



Council of the European Union
General Secretariat

Brussels, 28 September 2020

WK 10137/2020 INIT

LIMITE

**CT
ENFOPOL
COTER
JAI**

WORKING PAPER

This is a paper intended for a specific community of recipients. Handling and further distribution are under the sole responsibility of community members.

WORKING DOCUMENT

From:	General Secretariat of the Council
To:	Delegations
Subject:	Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on preventing the dissemination of terrorist content online

As announced, delegations will find in the Annex a number of Presidency proposals on the Proposal for a Regulation on preventing the dissemination of terrorist content online (TCO).

The proposals will be discussed at the JHA-Counsellors' meeting tomorrow, 29 September 2020 (afternoon).

Background/basis document following the fourth trilogue of 24 September 2020: WK 10137/2020.

Article 1: Subject matter and scope

Apart from the paragraphs 2a and 2c, Article 1 is agreed.

Paragraph 1a (line 73) was agreed at the trilogue of 24 September 2020

(a) rules on *reasonable and proportionate* duties of care to be applied by hosting service providers in order to ~~prevent~~ *address* the dissemination *to the public* of terrorist content through their services and ensure, where necessary, its swift removal;

Concerning paragraph 2a (line 76): The Presidency proposes to build upon the EP Proposal (Article 1(2a) (line 76)) and the Commission compromise proposal of 6 March 2020 (line 97) and suggests to move it to Article 2 as a new paragraph 5a. The new paragraph 5a addresses the concerns of the EP to strengthen fundamental right safeguards, as set out below under Article 2.

Concerning paragraph 2c (line 78): Regarding the reference to the e-Commerce-Directive and Audio Visual Media Services-Directive the Presidency proposes to align the wording to standard practice, amending the EP proposal, as follows:

"This Regulation is without prejudice to Directive 2000/31/EC and ~~For audiovisual media services as defined in article 1 paragraph 1 of Directive 2018/1808/EU~~ ~~Directive (EU) 2018/1808 shall prevail.~~"

Article 2: Definitions

There is agreement between the co-legislators that definition of terrorist content should be aligned as closely as possible to the Directive on combating terrorism. At the same time, the definition should capture material that is actually used by terrorist groups for recruitment and radicalisation purposes. This is why material promoting the criminal activities of a terrorist group should be included. This is in line with the spirit of the Directive on combating terrorism which criminalises supporting activities as well as the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights. The Presidency proposes to support the Commission compromise proposal from March 6 which builds upon the EP package of February 2020.

Concerning paragraph 1 (line 83): Regarding the definition of "hosting service provider" (line 83), the Presidency supports the Commission compromise proposal from 6 March 2020 and proposes to agree on this compromise. This paragraph should be read in conjunction with the recitals (10), (10a) and (10b)

(1) 'hosting service provider' means a provider of information society services consisting in the storage of information provided by and at the request of the content provider ~~and in making the information stored available to third parties;~~

Paragraphs 2 and 3 (lines 84-89) were agreed at the trilogue of 24 September 2020:

(2) 'content provider' means a user who has provided information that is, or that has been, stored **and made available to the public** at the request of the user by a hosting service provider;

(3) 'to offer services in the Union' means: enabling legal or natural persons in one or more Member States to use the services of the hosting service provider which has a substantial connection to that Member State or Member States.

Such a substantial connection shall be deemed to exist where the hosting service provider has an establishment in the Union. In the absence of such an establishment, the assessment of a substantial connection shall be based on specific factual criteria, such as

(a) ~~establishment of the hosting service provider in the Union;~~

(a) a significant number of users in one or more Member States;

(b) or targeting of activities towards one or more Member States.

Concerning paragraphs 4 and 5(a) and (b) (lines 90-93): the Presidency encourages the Member States to accept the EP proposal which was part of its February-package, with the aim to better align Article 2 to the Directive on combating terrorism and agreed language. This recalls the added value of this draft Regulation, which is the use of a harmonised tool, the removal order, based on a uniform definition of terrorist content throughout the Union.

