



Council of the European Union
General Secretariat

**Interinstitutional files:
2023/0202 (COD)**

Brussels, 20 May 2025

WK 6663/2025 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:	Presidency
To:	Delegations

N° Cion doc.:	ST 11657 2023 INIT + ST 11657 2023 ADD 1
---------------	--

Subject:	Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down additional procedural rules relating to the enforcement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 - 4-column table
----------	---

Delegations will find in the Annex for their information the version of the 4-column table prepared for the third trilogue scheduled on 21 May 2025 on the above-mentioned file.

**Proposal for a REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL laying down additional procedural rules relating to the enforcement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679
2023/0202(COD)**

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
Formula				
1	2023/0202 (COD)	2023/0202 (COD)	2023/0202 (COD)	2023/0202 (COD) <small>Text Origin: Commission Proposal</small>
Proposal Title				
2	Proposal for a REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL laying down additional procedural rules relating to the enforcement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679	Proposal for a REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL laying down additional procedural rules relating to the enforcement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679	Proposal for a REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL laying down additional procedural rules relating to the enforcement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (Text with EEA relevance)	Proposal for a REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL laying down additional procedural rules relating to the enforcement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 <u>(Text with EEA relevance)</u> <small>Text Origin: Council Mandate</small>
Formula				
3	THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND THE COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION,	THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND THE COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION,	THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND THE COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION,	THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND THE COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION, <small>Text Origin: Commission Proposal</small>
Citation 1				
4	Having regard to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, and in particular Article 16 thereof,	Having regard to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, and in particular Article 16 thereof,	Having regard to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, and in particular Article 16 thereof,	Having regard to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, and in particular Article 16 thereof,

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Citation 2				
6	5 Having regard to the proposal from the European Commission,	Having regard to the proposal from the European Commission,	Having regard to the proposal from the European Commission,	Having regard to the proposal from the European Commission, Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Citation 3				
6	6 After transmission of the draft legislative act to the national parliaments,	After transmission of the draft legislative act to the national parliaments,	After transmission of the draft legislative act to the national parliaments,	After transmission of the draft legislative act to the national parliaments, Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Citation 4				
6	7 Having regard to the opinion of the European Economic and Social Committee ¹ , <u>1. OJ C , , p. .</u>	Having regard to the opinion of the European Economic and Social Committee ¹ , <u>1. OJ C , , p. .</u>	Having regard to the opinion of the European Economic and Social Committee ¹ , <u>1. OJ C , , p. .</u>	Having regard to the opinion of the European Economic and Social Committee ¹ , <u>1. OJ C , , p. .</u> Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Citation 5				
6	8 Having regard to the opinion of the Committee of the Regions ¹ , <u>1. OJ C , , p. .</u>	Having regard to the opinion of the Committee of the Regions ¹ , <u>1. OJ C , , p. .</u>	Having regard to the opinion of the Committee of the Regions ² , <u>1. OJ C , , p. .</u> <u>2. OJ C , , p. .</u>	Having regard to the opinion of the Committee of the Regions ² , <u>1. OJ C , , p. .</u> <u>2. OJ C , , p. .</u> Text Origin: Council Mandate
Citation 6				
6	9 Acting in accordance with the ordinary legislative procedure,	Acting in accordance with the ordinary legislative procedure,	Acting in accordance with the ordinary legislative procedure,	Acting in accordance with the ordinary legislative procedure,

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Formula				
10	Whereas:	Whereas:	Whereas:	Whereas: Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Recital 1				
11	<p>(1) Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council¹ establishes a decentralised enforcement system which aims to ensure the consistent interpretation and application of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 in cross-border cases. In cases concerning cross-border processing of personal data, this system requires cooperation between supervisory authorities in an endeavour to reach consensus and, where supervisory authorities cannot reach consensus, provides for dispute resolution by the European Data Protection Board (the Board).</p> <p>¹ Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive 95/46/EC (General Data Protection Regulation) (OJ L 119, 4.5.2016, p. 1).</p>	<p>(1) Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council¹ establishes a decentralised enforcement system which aims to ensure the consistent interpretation and application of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 in cross-border cases. In cases concerning cross-border processing of personal data, this system requires cooperation between supervisory authorities in an endeavour to reach consensus and, where supervisory authorities cannot reach consensus, provides for dispute resolution by the European Data Protection Board (the Board).</p> <p>¹ Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive 95/46/EC (General Data Protection Regulation) (OJ L 119, 4.5.2016, p. 1).</p>	<p>(1) Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council¹ establishes a decentralised enforcement system which aims to ensure the consistent interpretation and application of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 in cross-border cases. In cases concerning cross-border processing of personal data, this system requires cooperation between supervisory authorities in an endeavour to reach consensus and, where supervisory authorities cannot reach consensus, provides for dispute resolution by the European Data Protection Board (the Board).</p> <p>¹ Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive 95/46/EC (General Data Protection Regulation) (OJ L 119, 4.5.2016, p. 1).</p>	<p>(1) Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council¹ establishes a decentralised enforcement system which aims to ensure the consistent interpretation and application of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 in cross-border cases. In cases concerning cross-border processing of personal data, this system requires cooperation between supervisory authorities in an endeavour to reach consensus and, where supervisory authorities cannot reach consensus, provides for dispute resolution by the European Data Protection Board (the Board).</p> <p>¹ Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive 95/46/EC (General Data Protection Regulation) (OJ L 119, 4.5.2016, p. 1).</p> <p>Text Origin: Commission Proposal</p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
Recital 2				
12	<p>(2) In order to provide for the smooth and effective functioning of the cooperation and dispute resolution mechanism provided for in Articles 60 and 65 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, it is necessary to lay down rules concerning the conduct of proceedings by the supervisory authorities in cross-border cases, and by the Board during dispute resolution, including the handling of cross-border complaints. It is also necessary for this reason to lay down rules concerning the exercise of the right to be heard by the parties under investigation prior to the adoption of decisions by supervisory authorities and, as the case may be, by the Board.</p>	<p>(2) In order to provide for the smooth and effective functioning of the cooperation and dispute resolution mechanism provided for in Articles 60 and 65 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, it is necessary to lay down rules concerning the conduct of proceedings by the supervisory authorities in cross-border cases, and by the Board during dispute resolution, including the handling of cross-border complaints. It is also necessary for this reason to lay down rules concerning the exercise of the right to be heard by the parties under investigation prior to the adoption of decisions by supervisory authorities and, as the case may be, by the Board. <u>This Regulation thereby aims at protecting the right to good administration as enshrined in Article 41 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union (the ‘Charter’). To achieve this objective, when applying provisions of this Regulation, all data protection authorities should act in an impartial and independent manner and in accordance with the rule of law, as enshrined in Article 2 of the Treaty on European Union.</u></p>	<p>(2) In order to provide for the smooth and effective functioning of the cooperation and dispute resolution mechanism provided for in Articles 60 and 65 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, it is necessary to lay down rules concerning the conduct of proceedings by the supervisory authorities in cross-border cases, and by the Board during dispute resolution, including the handling of cross-border complaints. It is also necessary for this reason to lay down rules concerning the exercise of the right to be heard by the parties under investigation prior to the adoption of decisions by supervisory authorities and, as the case may be, by the Board.</p>	<p>(2) In order to provide for the smooth and effective functioning of the cooperation and dispute resolution mechanism provided for in Articles 60 and 65 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, it is necessary to lay down rules concerning the conduct of proceedings by the supervisory authorities in cross-border cases, and by the Board during dispute resolution, including the handling of cross-border complaints. It is also necessary for this reason to lay down rules concerning the exercise of the right to be heard by the parties under investigation prior to the adoption of decisions by supervisory authorities and, as the case may be, by the Board.</p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p> <p>Text Origin: Commission Proposal</p>
Recital 2a				


	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
12a		<u><i>(2a) This Regulation and Chapter VII of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 only govern certain elements of the cooperation procedure, when supervisory authorities of more than one Member State participate in the procedure. This Regulation does not apply when a party lodges a complaint directly with a lead supervisory authority in another Member State.</i></u>	PUBLIC	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>deleted</i></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
<i>Recital 2b</i>				
12b		<u><i>(2b) The procedural law of each Member State should apply to the supervisory authorities insofar as this Regulation does not harmonise a matter. Some procedural elements, such as the horizontal burden of proof of the controller in Article 5(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, are already governed by Union law. In line with the primacy of Union law, supervisory authorities should not apply national procedural law where it is in conflict with this Regulation and Regulation (EU) 2016/679. Cooperation among supervisory authorities should not be limited because of differences in national procedural law. Supervisory authorities should make use of all options under applicable national law to allow parties in another Member State to participate in procedures. This may include</i></u>		<p><u><i>(2b) In the absence of EU rules governing the matter, it is for each Member State, in accordance with the principle of the procedural autonomy of the Member States, to lay down the detailed rules of administrative and judicial procedures intended to ensure a high level of protection of rights which individuals derive from EU law. The procedural law of each Member State should therefore apply to the supervisory authorities insofar as this Regulation does not harmonise a matter, and as long as such national procedural rules do not impede the principles of effectiveness and equivalence of EU law.</i></u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
		<u>remote video participation, interpreters or generally available means of communication.</u>		
Recital 3				
6	13	(3) Complaints are an essential source of information for detecting infringements of data protection rules. Defining clear and efficient procedures for the handling of complaints in cross-border cases is necessary since the complaint may be dealt with by a supervisory authority other than the one to which the complaint was lodged.	(3) Complaints are an essential source of information for detecting infringements of data protection rules. Defining clear and efficient procedures for the handling of complaints in cross-border cases is necessary since the complaint may be dealt with by a supervisory authority other than the one to which the complaint was lodged. <u>To this end, it is recommended that an efficient mechanism for communication between supervisory authorities should be created used so as to facilitate rapid and secure sharing of information necessary to resolve complaints in accordance with data protection rules.</u>	(3) Complaints are an essential source of information for detecting infringements of data protection rules. <u>Information provided by complainant as part of the complaint lodged or when making their views known can include arguments and evidences which can help progress the investigation.</u> Defining clear and efficient procedures for the handling of complaints in cross-border cases is necessary since the complaint may be dealt with by a supervisory authority other than the one to which the complaint was lodged. ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Recital 3a				
6	13a			<u>(3a) This Regulation aims at ensuring that investigations in cases of cross-border processing are dealt in accordance with the principle of good administration, in particular that they are dealt impartially, fairly and within a reasonable time. To this end, this</u>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				<u>Regulation lays down some horizontal principles relating to the procedures in the enforcement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 for cross-border processing.</u>
Recital 3b				
13b			(3a) 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, seeking protection of his or her rights due to an alleged infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 by processing of the data subject's personal data. 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 the GDPR, either from controllers, processors or natural persons, should not be regarded as a complaint.	<u>(3b) 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.</u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Recital 4				
14	(4) In order to be admissible a complaint should contain certain specified information. Therefore, in order to assist complainants in submitting the necessary facts to the supervisory authorities, a complaint	(4) In order to be admissible a complaint should contain certain <u>specified minimum information about the alleged violation, whether ongoing or past. The cessation of a violation should not</u>	(4) In order to be admissible a complaint should contain certain specified information. Therefore, in order to assist complainants in submitting the necessary facts to the supervisory authorities, a complaint	(4) <u>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</u>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	<p>form should be provided. The information specified in the form should be required only in cases of cross-border processing in the sense of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, though the form may be used by supervisory authorities for cases that do not concern cross-border processing. The form may be submitted electronically or by post. The submission of the information listed in that form should be a condition for a complaint relating to cross-border processing to be treated as a complaint as referred to in Article 77 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. No additional information should be required for a complaint to be deemed admissible. It should be possible for supervisory authorities to 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 information required by the form and no additional information is required in order to find the complaint admissible.</p>	<p><u><i>be sufficient grounds to reject a complaint.</i></u> Therefore, in order to assist complainants in submitting the necessary facts to the supervisory authorities, a complaint form<u>template</u> should be provided. The information specified in the form<u>template</u> should be required only in cases of cross-border processing in the sense of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, though the form<u>template</u> may be used by supervisory authorities for cases that do not concern cross-border processing. The form<u>information</u> may be submitted electronically or by post. The submission of the information listed in that form should be a condition for a complaint relating to cross-border processing to be treated as a complaint as referred to in Article 77 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. No additional information should be required for a complaint to be deemed admissible. <u><i>Where a complaint does not meet the minimum requirements, the supervisory authority should reject it and inform the complainant about the missing information. The complainant can then resubmit a complete complaint. While the complainant should not be required to contact the party under investigation before submitting a complaint, if the complainant was</i></u></p>	<p>form should be provided. The information specified in the form should be required only in cases of cross-border processing in the sense of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, though the form may be used by supervisory authorities for cases that do not concern cross-border processing. The form may be submitted electronically or by post. The submission of the information listed in that form should be a condition for a complaint relating to cross-border processing to be treated as a complaint as referred to in Article 77 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. No additional information should be required for a complaint relating to cross-border processing to be deemed admissible. It should be possible for supervisory authorities to facilitate the submission. However, administrative modalities and requirements for the admissibility of complaints in a user-friendly under the national procedural law of the supervisory authority with which a complaint is lodged, such as language, statute of limitations, means of identification, electronic format and bearing in mind the needs of persons with disabilities, as long as the information required from the complainant corresponds to the information required by the form</p>	<p><u><i>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.</i></u></p> <p><u><i>New recital (xx) The complainant should not be required to contact the party under investigation before lodging a complaint in order for that complaint to be admissible. Where the complaint relates to the exercise of a right of the data subject which relies on a request to be submitted to the data controller by the data subject concerned, such request is expected to be made to the controller before the submission of such complaint.</i></u></p> <p><u><i>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,</i></u></p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
		<p><u>in contact with the party under investigation before submitting the complaint relating to the same matter, he or she should submit the communication related to that contact.</u> It should be possible for supervisory authorities to 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 information required by the form and no additional information is required in order to find the complaint admissible.</p>	<p>and no additional information is required in order to find the complaint admissible, specific template or signature, continue to apply.</p>	<p><u>paragraph 2 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 applies.</u></p> <p><u>Where a procedure for the early resolution has not been initiated, the supervisory authority with which the complaint has been lodged should transmit the admissible 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 should be binding on the lead supervisory authority.</u> In order to be admissible a complaint should contain certain specified information. Therefore, in order to assist complainants in submitting the necessary facts to the supervisory authorities, a complaint form should be provided. The information specified in the form should be required only in cases of cross-border processing in the sense of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, though the form may be used by supervisory authorities for cases that do not concern cross-border processing. The form may be submitted electronically or by post. The submission of the information listed in that form should be a condition for a complaint relating to cross-border processing to be</p>


	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				<i>treated as a complaint as referred to in Article 77 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. No additional information should be required for a complaint to be deemed admissible. It should be possible for supervisory authorities to 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 information required by the form and no additional information is required in order to find the complaint admissible.</i>
Recital 4a				
6	14a		(4a) As part of the specified information required, the contact details of the person, or entity, filling the complaint could include the postal address, place of residence, and where available email address, in order to allow supervisory authorities to acknowledge receipt of complaint and, when necessary, contact the complainant.	<u>(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.</u>
Recital 4b				
6	14b		(4b) Where the entity filling the complaint is a body, organisation or association referred to in Article 80 of Regulation 2016/679, a proof that the body,	<u>(4b) Where the entity filling the complaint is a body, organisation or association referred to in Article 80 of Regulation 2016/679, a proof that the body, organisation or</u>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
			<p>organisation or association has been properly constituted in accordance with the national law of the Member State of the authority with which the complaint is lodged should be provided, together with a proof that such body, organisation or association is acting on the basis of the mandate of the data subject. The modalities and procedures for the establishment of such proofs are determined in accordance with the national law of the Member State of the authority with which the complaint was lodged.</p>	<p><u>association has been properly constituted in accordance with the national law of the Member State of the authority with which the complaint is lodged should be provided, together with a proof that such body, organisation or association is acting on the basis of the mandate of the data subject. The modalities and procedures for the establishment of such proofs are determined in accordance with the national law of the Member State of the authority with which the complaint was lodged.</u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p> <p>Text Origin: Council Mandate</p>
Recital 4c				
14c			<p>(4c) Where the complainant is a natural person not in a position to exercise his/her right to lodge a complaint without the assistance of a legal representative, for example because he/she is a child or because he/she has a disability or vulnerability, the result of which is that his/her rights are being 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</p>	<p><u>(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</u></p>


	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
			<p>identified at the point in time at which the complaint is lodged together with sufficient information so as to enable the supervisory authority with which the complaint is lodged to satisfy itself that it is appropriate for it to engage with the representative on the complainant's behalf.</p>	<p><u>point in time at which the complaint is lodged.</u></p>
Recital 4d				
14d			<p>(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. Only the supervisory authority with which the complaint is lodged should decide on its admissibility and such decision should be binding on the lead supervisory authority.</p>	<p><u>(4d) Supervisory authorities should facilitate the submission of all required information by the complainant. This could include providing templates or electronic forms, including in line with relevant European Data Protection Board's guidelines. Supervisory authorities 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. Where the complaint is inadmissible, the supervisory authority should decide on its inadmissibility within the deadline provided by this Regulation while informing the complainant of the missing information, so as to allow</u></p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				<u>him to resubmit an admissible complaint.</u>
Recital 4e				
14e			<p>(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. The lead supervisory authority should not contest the admissibility of a complaint relating to cross-border processing.</p>	<p><u>(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.</u></p> <p>Text Origin: Council Mandate</p>
Recital 4f				
14f			<p>(4f) It should be possible for supervisory authorities to 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</p>	<p><u>(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</u></p>


	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
			should be required in order to find the complaint admissible.	<u>be required in order to find the complaint admissible.</u>
Recital 4g				
6	14g			<p><u>(4g) Where the lead supervisory authority initiates an investigation on the basis of a complaint, the parties under investigation should be informed without delay about the lodging of the complaint and the main elements thereof. Such provision of information by the lead supervisory authority could however be postponed for as long as it is necessary to protect the integrity of the investigation and allow for the effective conduct of investigative measures.</u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
Recital 5				
6	15	(5) Supervisory authorities are obliged to decide on complaints within a reasonable timeframe. What is a reasonable timeframe depends on the circumstances of each case and, in particular, its context, the various procedural steps followed by the lead supervisory authority, the conduct of the parties in the course of the procedure and the complexity of the case.	(5) Supervisory authorities are obliged to decide on complaints within a reasonable timeframe. What is a reasonable timeframe depends on the circumstances of each case and, in particular, its context, the various procedural steps followed by the lead supervisory authority, the conduct of the parties in the course of the procedure and the complexity of the case. <u>Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) and</u>	(5) Supervisory authorities are obliged to <u>should</u> decide on complaints within a reasonable timeframe. <u>For this reason, this regulation lays down time limits.</u> What is a reasonable timeframe depends on the circumstances of each case and, in particular, its context, the various procedural steps followed by the lead supervisory authority, the conduct of the parties in the course of the procedure and the complexity of the case.

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
		<p><u>Articles 41 and 47 of the Charter require a reasonable overall duration of procedures. Given that this includes judicial remedies under Article 78 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, procedures before supervisory authorities should typically not take more than nine months, unless exceptional circumstances arise. This Regulation foresees prolongations for delays or disruptions that are outside of the control of the lead supervisory authority. To that end, sufficient funding and staffing should be ensured in order to guarantee a timely and efficient handling of cases that does not affect the right to a good administration.</u></p>		<p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p> <p>Text Origin: Council Mandate</p>
Recital 5a				
15a		<p><u>(5a) The direct interaction between Member States' supervisory authorities and the parties is governed by national procedural law, insofar as Regulation (EU) 2016/679, this Regulation or Union law do not take primacy. In the case of indirect interaction of a lead supervisory authority with a party via another supervisory authority, the latter authority's procedural law should apply to any direct interaction with the party. In line with Article 56(6) of Regulation</u></p>		<p><u>(5a) A complainant should have the possibility to exclusively communicate with the supervisory authority with which the complaint has been lodged. This should not prevent the complainant from communicating directly with another supervisory authority, including the lead supervisory authority.</u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
		<u>(EU) 2016/679, a complainant has the right to solely communicate with the supervisory authority with which the complaint has been lodged. This does not prevent the complainant to directly communicate with another supervisory authority, including the lead supervisory authority, which may be more efficient.</u>	PUBLIC	
Recital 5b				
15b		<u>(5b) To ensure that minimum requirements of fair and efficient procedures are met in all cross-border cases, including in Member States where there is no codified national procedural law, the Regulation sets directly applicable rules based on Article 41 of the Charter.</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Recital 5c				
15c		<u>(5c) It should be possible to apply, in accordance with national procedural law applicable to the supervisory authority that the party directly interacts with, strictly necessary and proportionate limitations in relation to the disclosure or the further use of legally protected information, such as personal data or trade secrets protected under Directive (EU) 2016/943^{1a}. This could include the internal deliberations and decision-making of the authority. The least</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
		<p><u><i>intrusive measures, such as limitation of the use of information or blackening of information should be applied. Parties should always be informed that information was withheld from them, and why.</i></u></p> <p><u><i>Ia. Directive (EU) 2016/943 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 8 June 2016 on the protection of undisclosed know-how and business information (trade secrets) against their unlawful acquisition, use and disclosure (OJ L 157, 15.6.2016, p. 1.)</i></u></p>		
<i>Recital 5d</i>				
<i>15d</i>		<p><u><i>(5d) The lead supervisory authority manages the case in line with this Regulation, Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and its national procedural law, while fully cooperating with other supervisory authorities in a spirit of common understanding and trust. Other supervisory authorities should provide any relevant information and their views to the lead supervisory authority. The lead supervisory authority should structure the case in an efficient and expedient way taking full account of the views of other supervisory authorities. At the same time, the procedure should be in line with Regulation (EU) 2016/679, in particular the one-stop-shop dispute resolution</i></u></p>		<p><u><i>(5d) Supervisory authorities should conduct procedures in an expedient and efficient way and should cooperate with each other in a sincere and effective manner, including by providing support where necessary and responding to requests without delay.</i></u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
		<u>architecture and the competences of the lead supervisory authority.</u>		
Recital 5e				
6	15e	<u>(5e) Supervisory authorities may also start additional procedures, for example in the case of systemic or repetitive infringements. This should however, not lead to any interference with the rights of the parties.</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Recital 5f				
6	15f	<u>(5f) Violations may concern the rights of multiple data subjects, therefore, evidence from procedures may need to be used in other procedures to facilitate an efficient procedure and consistent decision making. In order to objectively assess the amount of non-material damages based on the average data subject, civil courts may benefit from relying on established facts and evidence to determine a claim under Article 82 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Recital 5g				
6	15g	<u>(5g) Each supervisory authority should define one or more languages that it accepts for incoming information by other supervisory authorities. An additional joint “cooperation language” should be defined which all supervisory authorities must</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level



	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
		<p><u>accept for incoming or outgoing information. In case of judicial remedies, the supervisory authority against which a judicial remedy is brought should have the duty to translate all relevant documents to the accepted languages.</u></p>	<p>PUBLIC</p>	
Recital 6				
16	<p>(6) Each complaint handled by a supervisory authority pursuant to Article 57(1), point (f), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 is to be investigated with all due diligence to the extent appropriate bearing in mind that every use of powers by the supervisory authority must be appropriate, necessary and proportionate in view of ensuring compliance with Regulation (EU) 2016/679. It falls within the discretion of each competent authority to decide the extent to which a complaint should be investigated. While assessing the extent appropriate of an investigation, supervisory authorities should aim to deliver a satisfactory resolution to the complainant, which may not necessarily require exhaustively investigating all possible legal and factual elements arising from the complaint, but which provides an effective and quick remedy to the complainant. The assessment of the extent of the investigative measures</p>	<p>(6) Each complaint handled by a supervisory authority pursuant to Article 57(1), point (f), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 is to be investigated with all due diligence to the extent appropriate bearing in mind that every use of powers by the supervisory authority must be appropriate <u>effective, necessary and</u> proportionate <u>and dissuasive</u> in view of ensuring compliance with Regulation (EU) 2016/679. It falls within the discretion of each competent authority to decide the extent to which a complaint should be investigated. While assessing the extent appropriate of an investigation, supervisory authorities should aim to deliver a satisfactory resolution to the complainant, which may not necessarily require <u>exhaustively requires</u> investigating all possible <u>relevant</u> legal and factual elements arising from the complaint, but which provides to <u>ensure that a decision can be jointly taken and</u> an effective and</p>	<p>(6) Each complaint handled by a supervisory authority pursuant to Article 57(1), point (f), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 is to should be investigated with all due diligence to the extent appropriate bearing in mind that every use of powers by the supervisory authority must be appropriate, necessary and proportionate in view of ensuring compliance with Regulation (EU) 2016/679. It falls within the discretion of each competent authority to decide the extent to which a complaint should be investigated. While assessing the extent appropriate of an investigation, supervisory authorities should aim to deliver a satisfactory resolution to the complainant, which may not necessarily require exhaustively investigating all possible legal and factual elements arising from the complaint, but which provides an effective and quick remedy to the complainant. The assessment of the extent of the investigative measures</p>	<p>(6) Each complaint handled by a supervisory authority pursuant to Article 57(1), point (f), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 is to be investigated with all due diligence to the extent appropriate bearing in mind that every use of powers by the supervisory authority must be appropriate, necessary and proportionate in view of ensuring compliance with Regulation (EU) 2016/679. It falls within the discretion of each competent authority to decide the extent to which <u>It is important to consider the personal data processed and the situation of the data subject, for example where</u> a complaint should be investigated. While assessing the extent appropriate of an investigation, supervisory authorities should aim to deliver a satisfactory resolution <u>relates</u> to the complainant, which may not necessarily require exhaustively investigating all possible legal and factual elements arising from the complaint, but which provides an</p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	<p>required could be informed by the gravity of the alleged infringement, its systemic or repetitive nature, or the fact, as the case may be, that the complainant also took advantage of her or his rights under Article 79 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</p>	<p>quick remedy to the complainant <u>can be quickly delivered. Without prejudice to the necessity of providing a satisfactory resolution to.</u> The assessment of the extent of the investigative measures required could be informed by the gravity of the alleged infringement, its systemic or repetitive nature, or the fact, as the case may be, that the complainant also took advantage of her or his <u>within a short timeframe, supervisory authorities should investigate to a degree that allows them to satisfy themselves as to whether a complaint is indicative of more serious or systemic infringements. Planning the procedure is important to ensure a quick result. Supervisory authorities should not refer to the</u> rights under Article 79 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 <u>as a reason to limit the investigation of a complaint. To ensure compliance with Article 47 of the Charter, the handling of a complaint should always lead to an appealable decision. Unless a complaint is withdrawn, it should not be possible for complaints to be closed or otherwise terminated without a decision that can be submitted to judicial review.</u></p>	<p>required could be informed by the gravity of the alleged infringement, its systemic or repetitive nature, or the fact, as the case may be, that the complainant also took advantage of her or his rights under Article 79 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</p>	<p>effective and quick remedy to the complainant. The assessment of the extent of the investigative measures required could be informed by the gravity of the alleged infringement, its systemic or repetitive nature, or the fact, as the case may be, that the complainant also took advantage of her or his rights under Article 79 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. <u>processing of personal data of children.</u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p> <p>Text Origin: Council Mandate</p>
Recital 7				

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
17	(7) The lead supervisory authority should provide the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged with the necessary information on the progress of the investigation for the purpose of providing updates to the complainant.	(7) The lead supervisory authority should provide the supervisory <u>authorities instant remote access to a joint case file that holds all relevant documents of the case, including all internal or confidential information, as well as a translation of all documents to the cooperation language. In addition, the lead supervisory authority should actively inform the other supervisory authorities on major changes that may require imminent action or closer attention. Defining clear and efficient procedures for the handling of complaints in cross-border cases is also necessary, since the complaint may be dealt with by a supervisory authority other than the one</u> with which the complaint was lodged with the necessary information on the progress of the investigation for the purpose of providing updates to the complainant.	(7) The lead supervisory authority should provide the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged with the necessary information on the progress of the investigation for the purpose of providing updates to the complainant.	(7) The lead supervisory authority should provide the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged with the necessary information on the progress of the investigation for the purpose of providing updates to the complainant. ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Recital 8				
18	(8) The competent supervisory authority should provide the complainant with access to the documents on the basis of which the supervisory authority reached a preliminary conclusion to reject fully or partially the complaint.	(8) The competent supervisory authority should provide the complainant with <u>parties with remote access to the documents on the basis of which the supervisory authority reached a preliminary conclusion to reject fully or partially the complaint</u> <u>joint case file, but may restrict this right of</u>	(8) The competent supervisory authority should provide the complainant with access to the documents on the basis of which the supervisory authority reached a preliminary conclusion to reject fully or partially the complaint.	<i>deleted</i>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
		<p><u>access under certain circumstances. Such access should allow the use of an effective judicial remedy in line with Article 47 of the Charter.</u></p>		
Recital 9				
19	<p>(9) In order for supervisory authorities to bring a swift end to infringements of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and to deliver a quick resolution for complainants, supervisory authorities should endeavour, where appropriate, to resolve complaints by amicable settlement. The fact that an individual complaint has been resolved through an amicable settlement does not prevent the competent supervisory authority from pursuing an ex officio case, for example in the case of systemic or repetitive infringements of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</p>	<p>(9) In order for supervisory authorities to bring a swift end to infringements of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and to deliver a quick resolution for complainants, supervisory authorities should <u>be able to</u> endeavour, where appropriate, to resolve complaints by amicable settlement <u>between the parties. Supervisory authorities should not make the handling of a complaint contingent on participation in an amicable settlement process. Settlements should be able to take the form of a contract between the parties under applicable law, but should bind the authorities.</u> The fact that an individual complaint has been resolved through an amicable settlement does not prevent the competent supervisory authority from pursuing an ex officio case, for example in the case of systemic or repetitive infringements of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. <u>However, such an ex officio possibility should not be used to defer decisions on complaints.</u></p>	<p>(9) In order for supervisory authorities to bring a swift end to infringements of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and to deliver a quick resolution for complainants, supervisory authorities should endeavour, where appropriate, to resolveapply procedures allowing for the early resolution of complaints by amicable settlement. The fact that an individual, provided that such resolution results in the satisfaction of the complainant's request and that the infringement has been terminated. The early resolution of a complaint should therefore apply to cases where the complainant is duly able to assess the proposed outcome and determine that its request has been resolved through an amicable settlement does not prevent the competent supervisory authority from pursuing an ex officio case, for example in the case of systemic or repetitive infringements of Regulation (EU) 2016/679satisfied.</p>	<p>(9) <u>In order for supervisory authorities to bring a swift end to infringements of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and to deliver a quick resolution for complainants, supervisory authorities should endeavour, where appropriate, to resolve complaints by the procedure for early resolution in accordance with this regulation. Such procedure should establish whether the infringement alleged in the complaint has been brought to an end in a manner rendering the complaint devoid of purpose. Member States are not required to introduce new procedures under national law to allow their supervisory authorities to resolve a complaint through early resolution.</u>In order for supervisory authorities to bring a swift end to infringements of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and to deliver a quick resolution for complainants, supervisory authorities should endeavour, where appropriate, to resolve complaints by amicable settlement. The fact that an individual complaint has been</p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				<p><i>resolved through an amicable settlement does not prevent the competent supervisory authority from pursuing an ex officio case, for example in the case of systemic or repetitive infringements of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</i></p>
Recital 9a				
19a			<p>(9a) The early resolution of a complaint may be particularly useful in expeditiously resolving disputes concerning infringements of data subject rights to the satisfaction of the complainant’s request. Such outcome should allow the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged to consider, on the basis of preliminary engagement with the data controller and processor and provided that supporting evidence has been obtained, that the complaint becomes devoid of purpose and that the complainant’s request is satisfied. In such a case, the lead supervisory authority should be informed about the early resolution but the complaint should not be transmitted. Where the lead supervisory authority is the authority receiving the complaint, it may also apply such procedure.</p>	<p><u><i>(9-a) A procedure for the early resolution of a complaint should only be concluded where the complainant has not submitted a timely objection to the finding that the alleged infringement has been brought to an end. The early resolution of a complaint should therefore apply to cases where the complainant is duly able to assess the proposed outcome.</i></u></p> <p><u><i>(9a) The early resolution of a complaint may be particularly useful in expeditiously resolving disputes concerning infringements of data subject rights pursuant to Chapter III of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 to the satisfaction of the complainant. Such outcome should allow the supervisory authority with which the complaint has been lodged or the lead supervisory authority to establish, on the basis of preliminary engagement with the data controller and provided that supporting evidence has been</i></u></p>


