Council of the European Union
General Secretariat

Brussels, 29 November 2024

Interinstitutional files:
2023/0202 (COD)

WK 15199/2024 INIT

LIMITE

DATAPROTECT
JAI
DIGIT
MI
FREMP
CODEC

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: To:	Presidency Delegations
N° Cion doc.:	ST 11657 2023 ADD 1 + ST 11657 2023 INIT
Subject:	Proposal for REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL laying down additional procedural rules relating to the enforcement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 - Discussion paper

In view of the meeting of the JHA Counsellors on data protection of 5th December, delegations will find in the annex a discussion paper from the Presidency.

The Presidency would also like to inform delegations that the revised draft compromise regarding Article 5 (early resolution) will be circulated later in a separate document.

<u>Annex</u>

Discussion paper

Delegations are reminded that the compromise texts presented in this discussion paper remain provisional, and are still subject to discussions with the Parliament at technical level. Further adjustments may therefore be necessary, depending on the outcome of the interinstitutional negotiations.

1. Admissibility of complaints (Article 3, starting from line 61) – Updated draft

The Presidency presents the below draft compromise as supplemented with additional texts reflecting the discussions at the interinstitutional technical meeting and the work within the drafting team.

In particular, the fourth subparagraph in paragraph 1 reflects a compromise which addresses the consequence of a case where a complaint does not contain the mandatory elements, resulting in the declaration of the complaint inadmissible by the supervisory authority after the expiry of a deadline yet to be agreed. This is to be read in conjunction with recital 4d (in line 14d) which still allows supervisory authorities to facilitate the submission of all required information by the complainant and to ask for further information. The compromise text in paragraph (1b) and the proposed corresponding recital clarify that the obligation of contacting the party under investigation applies only for a complaint relating to the exercise of the right of the data subject which requires a request to be submitted to data controller by the data subject concerned.

In addition, recital 3a (line 13a) of the Council position which is aimed to clarify the notion of complaint and to delineate it from other forms of warnings (tipping off) is maintained and its drafting is slightly adjusted to express the link with Article 77(1) and 80 of the GDPR as clearly as possible without referring to elements not featuring in those Articles (see new recital (4X)). All other recitals were aligned with the corresponding wording in the enacting terms.

The Presidency considers that those compromise texts reflect to a large extent the Council mandate while incorporating some elements from the EP position which are in line with the spirit of the Council position, also taking into account the context of the interinstitutional negotiations.

Changes compared to the previous drafted compromise presented in WK 14835/24 are highlighted in bold. The updated compromise text now also includes proposals for corresponding recitals.

Article 3
Complaints concerning cross-border processing

1. *A complaint on the basis of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 concerning cross-border processing shall be admissible provided that it includes the following information:*

   (a) *name of person or entity lodging the complaint;*

   (b) *where the complaint is lodged by a body, organisation or association referred to in Article 80 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, proof that the body, organisation or* *association has been properly constituted in accordance with the law of a Member State;*

(c) *where the complaint is lodged on the basis of Article 80(1) of Regulation 2016/679, name of the body, organisation or association, contact details and proof that the body, organisation or association lodging the complaint is acting on the basis of the mandate of a data subject;*

(d) *contact details of the person or entity lodging the complaint;*

(e) *information which facilitates the identification of the controller or processor which is the subject of the complaint;*

(f) *description of the alleged infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.*

Only information referred to in the first subparagraph shall be required in order for the complaint relating to cross-border processing to be admissible.

[*Administrative modalities and requirements under the national procedural law of the supervisory authority with which the complaint is lodged shall continue to apply.****]***

Where the supervisory authority with which a complaint has been lodged determines that the complaint does not contain the information referred to paragraph 1, it shall [, within two weeks of receiving the complaint,], declare the complaint inadmissible and inform the complainant about the reasons thereof.

1a. *Without prejudice to the admissibility of a complaint, supervisory authorities may ask the submission of supplementary information by the complainant in order to facilitate the handling of the complaint and enable the full investigation of the case.*

1b. The complainant shall not be required to contact the party under investigation before lodging a complaint in order for that complaint to be admissible.

<u>Proposal for a corresponding recital</u>

(xx) Unless the complaint relates to the exercise the right of the data subject which requires a request to be submitted to data controller by the data subject concerned, the complainant should not be required to contact the party under investigation before lodging a complaint in order for that complaint to be admissible.

