive (477/91)\(^3\). The evaluation study should avoid any duplication with previous evaluations by focusing on the issues specifically relevant for Regulation 258/2012.

4. Evaluation tasks

The evaluator shall assess:

4.1. contextual analysis (market analysis)

- With respect to external trade, the economic situation, competitiveness and structure of the firearms sector in the EU including major trends and developments and international comparisons, in particular the economic importance of the sector (market size, turn-over, employment, investment, international competitiveness) and main trends in external trade;

4.2. analysis of implementation aspects

- Possible full, partial, mistaken or non-implementation of the provisions of the Regulation (implementation/application analysis);

\(^3\) - Study to Support an Impact Assessment on Options for Combatting Illicit Firearms Trafficking in the European Union
- Study to support an Impact Assessment on a possible initiative related to improving rules on deactivation, destruction and marking procedures of firearms in the EU, as well as on alarm weapons and replicas
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- The scope and content of the Regulation, the definitions, the appropriateness of the currently covered sectors and subsectors including the preliminary experiences with sectors currently not-covered, the question of alternatives, dependencies, interdependencies and cascading effects.

- The division of responsibilities between the responsible bodies (both public and private) and their responsibilities in the context of the Regulation and the workflow of the Regulation, establishing the procedures required for the implementation of the Regulation (e.g. reporting requirements, normal and simplified procedures or the engagement procedure between an originating and possibly affected Member State(s)).

- The identification of possible obstacles and practical issues preventing a full implementation of the Regulation (e.g. gaps, shortcomings, omissions, ambiguities in the text of the Regulation that cause difficulties in the implementation and the question whether further/other measures should be considered at EU level). This will need to be evaluated predominantly to identify bottlenecks in the legislative framework set out by the Regulation as well as to learn from solutions taken in national legislative processes. This entails the analysis of all the legislation or other implementation methods that was established in the national context of the Member States as a result of the Regulation, specifically looking what the legislation strives to achieve, possible ambiguities, roles of different actors, differences and similarities between Member States, possible incompatibilities between the Member States both from legal and practical terms.

4.3 evaluation questions

The evaluation should address the following 7 evaluation criteria and provide clear answers to the following questions in a report following the structure recommended by the Commission Better Regulation Guidelines.

Relevance:
- To what extent the definitions contained in the Regulation and not previously evaluated in the context of work on the new Weapons Directive are still deemed accurate and fit for purpose?
- To what extent do the objectives and scope of the Regulation correspond to the needs and risks defined in current security context?

European added value:
- To what extent has the Regulation achieved EU-added value as opposed to what could have been achieved under national/international legislation?
- To what extent could the EU added-value be improved?

Effectiveness:
- To what extent has the Regulation achieved its objectives and in particular what has been its contribution to the security of persons and businesses and to an efficiently operating market for firearms?
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Efficiency:
- Are the results achieved at a reasonable cost? In particular is the administrative burden created by the implementation of the Regulation's concepts and procedures for national authorities, industry and citizens justified/proportionate by its benefits (and, if not, recommend the measures to reduce it)?

Coherence:
- To what extent is this intervention coherent with other interventions (EU / Member States / international) which have similar objectives?

Complementarity:
- To what extent has the Regulation proved complementary to other (EU / Member States) interventions/initiatives in the field?
- In particular, the relationship/interaction of the Regulation with other existing policy approaches and legislative frameworks in the field of arms control, notably with the implementation of the Common Position 2008/944/CFSP and Regulation 258/2012/EU on deactivation standards. This evaluation should avoid any duplication with previous evaluations by focusing on the issues specifically relevant for Regulation 258/2012.

Sustainability:
- Are the effects likely to last after the intervention ends?

Special consideration shall also be given to the following issues:

Export procedures

Art. 7 of the Regulation requests a verification of import and, if needed, transit authorisation before issuing an export authorisation. Has this procedure any shortcomings? Member States may decide to apply implied consent in the case of transit authorisation. Are these provisions applied by all Member States? Has it caused any problems?

Some Member States seem to be applying Common Position 2008/944/CFSP to the export of all kind of weapons -aimed at both military and civilian use-, hence disregarding Regulation (EU) No 258/2012. However, Article 4(2) of Regulation (EU) No 258/2012 cannot be interpreted in a way as to apply the provisions of Common Position 2008/944/CFSP to weapons which are not covered by the latter. Article 4(2) of Regulation (EU) No 258/2012 only lays down the possibility for Member States to apply a single procedure to carry out the obligations imposed on them by the said two different instruments, but neither that provision nor any other in that instrument can be used in such a way as to impose the substantive regime of Common Position 2008/944/CFSP to items other than those included in EU Common Military List.