(4) 'terrorist offences' means offences as defined in Article 3(1) of Directive (EU) 2017/541;

(5) 'terrorist content' means one or more of the following ~~information~~ **material**:

Council amendment (aa) moved down as point (e)

(a) ~~inciting or advocating, including by glorifying,~~ ***the commission of one of the offences referred to in points (a) to (i) of Article 3(1) of Directive (EU) 2017/541, where such material, directly or indirectly, such as by the glorification of terrorist acts, advocates the commission of terrorist offences, thereby causing a danger that such acts one or more such offences may be committed;***

(b) ~~encouraging the contribution to terrorist~~ ***soliciting a person or a group of persons to commit or contribute to the commission of one of the offences referred to in points (a) to (i) of Article 3(1) of Directive (EU) 2017/541;***

Concerning paragraph 5c (line 95): the Presidency suggests accepting the Commission compromise proposal, including the EP's request to use "soliciting" instead of "promoting". However, for reason of clarification it is suggested to add "*criminal*" in the last part of the sentence.

c) soliciting a person or a group of persons to participate in the activities of a terrorist group within the meaning of Article 2(3) of Directive (EU) 2017/541, including in relation to supplying information or material resources, funding its activities in any way, or otherwise supporting its criminal activities.

Regarding paragraphs 5d and 5e (lines 96-97): The Presidency suggests accepting the EP proposal on these two paragraphs, which define terrorist content:

(d) ~~instructing on~~ providing instruction on the making or use of explosives, firearms or other weapons or noxious or hazardous substances, or on other specific methods or techniques for the purpose of committing or contributing to the commission of one of the terrorist offences referred to in points (a) to (i) of Article 3(1) of Directive (EU) 2017/541;

(e) constituting a threat to commit one of the offences referred to in points (a) to (i) of Article 3(1) of Directive (EU) 2017/541;

In order to strengthen fundamental right safeguards, the Presidency suggests inserting a new paragraph 5a on material disseminated for educational, journalistic, artistic or research purposes, which introduces the Commission compromise proposal and the EP proposal from line 76 as a new paragraph 5a in Article 2. In this way it shall be clarified, that content which is protected by the freedom of expression and information, the freedom of the arts and sciences, the freedom and pluralism of the media protected under Union law shall not be removed. However, a blank exemption might lead to postings of illegal content under the pretext of a protectworthy purpose. It is not the stated purpose that is decisive but whether or not the content is actually protected by fundamental rights.

New paragraph 5a: "*Material disseminated for educational, journalistic, artistic or research purposes or for the purposes of preventing or countering terrorism shall not be considered terrorist content in as far as the dissemination of the information is protected as legitimate exercise of the freedom of expression and information, the freedom of the arts and sciences as well as the freedom and pluralism of the media as protected under Union law.*"

The corresponding recital 9 is suggested split into two recitals. The new recital (9a) starting with "Content disseminated for educational, **journalistic** ...". should read as follows:

*"When determining whether **material** provided by a content provider constitutes 'terrorist content' within this Regulation account shall be taken of in particular the freedom of expression and information, the freedom of the arts and sciences, the freedom and pluralism of the media" (EP proposal, see line 76).*

Additionally, in order to strengthen the language regarding the protection of journalistic content, the Presidency proposes to add the following sentence to the new recital (9a):

" ... in cases where the content provider holds an editorial responsibility, any decision as to the removal of the disseminated material should take into account the journalistic standards established by press or media regulation consistent with the law of the Union and the Charter of Fundamental Rights."

The following recital is suggested as an additional corresponding recital to the new paragraph 5a:

Recital (9a): "In line with this Regulation's objective of effectively addressing the risks to internet users and society at large associated with terrorist content, whilst safeguarding fundamental rights as protected under Union law, in particular the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU ('the Charter'), such as the freedom of expression and information, the freedom of the arts and sciences and the freedom and pluralism of the media, information should not be considered as terrorist content where its dissemination entails the legitimate exercise of one or more of those rights. In this regard, the objective of the dissemination as stated by the content provider should not, in itself, be decisive. Instead, a case-by-case assessment that takes account of all relevant elements is required to determine whether any of those rights is legitimately being exercised, bearing in mind that activities or acts aimed at the destruction of the rights and freedoms recognised in the Charter, or at their limitation to a greater extent than is provided for therein, are not protected."