2. *The supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged shall determine, by way of a preliminary conclusion, whether the complaint relates to cross-border processing, which supervisory authority is assumed to act as a lead supervisory authority in accordance with Article 56, paragraph 1 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, and if Article 56, paragraph 2 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 applies.*

3. *deleted*

4. *Where a complaint that relates to cross-border processing is admissible, in the absence of early resolution pursuant to Article 5, the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged shall transmit the complaint to the assumed lead supervisory authority and inform the*

complainant thereof. The assessment of the admissibility of the complaint by the supervisory authority with which the complaint has been lodged shall be binding on the lead supervisory authority.

Article 3 - Related recitals

(4) *In order for a complaint relating to cross-border processing to be admissible, it should contain specified information. No additional information should be required for such a complaint to be admissible. Administrative modalities and requirements of admissibility of complaints under national law of the supervisory authority with which a complaint has been lodged, such as language, statute of limitations, means of identification, electronic form, specific template or signature, continue to apply.*

(4a) *As part of the specified information required, the contact details of the person or entity lodging the complaint could include postal address, place of residence and, where available, email address.*

(4b) [To be discussed in connexion with the EP position on the Annex]

(4c) *Where the complainant is a natural person not in a position to exercise his or her right to lodge a complaint without the assistance of a legal representative, for example because he or she is a child or because he or she has a disability or vulnerability, the result of which is that his or her rights are exercised through another person, such as a parent, legal guardian or family member, and where such representation is allowed under national law, that circumstance must be clearly identified at the point in time at which the complaint is lodged.*

(4d) *Supervisory authorities should facilitate the submission of all required information by the complainant and could ask for further information from the complainant in order to facilitate the handling of the complaint. Where some of the information necessary for the complaint to be deemed admissible is missing, the supervisory authority with which the complaint is lodged could contact the complainant in order to obtain the missing information where feasible.*

(4e) *Where, following receipt of a complaint relating to cross-border processing from a supervisory authority, the lead supervisory authority requires additional information from the complainant in order to allow for the full investigation of the complaint, the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged should assist the lead supervisory authority, including by contacting the complainant to seek the required information if needed.*

(4f) *Supervisory authorities can facilitate the submission of complaints in a user-friendly electronic format and bearing in mind the needs of persons with disabilities, as long as the information required from the complainant corresponds to the specified information required and no additional information should be required in order to find the complaint admissible.*

(4X) *A complaint should be understood as a claim lodged by a data subject with a supervisory authority in accordance with Article 77(1) or Article 80 of the Regulation (EU) 2016/679. The mere reporting of alleged infringements which does not concern the processing of personal data relating to the data subject, requests for advice from controllers or processors or general*

requests regarding the application of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, either from controllers, processors or natural persons, should not be regarded as a complaint.

2. Investigation of complaints (Article 4)

After extensive negotiations with the European Parliament on this subject, an agreement has been reached on the introductory section (chapeau) of the Article (lines 69 to 72). The Council's original wording – with a small modification – has been accepted, with points (a) to (c) of the criteria being revised during the drafting session. These revisions align with the agreed legislative purpose, reflecting the shared intent of both institutions while accommodating necessary refinements. The remaining parts of Article 4 contain deadlines. These aspects are scheduled for discussion at a later stage, during interinstitutional technical meetings, as per the agreed timetable.

The Presidency has meticulously crafted the proposed provision to adhere as closely as possible to the text of the Council's general approach. Wherever it was feasible, the original wording from the Council mandate has been retained, ensuring consistency with the Council's intended framework. The Presidency approach strikes a careful balance between fidelity to the Council's initial position and the need to incorporate necessary clarifications and adjustments resulting from interinstitutional negotiations. This ensures that the evolving text respects the Council's objectives while accommodating shared solutions.

Article 4

[Investigation] of complaints

While assessing the extent appropriate to which a complaint should be investigated in each case the lead supervisory authority or, where applicable, the supervisory authorities concerned, shall take into account all relevant circumstances, including all of the following:

(a) the expediency of the investigation and the effective and timely resolution of the complaint;
(b) the nature [and/or gravity] of the alleged infringement;
(c) the systemic or repetitive character of the alleged infringement;
(d) other elements related to the complaint and relevant for the effective enforcement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.