How are these two different regimes applied in the Member States? To what extent is there a risk that the two regimes are mixed up in issuing the authorisation for the export of firearms, and with what consequences?

In some Member States the crossing of its own territory for goods coming from another EU Member States and destined to be exported to third countries are subject to a fee.
To what extent is the existence of a fee and the administrative procedure for collecting such fees hampering the cross-border activities and the free circulation of trade?

**Simplified procedures**

Are simplified procedures implemented in accordance with the Regulation? Is there any significant problem in the application of those procedures?

**European firearms pass**

- According to feedback from Member States the European firearms pass provision does not seem to work properly with respect to imports/exports. What are the reasons? Is the balance between the effectiveness of current harmonisation of procedures and the burden on MS and other stakeholders satisfactory or is there room for improvement?

**Categories**

Is there a need for a clearer distinction between different categories, going beyond the list of annex 1, based on the combined nomenclature? Should the categories used be the same as of intra-EU transfers and acquisitions? How to better identify for exports purposes e.g. military firearms or firearms for hunting and sport shooting?

**Information sharing**

According to Member States authorities and stakeholders, the lack of information sharing and communication is a major concern in combatting illicit firearms trade. Do they use different databases than for intra-EU transfers? Do Member States authorities have the means to collect and store related information on exporters and consignees? If this information is or can be collected, has it been disseminated or shared and how? Are there initiatives taken to interconnect such national repositories between themselves and with national registers in order to ensure full traceability throughout the life of the weapon? Is there a need for additional information to be shared between competent authorities? Such analysis is to be made taking into account the recent Directive proposal which introduces a system of exchange of information among Member States and requires dealers and brokers to be connected to central/national firearm registers and its underlying evaluation studies (which should not be repeated).

Further questions can be designed by the contractor in order to fully respond to the evaluation criteria mentioned above.

**5. Others tasks under the assignment**

**Description of intervention logic**

Task: to develop an intervention logic of the Regulation showing how the chain of expected effects (outputs, results, impacts of the intervention. The intervention logic shall include a mapping of other factors - external factors, other EU policies and national policies - that had an impact on policy in the reference period.
The description of the intervention logic serves the purpose of systematically evaluating whether and to which extent the intended chain of effects have materialised in the reference period.

*The Commission will launch an internet based public consultation, opened for a period of 12 weeks, to feed into the evaluation.*

The contractor shall prepare and draft the relevant questionnaires (to be agreed upon by the Commission) as well as analyse the replies received. The outcome of the consultation will feed into the evaluation and be clearly identifiable. The contractor will also prepare a summary analysis of these replies, consistent with the structure requested by the Better Regulation Guidelines, as an Annex.

On the basis of the evaluation findings, the contractor will formulate robust (evidence-based) and clear conclusions regarding the evaluation of the Regulation, and make recommendations as to the advisability of possible amendments of the Regulation taking full account of the changing overall EU firearms legal framework and prevention of firearms trafficking needs.

6. Data collection and methodological approach

The offer of the contractor must include a detailed methodology to achieve the evaluation objectives and reply to the evaluation questions. The methodological approach may include the use of such tools as:

- Desk research:
  - Quantitative and qualitative analysis of existing reports, studies and documents;
  - Structured analysis of the provisions of the Regulation and its implementation through national laws and measures;
  - Collection, grouping and analysis of statistical data.

- Survey(s) and interviews to consult (parts of) the stakeholders based on questionnaires to be agreed with the Commission beforehand.

- Case studies related to the evaluated Regulation in order to assess the results achieved so far as well as the perception of stakeholders.

- Any other tools deemed appropriate for the purpose of the evaluation in particular a methodology to allow for a quantitative assessment of the efficiency of the Regulation.

Stakeholders include:

- EU officials in DG HOME, DG GROW, DG TAXUD, the EEAS and other EU services/agencies if deemed relevant;
- Competent authorities in the Member States that are responsible for the implementation of the Regulation;
- Representatives from industry/manufacturing, firearms producers/exporters/users and other stakeholder representatives impacted by the Regulation as relevant.
7. Risks

Describe risks (if any) to the success of the study, e.g. inaccessibility of data, security clearance issues etc and provide a mitigation strategy.