	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				<u>obtained, that the complaint is devoid of purpose.</u>
Recital 9b				
19b			(9b) Where allowed under national law, an amicable settlement could also be considered as a way allowing for the early resolution of a complaint. However, resolution of the complaint by amicable settlement should not be possible where the data subject objects to the proposed outcome. In any event, the resolution of a complaint through amicable settlement by the lead supervisory authority should rely on a final decision pursuant to Article 60, paragraph 7 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.	<u>(9b) The circumstance that an individual complaint has been resolved through a procedure allowing for its early resolution should be without prejudice to the exercise by the lead supervisory authority of its powers in accordance with Regulation (EU) 2016/679 on the same subject matter, for example in the case of systemic or repetitive infringements of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</u>
Recital 9c				
19c			(9c) Where the lead supervisory authority considers that a complaint can be resolved through a procedure allowing for its early resolution, a draft decision pursuant to Article 60, paragraph 3 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 should be submitted to the other supervisory authorities concerned, with a view to adopting a final decision in accordance with Art. 60(7) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 finding that the complaint, or part of the	<u>(9c) Where the lead supervisory authority to which the complaint has been transmitted considers that a complaint can be resolved through early resolution, a draft decision pursuant to Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 should be submitted to the other supervisory authorities concerned, with a view to adopting a final decision in accordance with Article 60(7) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 establishing that the alleged infringement has been brought to</u>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
			complaint, has been resolved by the lead supervisory authority and that the handling of the complaint will be terminated. The draft decision submitted could therefore be simplified and limited to an information that the complaint was settled, in whole or in part, through a procedure allowing for its early resolution, indicating the reasons underlying the decision and the scope of the resolution, and confirming that the complaint is therefore devoid of purpose. In such cases, the lead supervisory authority should directly submit its draft decision, without having to prepare and circulate a summary of key issues nor preliminary findings.	<u><i>an end and that the complaint, or part of the complaint, has been resolved by the lead supervisory authority. The draft decision submitted could therefore be simplified and limited to an information that the complaint was settled, in whole or in part, through a procedure allowing for its early resolution, indicating the reasons underlying the decision and the scope of the resolution, and confirming that the complaint is therefore devoid of purpose. In such cases, the lead supervisory authority should directly submit its draft decision, without having to prepare and circulate a summary of key issues or preliminary findings.</i></u>
Recital 9d				
6	19d		(9d) The circumstance that an individual complaint has been resolved through a procedure allowing for its early resolution should not prevent the competent supervisory authority from pursuing an <i>ex officio</i> case, in particular in the case of systemic or repetitive infringements of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.	<i>deleted</i> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Recital 10				
6	20	(10) In order to guarantee the effective functioning of the cooperation and consistency	(10) In order to guarantee the effective functioning of the cooperation and consistency	(10) In order to guarantee the effective functioning of the cooperation and consistency


	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	<p>mechanisms in Chapter VII of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, it is important that cross-border cases are resolved in a timely fashion and in line with the spirit of sincere and effective cooperation that underlies Article 60 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. The lead supervisory authority should exercise its competence within a framework of close cooperation with the other supervisory authorities concerned. Likewise, supervisory authorities concerned should actively engage in the investigation at an early stage in an endeavour to reach a consensus, making full use of the tools provided by Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</p>	<p>mechanisms in Chapter VII of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, it is important that cross-border cases are resolved in a timely fashion and in line with the spirit of sincere and effective cooperation that underlies Article 60 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. The lead supervisory authority should exercise its competence within a framework of close cooperation with the other supervisory authorities concerned. Likewise, supervisory authorities concerned should actively engage in the investigation at an early stage in an endeavour to reach a consensus, making full use of the tools provided by Regulation (EU) 2016/679. <u><i>This should be in line with the ‘one-stop-shop’ mechanism of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and guarantee, where applicable, non-discriminatory treatment of parties, legal certainty and independence of issuing of decisions by the supervisory authorities.</i></u></p>	<p>mechanisms in Chapter VII of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, it is important that cross-border cases are resolved in a timely fashion and in line with the spirit of sincere and effective cooperation that underlies Article 60 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. The lead supervisory authority should exercise its competence within a framework of close cooperation with the other supervisory authorities concerned. Likewise, supervisory authorities concerned should actively engage in the investigation at an early stage in an endeavour to reach a consensus, making full use of the tools provided by Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</p>	<p>mechanisms in Chapter VII of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, it is important that cross-border cases are resolved in a timely fashion and in line with the spirit of sincere and effective cooperation that underlies Article 60 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. The lead supervisory authority should exercise its competence within a framework of close cooperation with the other supervisory authorities concerned. Likewise, supervisory authorities concerned should actively engage in the investigation at an early stage in an endeavour to reach a consensus, making full use of the tools provided by Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p> <p>Text Origin: Commission Proposal</p>
	Recital 10a			
20a			<p>(10a) Cases where the rights of a child as data subject are at stake, and cases related to the dissemination of intimate material, should be given high priority to ensure the adequate protection of the rights of the child.</p>	<p><i>deleted</i></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
Recital 10b				
20b			<p>(10b) Where the lead supervisory authority, based on the characteristics of the case and previous decisions, considers that enhanced cooperation or further engagement in formal procedural steps for the handling of a complaint-based investigation relating to cross-border processing is not necessary, the lead supervisory authority should inform supervisory authorities concerned of such assessment and provide all relevant information concerning the complaint, including the main relevant facts and the provisions to be investigated. This may apply for example where the case does not raise any structural or recurring problem in several Member States, where the case does not concern a general legal issue with regards to the interpretation, application or enforcement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, where the case is not related to the intersection of data protection with other legal fields, where the case does not affect a large number of data subjects in several Member States, where the case is not related to a large number of complaints in several Member States; or where Regulation (EU) 2016/679 does not imply that a</p>	<p><u><i>(10b) Where the lead supervisory authority has formed a preliminary view on the main issues in an investigation, it should be possible for the lead supervisory authority to cooperate with supervisory authorities through a simple cooperation procedure. In such a case, the lead supervisory authority should inform supervisory authorities concerned of such consideration and provide all relevant information concerning the characteristics of the case and the complaint, including the main relevant facts and the alleged infringement to be investigated. Unless any of the supervisory authorities concerned object, the lead supervisory authority should continue cooperating with concerned supervisory authorities and submit a draft decision within the time limits foreseen in this Regulation.</i></u></p> <p>TM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
			<p>high risk can be assumed. In such a case, unless any of the supervisory authorities concerned object, the lead supervisory authority shall continue cooperating in accordance with Article 60 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and submit a draft decision as referred to in Article 60, paragraph 3 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</p>	
Recital 10c				
20c				<p><i><u>(10c) The simple cooperation procedure should only be applied on a case-by-case basis, following a consideration by the lead supervisory authorities that, no reasonable doubt exists as to the scope of the investigation and the legal and factual issues identified do not require additional cooperation of the purpose of a complex investigation, in particular on the basis of the characteristics of the case and previous decisions in similar cases. In addition, existing case-law and guidelines adopted by the Board on the alleged infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 to be investigated should also be taken into account by the lead supervisory authority in considering that consensus on the main elements of a case is likely to be established. In principle, the</u></i></p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				<p><u>simple cooperation procedure should not apply where the case raises structural or recurring problems in several Member States, where the case concerns a general legal issue with regards to the interpretation, application or enforcement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, where the case is related to the intersection of data protection with other legal fields, where the case affects a large number of data subjects in several Member States, where the case is related to a large number of complaints in several Member States; or where there may be a high risk to the rights and freedoms of data subject.</u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
Recital 10d				
20d			<p>(10c) Where formal steps for the enhanced cooperation procedure pursuant to this regulation are not engaged, supervisory authorities should ensure that the right to be heard of the parties under investigation and the complainant applies in a timely manner, as provided for in this Regulation and in line with Article 41(2) of the Charter which enshrines the right to good administration and the right of</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>deleted</i></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
			every person to be heard before any individual measure which would affect him or her adversely is taken.	
Recital 10e				
20e				<p><i><u>(10e) In cases where a supervisory authority is required to take certain procedural steps within specified time limits, it is the purpose of such time limits to ensure that the procedure progresses and concludes within a reasonable time. However, the purpose of such time limits is not to preclude supervisory authorities from taking the required procedural steps after their expiry. It is therefore necessary to ensure that where such procedural steps are taken after the expiry of the corresponding time limits, that fact cannot be considered grounds for illegality or invalidity either of the procedural step in question or of the final decision.</u></i></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
Recital 10f				
20f				<p><i><u>(10f) A mechanism should be introduced to allow the lead supervisory authority to extend the time limit for submitting a draft decision. Such extensions should be applied only in exceptional</u></i></p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				<p><u>cases where it is required by the complexity of a case. Supervisory authorities concerned should be informed and have the opportunity to submit objections to the extension, which should be considered by the lead supervisory authority when determining whether to apply an extension to the time limit and, where applicable, the length of such an extension.</u></p> <p>TM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
Recital 10g				
20g				<p><u>(10g) In cases where the lead supervisory authority extends the time limit for submitting a draft decision, supervisory authorities concerned should have the opportunity to inform the lead supervisory authority of their assessment that there is a need to act in order to protect the rights and freedoms of data subjects. In cases where the lead supervisory authority has been informed of such assessment in a timely manner, and does not submit a draft decision within the extended time limit, the urgent need to act as referred to in Article 66(1) of Regulation 2016/679 should be presumed. Notwithstanding this possibility, the urgency procedure</u></p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				<p><u>remains available to supervisory authorities subject to the conditions set out in Article 66 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
Recital 10h				
20h				<p><u>(10h) In order to ensure that proceedings are conducted in an efficient manner, unless the procedural step in itself irreversibly affects the rights of the party under investigation or the complainant irrespective of the final decision, without prejudice to the procedural autonomy of Member States, it is preferable that remedies against procedural steps taken by supervisory authorities only be available in conjunction with a remedy against a final decision.</u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
Recital 11				
21	(11) It is particularly important for supervisory authorities to reach consensus on key aspects of the investigation as early as possible and prior to the communication of allegations to the parties under investigation and adoption of the draft decision referred to in Article 60 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679,	(11) It is particularly important for supervisory authorities to reach consensus on key aspects of the <u>investigation case via the summary of key issues and comments on that summary</u> as early as possible and prior to the communication of allegations to the parties under investigation and adoption of the	(11) It is particularly important for supervisory authorities to reach consensus on key aspects of the investigation as early as possible and prior to the communication of allegations to the parties under investigation and adoption of the draft decision referred to in Article 60 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679,	(11) It is particularly important for supervisory authorities to reach consensus on key aspects of the <u>investigation case</u> as early as possible and prior to the communication of allegations to the parties under investigation and adoption of the draft decision referred to in Article 60 of

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	thereby reducing the number of cases submitted to the dispute resolution mechanism in Article 65 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and ultimately ensuring the quick resolution of cross-border cases.	draft decision referred to in Article 60 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, thereby reducing the number of cases submitted to the dispute resolution mechanism in Article 65 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and ultimately ensuring the quick resolution of cross-border cases.	thereby reducing the number of cases submitted to the dispute resolution mechanism in Article 65 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and ultimately ensuring the quick resolution of cross-border cases.	<p>Regulation (EU) 2016/679, thereby reducing the number of cases submitted to the dispute resolution mechanism in Article 65 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and ultimately ensuring the quick resolution of cross-border cases.</p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p> <p>Text Origin: EP Mandate</p>

Recital 12

22	<p>(12) Cooperation between supervisory authorities should be based on open dialogue which allows concerned supervisory authorities to meaningfully impact the course of the investigation by sharing their experiences and views with the lead supervisory authority, with due regard for the margin of discretion enjoyed by each supervisory authority, including in the assessment of the extent appropriate to investigate a case, and for the varying traditions of the Member States. For this purpose, the lead supervisory authority should provide concerned supervisory authorities with a summary of key issues setting out its preliminary view on the main issues in an investigation. It should be provided at a sufficiently early stage to allow effective inclusion of</p>	<p>(12) Cooperation between supervisory authorities should be based on open dialogue which allows concerned supervisory authorities to meaningfully impact the course of the investigation by sharing their experiences and views with the lead supervisory authority, with due regard for the margin of discretion enjoyed by each. <u>The</u> supervisory authority, including in the assessment of the extent appropriate to investigate a case, and for the varying traditions of the Member States. For this purpose, with which a complaint has been lodged or which requests an ex-officio action may provide the lead supervisory authority should provide concerned supervisory authorities with a summary of key issues setting out its preliminary view on the main issues in an</p>	<p>(12) Cooperation between supervisory authorities should be based on open dialogue which allows concerned supervisory authorities to meaningfully impact the course of the investigation by sharing their experiences and views with the lead supervisory authority, with due regard for the margin of discretion enjoyed by each supervisory authority, including in the assessment of the extent appropriate to investigate a case, and for the varying traditions of the Member States. For this purpose, the lead supervisory authority should provide concerned supervisory authorities with a summary of key issues setting out its preliminary view on the main issues in an investigation. It should be provided at a sufficiently early stage to allow effective inclusion of</p>	<p>(12) Cooperation between supervisory authorities should be based on open dialogue which allows concerned supervisory authorities to meaningfully impact the course of the investigation by sharing their experiences and views with the lead supervisory authority, with due regard for the margin of discretion enjoyed by each supervisory authority, including in the assessment of the extent appropriate to investigate a case, and for the varying traditions of the Member States. For this purpose, the lead supervisory authority should provide concerned supervisory authorities with a summary of key issues setting out its preliminary view on the main issues in an investigation. It should be provided at a sufficiently early stage to allow effective inclusion of</p>
----	--	--	---	---

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	<p>supervisory authorities concerned but at the same time at a stage where the lead supervisory authority's views on the case are sufficiently mature. Concerned supervisory authorities should have the opportunity to provide their comments on a broad range of questions, such as the scope of the investigation and the identification of complex factual and legal assessments. Given that the scope of the investigation determines the matters which require investigation by the lead supervisory authority, supervisory authorities should endeavour to achieve consensus as early as possible on the scope of the investigation.</p>	<p>investigation. <u>The lead supervisory authority should draft the final summary of key issues. The summary of key issues should be part of the joint case file, and should be a living document that is updated by the lead supervisory authority during the course of the procedure.</u> It should be provided at a sufficiently early stage to allow effective inclusion of supervisory authorities concerned but at the same time at a stage where the lead supervisory authority's views on the case are sufficiently mature. Concerned supervisory authorities should have the opportunity to provide their comments on a broad range of questions, such as the scope<u>any update</u> of the investigation and the identification of complex factual and legal assessments. Given that the scope of the investigation determines the matters which require investigation by the lead<u>summary of key issues.</u> <u>The supervisory authority authorities should be able to raise any dispute with the Board.</u> Supervisory authorities should endeavour to achieve consensus as early as possible on the scope of the investigation.</p>	<p>supervisory authorities concerned but at the same time at a stage where the lead supervisory authority's views on the case are sufficiently mature. Concerned supervisory authorities should have the opportunity to provide their comments on a broad range of questions, such as the scope of the investigation and the identification of complex factual and legal assessments. Given that the scope of the investigation determines the matters which require investigation by the lead supervisory authority, supervisory authorities should endeavour to achieve consensus as early as possible on the scope of the investigation.</p>	<p>supervisory authorities concerned but at the same time at a stage where the lead supervisory authority's views on the case are sufficiently mature. Concerned supervisory authorities should have the opportunity to provide their comments on a broad range of questions, such as the scope of the investigation and the identification of complex factual and legal assessments. Given that the scope of the investigation determines the matters which require investigation by the lead supervisory authority, supervisory authorities should endeavour to achieve consensus as early as possible on the scope of the investigation.</p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p> <p>Text Origin: Council Mandate</p>
Recital 12a				
22a			(12a) In this context, the exchange of relevant information between	<u>(12a) In this context, the exchange of relevant information between</u>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
			<p>the lead supervisory authority and supervisory authorities concerned is an important element to support the spirit of effective and sincere cooperation. The relevant information to be provided by the lead supervisory authority will depend on the specificity of the case being investigated and should be considered in a proportionate manner. Such exchange of relevant information, and the timely provision of specific elements of information by the lead supervisory authority, should be understood as a continuous process throughout the course of an investigation and may vary in terms of documents and details required, depending on the complexity of the case being investigated. In particular, depending on the stage of the investigation and the circumstances of a case, such relevant information could progressively include, among others, the exchange of correspondence with the data controller or the data subject on the subject of a complaint or investigation, the preparatory documents for an audit or inspection, or preliminary technical or legal assessment being considered by the lead</p>	<p><u><i>the lead supervisory authority and supervisory authorities concerned is an important element to support the spirit of effective and sincere cooperation. Such exchange of relevant information, and the timely provision of specific elements of information by the lead supervisory authority, should be understood as a continuous process throughout the course of an investigation and may vary in terms of documents and details required, depending on the complexity of the case being investigated. In particular, depending on the stage of the investigation and the circumstances of a case, such relevant information could progressively include, among others, the exchange of correspondence with the data controller or the data subject on the subject of a complaint or investigation, the preparatory documents for an audit or inspection, or preliminary technical or legal assessment being considered by the lead supervisory authority as a result of a specific step in its investigation.</i></u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p> <p>Text Origin: Council Mandate</p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
			supervisory authority as a result of a specific step in its investigation.	
Recital 12b				
22b			<p>(12b) While the lead supervisory authority should provide any relevant information to the supervisory authorities concerned without delay after the information becomes available, concerned supervisory authorities should also proactively make available any relevant information deemed useful to assess the legal and factual elements of a case. The exchange of relevant information should support the swift and effective cooperation between supervisory authorities and may, in certain cases, be supported by summary, extracts or copies of documents in order to facilitate a swift understanding of a case, while allowing for complementary information to be provided where further elements become necessary. In order to facilitate an effective and appropriate exchange of information between supervisory authorities, the Board could specify the modalities and requirements for the exchange of such information.</p>	<p><i><u>(12b) While the lead supervisory authority should provide any relevant information to the supervisory authorities concerned without delay after the information becomes available, concerned supervisory authorities should also proactively make available any relevant information deemed useful to assess the legal and factual elements of a case. The exchange of relevant information should support the swift and effective cooperation between supervisory authorities and may, in certain cases, be supported by summary, extracts or copies of documents in order to facilitate a swift understanding of a case, while allowing for complementary information to be provided where further elements become necessary. In order to facilitate an effective and appropriate exchange of information between supervisory authorities, the Board could specify the modalities and requirements for the exchange of such information.</u></i></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				Text Origin: Council Mandate
Recital 12c			<p>(12c) As part of the relevant information on a specific case, the lead supervisory authority should provide concerned supervisory authorities with a summary of key issues setting out its preliminary view on the main issues in an investigation. It should be provided at a sufficiently early stage to allow effective inclusion of the views submitted by supervisory authorities concerned but at the same time at a stage where the lead supervisory authority has sufficient elements to form its views on the case , where necessary by means of preliminary analysis and possible initial investigative measures. While the summary of key issues should always include the main relevant facts, the preliminary identification of the scope of investigations and the relevant provisions of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 concerned by the alleged infringement to be investigated, other additional elements should be provided in the summary of key issues depending on their availability and their relevance in order to facilitate the substantive assesment by supervisory</p>	<p><i><u>(12c) As part of the relevant information on a specific case, the lead supervisory authority should provide concerned supervisory authorities with a summary of key issues setting out its preliminary view on the main issues in an investigation. It should be provided at a sufficiently early stage to allow effective inclusion of the views submitted by supervisory authorities concerned but at the same time at a stage where the lead supervisory authority has sufficient elements to form its views on the case , where necessary by means of preliminary analysis and possible initial investigative measures. The summary of key issues should also include, where applicable, the preliminary identification of potential corrective measures in cases where the lead supervisory authority has sufficient elements to form a preliminary view on the matter, in particular when the provisions of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 concerned by the alleged infringement can be easily identified at an early stage.</u></i></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
22c				

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
			<p>authorities concerned and the formulation of their respective views. Such additional elements could include the identification of legal and technical issues deemed relevant for the investigation, in particular where such issues appear complex. The summary of key issues could also include the preliminary identification of potential corrective measures in cases where the lead supervisory authority has sufficient elements to form a preliminary view on the matter, in particular when the provisions of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 concerned by the alleged infringement can be easily circumscribed and identified at an early stage.</p>	<p>Text Origin: Council Mandate</p>
Recital 12d				
22d			<p>(12d) Concerned supervisory authorities should have the opportunity to provide their comments on the summary of key issues, including on a broad range of questions, such as the scope of the investigation, the identification of the alleged infringements and the identification of factual and legal issues which are relevant for the investigation. Given that the scope of the investigation determines the matters which require investigation by the lead</p>	<p><u><i>(12d) Concerned supervisory authorities should have the opportunity to provide their comments on the summary of key issues, including on a broad range of questions, such as the scope of the investigation, the identification of the alleged infringements and the identification of factual and legal issues which are relevant for the investigation. Given that the scope of the investigation determines the matters which require investigation by the lead supervisory authority, supervisory</i></u></p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
			<p>supervisory authority, supervisory authorities should endeavour to achieve consensus as early as possible on the scope of the investigation.</p>	<p><u>authorities should endeavour to achieve consensus as early as possible on the scope of the investigation.</u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p> <p>Text Origin: Council Mandate</p>
Recital 13				
23	<p>(13) In the interest of effective inclusive cooperation between all supervisory authorities concerned and the lead supervisory authority, the comments of concerned supervisory authorities should be concise and worded in sufficiently clear and precise terms to be easily understandable to all supervisory authorities. The legal arguments should be grouped by reference to the part of the summary of key issues to which they relate. The comments of supervisory authorities concerned may be supplemented by additional documents. However, a mere reference in the comments of a supervisory authority concerned to supplementary documents cannot make up for the absence of the essential arguments in law or in fact which should feature in the comments. The basic legal and factual particulars relied on in such documents should be indicated, at least in summary form, coherently</p>	<p>(13) In the interest of effective inclusive cooperation between all supervisory authorities concerned and the lead supervisory authority, <u>the comments of any documents submitted by</u> concerned supervisory authorities <u>and the parties</u> should be concise and worded in sufficiently clear and precise terms to be easily understandable to all supervisory authorities. <u>Supervisory authorities may therefore limit the length of submissions by the parties.</u> The legal arguments should be grouped by reference to the part of the summary of key issues to which they relate. The comments of supervisory authorities concerned may be supplemented by additional documents. However, a mere reference in the comments of a supervisory authority concerned to supplementary documents cannot make up for the absence of the essential arguments in law or in fact which should feature in the</p>	<p>(13) In the interest of effective inclusive cooperation between all supervisory authorities concerned and the lead supervisory authority, the summary of key issues and the comments of concerned supervisory authorities should be concise and worded in sufficiently clear and precise terms to be easily understandable to all supervisory authorities. The legal arguments should be grouped by reference to the part of the summary of key issues to which they relate. The summary of key issues and the comments of supervisory authorities concerned may be supplemented by additional documents. However, a mere reference in the comments of a supervisory authority concerned to supplementary documents cannotshould not make up for the absence of the essential arguments in law or in fact which should feature in the comments. The basic legal and factual particulars relied</p>	<p>(13) In the interest of effective inclusive cooperation between all supervisory authorities concerned and the lead supervisory authority, <u>the summary of key issues and</u> the comments of concerned supervisory authorities should be concise and worded in sufficiently clear and precise terms to be easily understandable to all supervisory authorities. The legal arguments should be grouped by reference to the part of the summary of key issues to which they relate. The <u>summary of key issues and the</u> comments of supervisory authorities concerned may be supplemented by additional documents. However, a mere reference in the comments of a supervisory authority concerned to supplementary documents cannotshould not make up for the absence of the essential arguments in law or in fact which should feature in the comments. The basic legal and factual particulars relied</p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	and intelligibly in the comment itself.	<i>comments. The basic legal and factual particulars relied on in such documents should be indicated, at least in summary form, coherently and intelligibly in the comment itself.</i>	on in such documents should be indicated, at least in summary form, coherently and intelligibly in the comment itself.	on in such documents should be indicated, at least in summary form, coherently and intelligibly in the comment itself. ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Recital 14				
24	(14) Cases that do not raise contentious issues do not require extensive discussion between supervisory authorities in order to reach a consensus and could, therefore, be dealt with more quickly. When none of the supervisory authorities concerned raise comments on the summary of key issues, the lead supervisory authority should communicate the preliminary findings provided for in Article 14 within nine months.	(14) Cases that do not raise contentious issues <u>(non-contentious cases)</u> do not require extensive discussion between supervisory authorities in order to reach a consensus and could, therefore, be dealt with more quickly. When none of the supervisory authorities concerned raise comments on the summary of key issues, the lead supervisory authority should communicate the <i>preliminary findings provided for in Article 14</i> draft decision within <i>ninethree</i> months <u>from the receipt of the complaint</u> .	(14) Cases that do not raise contentious issues do not require extensive discussion between supervisory authorities in order to reach a consensus and could, therefore, be dealt with more quickly. When none of the supervisory authorities concerned raise comments on the summary of key issues, the lead supervisory authority should communicate the preliminary findings provided for in Article 14 within nine months.	<i>deleted</i> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Recital 14a				
24a			(14a) Where the lead supervisory authority is required by national law to further engage in subsequent domestic procedures related to the same case, such as administrative appeal proceedings or misdemeanour proceedings, the summary of key	<i>deleted</i> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
			<p>issues should be prepared again if this domestic procedure conducts the lead supervisory authority to deviate from previous consensus, and would result in substantive changes compared to the previous summary of key issues, in order to take into account the views of the supervisory authorities concerned. However, if the subsequent procedure related to the same case involves no further changes in comparison to previous decisions, the new summary of key issues may not be necessary. The lead supervisory authority should inform the supervisory authority concerned of such a possibility when submitting a draft decision in accordance with Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</p>	
Recital 15				
25	<p>(15) Supervisory authorities should avail of all means necessary to achieve a consensus in a spirit of sincere and effective cooperation. Therefore, if there is a divergence in opinion between the supervisory authorities concerned and the lead supervisory authority regarding the scope of a complaint-based investigation, including the provisions of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 the infringement of which will be investigated, or where the</p>	<p>(15) Supervisory authorities should avail <u>themselves</u> of all means necessary to achieve a consensus in a spirit of sincere and effective cooperation. Therefore, if there is a divergence in opinion between the supervisory authorities concerned and the lead supervisory authority regarding the scope <u>or procedural issues of a case of a complaint-based investigation, including the provisions of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 the infringement of which</u></p>	<p>(15) Supervisory authorities should avail of all means necessary to achieve a consensus in a spirit of sincere and effective cooperation. Therefore, if there is a divergence in opinion between the supervisory authorities concerned and the lead supervisory authority regarding the scope of a complaint-based investigation, including the provisions of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 the infringement of which will be investigated, or where the</p>	<p>(15) Supervisory authorities should <u>avail of use</u> all means necessary to achieve a consensus in a spirit of sincere and effective cooperation. Therefore, if there is a divergence in opinion between the supervisory authorities concerned and the lead supervisory authority regarding the scope of a complaint-based investigation, including the provisions of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 the infringement of which will be investigated, or where the</p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	<p>comments of the supervisory authorities concerned relate to an important change in the complex legal or technological assessment, the concerned authority should use the tools provided for under Articles 61 and 62 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</p>	<p>will be investigated, or where the comments <u>the supervisory authorities should raise the matter quickly with the Board. The Board should make the necessary procedural determinations. The Board and supervisory authorities should endeavour to complete ongoing proceedings as quickly as possible. The lead supervisory authority or one</u> of the supervisory authorities concerned relate to an important change in the complex legal or technological assessment, the concerned authority <u>should use the tools provided for also be able to request an urgent binding decision of the Board without a request</u> under Articles 61 and 62 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 <u>or 62 having been made.</u></p>	<p>comments of the supervisory authorities concerned relate to an important change in the complex legal or technological assessment, the concerned authority should <u>could</u> use the tools provided for under Articles 61 and 62 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</p>	<p>comments of the supervisory authorities concerned relate to an important change in the complex legal or technological <u>factual</u> assessment, <u>or to the preliminary identification of potential corrective measures</u>, the concerned authority should <u>could</u> use the tools provided for under Articles 61 and 62 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p> <p>Text Origin: Council Mandate</p>