3. Access to the administrative file and confidential information

In the course of the interinstitutional negotiations, it became apparent that both co-legislators support provisions in relation to the content of the administrative file, as well as the conditions for its access. Hence, the compromise wording reflects the content in Article 19 on the content of the administrative file and Article 20 on the access to the administrative file of the Council position, merging those two Articles, for the sake of a more streamlined structure, in a single Article.

As regards the Article on confidential information, is the Presidency has been advocating a draft text reflecting as much as possible Article 21 of the Council position. The Presidency consider that the draft text is almost entirely based on the text of Article 21 of the general approach and reflects all key principles thereof.

The proposed draft also includes in recital 32 a reference to the proportionality element of the assessment of the confidentiality claims as suggested by the Parliament.

Article xx

Administrative file

1. *The administrative file in an investigation concerning an alleged infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 consists of the documents which have been obtained, or produced by the concerned supervisory authorities and the lead supervisory authority, and assembled by the lead supervisory authority during the investigation procedure, including all inculpatory and exculpatory evidence.*

2. *Upon request of a party under investigation, or a complainant where the decision is liable to affect his or her interests adversely, the lead supervisory authority shall grant access to the to the administrative file to the parties under investigation, or the complainant, enabling them to exercise their right to be heard. [This shall be without prejudice to more favorable rules on granting access to the administrative file under national law.] Where access is granted, the party under investigation or the complainant shall exercise this access with the lead supervisory authority or the supervisory authority concerned, as the case may be.*

3. *The following documents or their parts shall be excluded from access, notwithstanding whether access is granted under Union or national law:*

   a) *internal communication within a supervisory authority;*

   b) *correspondence or deliberations between the supervisory authorities;*

   c) *confidential information pursuant to Article 8a(1) of this Regulation.*

4. *Access to relevant and reasoned objections pursuant to Article 60(4) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 on the basis to which the lead supervisory authority intends to adopt a revised draft decision shall only be provided by the lead supervisory authority where necessary to enable the parties under investigation or the complainant to express their views and defend their rights.*

Article xx

Identification and protection of confidential information

1. *Any information and documents or parts of documents shall be considered confidential in so far as they contain trade secrets as defined in Directive (EU) 2016/943 or other confidential information in accordance with Union and national law.*

2. *Unless otherwise provided by this Regulation, information collected, produced or obtained by a supervisory authority in cross-border cases under Regulation (EU) 2016/679, which is considered confidential pursuant to paragraph 1, shall not be communicated or made accessible to a party under investigation or a complainant. Such information shall also not be*

disclosed to third parties, unless required by Union or national law, [as long as the proceedings are ongoing].

3. *deleted*

4. *A party under investigation, a complainant, or a third-party submitting information that it considers to be confidential shall clearly identify the information which it considers to be confidential, giving reasons for the confidentiality claimed. The party under investigation, complainant, or third party shall always provide the full version of the information. Where possible, it shall also provide a proposed non-confidential [version].*

5. *Without prejudice to paragraph 4, the supervisory authority to which the information is submitted may require the parties under investigation, or any other party which produces documents pursuant to Regulation (EU) 2016/679, to identify the documents or parts of documents which they consider to contain trade secrets or other confidential information belonging to them and to identify the parties for which these documents are considered to be confidential.*

6. *The supervisory authority to which the information is submitted shall set a time-limit for parties under investigation and any other party raising a confidentiality claim to:*
   (a) *substantiate their claims for trade secrets and other confidential information for each individual document or part of document, statement, or part of statement;*
   (b) *provide, where possible, a non-confidential version of the documents and statements, in which the trade secrets and other confidential information are redacted;*
   (c) *provide a concise, non-confidential, description of each piece of redacted information.*

7. *If the parties under investigation or any other party fails to comply with paragraphs 5 and 6, the supervisory authority to which the information is submitted may assume that the documents or statements concerned do not contain business trade secrets or other confidential information.*

7a. *The authority to which the information is submitted shall determine whether or not the information or relevant and specific parts of documents are confidential, in accordance with paragraph 1, and shall inform the other supervisory authorities about the confidential nature of the information when transmitted.*

7b. *Information exchanged between supervisory authorities in the application of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, where it is regarded as confidential information under the national law of the supervisory authority to which the information is submitted, shall remain treated as confidential by the supervisory authority receiving it.*

<u>Corresponding recitals:</u>

(31) *When granting access to the administrative file to parties under investigation and the complainant, supervisory authorities should ensure the protection of trade secrets and other confidential information. The category of other confidential information includes information*

other than trade secrets, which may be considered as confidential in accordance with national law, insofar as its disclosure would significantly harm a controller, a processor or a natural or legal person. Confidential information shall in particular include information which is known only to a limited number of persons and which disclosure is liable to cause serious harm to the person who provided it or to third parties, and where the interests liable to be harmed by the disclosure of such information are, objectively, worthy of protection. The supervisory authorities should be able to request that parties under investigation that submit or have submitted documents or statements identify confidential information.