Regarding paragraph 6 (line 98): The Presidency proposes to agree on the Commission's compromise proposal to define the "dissemination to the public" as follows:

(6) 'dissemination *to the public* of terrorist content' means *the making available of information, at the request of the content provider, available to third parties on the hosting service providers' services, to a potentially unlimited number of persons.*

This definition reads together with Article 1 and the corresponding recitals 10, 10a and 10b in order to clarify that only content disseminated to the public is covered by the Regulation. The definition of "public" as opposed to "private" is based on relevant case law as well as the telecommunications code¹.

Regarding the corresponding recital (10a) (line 25): The EP has suggested deleting two sentences following their shadow's meeting of 23 September 2020 (the part in *italics and underlined*). This part was inserted for reasons of legal certainty by the Commission to clarify what this general definition means for groups. The Presidency suggests keeping these sentences in and asks the Member States for their opinion

(10a) The concept of "dissemination to the public" should entail the making available of information to a potentially unlimited number of persons that is, making the information easily accessible to users in general without further action by the content provider being required, irrespective of whether those persons actually access the information in question. Accordingly, the mere possibility to create groups of users of a given service does not, in itself, mean that this Regulation does not apply. However, the Regulation does not apply to closed groups consisting of a finite number of pre-determined persons. Interpersonal communication services, as defined in [the Telecommunications Code (Dir. 2018/1972)] such as emails or private messaging services, fall outside the scope of this Regulation. Information should be considered stored and disseminated to the public within the meaning of this Regulation only where such activities are performed upon direct request by the content provider. Consequently, providers of services such as cloud infrastructure, which are provided at the request of other parties than the content providers and only indirectly benefit the latter, should not be covered by this Regulation. By way of example, included in the scope of this Regulation are providers of social media, video, image and audio-sharing, as well as file-sharing and other cloud services, in as far as those services are used to make the stored information available to the public at the direct request of the content provider. Where a service provider offers several services, this Regulation should be applied only in respect of the services that fall within its scope.

¹ Directive 2018/1972, article 2(5) and recital 17

Regarding paragraph 8, the definition of "referrals": The EP made it clear during the trilogue on 24 September that Article 5 on referrals shall be deleted as well as the definition in paragraph 8. The Presidency suggests keeping for now the definition on referrals in paragraph 8 and the corresponding Article 5. It is a central and widely used concept which are part of the cooperation between the Member States and with Europol (see also Article 13). During the trilogue on 24 September, the EP emphasised that the draft Regulation shall only focus on one new key measure, the removal order. Therefore, the Presidency suggests that if the EP accepts the removal order as one new key measure, the Council may accept the deletion of Article 5.

The merged Article 3/6/9 will be dealt with at the next JHA-Counsellors' meeting on 7 October 2020. In this regard, the EP made very clear at the trilogue of 24 September, that they do not want the use of automated tools to be made mandatory.]

Article 4: Removal orders, Article 4(a): Consultation and cooperation procedure for removal orders and 4b: Enforcement of removal orders

(Lines 110-132)

General remarks to Article 4:

In order to effectively address terrorist content online, Article 4 of the draft Regulation introduces removal orders with EU-wide applicability. The following amendments propose a structured process, which guarantees respect for the EU-Charter of Fundamental rights, strengthens the internal market and protects public security. The Presidency proposal takes into account the concerns pointed out by the EP Package in February and raised by the EP during the last political trilogue.

The Presidency proposes to include a new paragraph 1a in Article 4 which builds upon the EP proposal about a 12-hour warning. It is suggested to clarify either in a corresponding recital or in paragraph 1a that the 12-hour deadline does not apply in exceptional cases: "**In exceptional cases, including live transmissions of terrorist offences, this 12-hour deadline does not apply.**".