Recital 16

26	<p>(16) If the use of those tools does not enable the supervisory authorities to reach a consensus on the scope of a complaint-based investigation, the lead supervisory authority should request an urgent binding decision of the Board under Article 66(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. For this purpose, the requirement of urgency should be presumed. The lead supervisory authority should draw appropriate conclusions from the urgent binding decision of the Board for the</p>	<p><i>deleted</i></p>	<p>(16) If the use of those tools does not enable the supervisory authorities to reach a consensus on the scope of a complaint-based investigation, the lead supervisory authority should request an urgent binding decision of the Board under Article 66(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 should be requested by any supervisory authority concerned or the lead supervisory authority. For this purpose, the requirement of urgency should be presumed. The lead supervisory</p>	<p>(16) # <u>Regulation 2016/679 enables the supervisory authority to request an urgent binding decision from the Board where a competent supervisory authority has not taken an appropriate measure in a situation where there is an urgent need to act, in order to protect the rights and freedoms of data subjects. Under this Regulation, where following the use of the means set out in this Regulation the supervisory authorities fail to reach a</u></p>
----	--	-----------------------	---	---

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	<p>purposes of preliminary findings. The urgent binding decision of the Board cannot pre-empt the outcome of the investigation of the lead supervisory authority or the effectiveness of the rights of the parties under investigation to be heard. In particular, the Board should not extend the scope of the investigation on its own initiative.</p>		<p>authority should draw appropriate conclusions from the urgent binding decision of the Board for the purposes of preliminary findings. The urgent binding decision of the Board in the context of deciding on the scope of a complaint-based investigation cannot pre-empt the outcome of the investigation of the lead supervisory authority or the effectiveness of the rights of the parties under investigation to be heard. In particular, the Board should not extend the scope of the investigation on its own initiative.</p>	<p><u><i>consensus on the scope of a complaint-based investigation, the conditions under Article 66(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 to request an urgent binding decision should be presumed to be met and the lead supervisory authority should request an urgent binding decision of the Board. The urgent binding decision of the Board on the scope of a complaint-based investigation cannot pre-empt the outcome of the investigation of the lead supervisory authority or the effectiveness of the right to be heard of the parties under investigation . the use of those tools does not enable the supervisory authorities to reach a consensus on the scope of a complaint-based investigation, the lead supervisory authority should request an urgent binding decision of the Board under Article 66(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. For this purpose, the requirement of urgency should be presumed. The lead supervisory authority should draw appropriate conclusions from the urgent binding decision of the Board for the purposes of preliminary findings. The urgent binding decision of the Board cannot pre-empt the outcome of the investigation of the lead supervisory authority or the effectiveness of the rights of the parties under investigation to be</i></u></p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				<p><i>heard. In particular, the Board should not extend the scope of the investigation on its own initiative.</i></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
Recital 16a				
26a			<p>(16a) Complainant's procedural rights under this Regulation should be conferred on the complainant solely to the extent relative to his or her individual rights. Where Article 80(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 applies, procedural rights should be conferred on the complainant pursuant to Article 80(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 to the extent relative to the rights of the data subject that are considered to have been infringed.</p>	<p><u>(16a) Procedural rights should be conferred on the complainant to the extent his or her rights and freedoms as a data subject are concerned. Procedural steps laid down in this regulation, relating to the cooperation between supervisory authorities, do not confer rights on the complainant or the parties under investigation. Therefore this regulation clarifies which provisions on procedural steps do not confer rights on individuals or parties under investigation, or do not limit those rights.</u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
Recital 17				
27	<p>(17) To enable the complainant to exercise her or his right to an effective judicial remedy under Article 78 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, the supervisory authority fully or partially rejecting a complaint should do so by means of</p>	<p>(17) To enable the complainant to exercise her or his right to an effective judicial remedy under Article 78 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, <i>the supervisory authority fully or partially rejecting</i> <u>handling of any</u> complaint should <i>do so by means of</i> <u>always lead to</u> a</p>	<p>(17) To enable the complainant to exercise her or his right to an effective judicial remedy under Article 78 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, the supervisory authority fully or partially rejecting a complaint should do so by means of</p>	<p><i>deleted</i></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	a decision which may be challenged before a national court.	decision which may be challenged before a national court.	a decision which may be challenged before a national court.	
Recital 18				
28	(18) Complainants should have the opportunity to express their views before a decision adversely affecting them is taken. Therefore, in the event of full or partial rejection of a complaint in a cross-border case, the complainant should have the opportunity to make her or his views known prior to the submission of a draft decision under Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, a revised draft decision under Article 60(4) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 or a binding decision of the Board under Article 65(1), point (a), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. The complainant may request access to the non-confidential version of the documents on which the decision fully or partially rejecting the complaint is based.	<i>deleted</i>	(18) Complainants should have the opportunity to express their views before a decision adversely affecting them is taken. Therefore, in the event of full or partial rejection of a complaint in a cross-border case, the complainant should have the opportunity to make her or his views known prior to the submission of a draft decision under Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, a revised draft decision under Article 60(4) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 or a binding decision of the Board under Article 65(1), point (a), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. The complainant may request access to the non-confidential version of the documents on which the decision fully or partially rejecting the complaint is based.	(18) Complainants should have the opportunity to express their views before a decision adversely affecting them is taken. Therefore, in the event of full or partial rejection of a complaint in a cross-border case, the complainant should have the opportunity to make her or his views known prior to the submission of a draft decision under Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, a revised draft decision under Article 60(4) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 or a binding decision of the Board under Article 65(1), point (a), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. The complainant may request access to the non-confidential version of the documents on which the decision fully or partially rejecting the complaint is based. ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Recital 19				
29	(19) It is necessary to clarify the division of responsibilities between the lead supervisory authority and	(19) It is necessary to clarify the division of responsibilities between the lead supervisory authority and	(19) It is necessary to clarify the division of responsibilities between the lead supervisory authority and	(19) It is necessary to clarify the division of responsibilities between the lead supervisory authority and

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	<p>the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged in the case of rejection of a complaint in a cross-border case. As the point of contact for the complainant during the investigation, the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged should obtain the views of the complainant on the proposed rejection of the complaint and should be responsible for all communications with the complainant. All such communications should be shared with the lead supervisory authority. Since under Article 60(8) and (9) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged has the responsibility of adopting the final decision rejecting the complaint, that supervisory authority should also have the responsibility of preparing the draft decision under Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</p>	<p>the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged in the case of rejection of a complaint in a cross-border case. As the point of contact for the complainant during the investigation, the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged should obtain the views of the complainant on the proposed rejection of the complaint and should be responsible for all communications with the complainant. All such communications should be shared with the lead supervisory authority. Since under Article 60(8) and (9) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged has the responsibility of adopting the final decision <u>which needs to comply with its national procedural law,</u> rejecting the complaint, that supervisory authority should also have the responsibility of <u>be involved by the lead supervisory authority in</u> preparing the draft decision under Article 60(3) <u>and any final decision under Article 60(7) to (9)</u> of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</p>	<p>the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged in the case of rejection of a complaint in a cross-border case. As the point of contact for the complainant during the investigation, the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged should obtain the views of the complainant on the proposed rejection of the complaint and should be responsible for all communications with the complainant. All such communications should be shared with the lead supervisory authority. Since under Article 60(8) and (9) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged has the responsibility of adopting the final decision rejecting the complaint, that the lead supervisory authority should also have the responsibility of possibility to ask for the assistance of the complaint receiving supervisory authority if necessary in preparing the draft decision under Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</p>	<p>the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged in the case of <u>full or partial rejection or dismissal</u> of a complaint in a cross-border case. As the point of contact for the complainant during the investigation, the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged should obtain the views of the complainant on the proposed <u>full or partial rejection or dismissal</u> of the complaint and <u>that authority</u> should be responsible for all communications with the complainant. All such communications should be shared with the lead supervisory authority. Since under Article 60(8) and (9) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged has the responsibility of adopting the final decision <u>fully or partially rejecting or dismissing</u> the complaint, that <u>the lead</u> supervisory authority should also have the responsibility of preparing <u>prepare</u> the draft decision under Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, <u>in cooperation with the supervisory authority with which the complaint has been lodged, including the possibility to request the assistance of the supervisory authority with which the complaint has been lodged in preparing such a draft.</u></p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Recital 20				
6	30	(20) The effective enforcement of Union data protection rules should be compatible with the full respect of the parties' rights of defence, which constitutes a fundamental principle of Union law to be respected in all circumstances, and in particular in procedures which may give rise to penalties.	(20) The effective enforcement of Union data protection rules should be compatible with the full respect of the parties' rights of defence, which constitutes a fundamental principle of Union law to be respected in all circumstances, and in particular in procedures which may give rise to penalties.	(20) The effective enforcement of Union data protection rules should be compatible with the full respect of the parties' rights of defence, which constitutes a fundamental principle of Union law to be respected in all circumstances, and in particular in procedures which may give rise to penalties. Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Recital 21				
6	31	(21) In order to effectively safeguard the right to good administration and the rights of defence as enshrined in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union ('the Charter'), including the right of every person to be heard before any individual measure which would affect him or her adversely is taken, it is important to provide for clear rules on the exercise of this right.	(21) In order to effectively safeguard the right to good administration and the rights of defence as enshrined in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union ('the Charter') , including the right of every person to be heard before any individual measure which would affect him or her adversely is taken, it is important to provide for clear rules on the exercise of this right <u>for all parties involved in a case. Every party should have the right to decline the right to be heard.</u>	(21) In order to effectively safeguard the right to good administration and the rights of defence as enshrined in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union ('the Charter'), including the right of every person to be heard before any individual measure which would affect him or her adversely is taken, it is important to provide for clear rules on the exercise of this right. ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Recital 21a				

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
31a			(21a) Member States may introduce into their national law provisions on the legal consequences of the failure of individuals to submit their observations within the time limit set by the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged.	<i>deleted</i> <i>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</i>
<i>Recital 22</i>				
32	(22) The rules regarding the administrative procedure applied by supervisory authorities when enforcing Regulation (EU) 2016/679 should ensure that the parties under investigation effectively have the opportunity to make known their views on the truth and relevance of the facts, objections and circumstances put forward by the supervisory authority throughout the procedure, thereby enabling them to exercise their rights of defence. The preliminary findings set out the preliminary position on the alleged infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 following investigation. They thus constitute an essential procedural safeguard which ensures that the right to be heard is observed. The parties under investigation should be provided with the documents required to defend themselves effectively and to comment on the allegations made	(22) The rules regarding the administrative procedure applied by supervisory authorities when enforcing Regulation (EU) 2016/679 should ensure that the parties under investigation effectively have the <u>right to be heard and</u> opportunity to make known their views on the truth and relevance of the facts, objections and circumstances put forward by the supervisory authority throughout the procedure, thereby enabling them to exercise their rights of defence. The preliminary findings set out the preliminary position on the alleged infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 following investigation. They thus constitute an essential procedural safeguard which ensures that the right to be heard is observed. The parties under investigation should be provided with <u>all the necessary</u> the documents required to defend themselves effectively and to	(22) The rules regarding the administrative procedure applied by supervisory authorities when enforcing Regulation (EU) 2016/679 should ensure that the parties under investigation effectively have the opportunity to make known their views on the truth and relevance of the facts, objections and circumstances put forward by the supervisory authority throughout the procedure, thereby enabling them to exercise their rights of defence. The preliminary findings set out the preliminary position on the alleged infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 following investigation. They thus constitute an essential procedural safeguard which ensures that the right to be heard is observed. The parties under investigation should be provided with the documents required to defend themselves effectively and to comment on the allegations made	(22) The rules regarding the administrative procedure applied by supervisory authorities when enforcing Regulation (EU) 2016/679 should ensure that the parties under investigation effectively have the opportunity to make known their views on the truth and relevance of the facts, objections and circumstances put forward by the supervisory authority throughout the procedure, thereby enabling them to exercise their rights of defence. The preliminary findings set out the preliminary position on the alleged infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 following investigation. They thus constitute an essential procedural safeguard which ensures that the right to be heard is observed. The parties under investigation should be provided with the documents required to defend themselves effectively and to comment on the allegations made

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	against them, by receiving access to the administrative file.	comment on <u>matters relevant to the investigation</u> the allegations made against them , by receiving access to the administrative <u>joint case</u> file.	against them, by receiving access to the administrative file.	against them, by receiving access to the administrative file. ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Recital 22a				
32a			(22a) These rules should be without prejudice to the possibility for supervisory authorities to grant further access to the administrative file in order to hear further the views of any of the parties under investigation or of the complainant in the course of the proceedings, in accordance with national law.	<u>(22a) These rules should be without prejudice to the possibility for supervisory authorities to grant further access to the administrative file in order to hear further the views of any of the parties under investigation or of the complainant in the course of the proceedings, in accordance with national law.</u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Recital 23				
33	(23) The preliminary findings define the scope of the investigation and therefore the scope of any future final decision (as the case may be, taken on the basis of a binding decision issued by the Board under Article 65(1), point (a) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679) which may be addressed to controllers or processors. The preliminary findings should be couched in terms that, even if	(23) The preliminary findings define the scope of the investigation and therefore the scope of any future final decision (as the case may be, taken on the basis of a binding decision issued by the Board under Article 65(1), point (a) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679) which may be addressed to controllers or processors. The preliminary findings should be couched in terms that, even if	(23) The preliminary findings define the scope of the investigation and therefore the scope of any future final decision (as the case may be, taken on the basis of a binding decision issued by the Board under Article 65(1), point (a) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679) which may be addressed to controllers or processors. The preliminary findings should be couched in terms that, even if	(23) The preliminary findings define the scope of the investigation and therefore the scope of any future final decision (as the case may be, taken on the basis of a binding decision issued by the Board under Article 65(1), point (a) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679) which may be addressed to controllers or processors. The preliminary findings should be couched in terms that, even if


	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	<p>succinct, are sufficiently clear to enable the parties under investigation to properly identify the nature of the alleged infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. The obligation of giving the parties under investigation all the information necessary to enable them to properly defend themselves is satisfied if the final decision does not allege that the parties under investigation have committed infringements other than those referred to in the preliminary findings and only takes into consideration facts on which the parties under investigation have had the opportunity of making known their views. The final decision of the lead supervisory authority is not, however, necessarily required to be a replica of the preliminary findings. The lead supervisory authority should be permitted in the final decision to take account of the responses of the parties under investigation to the preliminary findings, and, where applicable, the revised draft decision under Article 60(5) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, and the Article 65(1), point (a), decision resolving the dispute between the supervisory authorities. The lead supervisory authority should be able to carry out its own assessment of the facts and the legal qualifications put forward by the</p>	<p>succinct, are sufficiently clear to enable the parties under investigation to properly identify the nature of the alleged infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. The obligation of giving the parties under investigation all the information necessary to enable them to properly defend themselves <u>be heard</u> is satisfied if the final decision does not allege that the parties under investigation have committed infringements other than those referred to in the preliminary findings and only takes into consideration facts on which the parties under investigation have had the opportunity of making known their views. The final decision of the lead supervisory authority is not, however, necessarily required to be a replica of the preliminary findings. The lead supervisory authority should be permitted in the final decision to take account of the responses of the parties under investigation to the preliminary findings, and, where applicable, the revised draft decision under Article 60(5) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, and the Article 65(1), point (a), decision <u>by the Board</u> resolving the dispute between the supervisory authorities <u>under Article 65(1), point (a), of that Regulation</u>. The lead supervisory authority should be able</p>	<p>succinct, are sufficiently clear to enable the parties under investigation to properly identify the nature of the alleged infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. The obligation of giving the parties under investigation all the information necessary to enable them to properly defend themselves is satisfied if the final decision does not allege that the parties under investigation have committed infringements other than those referred to in the preliminary findings and only takes into consideration facts on which the parties under investigation have had the opportunity of making known their views. The final decision of the lead supervisory authority is not, however, necessarily required to be a replica of the preliminary findings. The lead supervisory authority should be permitted in the final decision to take account of the responses of the parties under investigation to the preliminary findings, and, where applicable, the revised draft decision under Article 60(5) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, and the Article 65(1), point (a), decision resolving the dispute between the supervisory authorities. The lead supervisory authority should be able to carry out its own assessment of the facts and the legal qualifications put forward by the</p>	<p>succinct, are sufficiently clear to enable the parties under investigation to properly identify the nature of the alleged infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. The obligation of giving the parties under investigation all the information necessary to enable them to properly defend themselves is satisfied if the final decision does not allege that the parties under investigation have committed infringements other than those referred to in the preliminary findings and only takes into consideration facts on which the parties under investigation have had the opportunity of making known their views. The final decision of the lead supervisory authority is not, however, necessarily required to be a replica of the preliminary findings. The lead supervisory authority should be permitted in the final decision to take account of the responses of the parties under investigation to the preliminary findings, and, where applicable, the revised draft decision under Article 60(5) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, and the Article 65(1), point (a), decision resolving the dispute between the supervisory authorities. The lead supervisory authority should be able to carry out its own assessment of the facts and the legal qualifications put forward by the</p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	<p>parties under investigation in order either to abandon the objections when the supervisory authority finds them to be unfounded or to supplement and redraft its arguments, both in fact and in law, in support of the objections which it maintains. For example, taking account of an argument put forward by a party under investigation during the administrative procedure, without it having been given the opportunity to express an opinion in that respect before the adoption of the final decision, cannot per se constitute an infringement of defence rights.</p>	<p>to carry out its own assessment of the facts and the legal qualifications put forward by the parties under investigation in order either to abandon the objections when the supervisory authority finds them to be unfounded or to supplement and redraft its arguments, both in fact and in law, in support of the objections which it maintains. For example, taking account of an argument put forward by a party under investigation during the administrative procedure, without it having been given the opportunity to express an opinion in that respect before the adoption of the final decision, cannot per se constitute an infringement of defence rights.</p>	<p>parties under investigation in order either to abandon the objections when the supervisory authority finds them to be unfounded or to supplement and redraft its arguments, both in fact and in law, in support of the objections which it maintains. For example, taking account of an argument put forward by a party under investigation during the administrative procedure, without it having been given the opportunity to express an opinion in that respect before the adoption of the final decision, cannot per se constitute an infringement of defence rights.</p>	<p>parties under investigation in order either to abandon the objections when the supervisory authority finds them to be unfounded or to supplement and redraft its arguments, both in fact and in law, in support of the objections which it maintains. For example, taking account of an argument put forward by a party under investigation during the administrative procedure, without it having been given the opportunity to express an opinion in that respect before the adoption of the final decision, cannot per se constitute an infringement of defence rights.</p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p> <p>Text Origin: Council Mandate</p>
Recital 23a				
33a			<p>(23a) Where the lead supervisory authority is required by national law to further engage in subsequent domestic procedures related to the same case, such as administrative appeal proceedings or misdemeanour proceedings, the preliminary findings should be prepared again if this domestic procedure conducts the lead supervisory authority to deviate from previous consensus, and would</p>	<p><u><i>(23a) This regulation provides for rules where the lead supervisory authority is required by national law to further engage in subsequent domestic procedures related to the same case, such as administrative appeal proceedings.</i></u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
			<p>result in substantive changes compared to the previous preliminary findings, in order to enable the parties under investigation to properly defend themselves. However, if the subsequent procedure related to the same case involves no further changes in comparison to previous decisions and national law ensures the right to be heard, the new preliminary findings may not be necessary. The lead supervisory authority should inform the supervisory authority concerned of such a possibility when submitting a draft decision in accordance with Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</p>	
Recital 24				
34	<p>(24) The parties under investigation should be provided with a right to be heard prior to the submission of a revised draft decision under Article 60(5) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 or the adoption of a binding decision by the Board pursuant to Article 65(1), point (a), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</p>	<p>(24) The parties under investigation should be provided with a right to be heard <u>at appropriate stages of the procedure, in particular</u> prior to the submission of a revised draft decision under Article 60(5) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 or the adoption of a binding decision by the Board pursuant to Article 65(1), point (a), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</p>	<p>(24) The parties under investigation should be provided with a right to be heard prior to the submission of a revised draft decision under Article 60(5) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 or the adoption of a binding decision by the Board pursuant to Article 65(1), point (a), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</p>	<p>(24) The parties under investigation should be provided with a right to be heard prior to the submission of a revised draft decision under Article 60(5) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 or the adoption of a binding decision by the Board pursuant to Article 65(1), point (a), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. <u>New legal elements include relevant and reasoned objections where those objections contain legal assessments diferent from those proposed by the lead supervisory authority in the draf decision submitted pursuant to</u></p>


	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				<p>Article 60(4) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p> <p>Text Origin: Commission Proposal</p>
Recital 25				
35	<p>(25) Complainants should be given the possibility to be associated with the proceedings initiated by a supervisory authority with a view to identifying or clarifying issues relating to a potential infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. The fact that a supervisory authority has already initiated an investigation concerning the subject matter of the complaint or will deal with the complaint in an ex officio investigation subsequent to the receipt the complaint does not bar the qualification of a data subject as complainant. However, an investigation by a supervisory authority of a possible infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 by a controller or processor does not constitute an adversarial procedure between the complainant and the parties under investigation. It is a procedure commenced by a supervisory authority, upon its own initiative or based on a complaint, in fulfilment of its tasks under Article</p>	<p>(25) Complainants should be given the possibility to be associated with the proceedings initiated by a supervisory authority with a view to identifying or clarifying issues relating to a potential infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. The fact that a supervisory authority has already initiated an investigation concerning the subject matter of the complaint or will deal with the complaint in an ex officio investigation subsequent to the receipt <i>of</i> the complaint does not bar the qualification of a data subject as complainant. However, an investigation by a supervisory authority of a possible infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 by a controller or processor does not constitute an adversarial procedure between the complainant and the parties under investigation. It is a procedure commenced by a supervisory authority, upon its own initiative or based on a complaint, in fulfilment of its tasks under</p>	<p>(25) Complainants should be given the possibility to be associated with the proceedings initiated by a supervisory authority with a view to identifying or clarifying issues relating to a potential infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. The fact that a supervisory authority has already initiated an investigation concerning the subject matter of the complaint or will deal with the complaint in an ex officio investigation subsequent to the receipt the complaint does not bar the qualification of a data subject as complainant. However, an investigation by a supervisory authority of a possible infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 by a controller or processor does not constitute an adversarial procedure between the complainant and the parties under investigation. It is a procedure commenced by a supervisory authority, upon its own initiative or based on a complaint, in fulfilment of its tasks under Article</p>	<p>(25) Complainants should be given the possibility to be associated with the proceedings initiated by a supervisory authority with a view to identifying or clarifying issues relating to a potential infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. The fact that a supervisory authority has already initiated an investigation concerning the subject matter of the complaint or will deal with the complaint in an ex officio investigation subsequent to the receipt <i>of</i> the complaint does not bar the qualification of a data subject as complainant. However, An investigation by a supervisory authority of a possible infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 by a controller or processor does not constitute an adversarial procedure between the complainant and the parties under investigation. It is a procedure commenced by a supervisory authority, upon its own initiative or based on a complaint, in fulfilment of its tasks under Article</p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	<p>57(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. The parties under investigation and the complainant are, therefore, not in the same procedural situation and the latter cannot invoke the right to a fair hearing when the decision does not adversely affect her or his legal position. The complainant's involvement in the procedure against the parties under investigation cannot compromise the right of these parties to be heard.</p>	<p><i>Article 57(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. The parties under investigation and the complainant are, therefore, not in the same procedural situation and the latter cannot invoke the right to a fair hearing when the decision does not adversely affect her or his legal position. The complainant's involvement in the procedure against the parties under investigation cannot compromise the right of these parties to be heard.</i></p>	<p>57(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. The parties under investigation and the complainant are, therefore, not in the same procedural situation and the latter cannot invoke the right to a fair hearing when the decision does not adversely affect her or his legal position. The complainant's involvement in the procedure against the parties under investigation cannot compromise the right of these parties to be heard.</p>	<p>57(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. The parties under investigation and the complainant are, therefore, not in the same procedural situation, <u>and it is essential to safeguard</u> and the latter cannot invoke the right to a fair hearing when the decision does not adversely affect her or his legal position <u>of defence of the party under investigation.</u> The complainant's involvement in the procedure against The parties under investigation cannot compromise <u>the and the complainant can invoke the fundamental</u> right of these parties to be heard. <u>when the decision adversely affects their legal position</u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p> <p>Text Origin: EP Mandate</p>
Recital 25a				
35a		<p><u>(25a) Notwithstanding the fact that the parties under investigation and the complainant are not in the same procedural situation, there are circumstances in which complainants can be in a position to adduce arguments and evidence during an investigation which can help the progress of the investigation. This is particularly the case in circumstances in which a not-for-profit body, organisation</u></p>		<p><i>deleted</i></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
		<u>or association has lodged a complaint on behalf of a data subject or on its own initiative under Article 80 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. Supervisory authorities should facilitate the hearing of such complainants at all stages of the investigation, including ex officio investigations, while also maintaining their independence.</u>		
Recital 26				
36	(26) The complainants should be given the possibility to submit in writing views on the preliminary findings. However, they should not have access to business secrets or other confidential information belonging to other parties involved in the proceedings. Complainants should not be entitled to have generalised access to the administrative file.	<i>deleted</i>	(26) The complainants should be given the possibility to submit in writing views on the preliminary findings to the extent that their individual rights as data subject are considered to have been infringed . However, they should not have access to business secrets or other confidential information belonging to other parties involved in the proceedings. Complainants should not be entitled to have generalised access to the administrative file.	(26) The complainants should be given the possibility to submit in writing views on the preliminary findings <u>to the extent that it relates to their complaint concerning the processing of their personal data</u> . However, they should not have access to business <u>trade</u> secrets or other confidential information belonging to other parties involved in the proceedings. Complainants should not be entitled to have generalised access to the administrative file. ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Recital 27				
37	(27) When setting deadlines for parties under investigation and complainants to provide their views	(27) When setting deadlines <u>and limiting the length of submissions</u> for parties under investigation and	(27) When setting deadlines for parties under investigation and complainants to provide their views	(27) When setting deadlines for parties under investigation and complainants to provide their views

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	<p>on preliminary findings, supervisory authorities should have regard to the complexity of the issues raised in preliminary findings, in order to ensure that the parties under investigation and complainants have sufficient opportunity to meaningfully provide their views on the issues raised.</p>	<p><i>complainants</i> to provide their views on preliminary findings, supervisory authorities should have regard to the complexity of the issues raised in preliminary findings, in order to ensure that <u>as well as the capacity of</u> the parties under investigation and complainants <u>to respond, in order to ensure that the parties</u> have sufficient opportunity to meaningfully provide their views on the issues raised. <u>This should however not lead to unduly long procedures.</u></p>	<p>on preliminary findings, supervisory authorities should have regard to the complexity of the issues raised in preliminary findings, in order to ensure that the parties under investigation and complainants have sufficient opportunity to meaningfully provide their views on the issues raised.</p>	<p>on preliminary findings, supervisory authorities should have regard to the complexity of the issues raised in preliminary findings, in order to ensure that the parties under investigation and complainants have sufficient opportunity to meaningfully provide their views on the issues raised.</p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p> <p>Text Origin: Commission Proposal</p>
Recital 28				
38	<p>(28) The exchange of views prior to the adoption of a draft decision involves an open dialogue and an extensive exchange of views where supervisory authorities should do their utmost to find a consensus on the way forward in an investigation. Conversely, the disagreement expressed in relevant and reasoned objections pursuant to Article 60(4) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, which raise the potential for dispute resolution between supervisory authorities under Article 65 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and delay the adoption of a final decision by the competent supervisory authority, should arise in the exceptional case of a failure of supervisory authorities to achieve</p>	<p><i>deleted</i></p>	<p>(28) The exchange of views prior to the adoption of a draft decision involves an open dialogue and an extensive exchange of views where supervisory authorities should do their utmost to find a consensus on the way forward in an investigation. Conversely, the disagreement expressed in relevant and reasoned objections pursuant to Article 60(4) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, which raise the potential for dispute resolution between supervisory authorities under Article 65 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and delay the adoption of a final decision by the competent supervisory authority, should arise in the exceptional case of a failure of supervisory authorities to achieve</p>	<p>(28) The exchange of views prior to the adoption of a draft decision involves an open dialogue and an extensive exchange of views where supervisory authorities should do their utmost to find a consensus on the way forward in an investigation. Conversely, the disagreement expressed in relevant and reasoned objections pursuant to Article 60(4) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, which raise the potential for dispute resolution between supervisory authorities under Article 65 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and delay the adoption of a final decision by the competent supervisory authority, should arise in the exceptional case of a failure of supervisory authorities to achieve</p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	<p>a consensus and where necessary to ensure the consistent interpretation of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. Such objections should be used sparingly, when matters of consistent enforcement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 are at stake, since every use of relevant and reasoned objections postpones the remedy for the data subject. Since the scope of the investigation and the relevant facts should be decided prior to the communication of preliminary findings, these matters should not be raised by supervisory authorities concerned in relevant and reasoned objections. They may, however, be raised by supervisory authorities concerned in their comments on the summary of key issues pursuant to Article 9(3), before preliminary findings are communicated to the parties under investigation.</p>		<p>a consensus and where necessary to ensure the consistent interpretation of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. Such objections should be used sparingly, when matters of consistent enforcement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 are at stake, since every use of relevant and reasoned objections postpones the remedy for the data subject. Since the scope of the investigation and the relevant facts should be decided prior to the communication of preliminary findings, these matters should not be raised by supervisory authorities concerned in relevant and reasoned objections. They may, however, be raised by supervisory authorities concerned in their comments on the summary of key issues pursuant to Article 9(3), before preliminary findings are communicated to the parties under investigation.</p>	<p>a consensus and where necessary to ensure the consistent interpretation of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. Such objections should be used <i>sparingly</i>, when matters of consistent enforcement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 are at stake, since every use of relevant and reasoned objections postpones the remedy for the data subject. Since the scope of the investigation and the relevant facts should be decided prior to the communication of preliminary findings, these matters should not be raised by supervisory authorities concerned in relevant and reasoned objections. They may, however, be raised by supervisory authorities concerned in their comments on the summary of key issues pursuant to Article 9(3), before preliminary findings are communicated to the parties under investigation.</p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p> <p>Text Origin: Council Mandate</p>
	Recital 29			
39	<p>(29) In the interest of the efficient and inclusive conclusion of the dispute resolution procedure, where all supervisory authorities should be in a position to contribute their views and bearing in mind the time constraints during dispute</p>	<p>(29) In the interest of the efficient and inclusive conclusion of the dispute resolution procedure, where all supervisory authorities should be in a position to contribute their views and bearing in mind the time constraints during dispute</p>	<p><i>deleted</i></p>	<p>(29) In the interest of the efficient and inclusive conclusion of the dispute resolution procedure, where all supervisory authorities should be in a position to contribute their views and bearing in mind the time constraints during dispute</p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	<p>resolution, the form and structure of relevant and reasoned objections should meet certain requirements. Therefore, relevant and reasoned objections should be limited to a prescribed length, should clearly identify the disagreement with the draft decision and should be worded in sufficiently clear, coherent and precise terms.</p>	<p>resolution, the form and structure of relevant and reasoned objections should meet certain requirements. Therefore, relevant and reasoned objections should <i>be limited to a prescribed length, should</i> clearly identify the disagreement with the draft decision and should be worded in sufficiently clear, coherent and precise terms.</p>		<p>resolution, the form and structure of relevant and reasoned objections should meet certain requirements. <i>Therefore, relevant and reasoned objections should be limited to a prescribed length, should clearly identify the disagreement with the draft decision and should be worded in sufficiently clear, coherent and precise terms.</i></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
Recital 30				
40	<p>(30) Access to the administrative file is provided for as a part of the rights of defence and the right to good administration enshrined in the Charter. Access to the administrative file should be provided to the parties under investigation when they are notified of preliminary findings and the deadline to submit their written reply to the preliminary findings should be set.</p>	<p>(30) Access to the <i>administrative file is joint case file may be provided for as a part of the rights of defence and in the spirit of</i> the right to good administration enshrined in the Charter. Access to the <i>administrative joint case file</i> should be provided to the parties <i>under investigation when they are notified of preliminary findings and the deadline to submit their written reply. Access of the parties to the preliminary findings should be set joint case file may be limited at the request of a party to protect their legally recognised rights or the rights of others, or in the public interest. Such limitation must be proportionate in light of the respective recognised rights of others or the public interest pursued.</i></p>	<p>(30) Access to the administrative file is provided for as a part of the rights of defence and the right to good administration enshrined in the Charter. Access to the administrative file should be provided to the parties under investigation when they are notified of preliminary findings and the deadline to submit their written reply to the preliminary findings should be set.</p>	<p>(30) Access to the administrative file is provided for as a part of the rights of defence and the right to good administration enshrined in the Charter. Access to the administrative file should be provided to the parties under investigation when they are notified of preliminary findings and the deadline to submit their written reply to the preliminary findings should be set.</p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p> <p>Text Origin: Commission Proposal</p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
Recital 31				
41	(31) When granting access to the administrative file, supervisory authorities should ensure the protection of business secrets and other confidential information. The category of other confidential information includes information other than business secrets, which may be considered as confidential, insofar as its disclosure would significantly harm a controller, a processor or a natural person. The supervisory authorities should be able to request that parties under investigation that submit or have submitted documents or statements identify confidential information.	(31) When granting access to the administrative <u>joint case</u> file, supervisory authorities should ensure the protection of business secrets and other <u>legally protected confidential information and the protection of information in the public interest in accordance with applicable national law</u> . The category of other confidential information includes information other than business secrets, which may be considered as confidential, insofar as its disclosure would significantly harm a controller, a processor or a natural <u>or legal</u> person. The supervisory authorities should be able to request that parties under investigation that submit or have submitted documents or statements identify confidential information <u>and provide a non-confidential version</u> .	(31) When granting access to the administrative file to parties under investigation and the complainant , supervisory authorities should ensure the protection of business <u>trade</u> secrets and other confidential information. The category of other confidential information includes information other than business <u>trade</u> 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 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.	(31) When granting access to the administrative file <u>to parties under investigation and the complainant</u> , supervisory authorities should ensure the protection of business <u>trade</u> secrets and other confidential information. The category of other confidential information includes information other than business <u>trade</u> secrets, which may be considered as confidential <u>in accordance with Union and national law</u> , insofar as its disclosure would significantly harm a controller, a processor or a natural <u>or legal</u> person. <u>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.</u> The supervisory authorities should be able to request that parties under investigation that submit or have submitted documents or statements identify confidential information.
Recital 32				
42	(32) Where business secrets or other confidential information are	(32) Where business secrets or other confidential information are	(32) Where business <u>trade</u> secrets or other confidential information are	(32) Where business <u>trade</u> secrets or other confidential information are