(32) Where trade secrets or other confidential information are necessary to prove an infringement, the supervisory authorities should assess for each individual document in a proportionate manner whether the need to disclose is greater than the harm which might result from disclosure. In disclosing documents containing personal data, the supervisory authorities should also take into account the principle of data minimisation.

4. Cooperation file

In the course of the interinstitutional negotiations, and following questions raised by the Presidency, the Parliament confirmed that it would not maintain its proposals in relation to a possible joint case file.

There is however a common understanding between the co-legislators as regards the use of an electronic tool that the authorities could access on a permanent basis, thus avoiding the need to constantly send documents back and forth to each other . The Parliament confirmed that it does not demand the establishment of a new system for that purpose.

Such file would be maintained by the lead supervisory authority and would be remotely accessible to the supervisory authorities concerned, and depending on the case, to the Board. It would contain all information exchanged pursuant to Article 8 of this Regulation.

To clearly distinguish it from the "administrative file", it could be called "cooperation file" clearly reflecting the context in which it would be used by the supervisory authorities.

The Presidency considers that the above elements agreed between the co-legislators and reflecting the current practice are in line with the Council mandate and thus the draft proposals read in conjunction with the proposed updated version of recital (37a) in line 47a constitute an adequate compromise.

Article 8b

Cooperation file

1. The lead supervisory authority shall maintain a cooperation file dedicated to each complaint or investigation. The cooperation file shall be maintained in electronic form and shall be remotely accessible to supervisory authorities concerned and to the Board upon submission of a matter to dispute resolution under Article 65(1)(a) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, and, where applicable, when an urgent opinion or an urgent binding decision is requested pursuant to

Article 66 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. It shall not be directly accessible to parties under investigation, complainants or third parties. Council to send an additional drafting proposal.

2. *The cooperation file shall include all information exchanged pursuant to Article 8 of this Regulation.*

Corresponding recital

(37a) The successful implementation of the Regulation requires adequate communication tools supporting the exchange of relevant information in line with the Regulation. The cooperation file, to be maintained by the lead supervisory authority for the purpose of exchanging relevant information, should rely on an appropriate secure communication tool accessible to all supervisory authorities, building upon the experience gained in using the existing tools.

5. Judicial remedies (Article 26b)

Background

Article 26b of the EP position provides for a right to an effective judicial remedy against a supervisory authority in which each party to the procedure would have the right to turn to a court if

a) the supervisory authority with which the complaint has been lodged does not use its powers to ensure that another supervisory authority progresses the procedure, or
b) the lead supervisory authority does not comply with the deadlines provide for in the proposed Regulation, or
c) the supervisory authority does not comply with the decision of the EDPB.

The EP has considered the arguments of the Presidency and agreed that point c) is indeed unnecessary, thus they would be flexible on deleting that, but other than that, they still consider this Article to be useful in the context of the procedural regulation.

However, the EP also appeared open to further clarify wording of this provision. The EP's main concern is that to their knowledge there were some cases where cooperation under Article 60(1) of the GDPR were not triggered (and further ensured) so while they completely agree that such inaction shall be subject to remedies under the GDPR, in their view this also shall be strictly pointed out in the Regulation as well. The EP also noted that deadlines are indeed very important and they will push for strict deadlines, but missed deadlines shall also have their consequences.

Solutions to find a compromise:

In view of the fact that the EP also understand that there is no need for a new „right" to be laid down in this Regulation (as this is not a new right), a possible solution could be a provision that *only reflects* the existing remedies under the GDPR – without altering, amending or contradicting it.

The Presidency would there like to hear the view of delegations on a possible provision that would only reflect the content of the rights for the complainant provided for in Article 78 relating to the cases that the proposed Regulation covers (cross-border cases).

The EP position contains general principles in Article 2a and 2b and based on which a proposed wording could be envisaged:

„The right to an effective judicial remedy as provided for in Article 78 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 shall [mutatis mutandis] also apply to cases relating to cross-border processing laid down in this Regulation.”