The Presidency proposes to include a new paragraph 8a in Article 4 to strengthen the role of the hosting service provider during the issuing process. The new paragraph 8a gives the hosting service provider the right to request the issuing competent authority to review the issued removal order in exceptional circumstances, where the hosting service provider has reasonable grounds to believe that the removal order unduly limits the exercise of fundamental rights. The hosting service provider shall bring these concerns also to the attention of the host Member State by informing the competent authority.

General remarks to Article 4a:

While the general rule remains the possibility for all Member States to issue cross border removal orders with direct effect, based on cooperation and mutual trust resulting from strong structural safeguards in the Regulation and deriving from primary EU law, the Presidency proposes to further strengthen the role of the host Member State in Art. 4a. Therefore, the Presidency proposes to introduce a new paragraph 3 in Art. 4a as a procedural safeguard, which builds upon the consultation procedure between the Member States during the issuing process introduced by the Council. While paragraph 2 gives the host Member State the possibility to raise concerns regarding fundamental interests (e.g. criminal investigations), paragraph 3 focusses on fundamental rights. In exceptional circumstances where the host Member State holds a view that the removal order unduly limits the exercise of fundamental rights the host Member State can raise concerns which must be taken into account by the issuing Member State. The latter has to withdraw or adapt the removal order.

Considering that all removal orders issued under this draft Regulation need to comply with the definition of terrorist content, that the competent authorities need to assess possible interferences with fundamental rights and that overall, all Member States are subject to the Charter on Fundamental rights, and also taking into account that the Commission as guardian of the Treaty can launch infringement proceedings against Member States not respecting the rules, it is important that this procedure is limited to exceptional circumstances.

Additionally, the Presidency suggests including Europol in paragraph 1 to strengthen the institutionalized cooperation mechanism between the Member States and Europol.

General remarks on Article 4b:

The Presidency proposes to include a new Article 4b on the enforcement of removal orders. This new article shall also strengthen the role of the host Member State. Article 4b clarifies that the host Member State can refuse to the enforcement of a removal order in exceptional cases. In those exceptional circumstances where the removal order unduly limits the exercise of fundamental rights the host Member State does not take any measures to enforce the unlawful removal order.

Art. 4: Removal orders

1. The competent authority shall have the power to issue a **removal order** requiring the hosting service provider to remove terrorist content or disable access to it.

1a. If the relevant competent authority has not previously issued a removal order to a hosting service provider it shall provide the hosting service provider with information on procedures and applicable deadlines at least 12 hours before issuing a removal order except in cases of particular urgency.

2. Hosting service providers shall remove terrorist content or disable access to it ***as soon as possible and in any event*** within one hour from receipt of the removal order.

3. Removal orders shall contain the following elements in accordance with the template set out in Annex I:

(a) identification of the competent authority ***via an electronic signature*** issuing the removal order and authentication of the removal order by the competent authority;

(b) a statement of reasons explaining why the content is considered terrorist content, ~~at least, by~~ ***and*** reference to the ***relevant*** categories of terrorist content listed in Article 2(5);

(c) ~~a~~ ***an exact*** Uniform Resource Locator (URL) and, where necessary, additional information enabling the identification of the content referred;

(d) a reference to this Regulation as the legal basis for the removal order;

(e) date and time stamp of issuing;

(f) ***easily understandable*** information about redress available to the hosting service provider and to the content provider, ***including redress with the competent authority as well as recourse to a court as well as deadlines for appeal,***

(g) where ~~relevant~~ ***necessary and proportionate***, the decision not to disclose information about the removal of terrorist content or the disabling of access to it referred to in Article 11.

4. Upon request by the hosting service provider or by the content provider, the competent authority shall provide a ~~detailed~~ ***supplementary*** statement of reasons, ***explaining why the content is considered terrorist content*** without prejudice to the obligation of the hosting service provider to comply with the removal order within the deadline set out in paragraph 2.