8. Work plan, organisation and budget

Responsibility and management of the evaluation remain with the European Commission (Directorate General for Home Affairs).

A steering group will be set up to monitor the evaluation and will be the main interlocutor of the contractor. The steering group will follow the evaluation process, assess and decide on acceptance and rejection of the different deliverables that the selected contractor will have to provide. It will also be instrumental in the provision of information to the selected contractor. The contractor should take into account the comments and recommendations of the steering group and keep it regularly informed on the progress of the work.

The contractor will be requested, and should be prepared, to attend at least three meetings of the steering group at the Commission’s premises in Brussels. The contractor may be requested to prepare presentations on the progress and results of the evaluation. For these meetings, minutes should be drafted by the contractor, to be agreed among the participants.

As the evaluation report will be made available on the Commission website, no form of confidential data shall be contained in the final report.

9. Deliverables

The overall duration of the tasks should not exceed [9] months, commencing from the date of signature of the contract by the last of the two parties.

The Commission will require the contractor to submit an Inception, Interim and Final Reports, in English, in 6 hard copies in each case accompanied by an electronic version compatible with the Commission’s computer facilities (MS Word and/or pdf format). The final report should be of maximum 130 pages.

The study should include an abstract (200 words maximum), and be complemented by an executive summary (6 pages maximum) in a separate document, both in at least English, French and German.

The following deliverables will be produced following the timeframe specified below:

- A kick-off meeting will be held at the European Commission premises within 1 week after the signature of the contract to raise first issues linked notably to methodology.

- Within 3 weeks after the signature of the contract, an Inception Report for review shall be submitted by the contractor. It will specify the work programme for the evaluation and describe the methodological and empirical approaches to be used for the tasks, in particular regarding the desk research, but also concerning surveys proposed, interview programme, or case studies (number and scope). In particular, it will include a detailed work plan to be submitted to the Commission steering group.
The report will also identify any additional need for information to be collected during the evaluation. It will include a draft questionnaire for the public consultation. It will take the form of a draft document.

- An **inception meeting** will be held at the European Commission premises within 1 week of the submission of the Inception Report with the contractor to finalise the work plan and the methodology of the work to be undertaken and to discuss and clarify possible open questions and issues. The report will have to be accepted by the Commission to initiate the following step to be discussed to during.

- **Within 20 weeks** after the signature of the contract, an **Interim Report for review** shall be submitted by the contractor. The report must as a minimum provide:
  o An overview of the status of the evaluation project;
  o A description of problems encountered and solutions found;
  o A summary of initial findings and results of the data gathering and the interviews with practitioners including a substantial part of the desk research;
  o An assessment of the data collection process and of the quality of data collected, whether it meets expectations and will provide a sound basis for responding to the evaluation questions;
  o A conclusion whether any changes are required to the work plan, or any other solutions should be sought in order to ensure that the required results of the evaluation are achieved. If any such issues are to be identified, they must be discussed in the meeting with the Steering Group dedicated to this report;
  o An analysis of the public consultation.
  o A proposal for the final structure of the Final Report.
  o Present a first consolidated rationale for preliminary conclusions and recommendations

Clear references on sources of information used or to be used are to be made. It shall not exceed 130 pages, annexes excluded.

After submission, an **interim meeting** will be organised to discuss and clarify possible open questions and issues within two weeks following the report delivery. The exact delivery date and expected content will be agreed between contractor and the Commission based on the inception report and work plan proposed by the contractor.

- **Within 30 weeks** after the signature of the contract, a **Final Report for review** shall be submitted by the contractor. This document should deliver the results of all tasks covered by these Terms of Reference, and must be clear enough for any potential reader to understand. It will take account of the comments made by the steering group. It will cover all points of the work plan and shall include sound analysis of findings and factually based conclusions and recommendations in line with the purpose and objectives above.

The **Final Report for review** shall include:

  o introduction;
  o research methodology;
  o evaluation results;
  o conclusions & recommendations;
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- annexes (with the full results of the desk research, data gathering and interviews with practitioners, full implementation tables...)

It will be accompanied by an executive summary setting out the conclusions of the report, of no more than 6 pages. The executive summary outlines the evaluation's main conclusions, the main evidence supporting them and the recommendations arising from them. After being agreed with the Commission Services, it should be translated into English/French/German.