➔ **Delegations are invited to express their views on the elements above and proposal above.**

6. Deadlines

In order to facilitate the preparation of the discussion with the European Parliament regarding deadlines, the Presidency invites delegations to consider the following table, which compiles the position of the Parliament and Council regarding the main steps and deadlines of the additional procedural rules laid down by the Regulation.

➔ **During the meeting, the Presidency will invite delegations to express their views on a possible compromise regarding each time-limit, and indicate their degree of flexibility in terms of minimum or maximum time-limits, as the case may be.**

In addition to the possible compromises on time-lines discussed as per the table above, the Presidency would like to invite delegations to reflect on the consequences of non-compliance of the time-limit set in the proposed Regulation. It appears that this question has not always been addressed consistently in the Parliament and Council positions.

With a view to advance reflexion on this matter and future discussions with the Parliament, the Presidency consider that two main cases should be addressed:

- Deadlines related to the cooperation between supervisory authorities: The Presidency is of the view the consequences of not complying with such deadlines could be addressed by introducing, where relevant and appropriate, a reference to the presumption of an urgent need to act under Article 66(1) GDPR. Such a provision could actually mirror the GDPR wording of Article 61(8): *“In that case, the urgent need to act under Article 66(1) shall be presumed to be met and require an urgent binding decision from the Board pursuant to Article 66(2).”*
- Deadlines related to the relations between supervisory authorities and parties under investigation and the complainant: the Presidency is of the view that the consequence of not complying with such deadline should actually be considered as a situation covered under Article 78 GDPR (Right to an effective judicial remedy).

➔ **Delegations are invited to express their views on the element above and more generally on the opportunity to introduce in the regulation further clarification in this regard.**

Line[1]	Submission and handling of complaints	CSL Mandate	EP Mandate	Poss. compromise (min)	Poss. compromise (max)
COMPLAINT – Admissibility and competence of the LSA					
line 62h line 62k line 62l	Time-limit for the decision on the admissibility of a complaint	4 weeks + 2 weeks	2 weeks		
line 63 line 65a	Time-limit for confirmation of the competence of lead supervisory authority	8 weeks from receiving the complaint	3 weeks (after acknowledging admissibility) = 5 weeks from receiving the complaint		
line 63k	The LSA shall immediately provide the complaint to the PUI and request a reply	-	within undue delay, but no later than 3 weeks (from the day the PUI was informed by the LSA) + 3 weeks in complex cases		
Summary of key issues					
line 100 line 105a	Time limit for the summary of key issues to be sent to CSA	3+3 months (from the confirmation of the LSA competence)	1 month (from the receiving of the complaint)		

[1] Corresponding line number in 4-column document provided in WK 14835/24

line 106	Time-limit for the provision of comments by CSA on the summary of key issues	4 weeks + 2 weeks	4 weeks		
line 107a	Time-limit for the LSA to respond to comments	4 weeks + 4 weeks			
Cooperation between supervisory authorities					
line 118	Time-limit for a request to be made to the LSA under Article 61 GDPR or Article 62 GDPR in case of disagreement on the summary of key issues.	1 month	2 months		
line 118a	Time-limit in case of request of joint operation request, the LSA should respond to the request	1 month	-		
line 120	Request for EDPB urgent binding decision in the absence of consensus on the summary of key issues	No deadline	4 weeks (after the expiry of the deadlines for comments)		
Preliminary findings					
line 113b	Time-limit for the communication of the preliminary finding in case none of the CSA provided comments on the summary of key issues or in case consensus was found	6 months (may be extended once in an exceptional case)	-		
line 124a	Time-limit for the communication of the preliminary findings following the	6 months (may be extended once in an exceptional case)			

	implementation of the urgent binding decision by the Board.				
line 142a	Time-limit for CSAs to provide comments on the preliminary findings	4 weeks + 2 weeks (upon request of one of the CSAs)			
Hearing of the parties under investigation and complainant					
line 144	Time-limit for the parties under investigation to provide their views on the preliminary findings	4 weeks + 2 weeks (upon request of the PUI)	-		
line 148	Time-limit for the complainant to make its views known on the preliminary finding	4 weeks + 2 weeks (upon request of the complainant)	-		
line 157	Time-limit for the parties under investigation to make their views known on the revised draft decision	4 weeks + 2 weeks (upon request of the PUI)	-		
line 211	Time-limit for the parties under investigation and/or complainant to make their views known on the EDPB statement of reasons	"The Board shall set a time limit"	*No right to be heard at EDPB level (Deletion of Art. 24)*		
Draft decision					
line 72b line 72c line 72d line 72e line 72f	Time-limit for issuing a draft decision after receiving a complaint or initiating an ex officio procedure		9 months + 2 months in case of comments on the summary of key issues + 2 months in case of fines or penalties		