	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	necessary to prove an infringement, the supervisory authorities should assess for each individual document whether the need to disclose is greater than the harm which might result from disclosure.	necessary to prove an infringement, the supervisory authorities should assess for each individual document whether the need to disclose is greater than the harm which might result from disclosure.	necessary to prove an infringement, the supervisory authorities should assess for each individual document 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.	necessary to prove an infringement, the supervisory authorities should assess for each individual document <u><i>in a proportionate manner</i></u> whether the need to disclose is greater than the harm which might result from disclosure.
Recital 32a				
6	42a		(32a) Access to documents included in the administrative file on the basis of access to public documents shall be provided in accordance with Member States law. Until the final decision is adopted by the competent supervisory authority, the decision-making process of the authorities, including the performance of their tasks without undue external influence, shall be protected.	<u><i>(32a) Access to documents included in the administrative file on the basis of access to public documents is to be provided in accordance with Member States law. In this regard, it is important that the integrity of the decision-making process is protected until the final decision is adopted by the competent supervisory authority.</i></u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Recital 32b				
6	42b			<u><i>(32b) It is important that the Board facilitate access to decisions adopted in accordance with the cooperation and consistency mechanisms, by making the text of the final decisions adopted by national supervisory authorities available online through easily</i></u>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
			PUBLIC	<p><u>accessible registers. In accordance with applicable national law, supervisory authorities can redact names, any other information that allows for the identification of parties under investigation or the complainant, and other information that is protected under applicable Union and national law.</u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
Recital 32c				
6	42c			<p><u>(32c) It is important that the provision to the complainant of a version of the final decision in accordance with this Regulation remains without prejudice to the possibility for a supervisory authority to decide whether to make the decision public as part of its corrective powers.</u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
Recital 33				
6	43	(33) When referring a subject-matter to dispute resolution under Article 65 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, the lead supervisory authority should provide the Board with all necessary information to enable it to assess the admissibility of relevant and reasoned objections and to take the decision pursuant to	(33) When referring a subject-matter to dispute resolution under Article 65 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, the lead supervisory authority should provide the Board with all necessary information to enable it to assess the admissibility of relevant and reasoned objections and to take the decision pursuant to	(33) When referring a subject-matter to dispute resolution under Article 65 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, the lead supervisory authority should provide the Board with all necessary information to enable it to assess the admissibility of relevant and reasoned objections and to take the decision pursuant to

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	Article 65(1), point (a), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. Once the Board is in receipt of all the necessary documents listed in Article 23, the Chair of the Board should register the referral of the subject-matter in the sense of Article 65(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.	Article 65(1), point (a), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. Once the Board is in receipt of all the necessary documents <i>listed in Article 23, the Chair of</i> the Board should register the referral of the subject-matter in <i>the sense of</i> <u>accordance with</u> Article 65(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.	Article 65(1), point (a), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. Once the Board is in receipt of all the necessary documents listed in Article 23, the Chair of the Board should register the referral of the subject-matter in the sense of Article 65(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.	Article 65(1), point (a), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. Once the Board is in receipt of all the necessary documents <i>listed in Article 23,</i> the Chair of the Board should register the referral of the subject-matter in <i>the sense of</i> <u>accordance with</u> Article 65(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: EP Mandate
Recital 34				
44	(34) The binding decision of the Board under Article 65(1), point (a), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 should concern exclusively matters which led to the triggering of the dispute resolution and be drafted in a way which allows the lead supervisory authority to adopt its final decision on the basis of the decision of the Board while maintaining its discretion.	(34) The binding decision of the Board under Article 65(1), point (a), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 should concern exclusively matters which led to the triggering of the dispute resolution and be drafted in <i>a way which allows</i> <u>clear and precise language, allowing</u> the lead supervisory authority to adopt its final decision on the basis of the decision of the Board <i>while maintaining its discretion.</i>	(34) The binding decision of the Board under Article 65(1), point (a), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 should concern exclusively matters which led to the triggering of the dispute resolution and be drafted in a way which allows the lead supervisory authority to adopt its final decision on the basis of the decision of the Board while maintaining its discretion.	(34) The binding decision of the Board under Article 65(1), point (a), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 should concern exclusively matters which led to the triggering of the dispute resolution and be drafted in a way which allows the lead supervisory authority to adopt its final decision on the basis of the decision of the Board <i>while maintaining its discretion.</i> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Recital 35				
45	(35) In order to streamline the resolution of disputes between supervisory authorities submitted to	(35) In order to streamline the resolution of disputes between supervisory authorities submitted to	(35) In order to streamline the resolution of disputes between supervisory authorities submitted to	(35) In order to streamline the resolution of disputes between supervisory authorities submitted to

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	the Board under Article 65(1), points (b) and (c), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, it is necessary to specify procedural rules regarding the documents to be submitted to the Board and on which the Board should base its decision. It is also necessary to specify when the Board should register the submission of the matter to dispute resolution.	the Board under Article 65(1), points (b) and (c), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, it is necessary to specify procedural rules regarding the documents to be submitted to the Board and on which the Board should base its decision. It is also necessary to specify when the Board should register the submission of the matter to dispute resolution.	the Board under Article 65(1), points (b) and (c), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, it is necessary to specify procedural rules regarding the documents to be submitted to the Board and on which the Board should base its decision. It is also necessary to specify when the Board should register the submission of the matter to dispute resolution.	the Board under Article 65(1), points (b) and (c), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, it is necessary to specify procedural rules regarding the documents to be submitted to the Board and on which the Board should base its decision. It is also necessary to specify when the Board should register the submission of the matter to dispute resolution. Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Recital 35a				
6	45a		(35a) When the Board sets a time limit for the parties under investigation or the complainant to make their views known, it would be appropriate for the Board to extend the period for the adoption of its decision, given that in such circumstances the need to take into account the views made known by the parties or the complainant always increases the complexity of the subject -matter, for the purposes of Article 65(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.	<i>deleted</i> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Recital 36				
6	46	(36) In order to streamline the procedure for the adoption of urgent opinions and urgent binding decisions of the Board under Article 66(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, it is necessary to specify procedural	(36) In order to streamline the procedure for the adoption of urgent opinions and urgent binding decisions of the Board under Article 66(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, it is necessary to specify procedural	(36) In order to streamline the procedure for the adoption of urgent opinions and urgent binding decisions of the Board under Article 66(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, it is necessary to specify procedural

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	rules regarding the timing of the request for an urgent opinion or urgent binding decision, the documents to be submitted to the Board and on which the Board should base its decision, to whom the opinion or decision of the Board should be addressed, and the consequences of the opinion or decision of the Board.	rules regarding the timing of the request for an urgent opinion or urgent binding decision, the documents to be submitted to the Board and on which the Board should base its decision, to whom the opinion or decision of the Board should be addressed, and the consequences of the opinion or decision of the Board. <u>Provisional measures pursuant to Article 66(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 should include all possible measures within the powers of supervisory authorities, pursuant to Article 58 of that Regulation.</u>	rules regarding the timing of the request for an urgent opinion or urgent binding decision, the documents to be submitted to the Board and on which the Board should base its decision, to whom the opinion or decision of the Board should be addressed, and the consequences of the opinion or decision of the Board.	rules regarding the timing of the request for an urgent opinion or urgent binding decision, the documents to be submitted to the Board and on which the Board should base its decision, to whom the opinion or decision of the Board should be addressed, and the consequences of the opinion or decision of the Board. ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Recital 36a				
6	46a	<u>(36a) The Board should be able to request any further information from supervisory authorities necessary for it to take a binding decision.</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: EP Mandate
Recital 36b				
	46b	<u>(36b) The complainant should have a right to a judicial remedy in the event that a supervisory authority does not use its powers or does not otherwise take necessary action required by Regulation (EU) 2016/679. In addition, the parties should have a right to take action against the lead supervisory authority in case of inaction or</u>		trilogue

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
		<p><u>overly long procedures. To ensure that there is no enforcement gap, the parties to the case and organisations under Article 80(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 should be empowered to seek a judicial remedy in the public interest if a supervisory authority does not comply with a decision of the Board and if they consider that the rights of a data subject under Regulation (EU) 2016/679 have been infringed as a result of the processing.</u></p>		

Recital 37

47	<p>(37) Chapters III and IV concern cooperation between supervisory authorities, the procedural rights of parties under investigation and the involvement of complainants. To ensure legal certainty, those provisions should not apply to investigations already under way at the time this Regulation enters into force. They should apply to ex officio investigations opened after the entry into force of this Regulation and to complaint-based investigations where the complaint was lodged after the entry into force of this Regulation. Chapter V provides procedural rules for cases submitted to dispute resolution under Article 65 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. Also for reasons of legal certainty, this Chapter should not</p>	<p>(37) Chapters III and IV concern cooperation between supervisory authorities, the procedural rights of parties under investigation and the involvement of complainants. To ensure legal certainty, those provisions should not apply to investigations already under way at the time this Regulation enters into force. They should apply to ex officio investigations opened after the entry into force of this Regulation and to complaint-based investigations where the complaint was lodged after the entry into force of this Regulation. Chapter V provides procedural rules for cases submitted to dispute resolution under Article 65 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. Also for reasons of legal certainty, this Chapter should not</p>	<p>(37) Chapters III and IV concern cooperation between supervisory authorities, the procedural rights of parties under investigation and the involvement of complainants. To ensure legal certainty, those provisions should not apply to investigations already under way at the time this Regulation enters into force. They should apply to ex officio ex officio investigations opened after the entry into force of this Regulation and to complaint-based investigations where the complaint was lodged after the entry into force of this Regulation. Chapter V provides procedural rules for cases submitted to dispute resolution under Article 65 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. Also for reasons of legal certainty, this</p>	<p>(37) Chapters III and IV concern cooperation between supervisory authorities, the procedural rights of parties under investigation and the involvement of complainants. To ensure legal certainty, those provisions should not apply to investigations already under way at the time this Regulation enters into force. They should apply to ex officio ex officio investigations opened after the entry into force of this Regulation and to complaint-based investigations where the complaint was lodged after the entry into force of this Regulation. Chapter V provides procedural rules for cases submitted to dispute resolution under Article 65 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. Also for reasons of legal certainty, this</p>
----	---	---	---	---

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	apply to cases that have been submitted to dispute resolution prior to the entry into force of this Regulation. It should apply to all cases submitted to dispute resolution after the entry into force of this Regulation.	apply to cases that have been submitted to dispute resolution prior to the entry into force of this Regulation. It should apply to all cases submitted to dispute resolution after the entry into force of this Regulation.	Chapter should not apply to cases that have been submitted to dispute resolution prior to the entry into force of this Regulation. It should apply to all cases submitted to dispute resolution after the entry into force of this Regulation.	Chapter should not apply to cases that have been submitted to dispute resolution prior to the entry into force of this Regulation. It should apply to all cases submitted to dispute resolution after the entry into force of this Regulation. ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Recital 37a				
47a			(37a) The successful implementation of the Regulation requires adequate digital tools supporting the exchange of information in line with the Regulation. An appropriate secure common electronic communication system should be provided for all data protection authorities, which should build upon the experience gained in using the existing systems. The sufficient resources needed for the implementation of such communication system should be provided.	<u>(37a) The implementation of the Regulation requires adequate digital tools supporting the rapid and secure exchange of information. It is important that an appropriate secure common electronic tool be available for all data protection authorities, taking into account the experience gained in using the existing tools. It is also important that resources needed for the implementation of such an electronic tool be provided and that such tool facilitate the collection and consolidation of enforcement statistics on cross-border cases by the Board.</u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Recital 37b				

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
47b			PUBLIC	<p><u>(37b) In cases where a supervisory authority is required to take certain procedural steps within specified time limits, it is the purpose of such time limits to ensure that the procedure progresses and concludes within a reasonable time. However, the purpose of such time limits is not to preclude supervisory authorities from taking the required procedural steps after their expiry. It is therefore necessary to ensure that where such procedural steps are taken after the expiry of the corresponding time limits, that fact cannot be considered grounds for illegality or invalidity either of the procedural step in question or of the final decision.</u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
Recital 38				
48	(38) The European Data Protection Supervisor and the European Data Protection Board were consulted in accordance with Article 42(2) of Regulation (EU) 2018/1725 and delivered a joint opinion on [],	(38) The European Data Protection Supervisor and the European Data Protection Board were consulted in accordance with Article 42(2) of Regulation (EU) 2018/1725 and delivered a joint opinion on 19 <u>19</u> <u>September 2023</u> ,	(38) The European Data Protection Supervisor and the European Data Protection Board were consulted in accordance with Article 42(2) of Regulation (EU) 2018/1725 and delivered a joint opinion on [19 th September 2023-],	(38) The European Data Protection Supervisor and the European Data Protection Board were consulted in accordance with Article 42(2) of Regulation (EU) 2018/1725 and delivered a joint opinion on 19 <u>19</u> <u>September 2023</u> , Text Origin: EP Mandate
Formula				

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
49	HAVE ADOPTED THIS REGULATION:	HAVE ADOPTED THIS REGULATION:	HAVE ADOPTED THIS REGULATION:	HAVE ADOPTED THIS REGULATION: <small>Text Origin: Commission Proposal</small>
Chapter I				
50	Chapter I General provisions	Chapter I General provisions	Chapter I General provisions	Chapter I General provisions <small>Text Origin: Commission Proposal</small>
Section 1a (new)				
50a		<u>Section 1a (new) Subject matter, scope, and definitions</u>		<u>Section 1a (new) Subject matter, scope, and definitions</u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level <small>Text Origin: EP Mandate</small>
Article 1				
51	Article 1 Subject matter	Article 1 Subject matter <u>and scope</u>	Article 1 Subject matter Scope	Article 1 Subject matter <u>and scope</u> <small>Text Origin: EP Mandate</small>
Article 1, first paragraph				
52	This Regulation lays down procedural rules for the handling of complaints and the conduct of investigations in complaint-based and ex officio cases by supervisory authorities in the cross-border enforcement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.	This Regulation lays down procedural rules for the handling of complaints and the conduct of investigations in complaint-based and ex officio cases by supervisory authorities <u>whenever supervisory authorities of more than one Member State are involved</u> in the cross-border enforcement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 <u>case, as</u>	This Regulation lays down procedural rules for the handling of complaints and the conduct of investigations in complaint-based and ex officio ex officio cases by supervisory authorities in the cross-border cross-border enforcement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 for cross-border processing.	This Regulation lays down procedural rules for the handling of complaints and the conduct of investigations in complaint-based and ex officio ex officio cases by supervisory authorities in the cross-border cross-border enforcement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 <u>for cross-border processing, including the</u>


	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
		<u>well as procedural rules on related judicial remedies.</u>		<u>determination of whether a case relates to cross-border processing.</u> Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 1, first paragraph a				
52a		<u>1a. Article 26b of this Regulation also applies to cases before a supervisory authority of a single Member State, pursuant to Article 56(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</u>		deleted
Article 2				
53	Article 2 Definitions	Article 2 Definitions	Article 2 Definitions	Article 2 Definitions Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Article 2, first paragraph				
54	For the purposes of this Regulation the definitions in Article 4 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 shall apply.	For the purposes of this Regulation the definitions in Article 4 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 shall apply.	For the purposes of this Regulation the definitions in Article 4 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 shall apply.	For the purposes of this Regulation the definitions in Article 4 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 shall apply. Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Article 2, second paragraph				
55	The following definitions shall also apply:	The following definitions shall also apply:	The following definitions shall also apply:	The following definitions shall also apply: Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Article 2, second paragraph, point (1)				
56	(1) ‘parties under investigation’ means the controller(s) and/or processor(s) investigated for alleged	(1) ‘ <u>parties party</u> under investigation’ means the controller(s) and/or processor(s)	(1) ‘parties under investigation’ means the controller(s) and/or processor(s) investigated for alleged	(1) ‘ <u>parties party</u> under investigation’ means the controller(s) and/or processor(s)

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 related to cross-border processing;	<u>complained about, or</u> investigated for alleged infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 related to cross-border processing, as well as their representative(s) ;	infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 related to cross-border processing;	investigated for alleged infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 related to cross-border processing; ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Article 2, second paragraph, point (1a)				
56a		<u>(1a) 'complainant' means the data subject or non-for-profit body, organisation or association that has lodged a complaint under Article 77 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and is therefore considered as a party to the proceedings;</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: EP Mandate
Article 2, second paragraph, point (1b)				
56b		<u>(1b) 'party' means the party or parties under investigation, the complainant(s) and any third party involved in the proceedings as defined under national law;</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 2, second paragraph, point (1c)				
56c		<u>(1c) 'national procedural law' means laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member State that regulate the procedure before a supervisory authority;</u>		deleted
Article 2, second paragraph, point (1d)				


	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
6	56d	<u>(1d) ‘complaints procedure’ means a procedure determining the outcome of a complaint under Article 77 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679;</u>		deleted
Article 2, second paragraph, point (1e)				
6	56e	<u>(1e) ‘ex officio procedure’ means an investigation into the activities of a natural or legal person, public authority, agency or other body initiated on a supervisory authority’s initiative under Article 57(1), point (a), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679;</u>		deleted
Article 2, second paragraph, point (1f)				
6	56f	<u>(1f) ‘joint case file’ means a dedicated electronic file for any case falling under the scope of this Regulation, that is managed by the lead supervisory authority and in which all relevant information, in particular documents, submissions, memos and other information regarding a case, are stored and made remotely accessible to supervisory authorities concerned and parties to the case;</u>		deleted
Article 2, second paragraph, point (1g)				
6	56g	<u>(1g) ‘complaint-receiving authority’ means the supervisory authority with which the complaint has been lodged as referred to in Article 4(22), point (c), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679;</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
<i>Article 2, second paragraph, point (2)</i>				
57	(2) ‘summary of key issues’ means the summary to be provided by the lead supervisory authority to supervisory authorities concerned identifying the main relevant facts and the lead supervisory authority’s views on the case;	(2) ‘summary of key issues’ means the summary to be provided by the lead supervisory authority to supervisory authorities concerned, identifying the main relevant facts <u> <i>facts</i></u> <u> <i>factual and legal issues within the preliminary scope of the investigation</i></u> and the lead supervisory authority’s <u> <i>factual and legal</i></u> views on the case;	(2) ‘summary of key issues’ means the summary to be provided by the lead supervisory authority to supervisory authorities concerned identifying the main relevant facts and the lead supervisory authority’s views on the case;	(2) ‘summary of key issues’ means the summary to be provided by the lead supervisory authority to supervisory authorities concerned, identifying the main relevant facts <u> <i>facts</i></u> <u> <i>factual and legal issues</i></u> and the lead supervisory authority’s <u> <i>factual and legal</i></u> views on the case; Text Origin: EP Mandate
<i>Article 2, second paragraph, point (3)</i>				
58	(3) ‘preliminary findings’ means the document provided by the lead supervisory authority to the parties under investigation setting out the allegations, the relevant facts, supporting evidence, legal analysis, and, where applicable, proposed corrective measures;	(3) ‘preliminary findings’ means the document provided by the lead supervisory authority to the parties under investigation setting out the allegations, the relevant facts, supporting evidence, legal analysis, and, where applicable, proposed corrective measures;	(3) ‘preliminary findings’ means the document provided by the lead supervisory authority to the parties under investigation setting out the allegations, the relevant facts, supporting evidence, preliminary legal analysis, and, where applicable, proposed corrective measures;	<i>deleted</i> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
<i>Article 2, second paragraph, point (4)</i>				
59	(4) ‘retained relevant and reasoned objections’ means the objections which have been determined by the Board to be relevant and reasoned within the meaning of Article 4(24) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.	(4) ‘retained relevant and reasoned objections’ means the objections which have been determined by the Board to be relevant and reasoned within the meaning of Article 4(24) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.	(4) ‘retained relevant and reasoned objections’ means the objections which have been determined by the Board to be relevant and reasoned within the meaning of Article 4(24) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.	<i>deleted</i> Text Origin: Commission Proposal
<i>Article 2, second paragraph, point (4a)</i>				
59a		<u> <i>(4a) ‘confidential version of a document’ means a document containing confidential or sensitive information which may be subject to legal privilege under the</i></u>		<i>deleted</i>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
		<u>applicable Union or national law and data protection rules;</u>		
Article 2, second paragraph, point (4b)				
6	59b	<u>(4b) 'non-confidential version of a document' means a version of a document from which confidential or sensitive information has been redacted and which can be provided to the complainant without breaching Union or national law or data protection rules.</u>		deleted
Section 1b (new)				
6	59c	<u>Section 1b (new) Procedural rules</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 2a				
6	59d	<u>Article 2a Applicable Procedural Law</u>		<u>Article 2a Principles relating to the procedures in the enforcement of Regulation (Eu) 2016/679 for cross-border processing</u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: EP Mandate
Article 2a(1)				
6	59e	<u>1. In addition to this Regulation, and provided that it is not in conflict with this Regulation, the</u>		<u>1. Supervisory authorities shall conduct procedures in an expedient and efficient way and</u>




	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
		<u>procedural law applicable before a supervisory authority shall govern all direct interactions between that supervisory authority and the parties before it. This Regulation shall not preclude Member States from specifying procedural matters not regulated by this Regulation or Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</u>		<u>shall cooperate with each other in a sincere and effective manner, including by providing support where necessary and responding to requests without delay.</u>
Article 2a(2)				
g	59f	<u>2. This Regulation and Regulation (EU) 2016/679 govern the interaction between supervisory authorities of different Member States that falls within the scope of this Regulation.</u>		<u>2. A supervisory authority may join and separate proceedings in accordance with national procedural law, insofar as this does not undermine the rights of the parties under investigation and the complainant.</u>
Article 2a(3)				
g	59g	<u>3. A complainant shall have the right to communicate exclusively with the supervisory authority with which the complaint has been lodged pursuant to Article 77 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</u>		<u>3. A complainant shall have the possibility to communicate exclusively with the supervisory authority with which the complaint has been lodged pursuant to Article 77 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 2a(4)				
g	59h			<u>4. The handling of a complaint shall always lead to a decision that is subject to an effective legal remedy within the meaning of Article 78 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</u>




	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 2a(5)				
59i				<p><u>5. In the interest of efficiency of the procedures, supervisory authorities may limit the length of the submission by the party under investigation and the complainant, taking into account the complexity of the case and the documents submitted so far.</u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
Article 2b				
59j		<u>Article 2b</u> <u>Common procedural standards</u>		<p>deleted</p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
Article 2b(1)				
59k		<u>1. Without prejudice to additional rights under national procedural law, each party shall have at least the following rights:</u>		<p>deleted</p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
Article 2b(1), point (a)				
59l		<u>(a) to have their case handled impartially and fairly, and to be treated equally, even if they are before different supervisory</u>		<p>deleted</p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>


	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
		<u>authorities in different jurisdictions (“fair procedure”);</u>		
	Article 2b(1), point (b)			
6	59m	<u>(b) to be heard before any measure is taken that would adversely affect them, including before the decision to uphold, or to fully or partially reject a complaint is adopted (“right to be heard”);</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
	Article 2b(1), point (c)			
6	59n	<u>(c) to have access to the joint case file, except to any internal deliberations of the supervisory authority or deliberations between those authorities (“procedural transparency”).</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
	Article 2b(2)			
6	59o	<u>2. The lead supervisory authority shall inform and hear the parties at appropriate stages of the procedure, in order to allow them to effectively express their views on all factual findings and legal conclusions made by the lead supervisory authority.</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
	Article 2b(3)			
6	59p	<u>3. The joint case file shall include all evidence, inculpatory and exculpatory, including documents and other evidence provided by the parties under investigation.</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
	Article 2b(4)			

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
59q		<p><u>4. On the request of a party to protect their legally recognised rights or to protect the rights of others, or when it is in the public interest or in order to protect operational security and cybersecurity a supervisory authority may limit the rights referred to in paragraph 1, point (c). Any such limitation shall be carried out in accordance with the national procedural law applicable under Article 2a(1) to any direct interaction between a supervisory authority and the party receiving limited information, and must be proportionate in light of the respective recognised rights of others or the public interest pursued. The party claiming confidentiality shall provide a confidential version of any information, as well as a suggested non-confidential version.</u></p>		<p>deleted</p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
Article 2b(5)				
59r		<p><u>5. The non-confidential version of documents that were provided by a party shall be determined by the supervisory authority making a determination pursuant to first sentence of paragraph 4, applying only strictly proportionate measures, such as redacting specific parts of documents.</u></p>		<p>deleted</p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
Article 2b(6)				


	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
59s		<u>6. Supervisory authorities concerned shall always have access to the confidential version of all documents, and may object to redactions that they consider not strictly proportionate. Supervisory authorities pursuant to first sentence of paragraph 4 shall immediately inform the parties about the fact that information is withheld. The lead supervisory authority shall keep records of each access to the joint case file.</u>	PUBLIC	deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 2b(7)				
59t		<u>7. In the interest of efficiency of procedures, supervisory authorities shall limit the length of submissions by the parties to not more than 50 pages. Those authorities shall set reasonable and appropriate time limits not shorter than three weeks and not longer than six weeks, unless exceptional circumstances require a reasonable extension. The supervisory authorities shall not be obliged to take into account written views received after the expiry of that time-limit.</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: EP Mandate
Article 2b(8)				
59u		<u>8. The lead supervisory authority may join and separate cases in accordance with national procedural law, insofar as this does</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
		<u>not undermine the rights of the parties.</u>		
Article 2c				
g	59v	<u>Article 2c</u> <u>Cooperation between supervisory authorities</u>		deleted
Article 2c(1)				
g	59w	<u>1. The lead supervisory authority shall structure, coordinate and manage the case in an efficient and expedient way, in accordance with Regulation (EU) 2016/679, this Regulation and any applicable national procedural law.</u>		deleted
Article 2c(2), first subparagraph				
g	59x	<u>2. Any supervisory authority may declare that it is concerned, setting out the reasons why it meets the definition of a supervisory authority concerned under Article 4(22) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. The lead supervisory authority shall maintain a list of supervisory authorities concerned for each case in the joint case file.</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 2c(2), second subparagraph				
g	59y	<u>Where the lead supervisory authority considers that a supervisory authority which has made a declaration that it is concerned according to this paragraph does not meet the definition of a supervisory</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level