Clear references to sources of information used (bibliography; questionnaires and records of interviews conducted; list of interviews detailing dates, services contacted, contributors to the study – without actual natural person names) is required.

A final meeting will be organised with the contractor within the two weeks following its delivery, during which the steering group will provide comments.

The Final Report for acceptance, reflecting fully the Commission's comments on the draft submitted for review, must be submitted within 36 weeks after the signature of the contract. On top of that, an abstract of no more than 200 words in English, French and German should be provided. The purpose of the abstract is to act as a reference tool helping the reader to quickly ascertain the evaluation's subject.

The document must take into account the feedback from the Steering Group on the draft Final Report, insofar as these do not interfere with the autonomy of the Contractor in respect of the conclusions they have reached and the recommendations made.

The contracting authority will publish the Final Report, the Executive Summary, the Abstract, the annexes and the Quality Assessment Grid providing assessment of the evaluation final report on the Commission's central website.

In view of its publication, the final report by the contractors must be of high editorial quality. In cases where the contractor does not manage to produce a final report of high editorial quality within the timeframe defined by the contract, the contracting authority can decide to have the final report professionally edited at the expense of the contractor (e.g. deduction of these costs from the final payment).

The contractor may be called upon to make an interactive audio-visual presentation at a seminar held in Brussels at the premises of the Commission services based on the findings, conclusions and recommendations to Commission staff and also to stakeholder groups. The audio-visual presentation will be agreed with the Commission beforehand, and an electronic copy of the presentation will be made available to the Commission for further use.

Approval of the Reports

The Commission will have 20 working days to review the reports and submit comments. Once the comments have been addressed and each report has been approved, the Commission will issue a letter or email of formal acceptance.

---

European Commission | DG HOME AFFAIRS
Otherwise, the contractor shall modify the report according to Commission's requests, or duly explain why they cannot be accepted; a modified version of the report will be submitted within 10 working days.

**Intellectual property rights**

Rights concerning the rough data gathered by the contractor, reports and those relating to its reproduction and publication will remain the property of the European Commission. No document based, in whole or in part, upon the work undertaken in the context of this contract may be published except with the prior formal written approval of the European Commission.

**Format of the Reports**

Each report (except the final version of the Final Report) should have an introductory page providing an overview and orientation of the report. It should describe what parts of the document, on the one hand, have been carried over from previous reports or been recycled from other documents, and on the other hand, represent progress of the evaluation work with reference to the work plan.

The contractor must deliver the final report, using the same structure as the Commission's Staff Working Document which will summarize the evaluation, to the Commission in English in [6] hard copies and electronic version (Word and PDF formats). It will implement the Commission publication rules related to its "visual identity" policy by applying the graphic rules set out in the European Commission's Visual Identity Manual, including its logo5.

These files must be tested before dispatch. The report needs to be accepted by the Commission to allow full payment.

A possible timeline (purely indicative) would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Février 2017</td>
<td>Signature of the contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Février 2017</td>
<td>Inception Report for review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juin 2017</td>
<td>Interim Report for review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aout 2017</td>
<td>Final Report for review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 The Visual Identity Manual of the European Commission is available upon request. Requests should be made to the following e-mail address: comm-visual-identity@ec.europa.eu

The Commission is committed to making online information as accessible as possible to the largest possible number of users including those with visual, auditory, cognitive or physical disabilities, and those not having the latest technologies. The Commission supports the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 2.0 of the W3C.

For full details on Commission policy on accessibility for information providers, see:

http://ec.europa.eu/ipg/standards/accessibility/index_en.htm

Pdf versions of studies destined for online publication should respect W3C guidelines for accessible pdf documents. See: http://www.w3.org/WAI/GL/WCAG20-TECHS/pdf.html

For graphic requirements please refer to the standard word template in Annex 1. The cover page shall be filled in by the contractor in accordance with the instructions provided in the template. For further details you may also contact comm-visual-identity@ec.europa.eu.

In case you foresee other logos than the Commission logo, the additional logo may only be placed on the cover page of the study if they are one of the following categories:

- a logo duly authorised by the Secretary General and the Director-General for Communication of the European Commission;
- the logo of the author of the study (i.e. the contractor).
9. Budget

The estimated maximum budget for the evaluation of the action, covering all the results to be achieved by the contractor as listed above, is €150,000.