5. The competent authorities shall address removal orders to the main establishment of the hosting service provider or to the legal representative designated by the hosting service provider pursuant to Article 16 and transmit it to the point of contact referred to in Article 14(1). Such orders shall be sent by electronic means capable of producing a written record under conditions allowing to establish the authentication of the sender, including the accuracy of the date and the time of sending and receipt of the order.

6. Hosting service providers shall inform ~~acknowledge receipt and~~, without undue delay, the competent authority about the removal of terrorist content or disabling access to it, indicating, in particular, the time of action, using the template set out in Annex II.

7. If the hosting service provider cannot comply with the removal order because of force majeure or of de facto impossibility not attributable to the hosting service provider, it shall inform, without undue delay, the competent authority, explaining the reasons, using the template set out in Annex III. The deadline set out in paragraph 2 shall apply as soon as the reasons invoked are no longer present.

8. If the hosting service provider cannot comply with the removal order because the removal order contains manifest errors or does not contain sufficient information to execute the order, it shall inform the competent authority without undue delay, asking for the necessary clarification, using the template set out in Annex III. The deadline set out in paragraph 2 shall apply as soon as the clarification is provided.

8a. If the hosting service provider has reasonable grounds to believe that the removal order manifestly and seriously breach the fundamental rights and freedoms set out in the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, it may request the issuing competent authority to review the issued removal order without undue delay. The hosting service provider shall inform the competent authority of the Member States of main establishment about this request at the same time. The issuing competent authority shall decide on the request without undue delay and inform the hosting service provider and the competent authority of the Member State of main establishment. [The deadline set out in paragraph 2 shall apply as soon as the issuing competent authority has decided on the request.]

9. The competent authority which issued the removal order shall inform the competent authority which oversees the implementation of ~~proactive~~ **specific** measures, referred to in Article 17(1)(c) when the removal order becomes final. A removal order **shall** become final **upon the expiry of** ~~where it has not been appealed within the deadline for appeal under~~ according to the applicable national law or **when the removal order** ~~where it has been confirmed following an appeal.~~

Article 4a Consultation and cooperation procedure for removal orders

1. The issuing authority shall submit a copy of the removal order to the competent authority referred to in Article 17(1)(a) of the Member State in which the main establishment of the hosting service provider is located **and to Europol**, at the same time it is transmitted to the hosting service provider in accordance with Article 4(5).

2. In cases where the competent authority of the Member State in which the main establishment of the hosting service provider **or its legal representative** is located has reasonable grounds to believe that the removal order, may impact fundamental interests of that Member State, it shall inform the issuing competent authority. **The issuing authority shall take these circumstances into account and shall, where necessary, withdraw or adapt the removal order.**

~~3. The issuing authority shall take these circumstances into account and shall, where necessary, withdraw or adapt the removal order.~~

3. In cases where the competent authority of the Member State where the hosting service provider has its main establishment or its legal representative has reasonable grounds to believe that the removal order unduly limits the exercise of fundamental rights set out in the Charter of Fundamental Rights, the issuing authority shall take these circumstances into account and withdraw or adapt the removal order.

Article 4b Enforcement of removal orders

1. If the hosting service provider does not comply with a removal order, the competent authority of the issuing Member State may request the competent authority of the Member State, where the hosting service provider has its main establishment or its legal representative, to take the necessary measures to enforce the removal order.

2. The competent authority of the Member State of main establishment/legal representative shall take the necessary measures to enforce the removal order without undue delay [according to national law], except in those cases, where it holds the view that the removal order manifestly violates one or more fundamental rights set out in the EU-Charter of Fundamental Rights.

3. The competent authority of the Member State, in which the main establishment of the hosting service provider or its legal representative is located, shall consult the competent authority of the issuing Member State before refusing to enforce the removal order.

Article 5: Referrals (lines 137-144):

See comment under Article 2(8).

Article 8: Transparency obligations

The Article on Transparency obligations *for hosting service providers* is agreed apart from its paragraph 1 and paragraph 3c.