	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
		<p><u>authority concerned, it shall inform that authority of its assessment. The supervisory authority which declared that it is concerned shall within one week of receiving that assessment either withdraw its declaration, or produce a reasoned opinion setting out the reasons why it considers the assessment of the lead supervisory authority to be incorrect. Where the diverging assessments of the lead supervisory authority and the supervisory authority which declared to be concerned cannot be resolved in a different manner, the lead supervisory authority shall request a determination of the Board under Article 26a.</u></p>		
Article 2c(3)				
59z		<p><u>3. Any supervisory authority concerned which receives relevant information for a case shall provide it to the lead supervisory authority without delay, but no later than one week from the day that it received such information.</u></p>		deleted
Article 2c(4)				
59aa		<p><u>4. Where diverging views cannot be overcome or in the case of inactivity of another supervisory authority, supervisory authorities shall use the powers intended for resolution of such situations under</u></p>		deleted

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
		<u>this Regulation and under Chapter VII of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</u>		
Article 2c(5)				
6	59ab	<u>5. All written documents by the supervisory authorities shall be provided by electronic means and in a concise, transparent, intelligible and easily accessible form, using clear and plain language.</u>		deleted
Article 2d				
6	59ac	<u>Article 2d Use of Languages and Translations</u>		deleted
Article 2d(1)				
6	59ad	<u>1. The Board shall determine one language that shall be accepted by all supervisory authorities during the cooperation between authorities (“cooperation language”).</u>		deleted
Article 2d(2)				
6	59ae	<u>2. When a supervisory authority shares relevant information with another supervisory authority, it shall provide a translation into the cooperation language or any other language the receiving supervisory authority accepts.</u>		deleted
Article 2d(3)				
6	59af	<u>3. The lead supervisory authority shall provide submissions into the</u>		deleted




	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
		<u>joint case file in the original language, and shall provide translations into the cooperation language.</u>		
Article 2d(4)				
6	59ag	<u>4. In any direct interaction with the parties, supervisory authorities shall provide parties with information in the original language and, if necessary, either a translation into the language of the national procedural law, or into any other language the party understands or uses in its routine external communication.</u>		deleted
Article 2d(5)				
6	59ah	<u>5. A supervisory authority may provide automated translations, if it finds that the automated translation is not substantially different from the original.</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 2d(6)				
6	59ai	<u>6. When a judicial remedy is filed against a supervisory authority, the supervisory authority shall provide the joint case file and any other relevant information in a language accepted by the judiciary of the Member State.</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Chapter II				
6	60 Chapter II Submission and handling of complaints	deleted	Chapter II Submission and handling of complaints	Chapter II Submission and handling of complaints <u>and early resolution</u>



	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
		Heading "Chapter II" is placed after article 3 and its title is changed		Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 3				
61	Article 3 Cross-border complaints	Article 3 Cross-border complaints	Article 3 Complaints relating to cross-border complaints processing	Article 3 <u>Complaints concerning cross-border processing</u> cross-border complaints
Article 3(1)				
62	1. A complaint on the basis of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 that relates to cross-border processing shall provide the information required in the Form, as set out in the Annex. No additional information shall be required in order for the complaint to be admissible.	1. <u>A complaint on the basis of subject to this Regulation (EU) 2016/679 that relates to cross-border processing shall provide the information required in the Form template, as set out in the Annex. No additional information shall be required in order for the complaint to be admissible. <u>The information can be provided by any means the authority accepts, including by not using the template.</u></u>	1- For a complaint on the basis of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 that relates to cross-border processing shall provide the information required in the Form, as set out in the Annex. No additional to be admissible, the following information shall be required in order for the complaint to be admissible. provided:	1. <u>A complaint on the basis of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 concerning cross-border processing shall be admissible provided that it includes the following information:</u> A complaint on the basis of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 that relates to cross-border processing shall provide the information required in the Form, as set out in the Annex. No additional information shall be required in order for the complaint to be admissible.
Article 3(1), point (a)				
62a			(a) name of person or entity filing the complaint;	<u>(a) name of person or entity lodging the complaint;</u>
Article 3(1), point (b)				
62b			(b) where the complaint is submitted 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	<u>(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</u>


	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
			accordance with the law of a Member State;	<u>constituted in accordance with the law of a Member State;</u>
	Article 3(1), point (c)			
62c			(c) where the complaint is submitted 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;	<u>(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;</u>
	Article 3(1), point (d)			
62d			(d) contact details of the person or entity filing the complaint;	<u>(d) contact details of the person or entity lodging the complaint;</u>
	Article 3(1), point (e)			
62e			(e) elements allowing for the identification of the controller or processor which is the subject of the complaint;	<u>(e) information which facilitates the identification of the controller or processor which is the subject of the complaint;</u>
	Article 3(1), point (f)			
62f			(f) explanation of the alleged infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.	<u>(f) description of the alleged infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</u> <u>Only information referred to in the first subparagraph shall be required in order for the complaint relating to cross-border processing to be admissible.</u> <u>Administrative modalities and requirements under the national</u>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				<p><u>procedural law of the supervisory authority with which the complaint is lodged shall continue to apply.</u></p> <p><u>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.</u></p>
Article 3(1a)				
62g		<p><u>1a. The complainant shall not be required to contact the party under investigation before submitting a complaint. Where the complainant was in contact with the party under investigation before submitting the complaint relating to the same matter, he or she shall submit the communication related to that contact pursuant to the Annex.</u></p>		<p><u>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.</u></p> <p><u>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. Without prejudice to the admissibility of the complaint, where the complaint relates to the exercise of a right of the data subject which relies on a request to be submitted to the data controller by the data subject concerned, such</u></p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				<u>request shall be made to the controller before the submission of the complaint.</u>
Article 3(1b)				
62h		<u>1b. The supervisory authority with which a complaint has been lodged shall, within two weeks, acknowledge receipt and admissibility of the complaint, or, where a complaint does not meet the requirements pursuant to paragraph 1, declare the complaint inadmissible and inform the complainant about the missing information.</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 3(1c), first subparagraph				
62i			1bis. The supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged shall decide on the admissibility of the complaint within four weeks after receiving all the necessary information according to paragraph 1, pursuant to the following :	deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 3(1c), first subparagraph, point (a)				
62j			a) Only information under paragraph 1 shall be required in order for the complaint relating to cross-border processing to be admissible.	deleted
Article 3(1c), first subparagraph, point (b)				
62k			b) Administrative modalities and requirements under the national	deleted


	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
			procedural law of the supervisory authority with which the complaint is lodged shall continue to apply.	
<i>Article 3(1c), second subparagraph</i>				
6	62l		The supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged may extend by two weeks the period to decide on the admissibility of a complaint on account of the complexity of the case.	deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
<i>Article 3(1d)</i>				
6	62m	<u><i>1c. The supervisory authority shall attribute a case number to the complaint and communicate this information to the complainant. This shall be without prejudice to the assessment of admissibility of the complaint pursuant to paragraph 2(c), point (i).</i></u>		deleted
<i>Article 3(1e)</i>				
6	62n		1ter. 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.	deleted
<i>Article 3(2)</i>				
6	63	2. The supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged	2. The supervisory authority with which the complaint was has been	2. The supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	shall establish whether the complaint relates to cross-border processing.	lodge shall establish whether, <u>within three weeks after acknowledging the admissibility of the complaint</u> relates to cross-border processing-pursuant to paragraph 1b:	shall establish determine, by way of a preliminary conclusion, whether the complaint relates to cross-border processing and 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 where relevant whether the case may be handled in accordance with Article 56, paragraph 2 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 .	shall establish <u>determine, by way of a preliminary conclusion,</u> whether the complaint relates to cross-border processing, <u>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.</u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 3(2), point (a)				
63a		<u>(a) establish, by way of a preliminary conclusion, whether the complaint relates to cross-border processing of personal data of the complainant, considering at least the following:</u>		deleted
Article 3(2), point (a)(i)				
63b		<u>(i) relevant controller or processor for the processing in question;</u>		deleted
Article 3(2), point (a)(ii)				
63c		<u>(ii) number of establishments of the controller or processor in the EU;</u>		deleted
Article 3(2), point (a)(iii)				
63d		<u>(iii) place of the main establishment;</u>		deleted



	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement	
<i>Article 3(2), point (a)(iv)</i>					
g	63e	<u>(iv) activities of establishments in more than one Member State;</u>		<i>deleted</i>	g
<i>Article 3(2), point (a)(v)</i>					
g	63f	<u>(v) substantial effect or likely substantial effect on data subjects in more than one Member State.</u>		<i>deleted</i>	g
<i>Article 3(2), point (b)</i>					
g	63g	<u>(b) establish which supervisory authority is the assumed lead supervisory authority under Article 56(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, and whether the case is local in nature pursuant to Article 56(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679,</u>		<i>deleted</i>	g
<i>Article 3(2), point (c)</i>					
g	63h	<u>(c) take one of the following actions:</u>		<i>deleted</i>	g
<i>Article 3(2), point (c)(i)</i>					
g	63i	<u>(i) transmit the complaint to the assumed lead supervisory authority under Article 56(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 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;</u> <u>or</u>		<i>deleted</i>	g
<i>Article 3(2), point (c)(ii)</i>					

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
63j		<u>(ii) handle the complaint under Article 56(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</u>		deleted
Article 3(2a)				
63k		<u>3. The lead supervisory authority shall immediately provide the complaint to the party under investigation and request a reply without undue delay, but no later than three weeks from the day the party under investigation was informed by the lead supervisory authority. In complex cases, and where requested and duly justified by the party under investigation, the time for replying can be extended by the lead supervisory authority by another three weeks.</u>		<u>2a. The lead supervisory authority shall without delay inform the party under investigation about the lodging of a complaint and of its main elements.</u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: EP Mandate
Article 3(2b)				
63l		<u>4. The parties or the assumed lead supervisory authority shall raise any objection in relation to the competence of the assumed lead supervisory authority or to the handling of a complaint under Article 56(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 within three weeks from being informed about the action taken pursuant to Article 3(2), point (c).</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 3(2c)				
63m		<u>5. Where an objection under paragraph 2b was raised, the supervisory authority with which</u>		deleted



	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
		<u><i>the complaint has been lodged may withdraw the transmission of the complaint and either assume its own competence under Article 55 or 56 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 or transfer it to an assumed lead supervisory authority within two weeks. If none of these actions were taken, or where differing assessments of the supervisory authorities involved cannot be resolved otherwise, the supervisory authority with which the complaint has been lodged shall request a determination by the Board under Article 26a. It shall provide the Board with a description of relevant processing activities, of the company's organisation and a description of where decisions are taken.</i></u>	PUBLIC	ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 3(3)				
64	3. The supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged shall determine the completeness of the information required by the Form within one month.	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>
Article 3(4)				
65	4. Upon assessment of the completeness of the information required by the Form, the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged shall transmit the complaint to the lead supervisory authority.	<i>deleted</i>	4. Upon assessment of the completeness of the information required by the Form Where a complaint that relates to cross-border processing is admissible , in the absence of early resolution pursuant to Article 5, the	4. Upon assessment of the completeness of the information required by the Form <u>Where a complaint that relates to cross-border processing is admissible, in the absence of early resolution pursuant to Article 5, the</u>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
			<p>supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged shall transmit the complaint to the assumed lead supervisory authority.</p>	<p>supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged shall transmit the complaint to the <u>presumed 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</u> lead supervisory authority.</p> <p><u>(new) The supervisory authority with which the complaint has been lodged shall transmit the complaint to the assumed lead supervisory authority no later than 6 weeks from receiving the complaint, after having concluded the assessment of admissibility of the complaint, that the case concerns cross-border processing and the determination as to the presumed lead supervisory authority.</u></p>
Article 3(4a)				
65a			<p>4a. Within eight weeks after receipt of the complaint, the assumed lead supervisory authority shall either confirm its competence or, where there are conflicting views on which supervisory authorities concerned is competent for the main establishment, refer the subject-matter to the Board for dispute resolution under Article 65 (1) (b)</p>	<p><u>4a. Within six weeks after receipt of the complaint, the assumed lead supervisory authority shall either confirm its competence or, where there are conflicting views on which supervisory authorities concerned is competent for the main establishment, refer the subject-matter to the Board for dispute resolution under Article 65</u></p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
			of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. This shall not preclude supervisory authorities from referring the subject-matter to the Board for dispute resolution under Article 65(1)(b) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 after the expiry of this deadline.	<p><u>(1) (b) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</u></p> <p><u>Where the lead supervisory authority does not confirm its competence or refer the subject-matter to the Board within the time limit referred to in the first subparagraph, the supervisory authority with which the complaint has been lodged shall refer the subject-matter to the Board.</u></p> <p>TM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p> <p>Text Origin: Council Mandate</p>
Article 3(5)				
66	5. Where the complainant claims confidentiality when submitting a complaint, the complainant shall also submit a non-confidential version of the complaint.	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>
Article 3(6)				
67	6. The supervisory authority with which a complaint was lodged shall acknowledge receipt of the complaint within one week. This acknowledgement shall be without prejudice to the assessment of admissibility of the complaint pursuant to paragraph 3.	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>
Chapter II				
67a		<u>Chapter II</u>		


	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
		<u>Complaints and ex officio procedures</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 4				
68	Article 4 Investigation of complaints	Article 4 Investigation <u>Handling</u> of complaints	Article 4 Investigation of complaints	deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 4, first paragraph				
69	While assessing the extent appropriate to which a complaint should be investigated in each case the supervisory authority shall take into account all relevant circumstances, including all of the following:	While assessing the extent appropriate to which a complaint should be investigated in each case the lead supervisory authority shall take into account all relevant circumstances, including all of <u>endeavour to ensure</u> the following:	While assessing the extent appropriate to which a complaint should be investigated in each case the lead supervisory authority or, as the case may be, the supervisory authorities concerned , shall take into account all relevant circumstances, including all of the following:	deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 4, first paragraph, point (a)				
70	(a) the expediency of delivering an effective and timely remedy to the complainant;	(a) the expediency of delivering <u>delivery of</u> an effective and timely remedy to the complainant;	(a) the expediency of delivering handling the complaint in an effective and timely remedy to the complainant manner ;	deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 4, first paragraph, point (b)				
71	(b) the gravity of the alleged infringement;	(b) the gravity of the alleged infringement <u>investigation of relevant factual and legal elements required to jointly decide on the complaint and issue a decision</u>	(b) the gravity nature of the alleged infringement;	deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
		<u>under Article 60(7), (8) and (9) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679;</u>		
<i>Article 4, first paragraph, point (c)</i>				
72	(c) the systemic or repetitive nature of the alleged infringement.	(c) the <u>investigation of any other elements necessary for the efficient enforcement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, including the ex officio exercise of powers pursuant to Article 58(2), Article 83 or Article 84 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, especially in the case of systemic, grave or repetitive nature of the alleged infringement</u> infringements.	(c) the systemic or repetitive nature character of the alleged infringement.	<i>deleted</i> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
<i>Article 4, (1a)</i>				
72a		<u>1a. The handling of a complaint shall always lead to a legally binding decision that is subject to an effective legal remedy under Article 78 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</u>		<i>deleted</i> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
<i>Article 4, (1b), first sub-paragraph</i>				
72b		<u>1b. The lead supervisory authority shall deliver a draft decision pursuant to Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 without delay, and no later than nine months from the receipt of the complaint.</u>		<i>deleted</i> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
<i>Article 4, (1b), second sub-paragraph</i>				
72c		<u>This deadline may exceptionally be extended by:</u>		<i>deleted</i>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 4, (1b), second sub-paragraph, point (a)				
6	72d	<u>(a) eight weeks when comments under Article 9(3) are submitted with regard to a summary of key issues or an updated summary of key issues;</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 4, (1b), second sub-paragraph, point (b)				
6	72e	<u>(b) eight weeks where the lead supervisory authority intends to issue fines or other penalties;</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 4, (1b), second sub-paragraph, point (c)				
6	72f	<u>(c) the period of time between a reference under Article 26a(1) or (2) and the decision by the Board;</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 4, (1b), second sub-paragraph, point (d)				
6	72g	<u>(d) the period of any prolongation permitted by the Board under Article 26a(3).</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 4, (1b), third sub-paragraph				
6	72h	<u>Each extension under points (a) to (d) may only be done once.</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
Article 4, (1c)				
72i		<u><i>1c. Paragraph 1b shall not apply once a case is submitted to the consistency mechanism in accordance with Article 60(4) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</i></u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 5				
73	Article 5 Amicable settlement	Article 5 Amicable settlement	Article 5 Amicable settlement Procedure for the early resolution of complaints relating to cross-border processing	Article 5 Amicable settlement <u>Article 5</u> <u>Early resolution</u>
Article 5, first paragraph				
74	A complaint may be resolved by amicable settlement between the complainant and the parties under investigation. Where the supervisory authority considers that an amicable settlement to the complaint has been found, it shall communicate the proposed settlement to the complainant. If the complainant does not object to the amicable settlement proposed by the supervisory authority within one month, the complaint shall be deemed withdrawn.	A complaint may be resolved by amicable settlement between the complainant and the parties party under investigation. Where the <u>at any stage of the proceedings. The complaint-receiving or the lead supervisory authority considers that an amicable settlement to the complaint has been found, it shall communicate the proposed settlement to the complainant.</u> <u>may encourage and facilitate that voluntary process.</u> If the complainant does not object to the amicable settlement proposed by the supervisory authority within one month, the complaint shall be deemed withdrawn.	1.A complaint relating to cross-border processing which concerns the exercise of data subjects' rights under Regulation (EU) 2016/679, may be resolved by amicable settlement between the complainant and the parties under investigation. Where the supervisory authority considers that an amicable settlement to the complaint has been found, it shall communicate the proposed settlement to the complainant. If the complainant does not object to the amicable settlement proposed by the supervisory authority within one month, the complaint shall be deemed withdrawn. through a procedure allowing for its early resolution when:	<u><i>1.A complaint relating to cross-border processing which concerns the exercise of the rights of the data subject under Chapter III of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, may be resolved, where appropriate, through a procedure allowing for its early resolution by:</i></u> <i>A complaint may be resolved by amicable settlement between the complainant and the parties under investigation, where the supervisory authority considers that an amicable settlement to the complaint has been found, it shall communicate the proposed settlement to the complainant. If the complainant does not object to the amicable settlement proposed by the supervisory authority within one month, the complaint shall be deemed withdrawn.</i>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
Article 5, first paragraph, point (a)				
6	74a		<p>(a) the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged, prior to the possible transmission of the complaint to the lead supervisory authority, considers that the controller or processor has duly addressed the alleged infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and that the complainant's request has been dealt with in a satisfactory manner.</p> <p>or,</p>	<p><u>(a) the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged, after determining by way of preliminary conclusion that the complaint relates to cross-border processing and prior to the possible transmission of the complaint to the lead supervisory authority,</u></p> <p><u>or</u></p>
Article 5, first paragraph, point (b)				
6	74b		<p>(b) the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged, prior to the possible transmission of the complaint to the lead supervisory authority, or the lead supervisory authority to which the complaint has been transmitted where applicable, determines that an amicable settlement to the complaint has been found and that the issues raised by the complainant have been dealt with in a satisfactory manner, provided that such settlement is allowed under the supervisory authority's national law and results in the termination of the alleged infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</p>	<p><u>(b) the lead supervisory authority to which the complaint has been transmitted, at any time before the submission of the preliminary findings to supervisory authorities concerned pursuant to Article 14 of this Regulation, or, where the simple procedure referred to in Article [8a] applies, before the submission of the draft decision.</u></p>
Article 5, first paragraph a				

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement	
74c		<u>1a. An amicable settlement between the complainant and the party under investigation shall be considered to be found where there is explicit agreement. Where an amicable settlement to the complaint has been found, the parties shall within one month communicate the settlement to the lead supervisory authority and the supervisory authority where the complaint has been lodged.</u>		<u>Supervisory authorities may encourage and facilitate such early resolution and communicate with the controller or the complainant for this purpose, as appropriate.</u>	
Article 5, first paragraph b					
74d		<u>1b. Within one month after the communication of the amicable settlement under paragraph 1a, a draft decision pursuant to Article 56(4) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 shall be submitted, indicating:</u>			deleted
Article 5, first paragraph b, point (a)					
74e		<u>(a) whether the conditions of an amicable settlement under paragraph 1a are fulfilled, and</u>			deleted
Article 5, first paragraph b, point (b)					
74f		<u>(b) whether to open an ex officio investigation under paragraph 1d.</u>			deleted
Article 5, first paragraph c					
74g			2. The early resolution of a complaint pursuant to paragraph 1 (a) may only apply when:	<u>2. For the purpose of early resolution, a complaint shall be considered devoid of purpose where the supervisory authority has established, based on</u>	

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				<u>supporting evidence, that the alleged infringement has been brought to an end.</u>
Article 5, first paragraph c, point (a)				
6	74h		(a) the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged has obtained supporting evidence that the controller or processor has already complied with the request of the complainant and that the infringements of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 are terminated, the supervisory authority has documented and communicated this to the complainant, using clear and plain language, and	deleted
Article 5, first paragraph c, point (b)				
6	74i		(b) given that the complainant's request have been addressed in a satisfactory manner for the complainant, the supervisory authority can consider that the object of the complaint becomes devoid of purpose.	deleted
Article 5, first paragraph d				
6	74j	<u>1c. Where, within one month, none of the other supervisory authorities concerned have objected to the draft decision under paragraph 1b or the Board confirms the amicable settlement in the procedure under Article 65(1), point (a) of</u>		deleted


	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
		<u>Regulation (EU) 2016/679, the complaint shall be deemed withdrawn and the settlement shall become valid.</u>		
Article 5, first paragraph e				
6	74k		3.The early resolution of a complaint pursuant to paragraph 1 (b) may only apply when:	<u>3. The supervisory authority shall inform the complainant of the finding under paragraph 2 and of the consequences of the early resolution, using clear and plain language, including of the possibility that he or she may submit an objection within four weeks of receiving such information.</u>
Article 5, first paragraph e, point (a)				
6	74l		(a) the supervisory authority has documented and communicated the proposed settlement to the complainant, using clear and plain language, to inform the complainant about the nature and consequences of the proposed settlement, and	<i>deleted</i>
Article 5, first paragraph e, point (b)				
6	74m		(b) the complainant does not object to the amicable settlement proposed within four weeks after having received the proposed settlement. The complainant may request an extension of two weeks to object to the proposed settlement. In the absence of	<i>deleted</i>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
			objection by the complainant within four or six weeks, as the case may be, the proposed settlement is deemed to have been accepted, and therefore the complaint becomes devoid of purpose.	
Article 5, first paragraph f				
74n		<u>1d. An amicable settlement does not prevent the lead supervisory authority from conducting an ex officio investigation in the same matter. It may open an ex officio investigation instead, in particular where:</u>		<u>4. In a procedure before the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged, where the complainant does not object within the deadline set out in paragraph 3, the supervisory authority shall establish that the complaint has been resolved and inform the complainant and the party under investigation within 2 weeks, and, where applicable, the lead supervisory authority thereof.</u>
Article 5, first paragraph f, point (a)				
74o		<u>(a) the party under investigation is a repeat offender;</u>		deleted
Article 5, first paragraph f, point (b)				
74p		<u>(b) the party under investigation has been the subject of a large number of other amicable settlements;</u>		deleted
Article 5, first paragraph f, point (c)				
74q		<u>(c) the broad subject matter of the complaint concerns a large number of data subjects other than</u>		deleted


	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
		<u>the complainant, is of long duration, or is of serious nature; or</u>		
Article 5, first paragraph f, point (d)				
74r		<u>(d) the exercise of powers is otherwise required to ensure effective, proportionate and dissuasive enforcement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</u>		deleted
Article 5, first paragraph g				
74s			4. Where the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged considers that a complaint can be resolved through a procedure allowing for its early resolution in accordance with paragraph 1, it shall inform the assumed lead supervisory authority about the resolution and take into account any views that might be submitted.	<u>5. In a procedure before the lead supervisory authority to which the complaint has been transmitted, where the complainant does not object within the deadline set out in paragraph 3, the authority shall submit a draft decision in accordance with Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 within 4 weeks, with a view to adopting a final decision in accordance with Article 60(7) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 establishing that the complaint has been resolved.</u>
Article 5, first paragraph h				
74t			5. Where the lead supervisory authority considers that a complaint can be resolved through a procedure allowing for its early resolution in accordance with paragraph 1 b), it shall submit a draft decision to the concerned supervisory authorities in accordance with Article 60 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, with a	<u>6. The early resolution of a complaint shall be without prejudice to the exercise by the lead supervisory authority of its powers in accordance with Article 58 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 on the same subject matter.</u>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
			view to adopting a final decision in accordance with Article 60(7) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 finding that the complaint, or part of the complaint, has been resolved by the lead supervisory authority and that the handling of the complaint will be terminated.	
Article 5, first paragraph i				
6	74u			<u>7. Articles 9 to 15 of this Regulation do not apply to complaint-based cases resolved pursuant to this Article.</u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 5a				
	74v	<u>Article 5a</u> <u>Request for an ex officio procedure</u>		trilogue
Article 5a, first paragraph				
	74w	<u>1. Where it considers that Regulation (EU) 2016/679 may be violated and data subjects in the territory of its Member State are affected, any supervisory authority concerned may request an ex officio procedure by submitting a written request for a discretionary action pursuant to paragraph 2 to the lead supervisory authority. Such a request shall contain at least:</u>		
Article 5a, first paragraph, point (a)				

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
74x		<u>(a) a declaration to be a supervisory authority concerned, and</u>		
Article 5a, first paragraph, point (b)				
74y		<u>(b) a summary of key issues pursuant to Article 9.</u>		
Article 5a, (2), first sub-paragraph				
74z		<u>2. Within three weeks, the assumed lead supervisory authority shall:</u>		
Article 5a, (2), first sub-paragraph, point (a)				
74aa		<u>(a) inform the supervisory authority concerned that it has opened an ex officio procedure;</u>		
Article 5a, (2), first sub-paragraph, point (b)				
74ab		<u>(b) inform the supervisory authority concerned that Article 56(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 applies to the case and that in accordance with Article 56(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 the lead supervisory authority does not intend to handle the case itself; or</u>		
Article 5a, (2), first sub-paragraph, point (c)				
74ac		<u>(c) reject the request, if it takes the view that it is not the lead supervisory authority or there is no prima facie violation of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</u>		
Article 5a, (2), second sub-paragraph				
74ad		<u>In the case referred to in point (a) of this paragraph, the</u>		




	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
		<u>supervisory authority concerned may submit to the lead supervisory authority a draft decision pursuant to Article 56(4) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</u>		
Article 5a, (2), third sub-paragraph				
74ae		<u>In the cases referred to in point (b) and (c) of this paragraph, the supervisory authority concerned may resubmit an amended request for an ex officio procedure, or request a determination on the opening of the procedure by the Board in accordance with Article 26a(1).</u>		
Article 5a, third paragraph				
74af		<u>3. Where the lead supervisory authority opens an ex officio procedure, it shall deliver a draft decision pursuant to Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 without delay, but no later than nine months from the receipt of the request pursuant to paragraph 1. This deadline may exceptionally be extended by:</u>		
Article 5a, third paragraph, point (a)				
74ag		<u>(a) eight weeks when comments under Article 9(3) are submitted against a summary of key issues or an updated summary of key issues;</u>		
Article 5a, third paragraph, point (b)				



	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
74ah		<u>(b) eight weeks where the lead supervisory authority intends to issue fines or other penalties;</u>		
Article 5a, third paragraph, point (c)				
74ai		<u>(c) the period of time between a reference under Article 26a and the decision by the Board;</u>		
Article 5a, third paragraph, point (d)				
74aj		<u>(d) the period of any prolongation permitted by the Board under Article 26a(3).</u>		
Article 6				
75	Article 6 Translations	Article 6 deleted	Article 6 deleted	deleted
Article 6(1)				
76	1. The supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged shall be responsible for:	deleted	deleted	deleted
Article 6(1), point (a)				
77	(a) translation of complaints and the views of complainants into the language used by the lead supervisory authority for the purposes of the investigation;	deleted	deleted	deleted
Article 6(1), point (b)				
78	(b) translation of documents provided by the lead supervisory authority into the language used for communication with the	deleted	deleted	deleted