line 72g line 74ae line 74af line 74 ag line 74ah line 74ai			+ period of time for "procedural determination" + possible extension by the Board (up to 9 months – line 231d)		
Line 112	Time-limit for issuing a draft decision in the absence of comments to the summary of key issues	-	3 months		
line 146a	Time-limit for the LSA to submit a draft decision after hearing of the parties under investigation and receiving the views of the complainant	3 months (from the receiving if the views of the PUI) – may be extended once in an exceptional case			
Final decision					
line 154	Time-limit for the LSA to adopt and notify its decision	1 month	1 month (from the end of the periods referred to in Art. 60 (4) and (5) of the GDPR		
line 154m	Time-limit for the SAs to publish all legally binding decisions they issue	-	without undue delay, but no later than 3 months (after adoptions)		
Full or partial rejection of a complaint					

line 128	Time-limit for the complainant to make her or his view known on a full or partial rejection of the complaint	4 weeks + 2 weeks (upon request of the complainant)	-		
line 129	Time-limit for the CSA to transmit the complainant's views to the LSA	"without delay"	-		
Dispute resolution (EDPB procedures)					
line 154b line 191	Time-limit for the LSA to submit the matter to the consistency mechanism	4 weeks	4 weeks		
line 191a	Time-limit for the LSA to submit a revised draft or refer to the subject-matter to the Board	3 months	-		
line 191b	Time-limit for the LSA to submit another revised draft or refer to the subject-matter to the Board	3 months	-		
line 200	Time-limit for the Board to identify retained relevant and reasoned objections.	4 weeks	2 weeks		
line 200a	Time-limit for authorities to provide additional information to the Board	-	no later than 1 week (after having received the request)		
line 200b	Time-limit for the CSA to submit other relevant information	-	2 weeks (after having been provided with the submission)		
line 202	Time-limit for the Chair of the Board to register the referral after having received all documents	no later than 1 week (after having received all of the documents)	-		

line 221	Time-limit for the Chair of the Board to register the referral after having received all documents	no later than 1 week (after having received the documents)			
line 221b	Time-limit for the supervisory authority to acknowledge receipt of the binding decision and its competence	1 month	-		
line 230	Time-limit for the Chair of the Board to submit the views of supervisory authorities on the referred subject matter	2 weeks	2 weeks	already agreed	already agreed
line 231	Time-limit for the Chair of the Board to register the referral after having received all documents	no later than 1 week	no later than 1 week		
line 231a	Time-limit to provide file to EDPB members	“As soon as the file is registered by the Chair of the Board”	-		
line 231i	Time-limit within which the Board shall determine the matter	-	2 weeks		
Urgency procedure (EDPB)					
line 234	Time-limit for a request for an urgent opinion of the Board to be made	4 weeks (prior to the expiry of provisional measures adopted)	3 weeks (prior to the expiry of provisional measures adopted)		
line 237c	Time-limit for the Chair of the Board to register the referral after having received all documents	no later than 1 week (after having received the documents referred)	-		

line 240	Time-limit for a request for an urgent decision of the Board to be made	4 weeks (prior to the expiry of provisional measures adopted)	3 weeks (after the adoption of provisional measures)		
line 246b	Time-limit for the Chair of the Board to register the referral after having received all documents	no later than 1 week (after having received the documents)	-		
line 246c	Time-limit for the parties under investigation or complainant to make their views knows prior to the adoption of an urgent binding decision by the Board	"Prior to the adoption of the urgent binding decision"	-		
line 250h	Time-limit for the Chair of the Board to register the referral	no later than 1 week (after having received the documents)	-		
line 250i	Time-limit for the Board to assess whether the adoption of such decision relies on elements on which the PUI have not been provided	"Prior to the adoption of the urgent binding decision"	-		
line 250j	Time-limit for the SA to adopt appropriate measures	as soon as possible and within a maximum of 1 month	-		