Concerning paragraph 1, the Presidency suggests the following wording (changes to the wording, the general approach not deviating from the Commission proposal, are marked):

"1. Hosting service providers shall set out clearly in their terms and conditions their policy to prevent the dissemination of terrorist content, including, where appropriate, a meaningful explanation of the functioning of ~~proactive~~ specific measures, including where applicable, the use of automated tools."

Concerning paragraph 3c: the Presidency encourages Member States to accept the amendment suggested by the EP.

"3(c) number of pieces of terrorist content removed or to which access has been disabled, following removal orders, ~~referrals, or proactive~~, *or specific* measures, respectively, **and the number of orders where the content has not been removed in accordance with Article 4(7) and (8) together with reasons for refusal.**

Article 8a: Transparency obligations for competent authorities

In the interest of transparency, the Presidency would encourage Member States to accept the text, as it currently appears in the 4-column document.

1. *Competent authorities shall publish annual transparency reports relating to their activities under this Regulation. Those reports shall include at least the following information in relation to the year covered.*

a) *the total number of removal orders issued in accordance with Article 4 and the number of instances in which the removal orders led to the removal of or disabling of access to terrorist content and the number of instances in which they did not.*

(b) *the total number of referrals issued in accordance with Article 5 and number of instances in which the referrals led to the removal of or disabling of access to terrorist content and the number of instances in which they did not.*

(c) *the total number of decisions imposing specific measures taken in accordance with Article 6(4) and a description of the measures imposed;*

(d) *the total number of instances in which removal orders and decisions imposing specific measures were subject to administrative or judicial remedies and information on the outcome of the relevant proceedings.*

(e) *The total number of decisions imposing penalties, including a description of the type of penalty imposed.*

2. *The transparency reports referred to in paragraph 1 shall not contain information that may affect ongoing activities for the prevention, detection, investigation or prosecution of terrorist offences or national security interests.*

Art. 9a Effective remedies

In order to add additional safeguards and integrate references to judicial redress (among other things proposed by EP in relation to specific measures pursuant to the new Article x), it is proposed to build upon the Commission compromise proposal for Article 9a, as follows:

*Content providers, whose content has been removed or access to which has been disabled following a removal order, and hosting service providers that have received a removal order pursuant to Article 4[, **or a decision pursuant to Article X([para 4), (6) and (7)]**] shall have a right to an effective remedy. This shall include a right to contest the removal order before the courts of the issuing Member State. Member States shall put in place effective procedures for exercising this right.*

Art. 12: Capabilities of competent authorities

The Presidency proposes the following changes to Article 12, which integrate concerns raised by the EP regarding Article 17 and builds upon the Commission compromise from March. The new paragraph (2) shall emphasise that the competent authorities of the Member States shall not take any instructions in exercising the tasks assigned by this regulation:

(1) “Member States shall ensure that their competent authorities have the necessary capability and sufficient resources to achieve the aims and fulfil their obligations under this Regulation.(2) Member States shall ensure that their national competent authorities exercise their tasks in a manner that is objective, non-discriminatory and in full respect of fundamental rights. Competent authorities shall not seek or take instructions from any other body in relation to the exercise of the tasks assigned to them by this regulation. This shall not prevent supervision in accordance with national constitutional law.”².

² See Article 30(2), second part, and recital (53) of Directive (EU) 2018/1808 (AVMSD): "National regulatory authorities or bodies shall not seek or take instructions from any other body in relation to the exercise of the tasks assigned to them under national law implementing Union law. This shall not prevent supervision in accordance with national constitutional law."

Article 13: Cooperation between hosting service providers, competent authorities and where appropriate competent Union bodies

In order to contribute to the development of a common understanding of what constitutes terrorist content, the Commission compromise proposal from 6 March suggested that Europol shall provide an annual report, including an analysis of the types of content subject to removal orders.

The Presidency encourages welcoming this addition as a new paragraph 5 in order to address the concerns by the EP of diverging interpretations of content:

"(5) On the basis of the copies of the removal orders transmitted to it in accordance with Article 4a(1), Europol shall provide an annual report, including an analysis of the types of content subject to removal orders transmitted to the hosting service providers pursuant to this Regulation."