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	complainant, where it is necessary to provide such documents to the complainant pursuant to this Regulation or Regulation (EU) 2016/679.			
<i>Article 6(2)</i>				
79	2. In its rules of procedure, the Board shall determine the procedure for the translation of comments or relevant and reasoned objections expressed by supervisory authorities concerned in a language other than the language used by the lead supervisory authority for the purposes of the investigation.	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>
<i>Chapter III</i>				
80	Chapter III Cooperation under Article 60 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679	Chapter III Cooperation under Article 60 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 <u>and with other relevant authorities</u>	Chapter III Cooperation under Article 60 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679	Chapter III Cooperation under Article 60 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Commission Proposal
<i>Section 1</i>				
81	Section 1 Reaching consensus within the meaning of Article 60(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679	Section 1 Reaching consensus within the meaning of Article 60(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679	Section 1 Reaching consensus within the meaning of Article 60(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 General principles of cooperation	Section 1 Reaching consensus within the meaning of Article 60(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 <u>Section 1 Simple cooperation</u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
Article 6a				
81a			Article 6 bis Application of enhanced cooperation procedures	<u>Article 6bis</u> <u>Simple cooperation procedure</u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 6a, first paragraph				
81b			1. Supervisory authorities shall cooperate in accordance with the provisions of this Chapter in order to enhance cooperation procedures under Article 60 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.	<u>1. Once the lead supervisory authority has formed a preliminary view on the main issues in an investigation, it may cooperate with supervisory authorities concerned through a simple cooperation procedure, in accordance with this Article, where:</u> <u>(a) the lead supervisory authority considers that no reasonable doubt exists as to the scope of the investigation, in particular the provisions of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 concerned by the alleged infringement which are to be investigated; and</u> <u>(b) the legal and factual issues identified by the lead supervisory authority do not require additional cooperation between supervisory authorities for the purpose of a complex investigation, in particular where they can be addressed based on previous decisions in similar cases.</u>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				<p><u><i>In such a case, Articles 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 18(1), points (a) and (b) and 18(2) of this Regulation shall not apply, and the lead supervisory authority shall submit a draft decision in accordance with Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679) within the time limit referred to in Article 10a, paragraph 6, of this Regulation.</i></u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
Article 6a, second paragraph				
81c			<p>2. Where the lead supervisory authority considers that, on the basis of the characteristics of a case and previous decisions on similar cases, there is no need to trigger enhanced cooperation procedures between supervisory authorities provided for under Chapter III of this Regulation, the lead supervisory authority may not apply the procedures pursuant to Chapter III of this Regulation and continue to cooperate with supervisory authorities concerned under Article 60 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. The lead supervisory authority shall inform the supervisory authorities concerned thereof, providing the relevant information on the characteristics of the case and the relevant</p>	<p><u><i>2. The lead supervisory authority shall notify the supervisory authorities concerned of its intention to apply the simple cooperation procedure, providing information on the characteristics of the case relevant to establishing the conditions set out in paragraph 1, no later than within six weeks from the confirmation of its competence pursuant to Article 3, paragraph 4a of this Regulation or after a binding decision by the Board pursuant to Article 65, paragraph 1, point b), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</i></u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
			<p>previous decisions taken into consideration for this assessment, no later than within six weeks from the transmission of a complaint in accordance to Article 3, paragraph 4, of this Regulation. In such a case, the right to be heard of the parties under investigation and/or of the complainant shall be ensured mutatis mutandis as provided in Section II and Article 14 and 17 of this Regulation.</p>	
Article 6a, third paragraph				
81d			<p>3. Where any of the supervisory authorities concerned objects to the assessment made by the lead supervisory authority pursuant to paragraph 2, within two weeks after having been notified of it, the provisions of Chapter III of this Regulation shall apply.</p>	<p><u>3. Where any of the supervisory authorities concerned objects to the application of the simple cooperation procedure, within two weeks after having been notified of it, this procedure shall not apply and the lead supervisory authority shall draft a summary of key issues in accordance with Article 9 of this Regulation and cooperate under the procedures pursuant to Chapter III of this Regulation.</u></p> <p><u>4. When applying the procedure referred to in paragraph 1, the lead supervisory authority shall, prior to the submission of a draft decision, ensure that, where applicable, the parties under investigation are provided with the right to be heard and the complainant is provided with an opportunity to make his or</u></p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
			PUBLIC	<p><u>her views known. For the purpose of this paragraph, administrative modalities and requirements under national procedural law of the lead supervisory authority, or the supervisory authority with which the complaint has been lodged, where applicable, shall continue to apply.</u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
Article 6a, fourth paragraph				
81e			<p>4. Chapter III does not apply for cross-border processing cases handled pursuant to Article 56, paragraph 2 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</p>	<p><u>4. Chapter III does not apply to cases handled by the concerned supervisory authority pursuant to Article 56, paragraph 2 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p> <p>Text Origin: Council Mandate</p>
Article 6a, fifth paragraph				
81f			<p>5. Articles 9 to 15 of this Regulation do not apply to complaint-based cases resolved pursuant to Article 5 of this Regulation.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>deleted</i></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
Section 1a				
81g			<p>Section 1bis REACHING CONSENSUS WITHIN THE MEANING OF ARTICLE 60(1)</p>	<p><u>Section 1a Reaching consensus within the meaning of Article 60(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679</u></p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
			OF REGULATION (EU) 2016/679	ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 6b				
81h				<p><u>Article 6b</u> <u>Conferral or limitation of rights</u></p> <p><u>The provisions in this section concern the cooperation between supervisory authorities and do not confer or limit rights on individuals or the parties under investigation.</u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
Article 7				
82	Article 7 Cooperation between supervisory authorities	Article 7 Cooperation between supervisory authorities	Article 7 Cooperation between supervisory authorities	<p>Article 7 Cooperation between supervisory authorities</p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p> <p>Text Origin: Commission Proposal</p>
Article 7, first paragraph				
83	While cooperating in an endeavour to reach a consensus, as provided for in Article 60(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, supervisory authorities shall use all the means provided for in Regulation (EU) 2016/679, including mutual assistance pursuant to Article 61 and joint operations pursuant to	While cooperating in an endeavour to reach a consensus, as provided for in Article 60(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, supervisory authorities shall use all the means provided for in Regulation (EU) 2016/679, including mutual assistance pursuant to Article 61 and joint operations pursuant to	<i>deleted</i>	While cooperating in an endeavour to reach a consensus, as provided for in Article 60(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, supervisory authorities shall use all the means provided for in Regulation (EU) 2016/679, including mutual assistance pursuant to Article 61 and joint operations pursuant to

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	Article 62 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.	Article 62 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.		Article 62 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Article 7, second paragraph				
84	The provisions in this section concern the relations between supervisory authorities and are not intended to confer rights on individuals or the parties under investigation.	<i>deleted</i>	The provisions in this section concern the relations cooperation between supervisory authorities and are not intended to do not confer rights on individuals or the parties under investigation.	<i>deleted</i> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 8				
85	Article 8 Relevant information within the meaning of Article 60(1) and (3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679	Article 8 Relevant information within the meaning of Article 60(1) and (3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679	Article 8 Relevant information to be exchanged between the lead supervisory authority and supervisory authorities concerned within the meaning of Article 60(1) and (3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679	Article 8 Relevant information <u>to be exchanged between the lead supervisory authority and supervisory authorities concerned</u> within the meaning of Article 60(1) and (3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 8(1)				
86	1. The lead supervisory authority shall regularly update the other supervisory authorities concerned about the investigation and provide the other supervisory authorities concerned, at the earliest	1. The lead supervisory authority shall regularly update the other supervisory authorities concerned about the investigation and provide the other supervisory authorities concerned, at the earliest convenience, with <u>instant,</u>	1. The lead supervisory authority shall regularly update the other supervisory authorities concerned about the investigation and provide the other supervisory authorities concerned, at the earliest convenience, with all relevant	1. The lead supervisory authority shall regularly update the other <u>and</u> the supervisory authorities concerned about the investigation and provide the other supervisory authorities concerned, at the earliest convenience, with <u>all shall</u>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	convenience, with all relevant information once available.	<u>unrestricted and continuous remote access to the full joint case file, and shall include in the joint case file</u> all relevant information once available , <u>in particular documents, submissions, memos and other information related to the case within one week from producing or receiving them.</u>	information once as soon as it becomes available.	<u>exchange</u> relevant information once available <u>within the meaning of Article 60(1) and (3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</u> TM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 8(2)				
87	2. Relevant information within the meaning of Article 60(1) and (3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 shall include, where applicable:	2. <u>The lead supervisory authority shall actively provide and notify the other supervisory authorities concerned and, where necessary for dispute resolution under Article 65 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, the Board, with</u> relevant information within the meaning of Article 60(1) and (3) of <u>that</u> Regulation, <u>within one week from producing or receiving it. This information (EU) 2016/679 shall include cover information on major steps in the procedure, including</u> where applicable:	2- In the course of the investigation, the lead supervisory authority and the supervisory authorities concerned shall exchange relevant information within the meaning of Article 60(1) and (3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, which shall include, where applicable and as soon as available:	2. Relevant Information within the meaning of Article 60(1) and (3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 <u>referred to in paragraph 1</u> shall include, where applicable: TM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 8(2), point (a)				
88	(a) information on the opening of an investigation of an alleged infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679;	(a) information on the opening of an <u>ex officio</u> investigation of an alleged infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 <u>or of a complaints procedure;</u>	(a) information on the opening of an investigation of an alleged infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679;	(a) information on the opening of an investigation of an alleged infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679; Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Article 8(2), point (b)				

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
89	(b) requests for information pursuant to Article 58(1), point (e) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679;	(b) requests for information pursuant to Article 58(1), point (e) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679;	(b) requests for information pursuant to Article 58(1), point (e) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and related documents resulting from these requests ;	(b) requests for information pursuant to Article 58(1), point (e) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 <u>and related documents resulting from these requests</u> ; <small>Text Origin: Council Mandate</small>
Article 8(2), point (c)				
90	(c) information of the use of other investigative powers referred to in Article 58(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679;	(c) information of the use of other investigative powers referred to in Article 58(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679;	(c) information of the use of other investigative powers referred to in Article 58(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and related documents resulting from the exercise of these powers ;	(c) information of the use of other investigative powers referred to in Article 58(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 <u>and related documents resulting from the exercise of these powers</u> ; <small>Text Origin: Council Mandate</small>
Article 8(2), point (d)				
91	(d) in the case of envisaged rejection of complaint, the lead supervisory authority's reasons for rejection of the complaint;	(d) in the case of envisaged rejection of complaint, the lead supervisory authority's reasons for rejection of the complaint;	(d) in the case of envisaged rejection of complaint, the lead supervisory authority's reasons for rejection of the complaint;	(d) in the case of envisaged rejection of complaint, the lead supervisory authority's reasons for rejection of the complaint; <small>Text Origin: Council Mandate</small>
Article 8(2), point (da)				
91a			(dd) the possible early resolution of the complaint pursuant to Article 5 of this Regulation;	<u>(da) the early resolution of the complaint pursuant to Article 5 of this Regulation</u> ; ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 8(2), point (e)				
92	(e) summary of key issues in an investigation in accordance with Article 9;	(e) <u>the issuing or updating of the</u> summary of key issues in an	(e) summary of key issues in an investigation and related	(e) <u>the</u> summary of key issues in an investigation <u>and related comments</u> in accordance with Article 9;

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
		investigation in accordance with Article 9;	comments in accordance with Article 9;	ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 8(2), point (ea)				
92a		<u>(ea) any comments to a summary of key issues in accordance with Article 9(3);</u>	(ee) information on the scope of investigation, including developments or findings which may lead to the modification of the scope of investigation or the initiation of a new investigation;	<u>(ea) information on the scope of investigation, including developments or findings which might lead to the modification of the scope of investigation or the initiation of a new investigation;</u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 8(2), point (f)				
93	(f) information concerning steps aiming to establish an infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 prior to the preparation of preliminary findings;	(f) information concerning steps aiming to establish an infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 prior to the preparation of preliminary findings <u>and prior to the preparation of the draft decision;</u>	(f) information concerning steps and legal analysis aiming to establish an infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 prior to the preparation of preliminary findings;	(f) information concerning steps <u>and legal analysis</u> aiming to establish an infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 prior to the preparation of preliminary findings <u>and prior to the preparation of the draft decision;</u> Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 8(2), point (g)				
94	(g) preliminary findings;	(g) preliminary findings;	(g) preliminary findings;	(g) preliminary findings; Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Article 8(2), point (h)				
95	(h) the response of the parties under investigation to the preliminary findings;	(h) the response of the parties under investigation to the preliminary findings;	(h) the response of the parties under investigation to the preliminary findings;	(h) the response of the parties under investigation to the preliminary findings;

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Article 8(2), point (i)				
96	(i) the views of the complainant on the preliminary findings;	(i) the views of the complainant on the <u>non-confidential version of the preliminary findings</u> <u>and, if applicable, other aspects of the investigation on which formal written submissions have been made by the complainant</u> ;	(i) the views of the complainant on the non-confidential version of the preliminary findings;	(i) the views of the complainant on the <u>non-confidential version of the preliminary findings</u> <u>and, if relevant, on other aspects of the investigation on which formal written submissions might have been made by the complainant</u> ; ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 8(2), point (j)				
97	(j) in the case of rejection of a complaint, the written submissions of the complainant;	(j) in the case of rejection of a complaint, the written submissions of the complainant;	(j) in the case of rejection of a complaint, the written submissions of the complainant;	(j) in the case of rejection of a complaint, the written submissions of the complainant; Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Article 8(2), point (k)				
98	(k) any relevant steps taken by the lead supervisory authority after receiving the response of the parties under investigation to the preliminary findings and prior to submission of a draft decision in the sense of Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.	(k) any relevant steps taken by the lead supervisory authority after receiving the response of the parties under investigation to the preliminary findings and prior to submission of a draft decision in the sense of Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.	(k) any relevant steps taken by the lead supervisory authority after receiving the response of the parties under investigation -to the preliminary findings and prior to submission of a draft decision in the sense of Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.;	(k) any relevant steps taken by the lead supervisory authority after receiving the response of the parties under investigation to the preliminary findings and prior to submission of a draft decision in the sense of Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Article 8(2), point (ka)				

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
98a				<p><u>(ka) the views made by the parties under investigation on a revised draft decision;</u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
Article 8(2), point (kb)				
98b		<p><u>(ka) any draft decision in accordance with Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 or revised draft decision in accordance with Article 60(5) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679; any draft decision in accordance with Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 or revised draft decision in accordance with Article 60(5) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679;</u></p>	<p>(l) any other information deemed useful and relevant for the purpose of the investigation.</p>	<p><u>(kb) any other information deemed useful and relevant for the purpose of the investigation.</u></p> <p>Text Origin: Council Mandate</p>
Article 8(2), point (kc)				
98c		<p><u>(kb) any relevant and reasoned objections in accordance with Article 60(4) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679;</u></p>		<p><i>deleted</i></p>
Article 8(2), point (kd)				
98d		<p><u>(kc) any judicial remedy brought during a procedure under Article 60 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 or against a decision under Article 60(7) to (9) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</u></p>		<p><i>deleted</i></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
Article 8(2a)				
98e				<p><u>2a. In the course of the investigation, the lead supervisory</u></p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
			PUBLIC	<p><u>authority and the supervisory authorities concerned shall exchange the information referred to in paragraph 2 as soon as that information becomes available and, unless otherwise provided for in this Regulation or in Regulation (EU) 2016/679, no later than one week from when such information becomes available.</u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
Article 8(2b)				
98f			<p>2a. The Board may specify the modalities and requirements for the exchange of relevant information between supervisory authorities referred to in this Article and for the provision of comments by supervisory authorities concerned on the summary of key issues referred to in Article 9.</p>	<p><u>2b. The Board may specify the modalities and requirements for the exchange of relevant information between supervisory authorities referred to in this Article and for the provision of comments by supervisory authorities concerned on the summary of key issues.</u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
Article 9				
99	Article 9 Summary of key issues	Article 9 Summary of key issues	Article 9 Summary of key issues	<p>Article 9 Summary of key issues</p> <p>Text Origin: Commission Proposal</p>
Article 9(1)				
100	1. Once the lead supervisory authority has formed a preliminary	1. Once <u>Within four weeks after having received a complaint, or a</u>	1. Once the lead supervisory authority has formed sufficient	1. Once the lead supervisory authority has formed a preliminary


	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	view on the main issues in an investigation, it shall draft a summary of key issues for the purpose of cooperation under Article 60(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.	<u><i>request to open an ex officio procedure</i></u> , the lead supervisory authority has formed a preliminary view on the main issues in an investigation, it shall draft a summary of key issues <u><i>that presumably need to be determined in order to decide the case</i></u> , for the purpose of cooperation under Article 60(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, <u><i>and provide this summary to the supervisory authorities concerned. The summary shall be drafted in an impartial way, taking into account any diverging facts and arguments. When transferring a case to the lead supervisory authority pursuant to Article 3(2), point (c), point (i), the concerned supervisory authority may provide a draft of a summary of key issues, which is not binding on the lead supervisory authority.</i></u>	elements to form a preliminary view on the main issues in an investigation, it shall draft a summary of key issues for the purpose of cooperation under Article 60(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, which shall include the following elements:	view on the main issues in an investigation, it shall draft a summary of key issues for the purpose of cooperation under Article 60(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. <u><i>When transferring a case to the lead supervisory authority, the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged, may provide relevant elements to the lead supervisory authority.</i></u>
Article 9(2)				
6	101	2. The summary of key issues shall include all of the following elements:	<i>deleted</i>	2. The summary of key issues shall include all of the following elements: <small>Text Origin: EP Mandate</small>
Article 9(2), point (a)				
6	102	(a) the main relevant facts;	(a) the main relevant facts;	(a) the main relevant facts; <small>Text Origin: Council Mandate</small>
Article 9(2), point (b)				

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
103	(b) a preliminary identification of the scope of the investigation, in particular the provisions of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 concerned by the alleged infringement which will be investigated;	(b) a preliminary identification of the scope of the investigation, in particular the provisions of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 concerned by the alleged infringement which will be investigated, <u>and, where applicable, an indication of whether they appear to have been infringed;</u>	(b) a preliminary identification of the scope of the investigation, in particular the provisions of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 concerned by the alleged infringement which will are to be investigated;	(b) a preliminary identification of the scope of the investigation, in particular the provisions of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 concerned by the alleged infringement which will are to be investigated; Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 9(2), point (c)				
104	(c) identification of complex legal and technological assessments which are relevant for preliminary orientation of their assessment;	(c) identification of complex preliminary factual or and technological assessments which are, <u>dealing with all relevant for preliminary orientation of their assessment views as expressed by parties when the summary is drafted, and including relevant European case law, as well as guidelines, recommendations and best practices issued by the Board;</u>	(c) where applicable, identification of complex -legal, factual and/or and technological assessments issues which are relevant for preliminary orientation of their assessment;	(c) identification of complex -legal and technological assessments <u>which are relevant for preliminary orientation of their assessment</u> factual issues; TM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 9(2), point (ca)				
104a				<u>(ca) analysis of relevant views as expressed by a party under investigation or the complainant where available when the summary is drafted;</u>
Article 9(2), point (d)				
105	(d) preliminary identification of potential corrective measure(s).	(d) preliminary identification of potential corrective measure(s).	(d) where applicable, preliminary identification of - potential corrective measure(s).	(d) <u>where applicable,</u> preliminary identification of - potential corrective measure(s).
Article 9(2a)				

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
105a			The summary of key issues shall be communicated to the supervisory authorities concerned without delay, and no later than three months after the lead supervisory authority has confirmed its competence pursuant to Article 3, paragraph 4a of this Regulation. The lead supervisory authority may extend by another three months that period on account of the complexity of the case.	<p><u>2a. The summary of key issues shall be communicated to the supervisory authorities concerned without delay, and no later than three months after the lead supervisory authority has confirmed its competence pursuant to Article 3, paragraph 4a of this Regulation or after a binding decision by the Board pursuant to Article 65, paragraph 1, point b), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</u></p> <p>TM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p> <p>Text Origin: Council Mandate</p>
Article 9(2b)				
105b		<u>2a. The summary of key issues shall be updated by the lead supervisory authority without undue delay to reflect any factual or legal changes that emerge during the course of the procedure.</u>		deleted
Article 9(3)				
106	3. The supervisory authorities concerned may provide comments on the summary of key issues. Such comments must be provided within four weeks of receipt of the summary of key issues.	3. The supervisory authorities concerned may provide <u>factual or legal</u> comments on the summary of key issues. Such comments must be provided within four weeks of receipt of the summary of key issues <u>or any update of it, in accordance with Article 60 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</u>	3. The supervisory authorities concerned may provide comments on the summary of key issues. Such comments must be provided within four weeks of receipt of the summary of key issues. The period may be extended by another two weeks on account of the complexity of the case upon request of the supervisory	3. The supervisory authorities concerned may provide comments on the summary of key issues. Such comments must be provided within four weeks of receipt of the summary of key issues. <u>The period may be extended by the lead supervisory authority by another two weeks on account of the complexity of the case or upon</u>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
			authorities concerned or of the lead supervisory authority.	<u>request of the supervisory authorities concerned.</u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 9(4)				
6	107	4. Comments provided pursuant to paragraph 3 shall meet the following requirements:	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>
Article 9(4), point (-a)				
6	107a		4. In cases where the supervisory authorities concerned provided comments under paragraph 3, they shall be shared with all other supervisory authorities concerned. The lead supervisory authority shall respond to these comments within four weeks to indicate whether and how it intends to take them into account. The period may be extended by another four weeks on account of the complexity of the case.	<u>4. In cases where the supervisory authorities concerned provided comments under paragraph 3, they shall be shared with all other supervisory authorities concerned. The lead supervisory authority shall respond to these comments within four weeks to indicate whether and how it intends to take them into account. The period may be extended by another two weeks on account of the complexity of the case.</u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 9(4), point (a)				
6	108	(a) language used is sufficiently clear and contains precise terms to enable the lead supervisory authority, and, as the case may be,	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	supervisory authorities concerned, to prepare their positions;			
<i>Article 9(4), point (b)</i>				
109	(b) legal arguments are set out succinctly and grouped by reference to the part of the summary of key issues to which they relate;	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>
<i>Article 9(4), point (c)</i>				
110	(c) the comments of the supervisory authority concerned may be supported by documents, which may supplement the comments on specific points.	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>
<i>Article 9(5)</i>				
111	5. The Board may specify in its rules of procedure restrictions on the maximum length of comments submitted by supervisory authorities concerned on the summary of key issues.	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>
<i>Article 9(5a)</i>				
111a			5 Where the lead supervisory authority is required by national law to engage in subsequent domestic procedure related to the same case, the summary of key issues shall be prepared again if the lead supervisory authority intends to deviate from previous consensus on the case.	<i>deleted</i> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
<i>Article 9(6)</i>				

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
112	6. Cases where none of the supervisory authorities concerned provided comments under paragraph 3 of this Article shall be considered non-contentious cases. In such cases, the preliminary findings referred to in Article 14 shall be communicated to the parties under investigation within 9 months of the expiry of the deadline provided for in paragraph 3 of this Article.	6. Cases where none of the supervisory authorities concerned provided comments under paragraph 3 of this Article <u>which challenge the summary of key issues or raise other important factual or legal questions</u> shall be considered non-contentious cases. In such cases, the preliminary findings <u>deadline to issue a draft decision</u> referred to in Article 144(1b) shall be communicated to the parties under investigation within 93 months of the expiry of the deadline provided for in paragraph 3 of this Article.	deleted 	deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
<i>Section II</i>				
112a		<u>Section 2 Cooperation with other relevant authorities</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
<i>Article 10</i>				
113	Article 10 Use of means to reach consensus	Article 10 Use of means to reach consensus	Article 10 Use of means to reach consensus within within the meaning of Article 60(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679	Article 10 Use of means to reach consensus <u>within the meaning of Article 60(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679</u> <small>Text Origin: Council Mandate</small>
<i>Article 10(-1)</i>				
113a			1. Pursuant to Article 60(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, the lead supervisory authority and supervisory authorities concerned	<u>1. Pursuant to Article 60(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, the lead supervisory authority and supervisory authorities concerned</u>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
			<p>shall endeavour to reach consensus on cross-border processing cases, in accordance with this Article, and may use all the means provided for in Regulation (EU) 2016/679, including mutual assistance pursuant to Article 61 and joint operations pursuant to Article 62 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</p>	<p><u>shall endeavour to reach consensus on cross-border processing cases, in accordance with this Article, and may use all the means provided for in Regulation (EU) 2016/679, including mutual assistance pursuant to Article 61 and joint operations pursuant to Article 62 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</u></p> <p>Text Origin: Council Mandate</p>
Article 10(-1a)				
113b			<p>1a. In cases where none of the supervisory authorities concerned provided comments under Article 9, paragraph 3, of this Regulation, or in cases where consensus was found following comments received, the preliminary findings referred to in Article 14 shall be communicated to the parties under investigation within six months of the expiry of the deadline provided for in Article 9, paragraph 3, of this Regulation. In an exceptional case, that period may be extended once on account of the complexity of the case. In such a case, the lead supervisory authority shall notify the supervisory authorities concerned and set out the duration of and reasons for the extension.</p>	<p><i>deleted</i></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
Article 10(1)				

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
114	1. A supervisory authority concerned shall make a request to the lead supervisory authority under Article 61 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, Article 62 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, or both, where, following the comments of supervisory authorities concerned pursuant to Article 9(3), a supervisory authority concerned disagrees with the assessment of the lead supervisory authority on:	1. A supervisory authority concerned shall make a request to the lead supervisory authority under Article 61 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, or Article 62 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, or both, where, following the comments of supervisory authorities concerned pursuant to Article 9(3), a supervisory authority concerned disagrees with the assessment of the lead supervisory authority on:	1.1b In cases where a supervisory authority concerned shall disagrees with the lead supervisory authority and in the absence of consensus, that supervisory authority may make a request to the lead supervisory authority under Article 61 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679; or to trigger Article 62 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, or both, where, following the comments of supervisory authorities concerned pursuant to Article 9(3), a supervisory authority concerned disagrees with the assessment of the lead supervisory authority in order to reach consensus on:	1. <u>In cases where</u> a supervisory authority concerned shall <u>disagrees with the lead supervisory authority and in the absence of consensus, that supervisory authority may</u> make a request to the lead supervisory authority under Article 61 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679; <u>or to trigger</u> Article 62 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, or both, where, following the comments of supervisory authorities concerned pursuant to Article 9(3), a supervisory authority concerned disagrees with the assessment of the lead supervisory authority <u>in order to reach consensus</u> on: Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 10(1), point (a)				
115	(a) the scope of the investigation in complaint-based cases, including the provisions of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 concerned by the alleged infringement which will be investigated;	(a) the scope of the investigation in complaint-based cases, including the provisions of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 concerned by the alleged infringement which will be investigated;	(a) the scope of the investigation in complaint-based cases, including the provisions of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 concerned by the alleged infringement which will be investigated;	(a) the scope of the investigation in complaint-based cases, including the provisions of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 concerned by the alleged infringement which will be investigated; Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Article 10(1), point (b)				
116	(b) preliminary orientation in relation to complex legal assessments identified by the lead supervisory authority pursuant to Article 9(2), point (c);	(b) preliminary orientation in relation to complex <u>orientation in relation to complex factual or</u> legal assessments identified by the lead supervisory authority pursuant to Article 9(2), point (c);	(b) preliminary orientation in relation to complex <u>preliminary orientation in relation to complex</u> the legal assessments issues identified by the lead supervisory authority pursuant to Article 9(2), point (c), where applicable ;	(b) preliminary orientation in relation to complex <u>preliminary orientation in relation to complex</u> the legal assessments <u>the factual or</u> legal issues <u>issues</u> identified by the lead supervisory authority pursuant to Article 9(2), point (c), <u>where applicable</u> ;

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 10(1), point (c)				
117	(c) preliminary orientation in relation to complex technological assessments identified by the lead supervisory authority pursuant to Article 9(2), point (c).	<i>deleted</i>	(c) preliminary orientation in relation to complex technological assessments identified by the lead supervisory authority pursuant to Article 9(2), point (c), where applicable .	<i>deleted</i>
Article 10(1), point (ca)				
117a		<u>(ca) preliminary identification of potential corrective measure(s) pursuant to Article 9(2), point (d).</u>		<u>(ca) preliminary identification of potential corrective measure(s) pursuant to Article 9(2), point (d).</u> Text Origin: EP Mandate
Article 10(2)				
118	2. The request under paragraph 1 shall be made within two months of the expiry of the period referred to in Article 9(3).	2. The request under paragraph 1 shall be made within two months of the expiry of the period referred to in Article 9(3).	2. The request under paragraph 1 shall be made within two one months of the expiry of the period referred to in Article 9(3) 9(4) .	2. The request under paragraph 1 shall be made within two months one month of the expiry of the period referred to in Article 9(3) 9(4) . ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Article 10(2a)				
118a			2a. Where a request to conduct joint operations pursuant to Article 62 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 is made by a concerned supervisory authority, the lead supervisory authority should	<u>2a. Where a request to conduct joint operations pursuant to Article 62 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 is made by a concerned supervisory authority, the lead supervisory authority shall respond to the request within one month.</u>


	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
			respond to the request within one month.	Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 10(3)				
119	3. The lead supervisory authority shall engage with the supervisory authorities concerned on the basis of their comments on the summary of key issues, and, where applicable, in response to requests under Article 61 and 62 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, in an endeavour to reach a consensus. The consensus shall be used as a basis for the lead supervisory authority to continue the investigation and draft the preliminary findings or, where applicable, provide the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged with its reasoning for the purposes of Article 11(2).	3. <u>In cases not falling under Article 9(6) of this Regulation</u> , the lead supervisory authority shall <u>investigate facts relevant for diverging views and</u> engage, <u>making its best effort</u> , with the supervisory authorities concerned on the basis of their comments on the summary of key issues, and, where applicable, in response to requests under Article 61 and 62 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, in an endeavour to reach a consensus. The consensus shall be used as a basis for the lead supervisory authority to continue the investigation and draft the preliminary findings or, where applicable, provide the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged with its reasoning for the purposes of Article 11(2).	3. The lead supervisory authority shall engage with the supervisory authorities concerned on the basis of their comments on the summary of key issues, and, where applicable, in response to requests under Article 61 and 62 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, in an endeavour to reach a consensus. The consensus shall be used as a basis for the lead supervisory authority to continue the investigation and draft the preliminary findings or, where applicable, provide the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged -with its reasoning for the purposes of Article 11(2).	3. The lead supervisory authority shall engage with the supervisory authorities concerned on the basis of their comments on the summary of key issues, and, where applicable, in response to requests under Article 61 and 62 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, in an endeavour to reach a consensus. The consensus shall be used as a basis for the lead supervisory authority to continue the investigation and draft the preliminary findings or, where applicable, provide the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged with its reasoning for the purposes of Article 11(2). Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Article 10(4)				
120	4. Where, in a complaint-based investigation, there is no consensus between the lead supervisory authority and one or more concerned supervisory authorities on the matter referred to in Article 9(2), point (b), of this Regulation, the lead supervisory authority shall request an urgent binding decision	4. Where <u>within four weeks after the expiry of the deadlines for comments, the procedure provided for in paragraph 3 of this Article fails to generate</u> in a complaint-based investigation, there is no consensus between the lead supervisory authority and one or more concerned supervisory	4. Where, in a complaint-based investigation, there is no consensus between the lead supervisory authority and one or more concerned supervisory authorities on the matter referred to in Article 9(2)9(1), point (b), of this Regulation, the lead supervisory authority shall a request for an	4. Where, in a complaint-based investigation, <u>following the procedures under Article 9(4) and paragraph 3 of this Article</u> , there is no consensus between the lead supervisory authority and one or more concerned supervisory authorities <u>concerned</u> on the matter <u>matters</u> referred to in Article