10. Quality assessment criteria

The overall quality of the evaluation will be assessed by the European Commission on the basis of the Commission's quality assessment framework (Annex 1).

11. Background

Existing provisions in the area addressed by the Regulation:

Several EU legal acts have been adopted aiming at tracing firearms and facilitating and eliminating barriers for the transfers of conventional arms within the internal market, or aiming at regulating the exports of conventional arms to third countries:

- On 12/13 June 2007 the Council adopted a Recommendation on a standard procedure in Member States for cross-border enquiries by police authorities in investigating supply channels for seized or recovered crime-related firearms, which – also through use of its annexed handbook - will improve tracing activities and law enforcement cooperation in the field;
- Directive 2009/43/EC of the European Parliament and the Council sets the rules and procedures applicable to the intra-community transfers of defence-related products;
- Common Position 2008/944/CFSP of 8 December 20087.

Since the adoption of the Regulation 258/2012, the Commission notably adopted:

7 In June 1998 the EU Code of Conduct on Arms Exports was by the General Affairs Council as a declaration of the European Council in the framework of the Common Foreign and Security Policy - CFSP. The Code was later updated with the adoption of the Common Position 2008/944/CFSP of 8 December 2008 having a similar operative content. Both acts included and still include provisions for Member States which are not immediately applicable to citizens and companies of the European Union, having explicit reference to technologies and military equipment. The CFSP acts adopted under Title V of the TFEU are in fact related to Member States' political commitments, setting constraints on their national policies; Member States are obliged to make their national positions comply with those laid down by the Common Position. These acts and provisions are therefore not apt to direct application, and shall be implemented by Member States through regulatory measures and by means of administrative acts.

The Common Military List was attached to this framework, containing a list of products and technologies subject to its application. However, the adoption of the Common Military List caused some problems related to the interpretation of the EU legislation. The content of the List was in fact directly transposed from the so-called "Munitions List" of the Wassenaar system, concerning the Agreement for the control of exports of conventional weapons and sensitive goods and technologies with dual-use. As a result of subsequent updates, the two lists were kept consistent over time.
• a Communication on "firearms and the internal security of the EU: minimizing harm to the citizen and disrupting criminal circulation of lethal weapons";
• The European Agenda on Security (which emphasises the need to contribute to Member States actions' so as to prevent and fight firearms trafficking);
• A Proposal for a Directive revision of the Firearms Directive 477/91, aiming at tightening controls on the acquisition and possession of firearms;
• An implementing Regulation on common minimum standards for deactivation of firearms;
• An Action Plan against firearms trafficking and the illicit use of explosives.

In coherence and synergies with the above, the Council of the European Union notably:
• adopted conclusions on setting the EU's priorities for the fight against serious and organised crime between 2014 and 2017 which mention firearms trafficking as one of its priorities and the development of subsequent annual Operational Action Plans;
• invited Member States, the Commission, Europol and Interpol to strengthen the use of means of fighting trafficking of firearms.

Other documents of relevance:
• 2013 Arms Trade Treaty;
• Council Decision on the conclusion, on behalf of the European Union, of the Protocol against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Their Parts and Components and Ammunition, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime concerning the provisions of the Protocol, insofar as the provisions of the Protocol fall within the scope of Articles 114 and 207 of the Treaty on the functioning of the European Union;
• Council Decision 2001/748/EC of 16 October 2001 concerning the signing on behalf of the European Community of the United Nations Protocol on the illicit manufacturing of and trafficking in firearms, their parts, components and ammunition, annexed to the Convention against transnational organised crime;
• EU Strategy to combat illicit accumulation and trafficking of SALW and their ammunition;
contribution to combating the destabilising accumulation and spread of small arms and light weapons;

- Council Conclusions on the inclusion of a SALW article in agreements between the EU and third countries\(^1\);\(^8\);
- Council Decision 2009/42/CFSP of 19 January 2009 on support for EU activities in order to promote among third countries the process leading towards an Arms Trade Treaty, in the framework of the European Security Strategy\(^9\);
- Joint Declaration on Enhancing the Fight Against Illicit Trafficking of Firearms and Ammunition in the Western Balkans (EU-Western Balkans Ministerial Forum on Justice and Home Affairs Tirana, 5-6 November 2012);
- Council Decision 2013/43/CFSP of 22 January 2013 on continued Union activities in support of the Arms Trade Treaty negotiations, in the framework of the European Security Strategy\(^2\).