Based on the EP AM 118 (line 199), referring to a cooperation duty for hosting service providers, the proposed text in Article 13(4a) could be complemented as follows:

"Hosting service providers shall cooperate with competent authorities of Member States and Europol. This includes the duty for hosting service providers to assess expeditiously referrals [from competent authorities and Europol] and inform the competent authority or Europol about its decision. The receipt of a referral does not entail an obligation for the hosting service providers to remove or disable access to the content in question."

Article 17: Designation of competent authorities

The Presidency welcomes that the EP is prepared to give up the requirement of a single, independent administrative or judicial competent authority per Member State. The Presidency suggests incorporating the concerns of the EP regarding the independence of the competent authorities into Article 2.

Furthermore, referring to EPs amendment 129 (line 221) which moved Article 13(3) to a new paragraph 1a in Article 17, the Presidency suggests taking on board the second sentence of paragraph 2 (set-up of an online register by the Commission) as a new paragraph 2a:

- "(1) Each Member State shall designate the authority or authorities competent to
- (a) issue removal orders pursuant to Article 4;
 - (b) detect, identify and refer terrorist content to hosting service providers pursuant to Article 5;
 - (c) oversee the implementation of *proactive specific* measures pursuant to Article 6;
 - (d) impose penalties pursuant to Article 18.

(1a) Member States shall designate a point of contact within the competent authorities to handle requests for clarification and feedback in relation to removal orders issued by them. Information on the contact point shall be made publicly available.

(2) By [~~six~~ *twelve months after the entry into force of this Regulation*] at the latest Member States shall notify the Commission of the competent **authority or** authorities referred to in paragraph 1. The Commission shall publish the notification and any modifications of it in the *Official Journal of the European Union*.

(2a) By [~~six~~ twelve months after the entry into force of this Regulation] at the latest the Commission shall set up an online register listing all those competent authorities and the designated contact point for each competent authority. The Commission shall publish any modifications regularly."

Article 18: Penalties

Any infringement – and not only systematic and persistent infringements as proposed by the EP - is sanctionable. This does not mean that each and every infringement should necessarily be sanctioned. Any decision on sanctions should be proportionate, and minor breaches of first time offenders may not lead to a sanction at all. This is clarified by the addition "when deciding whether..." in paragraph 3, which could alleviate the burden for small businesses .

The Presidency suggests inserting additional text in recital (38), explaining that penalties can take different forms, including formal warnings for instance in cases of minor breaches or financial penalties in relation to more severe and systematic breaches.

The EP's request for inserting "systematic and persistent" in Article 18(1) shall be explained by the EP at the next technical trilogue. The Presidency asks for the opinion of the Member States if "persistent" could be added in paragraph 4 [systematic or persistent].

"1. Member States shall lay down the rules on penalties applicable to systematic³ breaches of the obligations by hosting service providers under this Regulation and shall take all necessary measures to ensure that they are implemented. Such penalties shall be limited to infringement of the obligations pursuant to:

...

3. Member States shall ensure that, when *deciding whether to impose a penalty and when* determining the type and level of penalties, the competent authorities take into account all relevant circumstances, including:

- (a) the nature, gravity, and duration of the breach;
- (b) the intentional or negligent character of the breach;
- (c) previous breaches by the legal *or natural* person held responsible;
- (d) the financial strength of the legal *or natural* person held liable;
- (e) the level of cooperation of the hosting service provider with the competent authorities.

(e a) the nature and size of the hosting service providers, in particular for microenterprises or small-sized enterprises within the meaning of Commission Recommendation 2003/361/EC.

4. Member States shall ensure that a systematic [*or persistent*] failure to comply with obligations pursuant to Article 4(2) is subject to financial penalties of up to 4% of the hosting service provider's global turnover of the last business year."

³ Error in 10137/2020, the word "systematic" should not appear in this paragraph.