	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	of the Board under Article 66(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. In that case, the conditions for requesting an urgent binding decision under Article 66(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 shall be presumed to be met.	authorities <u>concerned</u> on the matter <u>matters</u> referred to in Article 9(2), point (b), of this Regulation, the lead supervisory authority <u>or a supervisory authority concerned</u> shall request an urgent binding decision <u>a procedural determination</u> of the Board under Article 66(3) of 26a of this Regulation (EU) 2016/679. In that case, the conditions for requesting an urgent binding decision under Article 66(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 shall be presumed to be met.	urgent binding decision of the Board under Article 66(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 shall be submitted by any supervisory authority concerned or the lead supervisory authority. In those cases. In that case, the conditions for requesting an urgent binding decision under Article 66(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 shall be presumed to be met.	9(2), point (b), of this Regulation, the lead supervisory authority shall request an urgent binding decision of the Board under Article 66(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. In that case, the conditions for requesting an urgent binding decision under Article 66(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 shall be presumed to be met. ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: EP Mandate
Article 10(5)				
6	121	5. When requesting an urgent binding decision <u>a procedural determination</u> of the Board pursuant to paragraph 4 of this Article, the lead <u>requesting</u> supervisory authority shall provide all of the following:	5. When requesting an urgent binding decision of the Board pursuant to paragraph 4 of this Article, the lead <u>requesting</u> supervisory authority shall provide all of the following:	5. When requesting an urgent binding decision of the Board pursuant to paragraph 4 of this Article, the lead supervisory authority shall provide all of the following: ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Article 10(5), point (a)				
6	122	(a) the documents <u>relevant information</u> referred to in Article 9(2), points (a) and (b) <u>including any updates when they occur</u> ;	(a) the documents referred to in Article 9(2) <u>9(1)</u> , points (a) and (b) ;	(a) the documents <u>elements</u> referred to in Article 9(2), points (a) and (b) ; ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate


	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
Article 10(5), point (b)				
123	(b) the comments of the supervisory authority concerned that disagrees with the lead supervisory authority's preliminary identification of the scope of the investigation.	(b) the comments of the supervisory authority authorities concerned that disagrees disagree with the lead supervisory authority's preliminary identification of the scope of the investigation. <u>or the factual or legal assessment of the elements of the summary of key issues referred to in Article 9(2);</u>	(b) the comments of the supervisory authority concerned that disagrees with the lead supervisory authority's preliminary identification of the scope of the investigation.;	(b) the comments of the supervisory authority authorities concerned that disagrees disagree with the lead supervisory authority's preliminary identification of the scope of the investigation. Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Article 10(5), point (ba)				
123a		<u>(ba) access to the joint case file.</u>	(c) further exchanges between the lead supervisory authority and the supervisory authorities concerned under Article 9(4), 9(5) and 10(3);	<u>(c) further exchanges between the lead supervisory authority and the supervisory authorities concerned under Article 9(4), 9(5) and 10(3);</u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 10(5), point (bb)				
123b			(d) any other relevant document or information, as requested by the Board.	<u>(bb) any other relevant document or information, as requested by the Board.</u> Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 10(5a)				
123c		<u>5a. The Board may request the supervisory authorities to provide other documents or information, as it deems appropriate in the particular case.</u>		deleted
Article 10(6)				


	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
124	6. The Board shall adopt an urgent binding decision on the scope of the investigation on the basis of the comments of the supervisory authorities concerned and the position of the lead supervisory authority on those comments.	6. The Board shall adopt an urgent binding decision on the scope of the investigation <u>summary of key issues or on extending the period referred to in paragraph 4, in accordance with Article 26a</u> , on the basis of the comments of the supervisory authorities concerned and the position of the lead supervisory authority on those comments <u>all the documents received</u> .	6. The Board shall adopt an urgent binding decision on the scope of the investigation on the basis of the comments of the supervisory authorities concerned and the position of the lead supervisory authority on those comments <u>all the documents received</u> .	6. The Board shall adopt an urgent binding decision on the scope of the investigation on the basis of the comments of the supervisory authorities concerned and the position of the lead supervisory authority on those comments <u>all the documents received</u> . Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 10(6a)				
124a			6bis. Following the implementation of the urgent binding decision referred to under paragraph 6 by the Board, the lead supervisory authority shall continue to cooperate with the supervisory authorities concerned pursuant to Article 60 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and continue handling the case. The preliminary findings referred to in Article 14 shall be communicated to the parties under investigation within six months. In an exceptional case, that period may be extended once on account of the complexity of the case. In such a case, the lead supervisory authority shall notify the concerned supervisory authority and set out the duration of and reasons for the extension.	<i>deleted</i> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 10a				

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
124b		<u>Article 10a</u> <u>Cooperation with other relevant authorities</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 10a(1)				
124c		<u>Supervisory authorities shall strive to communicate non-personal information obtained in the context of the procedures set out in this Regulation to national and Union supervisory authorities competent in data protection and other areas, including competition, financial services, energy, telecommunications, consumer protection, digital services, or artificial intelligence supervisory authorities, where the information is deemed relevant to the tasks and duties of those authorities, in particular for opening administrative procedures and investigations into possible violations of legislation under their competences. Information can be only used for the purposes of which it was gathered. However, that does not preclude the supervisory authority to initiate other proceedings based on that information or to share it with other authorities for that purpose.</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 10b				

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
124d				<p><u>Article 10a Time limits for submission of a draft decision</u></p> <p><u>1. The lead supervisory authority shall submit a draft decision pursuant to Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 no later than [x] months after the lead supervisory authority has confirmed its competence pursuant to Article 3, paragraph 4a of this Regulation or after a binding decision by the Board pursuant to Article 65, paragraph 1, point b), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. This time limit may be extended once by the lead supervisory authority in line with the procedure in paragraphs 3 and 4.</u></p> <p><u>2. Where a request under Article 10(4) of this Regulation has been made, the time limits referred to in paragraph 1 shall be suspended until the Board has adopted its binding decision.</u></p> <p><u>3. In an exceptional case, the lead supervisory authority may extend the time limit referred to in paragraph 1 for a maximum period of [x] months on account of complexity of the case. In such a case, the lead supervisory authority shall inform the supervisory authorities concerned and set out the duration of and reasons for the</u></p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				<p><u><i>intended extension, at least four weeks before the expiry of the time limit referred to in paragraph 1.</i></u></p> <p><u><i>4. Any supervisory authority concerned may submit an objection to the extension within two weeks from being informed pursuant to paragraph 3. The authority shall set out the reasons for its objection. When determining whether to apply an extension to the time limit and, where applicable, the length of such an extension, the lead supervisory authority shall take due account of such an objection.</i></u></p> <p><u><i>5. Following the extension referred to in paragraph 3 of this Article, any supervisory authority concerned may inform the lead supervisory authority that it considers there is a need to act in order to protect the rights and freedoms of data subjects. Where the lead supervisory authority does not submit a draft decision within the extended time limit referred to in paragraph 3, an authority that has informed of a need to act in order to protect the rights and freedoms of data subjects may adopt a provisional measure on the territory of its Member State in accordance with Article 55 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. In that</i></u></p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				<p><u>case, the urgent need to act under Article 66(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 shall be presumed to be met.</u></p> <p><u>6. Where the simple cooperation procedure under Article 8bis is applied, the lead supervisory authority shall submit a draft decision pursuant to Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 no later than [x] months after the lead supervisory authority has confirmed its competence pursuant to Article 3, paragraph 4a of this Regulation or after a binding decision by the Board pursuant to Article 65, paragraph 1, point b), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</u></p> <p>trilogue</p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
	Section 1d			
6	124e			<p style="text-align: center;"><i>deleted</i></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
	Article 10c			
y	124f			<p><u>Article 10b</u></p> <p><u>Subsequent domestic proceedings</u></p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				<p><u>1. Where national law requires subsequent domestic proceedings related to the same case to be opened after the adoption of a decision pursuant to Articles 13 or 16, the lead supervisory authority shall:</u></p> <p><u>a) not draft a new summary of key issues,</u></p> <p><u>b) repeat the procedural steps pursuant to Article 11 or Articles 14 and 15 only where its factual or legal assessment differs from the preceding decision adopted pursuant to Articles 13 or 16, and</u></p> <p><u>c) submit a draft decision before adopting any subsequent decision that is different from the preceding decision pursuant to Articles 13 or 16.</u></p> <p><u>[2. The time limit pursuant to Article XX shall apply to submitting a draft decision in any subsequent proceedings referred to in paragraph 1.]</u></p> <p>trilogue - second para linked to deadlines</p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
Article 10d				
124g				<p><u>Article 10c Legality and validity of procedural steps and the final decision</u></p> <p><u>Where this Regulation or Article 65(6) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 requires that a supervisory authority take a procedural step within a specified time limit, taking such a step after the expiry of the time limit shall not affect the legality or validity of that procedural step or of the final decision.</u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
Section 2				
125	Section 2 Full or partial rejection of complaints	<p><i>deleted</i></p> <p>Heading "Section 2" is placed after Article 9 and its title is changed to "Section 2 Cooperation with other relevant authorities" - see line 112a</p>	Section 2 Full or partial rejection of complaints	<p>Section 2 Full or partial rejection of complaints</p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p> <p>Text Origin: Commission Proposal</p>
Article 11				
126	Article 11 Hearing of complainant prior to full or partial rejection of a complaint	<p>Article 11</p> <p><i>deleted</i></p>	Article 11 Hearing of complainant prior to full or partial rejection of a complaint within the meaning of Article 60(8) and Article 60(9) of Regulation EU 2016/679	Article 11 Hearing of complainant prior to Procedure for full or partial rejection or dismissal of a complaint <u>within the meaning of Article 60(8) and Article 60(9) of Regulation EU 2016/679</u>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 11(1)				
127	<p>1. Following the procedure provided for in Article 9 and 10, the lead supervisory authority shall provide the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged with the reasons for its preliminary view that the complaint should be fully or partially rejected.</p>	<p><i>deleted</i></p>	<p>1. Following the procedure provided for in Prior to submitting a draft decision pursuant to Article 9 and 10 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, the lead supervisory authority shall provide the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged with the reasons for its preliminary view that the complaint should be dismissed or fully or partially rejected.</p>	<p>1. Following the procedure provided for in Article 9 and 10, 1. Where the lead supervisory authority <u>intends to fully or partially reject or dismiss a complaint, it shall, prior to submitting a draft decision pursuant to Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679,</u> provide the supervisory authority with which the complaint was <u>has been</u> lodged with the reasons for its preliminary view that the complaint should be fully or partially rejected <u>or dismissed.</u></p> <p><u>The supervisory authority with which the complaint has been lodged shall inform the complainant of the reasons for the preliminary view referred to in the first subparagraph, provide the complainant with the possibility to make her or his views known and inform the complainant of the consequences of not making his or her views known.</u></p> <p><u>The complainant shall have an opportunity to make his or her views known in writing within an appropriate time-limit set by the lead supervisory authority no</u></p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
Article 11(2)				<p><u>shorter than three weeks and no longer than six weeks.</u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
128	<p>2. The supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged shall inform the complainant of the reasons for the intended full or partial rejection of the complaint and set a time-limit within which the complainant may make known her or his views in writing. The time-limit shall be no less than three weeks. The supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged shall inform the complainant of the consequences of the failure to make her or his views known.</p>	<p><i>deleted</i></p>	<p>2. The supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged shall inform the complainant of the reasons for the intended dismissal or full or partial rejection of the complaint and set a time limit within which the complainant may make known her or his views in writing. The time limit shall be no less than three weeks. The supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged shall provide the complainant with the possibility to make her or his views known and shall inform the complainant of the consequences of the failure to make her or his views known. The complainant shall make his or her views known in writing and within four weeks upon receiving the reasons for the intended dismissal or full or partial rejection of the complaint. Upon request of the complainant, the period shall be extended by two weeks on account of the complexity of the case.</p>	<p>2. The supervisory authority with which the complaint was <u>has been</u> lodged shall inform <u>transmit any views made known by</u> the complainant of the reasons for the intended full or partial rejection of the complaint and set a time limit within which the complainant may make known her or his views in writing. The time limit shall be no less than three weeks. The <u>to the lead</u> supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged shall inform the complainant of the consequences of the failure to make her or his views known. <u>as soon as they become available and in any case no later than one week from when they become available</u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
Article 11(3)				

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
129	3.If the complainant fails to make known her or his views within the time-limit set by the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged, the complaint shall be deemed to have been withdrawn.	<i>deleted</i>	3.If the complainant fails to make known her or his views within the time-limit set by The supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged, the complaint shall without delay transmit any views made by the complainant within the time-limit of four or six weeks, as the case may be, to the lead supervisory authority be deemed to have been withdrawn.	3. If <u>Where the views made known by</u> the complainant fails to make known her or his views within the time-limit set by <u>in accordance with paragraph 1 do not lead to a change of the preliminary view referred to in the first subparagraph of paragraph 1, the lead supervisory authority, in cooperation with</u> the supervisory authority with which the complaint was <u>has been</u> lodged, the complaint shall be deemed to have been withdrawn <u>prepare a draft decision and submit it to the supervisory authorities concerned, in accordance with Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 11(4)				
130	4.The complainant may request access to the non-confidential version of the documents on which the proposed rejection of the complaint is based.	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 11(5)				
131	5.If the complainant makes known her or his views within the time-limit set by the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged and the views do not lead to a change in the preliminary view that the complaint should be	<i>deleted</i>	5.If the complainant makes known her or his views within the time-limit set by the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged and the views do not lead to a change in the preliminary view that the complaint should be	<i>deleted</i> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	fully or partially rejected, the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged shall prepare the draft decision under Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 which shall be submitted to the other supervisory authorities concerned by the lead supervisory authority pursuant to Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.		dismissed or fully or partially rejected, the lead supervisory authority, in cooperation with the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged, shall prepare the draft decision under Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 which shall be submitted to the other supervisory authorities concerned by the lead supervisory authority pursuant to Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.-	
Article 11(5a)				
6	131a		6. When the draft decision submitted pursuant to paragraph 5 concludes that the complaint should be partially rejected, the lead supervisory authority shall continue its investigation in cooperation with the concerned supervisory authorities on the part of the complaint which remains to be investigated.	<u><i>6. When the draft decision submitted pursuant to paragraph 3 concludes that the complaint should be partially rejected, the lead supervisory authority shall continue its investigation in cooperation with the supervisory authorities concerned on the part of the complaint which remains to be investigated.</i></u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 12				
6	132	Article 12 Revised draft decision fully or partially rejecting a complaint	<i>deleted</i>	Article 12 Revised draft decision dismissing or fully or partially rejecting a complaint
			Article 12 Revised draft decision fully or partially rejecting <u><i>or dismissing</i></u> a complaint	

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 12(1)				
133	1. Where the lead supervisory authority considers that the revised draft decision within the meaning of Article 60(5) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 raises elements on which the complainant should have the opportunity to make her or his views known, the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged shall, prior to the submission of the revised draft decision under Article 60(5) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, provide the complainant with the possibility to make her or his views known on such new elements.	<i>deleted</i>	1. Where the lead supervisory authority considers that the revised draft decision within the meaning of Article 60(5) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 raises new elements on which the complainant should have the opportunity to make her or his views known, the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged shall, prior to the submission of the revised draft decision under Article 60(5) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, provide the complainant with the possibility to make her or his views known on such new elements, following the same procedure as provided under Article 11 of this Regulation.	1. Where the lead supervisory authority considers <u>assesses</u> that the revised draft decision within the meaning of Article 60(5) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, <u>fully or partially rejecting or dismissing a complaint</u> , raises <u>new</u> elements on which the complainant should have the opportunity to make her or his views known, the supervisory authority with which the complaint was <u>has been</u> lodged shall, prior to the submission of the revised draft decision under Article 60(5) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, provide the complainant with the possibility to make her or his views known on such new elements <u>in accordance with the procedure under Article 11 of this Regulation.</u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 12(2)				
134	2. The supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged shall set a time-limit within which the complainant may make known her or his views.	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 13				

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
135	Article 13 Decision fully or partially rejecting a complaint	Article 13 <i>deleted</i>	Article 13 Decision dismissing or fully or partially rejecting a complaint	Article 13 Decision fully or partially rejecting <u>or dismissing</u> a complaint ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 13, first paragraph				
136	When adopting a decision fully or partially rejecting a complaint in accordance with Article 60(8) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged shall inform the complainant of the judicial remedy available to him or her in accordance with Article 78 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.	<i>deleted</i>	1. When adopting a decision dismissing or fully or partially rejecting a complaint in accordance with Article 60(8) Articles 60(8) or 60(9) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged shall inform the complainant of the judicial remedy available to him or her in accordance with Article 78 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.	When adopting a decision <u>dismissing or</u> fully or partially rejecting a complaint in accordance with Article 60(8) Articles 60(8) or 60(9) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged shall inform the complainant of the judicial remedy available to him or her in accordance with Article 78 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 13, first paragraph a				
136a			2. The lead supervisory authority shall inform the controller of the decision adopted pursuant to Article 60(9) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.	<i>deleted</i> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Section 3				
137	Section 3 Decisions addressed to controllers and processors	Section 3 Decisions addressed to controllers and processors <u>parties under investigation</u>	Section 3 Decisions addressed to controllers and processors	Section 3 Decisions addressed to controllers and processors <u>parties under investigation</u>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: EP Mandate
Article 14				
138	Article 14 Preliminary findings and reply	Article 14 Preliminary findings and reply <u>the right to be heard</u>	Article 14 Preliminary findings and reply	Article 14 Preliminary findings and reply <u>the right to be heard</u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: EP Mandate
Article 14(1)				
139	1. When the lead supervisory authority intends to submit a draft decision within the meaning of Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 to the other supervisory authorities concerned finding an infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, it shall draft preliminary findings.	1. <u>Following the consultations and procedures under Articles 9 and 10 of this Regulation</u> , when the lead supervisory authority intends to submit a draft decision within the meaning of Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 to the other supervisory authorities concerned finding an infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, it shall draft preliminary findings.	1. When the lead supervisory authority intends to submit a draft decision within the meaning of Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 to the other supervisory authorities concerned finding an infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, -it shall draft preliminary findings.	1. <u>Following the consultations and procedures under Articles 9 and 10 of this Regulation</u> , when the lead supervisory authority intends to submit a draft decision within the meaning of Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 to the other supervisory authorities concerned finding an infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, it shall draft preliminary findings. Text Origin: EP Mandate
Article 14(2), first subparagraph				
140	2. The preliminary findings shall present allegations raised in an exhaustive and sufficiently clear way to enable the parties under investigation to take cognisance of the conduct investigated by the lead	2. The preliminary findings shall present allegations raised in an exhaustive and sufficiently clear way to enable the parties under investigation to take cognisance of the conduct investigated by the lead	2. The preliminary findings shall include the main findings of the investigation and present allegations raised in an exhaustive and sufficiently clear way to enable the parties under investigation to	2. The preliminary findings shall <u>include the findings of the investigation and</u> present allegations raised in an exhaustive and sufficiently clear way to enable the parties under investigation to

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	supervisory authority. In particular, they must set out clearly all the facts and the entire legal assessment raised against the parties under investigation, so that they can express their views on the facts and the legal conclusions the lead supervisory authority intends to draw in the draft decision within the meaning of Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, and list all the evidence it relies upon.	supervisory authority. In particular, they must shall set out clearly all the facts, <u>including listing all the evidence relied upon,</u> and the entire legal assessment raised against the parties under investigation, so that they <u>are heard and</u> can express their views on the facts and the legal conclusions the lead supervisory authority intends to draw in the draft decision within the meaning of Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, and list all the evidence it relies upon.	take cognisance of the conduct investigated by the lead supervisory authority. In particular, they must set out clearly all the facts and the entire legal assessment raised against the parties under investigation, so that they can express their views on the facts and the legal conclusions the lead supervisory authority intends to draw in the draft decision within the meaning of Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, and list all the evidence it relies upon.	take cognisance of the conduct investigated by the lead supervisory authority. In particular, they must shall set out clearly all the facts, <u>including listing the evidence relied upon,</u> and the entire legal assessment raised against the parties under investigation, so that they can express their views on the facts and the legal conclusions the lead supervisory authority intends to draw in the draft decision within the meaning of Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, and list all the evidence it relies upon. ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Article 14(2), second subparagraph				
141	The preliminary findings shall indicate corrective measures the lead supervisory authority intends to use.	The preliminary findings shall indicate <u>the</u> corrective measures <u>that are considered by</u> the lead supervisory authority intends to use.	The preliminary findings shall indicate, based on the information available at that stage and without prejudice to the views of the parties, corrective measures the lead supervisory authority intends to use considers using.	The preliminary findings shall indicate, <u>based on the information available at that stage and without prejudice to the views of the parties,</u> corrective measures the lead supervisory authority intends to use considers using. Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 14(2), third subparagraph				
142	Where the lead supervisory authority intends to impose a fine, it shall list in the preliminary findings the relevant elements on which it	Where the lead supervisory authority intends to impose considers imposing a fine, it shall list in the preliminary findings	Where the lead supervisory authority intends to impose a fine, it shall list in the preliminary findings the relevant elements on which it	Where the lead supervisory authority intends to impose a fine, it shall list in the preliminary findings the relevant elements on which it

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	<p>relies while calculating the fine. In particular, the lead supervisory authority shall list the essential facts and matters of law which may result in the imposition of the fine and the elements listed in Article 83(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, including any aggravating or mitigating factors it will take into account.</p>	<p>the relevant elements on which it relies<u>intends to rely in deciding whether to impose an administrative fine and</u> while calculating the fine. In particular, the lead supervisory authority shall list the essential facts and matters of law which may result in the imposition of the fine and the elements listed in Article 83(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, including any aggravating or mitigating factors it will take into account.</p>	<p>relies while calculating the, based on the information available at that stage and without prejudice to the views of the parties, considers imposing an administrative fine. In particular in accordance with Article 83 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, the lead supervisory authority shall list in the preliminary findings the main legal and factual elements, the essential facts and matters of law which may result in the imposition are known to it, and on which it intends to rely in deciding whether to impose an administrative fine and in deciding on the amount of the fine, having regard to and the elements listed in Article 83(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, including any aggravating or mitigating factors it will take into account.</p>	<p>relies while calculating the, based on the information available at that stage and without prejudice to the views of the parties, considers imposing an administrative fine. In particular in accordance with Article 83 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, the lead supervisory authority shall list <u>in the preliminary findings the main legal and factual elements,</u> the essential facts and matters of law which may result in the imposition <u>are known to it, and on which it intends to rely in deciding whether to impose an administrative fine and in deciding on the amount</u> of the fine, <u>having regard to</u> and the elements listed in Article 83(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, including any aggravating or mitigating factors it will take into account.</p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p> <p>Text Origin: Council Mandate</p>
Article 14(2a)				
142a			<p>2bis. The preliminary findings shall be transmitted to the supervisory authorities concerned, which may provide comments to the lead supervisory authorities within four weeks. Upon request of one of the supervisory authority concerned,</p>	<p><u>2bis. The preliminary findings shall be transmitted to the supervisory authorities concerned, which may provide comments to the lead supervisory authorities within four weeks. Upon request of one of the supervisory authority</u></p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
			the period shall be extended by another two weeks on account of the complexity of the case.	<u>concerned, the period shall be extended by another two weeks.</u> Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 14(3)				
143	3.The lead supervisory authority shall notify preliminary findings to each of the parties under investigation.	3.The lead supervisory authority shall notify preliminary findings to each of the parties under investigation <u>that may be subject to the exercise of a corrective power, as well as to the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged and the supervisory authorities concerned. The supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged shall notify preliminary findings to the complainant.</u>	3.The lead supervisory authority shall notify preliminary findings, where relevant amended to take into account comments received by the supervisory authorities concerned , to each of the parties under investigation.	3.The lead supervisory authority shall notify preliminary findings, <u>where relevant amended to take into account comments received by the supervisory authorities concerned</u> , to each of the parties under investigation. Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 14(4)				
144	4.The lead supervisory authority shall, when notifying the preliminary findings to the parties under investigation, set a time-limit within which these parties may provide their views in writing. The lead supervisory authority shall not be obliged to take into account written views received after the expiry of that time-limit.	<i>deleted</i>	4.The lead supervisory authority shall, when notifying the preliminary findings to the parties under investigation, set a time-limit of four weeks within which these parties may provide their views in writing, or hold a hearing within the same time-limit in order to hear the views of the parties orally. Upon request of the parties under investigation, the period shall be extended by another two weeks on account of the complexity of the case. The lead supervisory authority shall not be obliged to may take into account	4.The lead supervisory authority shall, when notifying the preliminary findings to the parties under investigation, set a <u>an appropriate</u> time-limit <u>no shorter than three weeks and no longer than six weeks from the date of notification</u> , within which these <u>those</u> parties may provide their views in writing, or the lead supervisory authority shall not be obliged to take into account written views received after the expiry of <u>that</u> <u>hold a hearing within the same time-limit in order to hear the views of the parties orally.</u>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
			written views received after the expiry of that time-limit, in accordance with national law.	ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 14(5)				
145	5. When notifying the preliminary findings to the parties under investigation, the lead supervisory authority shall provide those parties with access to the administrative file in accordance with Article 20.	<i>deleted</i>	5. When notifying the preliminary findings to the parties under investigation, the lead supervisory authority shall provide those parties with access to the administrative file in accordance with Article 20.	5. When notifying the preliminary findings to the parties under investigation, the lead supervisory authority shall provide those parties with access to the administrative file in accordance with Article 20 <u>19 and 21</u> . Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Article 14(6)				
146	6. The parties under investigation may, in their written reply to preliminary findings, set out all facts and legal arguments known to them which are relevant to their defence against the allegations of the lead supervisory authority. They shall attach any relevant documents as proof of the facts set out. The lead supervisory authority shall, in its draft decision, deal only with allegations, including the facts and the legal assessment based on those facts, in respect of which the parties under investigation have been given the opportunity to comment.	6. The parties under investigation may, in their written reply to preliminary findings, set out all facts and legal arguments known to them which are relevant to their defence against the allegations of the lead supervisory authority. They shall attach any relevant documents as <i>proof</i> of the facts set out. The lead supervisory authority shall, in its draft decision, deal only with allegations, including the facts and the legal assessment based on those facts, in respect of which the parties under investigation have been given the opportunity to comment.	6. The parties under investigation may, in their written or oral reply to preliminary findings, set out all facts and legal arguments known to them which are relevant to their defence against the allegations of the lead supervisory authority. They shall attach any relevant documents as proof of the facts set out. The lead supervisory authority shall, in its draft decision, deal only with allegations, including the facts and the legal assessment based on those facts, in respect of which the parties under investigation have been given the opportunity to comment.	6. The parties under investigation may, in their written reply to preliminary findings, set out all facts and legal arguments known to them which are relevant to their defence against the allegations of the lead supervisory authority. They shall attach any relevant documents as proof of the facts set out. The lead supervisory authority shall, in its draft decision, deal only with allegations, including the facts and the legal assessment based on those facts, in respect of which the parties under investigation have been given the opportunity to comment. ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 14(6a)				
146a			7.The lead supervisory authority shall submit a draft decision in accordance with Article 60(3) GDPR to the other supervisory authorities concerned within three months from the receiving of the views of the parties under investigations and/or the complainant. In an exceptional case, that period may be extended once on account of the complexity of the case. In such a case, the lead supervisory authority shall notify the concerned supervisory authority and set out the duration of and reasons for the extension.	<p><i>deleted</i></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
Article 14(6b)				
146b			8.Where the lead supervisory authority is required by national law to engage in subsequent domestic procedure related to the same case, the preliminary findings shall be prepared again if the lead supervisory authority intends to deviate from previous consensus on the case.	<p><i>deleted</i></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
Article 15				
147	Article 15 Transmission of preliminary findings to complainants	Article 15 <i>deleted</i>	Article 15 Transmission of preliminary findings to complainants	Article 15 Transmission of preliminary findings to complainants


	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Article 15(1)				
148	1. Where the lead supervisory authority issues preliminary findings relating to a matter in respect of which it has received a complaint, the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged shall provide the complainant with a non-confidential version of the preliminary findings and set a time-limit within which the complainant may make known its views in writing.	<i>deleted</i>	1. Where the lead supervisory authority issues preliminary findings relating to a matter in respect of which it has received a complaint, the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged shall provide the complainant with a non-confidential version of the preliminary findings, in accordance with Article 20 and 21 , and set a time-limit of four weeks within which the complainant may make known its views in writing. Upon request of the complainant, the period shall be extended by another two weeks on account of the complexity of the case.	1. Where the lead supervisory authority issues preliminary findings relating to a matter in respect of which it has received a complaint, the supervisory authority with which the complaint was has been lodged shall provide the complainant with a non-confidential version of the those preliminary findings, in accordance with rules on access to the administrative file and on confidential information under Articles 19 and 21 , and set an appropriate time-limit no shorter than three weeks and no longer than six weeks , within which the complainant may make known his or her views in writing. ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 15(1a)				
148a			1a. For the purpose of paragraph 1, administrative modalities and requirement under the national procedural law of the supervisory authority with which the	<u>1a. For the purpose of paragraph 1, administrative modalities and requirement under the national procedural law of the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged shall continue to apply.</u>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
			complaint was lodged shall continue to apply.	Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 15(2)				
149	2.Paragraph 1 shall apply also when a supervisory authority, where appropriate, treats several complaints jointly, splits the complaints in several parts or in any other way exercises its discretion concerning the scope of the investigation as set out in preliminary findings.	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>	<p>2.Paragraph 1 shall <u>also</u> apply also when a <u>where the lead</u> supervisory authority, where appropriate, treats several <u>handles a complaint jointly with other</u> complaints jointly, splits the complaints in several parts or in any other way exercises its discretion concerning <u>or where it handles a part of a complaint separately. It shall also apply where the lead supervisory authority has modified</u> the scope of the investigation as set out in preliminary findings <u>in any other way, including following a binding decision of the Board pursuant to Article 10(6).</u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
Article 15(3)				
150	3.Where the lead supervisory authority considers that it is necessary for the complainant to be provided with documents included in the administrative file in order for the complainant to effectively make known her or his views on the preliminary findings, the supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged shall provide the complainant with the	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>


	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	non-confidential version of such documents when providing the preliminary findings pursuant to paragraph 1.			
<i>Article 15(4)</i>				
151	4. The complainant shall be provided with the non-confidential version of the preliminary findings only for the purpose of the concrete investigation in which the preliminary findings were issued.	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>
<i>Article 15(5)</i>				
152	5. Before receiving the non-confidential version of preliminary findings and any documents provided pursuant to paragraph 3, the complainant shall send to the lead supervisory authority a confidentiality declaration, where the complainant commits himself or herself not to disclose any information or assessment made in the non-confidential version of preliminary findings or to use those findings for purposes other than the concrete investigation in which those findings were issued.	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>
<i>Article 16</i>				
153	Article 16 Adoption of final decision	Article 16 <u>Submission of draft decisions, revised draft decisions and adoption of final decision</u>	Article 16 Adoption of final decision	Article 16 Adoption of final decision ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Article 16, first paragraph				
154	<p>After submitting the draft decision to supervisory authorities concerned pursuant to Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and where none of the supervisory authorities concerned has objected to the draft decision within the periods referred to in Article 60(4) and (5) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, the lead supervisory authority shall adopt and notify its decision under Article 60(7) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 to the main establishment or single establishment of the controller or processor, as the case may be, and inform the supervisory authorities concerned and the Board of the decision in question, including a summary of the relevant facts and grounds.</p>	<p>After submitting the draft decision to supervisory authorities concerned pursuant to Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and where none of the supervisory authorities concerned has objected to the draft decision within the periods referred to in Article 60(4) and (5) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, the lead supervisory authority shall, <u>within four weeks from the end of the periods referred to in Article 60(4) and (5) of Regulation 2016/679</u>, adopt and notify its decision under Article 60(7) <u>and Article 60(9)</u> of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 to the main establishment or single establishment of the controller or processor, as the case may be, and inform the supervisory authorities concerned and the Board of the decision in question, including a summary of the relevant facts and grounds.</p>	<p>1. After submitting the draft decision to supervisory authorities concerned pursuant to Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and where none of the supervisory authorities concerned has objected to the draft decision within the periods referred to in Article 60(4) and (5) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, the lead supervisory authority shall adopt and notify, within one month, its decision under Article 60(7) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 to the main establishment or single establishment of the controller or processor, as the case may be, and inform the supervisory authorities concerned and the Board of the decision in question, including a summary of the relevant facts and grounds. The supervisory authority with which the complaint was lodged shall inform the complainant of the decision.</p>	<p><u>1.</u> After submitting the draft decision to supervisory authorities concerned pursuant to Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and where none of the supervisory authorities concerned has objected <u>object</u> to the draft decision within the periods referred to in Article 60(4) and (5) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 <u>as applicable</u>, the lead supervisory authority shall, <u>within one month from the end of the period referred to in Article 60(4) or (5) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679:</u></p> <p><u>(a)</u> adopt and notify its decision under referred to in Article 60(7) <u>or, where applicable Article 60(9)</u>, of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 to the main establishment or single establishment of the controller or processor, as the case may be, and inform the supervisory authorities concerned and the Board of the;</p> <p><u>(b)</u> <u>notify that</u> decision in question, including a summary to the <u>main establishment or single establishment</u> of the relevant facts and grounds. <u>controller or processor, as the case may be;</u></p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 16, first paragraph a				
154a		<u><i>1a. Where a supervisory authority concerned has objected to the draft decision within the period referred to in Article 60(4) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, and the lead supervisory authority intends to follow that objection, the lead supervisory authority shall, within four weeks, submit a revised draft decision pursuant to Article 60(5) of that Regulation.</i></u>	2. Where the lead supervisory authority and the supervisory authorities concerned agree to dismiss or reject parts of a complaint and act on other parts of that complaint, a separate decision shall be adopted and notified to the main or single establishment of the controller or the processor and the complainant, following the article 60 (9) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.	deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 16, first paragraph b				
154b		<u><i>1b. Where a supervisory authority concerned has objected to the draft decision within the period referred to in Article 60(4) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, and the lead supervisory authority does not follow the relevant and reasoned objection or is of the opinion that the objection is not relevant or reasoned, the lead supervisory authority shall, within four weeks, submit the matter to the consistency mechanism referred to in Article 63, in accordance with Article 60(4) of that Regulation.</i></u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 16, first paragraph c				


	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement	
154c		<u>1c. Without prejudice to additional requirements under national law, any draft decision or final decision under Article 60(3), (5) or (7) to (9) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 shall be issued in writing, using a short, concise, transparent, intelligible form and clear and plain language. It shall be drafted in an impartial way, taking into account any diverging evidence and views of the parties, and shall at least contain the following elements:</u>		<p style="text-align: center;"><i>deleted</i></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>	
Article 16, first paragraph c, point (a)					
154d		<u>(a) the name of the supervisory authority which issued the decision;</u>		<p style="text-align: center;"><i>deleted</i></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>	
Article 16, first paragraph c, point (b)					
154e		<u>(b) the date of issuing the decision;</u>		<p style="text-align: center;"><i>deleted</i></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>	
Article 16, first paragraph c, point (c)					
154f		<u>(c) an impartial summary of the relevant facts of the case and their source;</u>	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>deleted</i></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>		
Article 16, first paragraph c, point (d)					

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
g	154g	<u>(d) the legal grounds for the decision;</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 16, first paragraph c, point (e)				
g	154h	<u>(e) the exercised corrective powers, penalties or other measures; and</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 16, first paragraph c, point (f)				
g	154i	<u>(f) information on the right to an effective judicial remedy under Article 78 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and any applicable national procedural law.</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 16, first paragraph d				
g	154j	<u>1d. In the event where the legally binding decision is to be issued by the supervisory authority with which the complaint has been lodged in accordance with Article 60(8) or (9) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, the lead supervisory authority shall ensure that the decision contains all elements necessary under the applicable national procedural law of the supervisory authority concerned. The supervisory authority concerned with which the complaint has been lodged shall assist the lead supervisory</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level



	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
		<u>authority in drafting the decision in such a manner.</u>		
Article 16, first paragraph e				
154k		<u>I.e. Any draft decision or final decision shall only rely on factual findings made on the basis of documents or other evidence, on which the parties under investigation had the opportunity to make their views known.</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 16, first paragraph f				
154l		<u>If. The information provided to the parties under Article 60(7) to (9) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 shall include a copy of the legally binding decision, and information about a judicial remedy available in accordance with Article 78 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</u>		<u>The information to be provided to the complainant pursuant to Article 60(7) and Article 60(9) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 shall consist of a version of the decision adopted that includes its operative part in full and the grounds that do not include elements considered confidential in accordance with Article 21 of this Regulation, or a summary of the decision, including the relevant facts and grounds. In any case, the complainant shall, upon request, be provided with a version of that decision that includes its operative part in full and the grounds that do not include elements considered confidential in accordance with Article 21 of this Regulation. Administrative modalities and requirements under the national procedural law of the lead</u>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				<p><u>supervisory authority shall continue to apply.</u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
Article 16, first paragraph g				
g	154m	<p><u>1g. Supervisory authorities shall publish all legally binding decisions they issue without undue delay, but no later than three months after adoption, unless the new decisions do not materially depart from previously published decisions. In accordance with applicable national law, supervisory authorities may redact party names, any other information that may allow the identification of parties, and other information that is protected under applicable law.</u></p>		<p>deleted</p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
Article 17				
g	155	<p>Article 17</p> <p>Right to be heard in relation to revised draft decision</p> <p>Article 17</p> <p>deleted</p>	<p>Article 17</p> <p>Right to be heard in relation to revised draft decision</p>	<p>Article 17</p> <p>Right to be heard in relation to revised draft decision <u>finding an infringement</u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p> <p>Text Origin: Commission Proposal</p>
Article 17(1)				
g	156	<p>1. Where the lead supervisory authority considers that the revised draft decision within the meaning of</p> <p>deleted</p>	<p>1. Where the lead supervisory authority considers that the revised draft decision within the meaning of</p>	<p>1. Where the lead supervisory authority considers that the revised draft decision within the meaning of</p>



	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	Article 60(5) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 raises elements on which the parties under investigation should have the opportunity to make their views known, the lead supervisory authority shall, prior to the submission of the revised draft decision under Article 60(5) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, provide the parties under investigation with the possibility to make their views known on such new elements.		Article 60(5) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 raises new elements on which the parties under investigation should have the opportunity to make their views known, the lead supervisory authority shall, prior to the submission of the revised draft decision under Article 60(5) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, provide the parties under investigation with the possibility to make their views known on such new elements.	Article 60(5) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, <u>finding an infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679</u> , raises <u>new</u> elements on which the parties under investigation should have the opportunity to make their views known, the lead supervisory authority shall, prior to the submission of the revised draft decision under Article 60(5) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, provide the parties under investigation with the possibility to make their views known on such new elements. ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 17(2)				
157	2. The lead supervisory authority shall set a time-limit within which the parties under investigation may make known their views.	<i>deleted</i>	2. The lead supervisory authority shall set a time-limit of four weeks within which the parties under investigation may make known their views. Upon request of the parties under investigation, the period shall be extended by two week on account of the complexity of the case.	2. The lead supervisory authority shall set an appropriate time-limit <u>no shorter than three weeks and no longer than six weeks</u> within which the parties under investigation may make known their views. ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Article 17(2a)				
157a			2bis. The lead supervisory authority shall inform the	<u>2a. The lead supervisory authority shall inform the supervisory</u>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
			supervisory authorities concerned of the views made by the parties under investigation.	<u>authorities concerned of the views made known by the parties under investigations, as soon as they become available and in any case no later than one week from when they become available.</u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Section 4				
158	Section 4 Relevant and reasoned objections	Section 4 Relevant and reasoned objections	Section 4 Relevant and reasoned objections	Section 4 Relevant and reasoned objections Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Article 18				
159	Article 18 Relevant and reasoned objections	Article 18 Relevant and reasoned objections	Article 18 Relevant and reasoned objections	Article 18 Relevant and reasoned objections Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Article 18(1)				
160	1. Relevant and reasoned objections within the meaning of Article 4(24) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 shall:	1. Relevant and reasoned objections within the meaning of Article 4(24) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 shall:	1. Relevant and reasoned objections within the meaning of Article 4(24) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 shall:	1. Relevant and reasoned objections within the meaning of Article 4(24) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 shall: Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Article 18(1), point (a)				
161	(a) be based exclusively on factual elements included in the draft decision; and	(a) be based exclusively on factual elements included in the draft decision; and , <u>or on the evidence the joint case file or on any additional evidence submitted</u>	(a) be based exclusively on factual and legal elements included in the draft decision, taking into account the comments relating to the summary of key issues and the preliminary findings ; and	(a) be based exclusively on factual and legal elements included in the draft decision <u>or in the cooperation file</u> ; and

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
		<u>together with the relevant and reasoned objection;</u>		ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 18(1), point (b)				
162	(b) not change the scope of the allegations by raising points amounting to identification of additional allegations of infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 or changing the intrinsic nature of the allegations raised.	(b) not change the scope of the allegations by raising points amounting to identification of additional allegations of infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 or changing the intrinsic nature <u>case as defined in the latest version</u> of the allegations raised. <u>summary of key issues; and</u>	(b) not change concern the scope of the allegations by raising points amounting to identification of additional allegations of infringement of Regulation an investigation on which consensus was found pursuant to Article 10(EU1a) 2016/679 or changing the intrinsic nature 10(3), or as defined in the binding decision of the allegations raised. Board adopted under Article 10 (6) when applicable,	(b) not change concern the scope of the allegations by raising points amounting to identification of additional allegations of infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 or changing the intrinsic nature <u>an investigation in cases where none of the supervisory authorities provided comments under Article 9(3) or in cases where consensus has been reached following comments received, or the scope of an investigation as defined in the binding decision of the allegations raised. Board adopted under Article 10(6).</u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 18(1), point (ba)				
162a		<u>(ba) clearly identify the elements of the draft decision that should be changed, including, when possible, the precise wording of the proposed change or a sufficiently precise description of the proposed change to the draft decision.</u>	(c) not concern a draft decision adopted in accordance with the conditions pursuant to Article 5 of this Regulation.	<u>(ba) not concern a draft decision adopted in accordance with the conditions pursuant to Article 5 of this Regulation.</u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 18(1a)				

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
6	162b		2. Notwithstanding point (b) of paragraph 1, a supervisory authority concerned may provide relevant and reasoned objections that concern the scope of an investigation as referred to in point (b) of paragraph 1, provided that, in duly justified cases:	<p><u>2. Notwithstanding point (b) of paragraph 1, a supervisory authority concerned may provide relevant and reasoned objections that concern the scope of an investigation as referred to in point (b) of paragraph 1, provided that, in duly justified cases:</u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p> <p>Text Origin: Council Mandate</p>
Article 18(1a), point (a)				
6	162c		– the lead supervisory authority has failed to investigate all the elements of the summary of key issues agreed pursuant to Article 10(1a) or 10(3), or has failed to comply with the binding decision of the Board under Article 10 (6). or,	<p><u>– the lead supervisory authority has failed to investigate all the elements of the summary of key issues agreed pursuant to Article 10(1a) or 10(3), or has failed to comply with the binding decision of the Board under Article 10 (6). or,</u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p> <p>Text Origin: Council Mandate</p>
Article 18(1a), point (b)				
6	162d		– additional new elements not available at the time of agreeing on the summary of key issues pursuant to Article 10(1a) or 10(3), or at the time of the binding decision of the Board under Article 10 (6), demonstrate a significant risk posed by the draft	<p><u>– additional new elements not available at the time of agreeing on the summary of key issues pursuant to Article 10(1a) or 10(3), or at the time of the binding decision of the Board under Article 10 (6), demonstrate a significant risk posed by the draft decision as</u></p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
			decision as regards the fundamental rights and freedom of the data subject and, where applicable, the free flow of personal data within the Union; or both	<u>regards the fundamental rights and freedom of the data subject and, where applicable, the free flow of personal data within the Union; or both</u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 18(2)				
163	2. The form and structure of relevant and reasoned objections shall meet all of the following requirements:	2. The form and structure of relevant and reasoned objections shall meet all of the following requirements:	<i>deleted</i>	2. The form and structure of <u>A</u> relevant and reasoned objections <u>objection</u> shall meet all <u>be worded in sufficiently clear, coherent and precise terms and, where necessary, identify the elements</u> of the following requirements <u>draft decision that should be changed</u> , in order to enable supervisory authorities, to prepare their positions and, as the case may be, to enable the Board to efficiently resolve the dispute ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 18(2), point (a)				
164	(a) the length of each relevant and reasoned objection and the position of the lead supervisory authority on any such objection shall not exceed three pages and shall not include annexes. In cases involving particularly complex legal issues,	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	the maximum length may be increased to six pages, except if specific circumstances justifying a longer length are accepted by the Board;			
<i>Article 18(2), point (b)</i>				
165	(b) the disagreement of the supervisory authority concerned with the draft decision shall be stated at the beginning of the relevant and reasoned objection and shall be worded in sufficiently clear, coherent and precise terms to enable the lead supervisory authority, and as the case may be, supervisory authorities concerned, to prepare their positions and to enable the Board to efficiently resolve the dispute;	(b) the disagreement of the supervisory authority concerned with the draft decision shall be stated at the beginning of the relevant and reasoned objection and shall be worded in sufficiently clear, coherent and precise terms to enable the lead supervisory authority, and as the case may be, supervisory authorities concerned, to prepare their positions and to enable the Board to efficiently resolve the dispute;	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
<i>Article 18(2), point (c)</i>				
166	(c) legal arguments shall be set out and grouped by reference to the operative part of the draft decision to which they relate. Each argument or group of arguments shall generally be preceded by a summary statement.	(c) legal arguments shall be set out and grouped by reference to the operative part of the draft decision to which they relate. Each argument or group of arguments shall generally be preceded by a summary statement.	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
<i>Chapter IV</i>				
167	Chapter IV Access to the administrative file and treatment of confidential information	Chapter IV <i>deleted</i>	Chapter IV Access to the administrative file and treatment of confidential information	Chapter IV Access to the Administrative <u>file</u> , <u>cooperation</u> file and treatment of confidential information

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				<p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p> <p>Text Origin: Commission Proposal</p>
Article 19				
168	Article 19 Content of the administrative file	Article 19 <i>deleted</i>	Article 19 Content of the administrative file	Article 19 Content of the Administrative file
Article 19(1)				
169	1. The administrative file in an investigation concerning an alleged infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 consists of all documents which have been obtained, produced and/or assembled by the lead supervisory authority during the investigation.	<i>deleted</i>	1. The administrative file in an investigation concerning an alleged infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 consists of all the documents which have been obtained, or produced and/or by the concerned supervisory authorities and the lead supervisory authority, and assembled by the lead supervisory authority during the investigation procedure, including inculpatory and exculpatory documents. The administrative file shall not include internal communication within a supervisory authority or internal drafts.	1. The administrative file in an investigation concerning an alleged infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 consists of all the documents which have been obtained, or produced and/or 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. <u>The administrative file shall not include internal communications within a supervisory authority.</u>
Article 19(2)				
170	2. In the course of investigation of an alleged infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, the lead supervisory authority may return to the party from which they have	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>	2. In the course of <u>Upon request of a party under</u> investigation of an alleged infringement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, or a complainant where the decision is liable to



	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	<p>been obtained documents which following a more detailed examination prove to be unrelated to the subject matter of the investigation. Upon return, these documents shall no longer constitute part of the administrative file.</p>			<p><u>affect his or her interests adversely</u>, the lead supervisory authority may return <u>shall grant access</u> to the party from which they have been obtained documents which following a more detailed examination prove to be unrelated to <u>the administrative file</u> to the subject matter of the <u>parties under</u> investigation. Upon return, these documents, or the complainant, enabling them to exercise their right to be heard. This shall no longer constitute part of <u>be without prejudice to more favourable rules on granting access to</u> the administrative file <u>under the lead supervisory authority's national law</u>.</p> <p><u>Where access is granted by the lead supervisory authority, the party under investigation shall be provided with such access by the lead supervisory authority, while the complainant shall be provided with such access by the supervisory authority with which the complaint has been lodged.</u></p>
Article 19(3)				
171	<p>3. The right of access to the administrative file shall not extend to correspondence and exchange of views between the lead supervisory authority and supervisory authorities concerned. The</p>	<p><i>deleted</i></p>	<p><i>deleted</i></p>	<p>3. The right of <u>following documents or their parts shall be excluded from access, notwithstanding whether</u> access to the administrative file shall not extend</p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	information exchanged between the supervisory authorities for the purpose of the investigation of an individual case are internal documents and shall not be accessible to the parties under investigation or the complainant.			to is granted under Union or national law: <u>a) _____ correspondence and exchange of views between the lead supervisory authority and supervisory authorities concerned.</u> The information exchanged or deliberations between the supervisory authorities for the purpose of the investigation of an individual case are internal documents and shall not be accessible to the parties under investigation or the complainant; <u>b) _____ confidential information pursuant to Article XX(I) of this Regulation.</u>
Article 19(4)				
172	4. Access to relevant and reasoned objections pursuant to Article 60(4) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 shall be provided in accordance with Article 24.	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>	4. Access to relevant and reasoned objections pursuant to Article 60(4) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 <u>on the basis to which the lead supervisory authority intends to adopt a revised draft decision</u> shall <u>only</u> be provided in accordance with Article 24 <u>by the lead supervisory authority where necessary to enable the parties under investigation or the complainant to express their views and defend their rights.</u>
Article 20				
173	Article 20 Access to the administrative file and use of documents	Article 20 <i>deleted</i>	Article 20 Access to the administrative file by parties under investigation and	Article 20 <i>deleted</i>



	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
			the complainant and use of documents	
<i>Article 20(1)</i>				
174	1. The lead supervisory authority shall grant access to the administrative file to the parties under investigation, enabling them to exercise their right to be heard. Access to the administrative file shall be granted after the lead supervisory authority notifies the preliminary findings to the parties under investigation.	<i>deleted</i>	1. Upon request of the parties under investigation, or the complainant where the decision is liable to affect his or her interests adversely, the lead supervisory authority shall grant access to the administrative file to the parties under investigation, or the complainant, enabling them to exercise their right to be heard. Access to the administrative file shall be granted after the lead supervisory authority notifies the preliminary findings to the parties under investigation.	<i>deleted</i>
<i>Article 20(2)</i>				
175	2. The administrative file shall include all documents, inculpatory and exculpatory, including facts and documents which are known to the parties under investigation.	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>
<i>Article 20(3)</i>				
176	3. The conclusions of the lead supervisory authority in the draft decision under Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and the final decision under Article 60(7) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 may only rely on documents cited in the preliminary findings or on which the parties under investigation had	<i>deleted</i>	3. The conclusions of the lead supervisory authority in the draft decision under Article 60(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and the final decision under Article 60(7) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 may shall only rely on documents cited in the preliminary findings or on elements on which the parties under	<i>deleted</i> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level <i>Text Origin: Council Mandate</i>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	the opportunity to make their views known.		investigation had the opportunity to make their views known.	
<i>Article 20(3a)</i>				
176a			3bis. Correspondence, exchange of views and other information exchanged between supervisory authorities for the purpose of the investigation shall not be accessible to the parties under investigation, the complainant or third parties.	<i>deleted</i>
<i>Article 20(3b)</i>				
176b			3ter. 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.	<i>deleted</i> <i>Text Origin: Council Mandate</i>
<i>Article 20(4)</i>				
177	4. Documents obtained through access to the administrative file pursuant to this Article shall be used only for the purposes of judicial or administrative proceedings for the application of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 in the specific case for which such documents were provided.	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
<i>Article 21</i>				
178	Article 21 Identification and protection of confidential information	Article 21 <i>deleted</i>	Article 21 Identification and protection of confidential information	Article 21 Identification and protection of confidential information
<i>Article 21(1)</i>				
179	1. Unless otherwise provided in this Regulation, information collected or obtained by a supervisory authority in cross-border cases under of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, including any document containing such information, shall not be communicated or made accessible by the supervisory authority in so far as it contains business secrets or other confidential information of any person.	<i>deleted</i>	1. Unless otherwise provided in this Regulation, any information collected, produced or obtained by a supervisory authority in cross-border cases under of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, including any document containing such information, shall not be communicated or made accessible by the supervisory authority to the parties under the investigation or to the complainant in so far as it contains business trade secrets as defined in directive (EU) 2016/943 or other confidential information of any person in accordance with Union and Member State law.	1. Unless otherwise provided in this Regulation, 1. Any information collected or obtained by a supervisory authority in cross-border cases under of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, including any document containing such information, and documents or parts of documents shall not be communicated or made accessible by the supervisory authority <u>be considered confidential</u> in so far as it contains business <u>they contain trade</u> secrets <u>as defined in Directive (EU) 2016/943</u> or other confidential information of any person <u>in accordance with Union or national law.</u>
<i>Article 21(2)</i>				
180	2. Any information collected or obtained by a supervisory authority in cross-border cases under Regulation (EU) 2016/679, including any document containing such information, is excluded from access requests under laws on public access to official documents as long as the proceedings are ongoing.	<i>deleted</i>	2. Any information collected, produced or obtained by a supervisory authority in cross-border cases under Regulation (EU) 2016/679 referred to in paragraph 1 , including any document containing such information, is excluded from access requests under laws on public access to official documents shall not be	2. Any <u>Unless otherwise provided by Union law or national law,</u> information collected, <u>produced</u> or obtained by a supervisory authority in cross-border cases under Regulation (EU) 2016/679, including any document containing such information, is excluded from access requests <u>which is considered confidential pursuant to paragraph</u>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
			disclosed, unless required by Union or Member State law, as long as the proceedings are ongoing.	<u><i>1, shall not be communicated or made accessible to a party</i></u> under <i>laws on public access to official documents as long as the proceedings are ongoing</i> <u><i>investigation, a complainant or any third party.</i></u>
Article 21(3)				
181	3. When communicating preliminary findings to parties under investigation and providing for access to the administrative file on the basis of Article 20, the lead supervisory authority shall ensure that the parties under investigation to whom access is being given to information containing business secrets or other confidential information treat such information with utmost respect for its confidentiality and that such information is not used to the detriment of the provider of the information. Depending on the degree of confidentiality of the information, the lead supervisory authority shall adopt appropriate arrangements to give full effect to the rights of defence of the parties under investigation with due regard for the confidentiality of the information.	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>
Article 21(4)				
182	4. An entity submitting information that it considers to be confidential	<i>deleted</i>	4. An entity A party under investigation, a complainant, or a	4. An entity <u><i>A party under investigation, a complainant, or a</i></u>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	shall clearly identify the information which it considers to be confidential, giving reasons for the confidentiality claimed. The entity shall provide a separate non-confidential version of the submission.		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 entity party under investigation, complainant, or third party shall provide a separate non-confidential version of the submission.	<u>third party</u> 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 entity <u>party under investigation, complainant, or third party</u> shall <u>always provide the full version of the information. Where possible, it shall also</u> provide a separate <u>proposed</u> non-confidential version of the submission.
Article 21(5)				
183	5. Without prejudice to paragraph 4, the lead supervisory authority 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 business secrets or other confidential information belonging to them and to identify the parties for which these documents are considered to be confidential.	<i>deleted</i>	5. Without prejudice to paragraph 4, the lead 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 business trade secrets or other confidential information belonging to them and to identify the parties for which these documents are considered to be confidential.	5. Without prejudice to paragraph 4, the lead supervisory authority <u>to which the information is submitted</u> 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 business <u>trade</u> secrets or other confidential information belonging to them and to identify the parties for which these documents are considered to be confidential.
Article 21(6)				
184	6. The lead supervisory authority may set a time-limit for parties under investigation and any other party raising a confidentiality claim to:	<i>deleted</i>	6. The lead supervisory authority may to which the information is submitted shall set a time-limit for parties under investigation and any	6. The lead supervisory authority may set a <u>to which the information is submitted shall set an appropriate</u> time-limit <u>no longer than six weeks</u> for parties under

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
			other party raising a confidentiality claim to:	investigation and any other party raising a confidentiality claim to:
Article 21(6), point (a)				
185	(a) substantiate their claims for business secrets and other confidential information for each individual document or part of document, statement, or part of statement;	<i>deleted</i>	(a) substantiate their claims for business trade secrets and other confidential information for each individual document or part of document, statement, or part of statement;	(a) substantiate their claims for business trade secrets and other confidential information for each individual document or part of document, statement, or part of statement;
Article 21(6), point (b)				
186	(b) provide a non-confidential version of the documents and statements, in which the business secrets and other confidential information are redacted;	<i>deleted</i>	(b) provide a non-confidential version of the documents and statements, in which the business trade secrets and other confidential information are redacted;	(b) provide, <u>where possible, a proposed</u> a non-confidential version of the documents and statements, in which the business trade secrets and other confidential information are redacted;
Article 21(6), point (c)				
187	(c) provide a concise, non-confidential, description of each piece of redacted information.	<i>deleted</i>	(c) provide a concise, non-confidential, description of each piece of redacted information.	(c) provide a concise, non-confidential, description of each piece of redacted information.
Article 21(7)				
188	7.If the parties under investigation or any other party fails to comply with paragraphs 4 and 5, the lead supervisory authority may assume that the documents or statements concerned do not contain business secrets or other confidential information.	<i>deleted</i>	7.If the parties under investigation or any other party fails to comply with paragraphs 4 and 5, the lead 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.	7.If the parties under investigation or any other party fails to comply with paragraphs 4 and 5, the lead <u>5 and 6, the</u> supervisory authority <u>to which the information is submitted</u> may assume that the documents or statements concerned do not contain business trade secrets or other confidential information.
Article 21(7a)				

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
G	188a		7bis. 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.	<u>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, ensuring that the redaction of documents is limited to the extent necessary and proportionate to protect the confidential information. It shall inform the other supervisory authorities about the confidential nature of the information when transmitted.</u>
Article 21(7b)				
G	188b		8.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>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>
Article 21a				
G	188c			<u>Article 21a</u> <u>Cooperation file</u>
Article 21a(1)				
G	188d			<u>1. For the purpose of relevant information to be exchanged between the lead supervisory</u>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
			PUBLIC	<u><i>authority and supervisory authorities concerned in accordance with Article 8, the lead supervisory authority shall ensure such relevant information is available through a cooperation file dedicated to each complaint or investigation related to cross-border processing. The cooperation file shall be maintained in electronic form and shall, by means of a common electronic tool, be remotely accessible to supervisory authorities and, 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, to the Board. It shall not be directly accessible to parties under investigation, complainants or third parties.</i></u>
	Article 21a(2)			
6	188e			<u><i>2. The cooperation file shall include all information exchanged pursuant to Article 8 of this Regulation.</i></u>
	Chapter V			
6	189	Chapter V Dispute resolution	Chapter V Dispute resolution	Chapter V Dispute resolution

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Article 22				
190	Article 22 Referral to dispute resolution under Article 65 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679	Article 22 Referral to dispute resolution under Article 65 65(1), point (a) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679	Article 22 Referral to dispute resolution under Article 65, paragraph 1(a) , of Regulation (EU) 2016/679	Article 22 Referral to dispute resolution under Article 65, paragraph 1(a) , of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 22(1)				
191	1.If the lead supervisory authority does not follow the relevant and reasoned objections or is of the opinion that the objections are not relevant or reasoned, it shall submit the subject-matter to the dispute resolution mechanism set out in Article 65 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.	1.If the lead supervisory authority does not follow the relevant and reasoned objections or is of the opinion that the objections are not relevant or reasoned, it shall submit the subject-matter to the dispute resolution mechanism set out in Article 65 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, <u>within four weeks from the receipt of all relevant and reasoned objections or from the lapse of the deadline pursuant to Article 60(4) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. Relevant and reasoned objections that have been received after the deadline shall not be taken into consideration.</u>	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 22(1a)				
191a			1a. Within three months after the expiry of the period set out by Article 60(4) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, the lead supervisory authority shall either submit a revised draft pursuant to Article 60 (5) of Regulation (EU)	<u>1a. Within three months after the expiry of the period set out by Article 60(4) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, the lead supervisory authority shall either submit a revised draft pursuant to Article 60 (5) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 to</u>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
			2016/679 to the other supervisory authorities concerned or refer the subject-matter to the Board for dispute resolution under Article 65 (1) (a) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.	<p><u>the other supervisory authorities concerned or refer the subject-matter to the Board for dispute resolution under Article 65 (1) (a) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p> <p>Text Origin: Council Mandate</p>
Article 22(1b)				
191b			1b. Within three months after the expiry of the period set out by Article 60(5) of Regulation 2016/679, the lead supervisory authority shall either submit another revised draft decision under 60 (5) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 or refer the subject-matter to the Board for dispute resolution under Article 65 (1) (a) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.	<p><u>1b. Within three months after the expiry of the period set out by Article 60(5) of Regulation 2016/679, the lead supervisory authority shall either submit another revised draft decision under 60 (5) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 or refer the subject-matter to the Board for dispute resolution under Article 65 (1) (a) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p> <p>Text Origin: Council Mandate</p>
Article 22(2)				
192	2. When referring the subject-matter to dispute resolution, the lead supervisory authority shall provide the Board with all of the following documents:	2. When referring the subject-matter to dispute resolution, the lead supervisory authority shall provide the Board with all of the following <i>documents</i> :	2. When referring the subject-matter to dispute resolution under Article 65, paragraph 1(a) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 , the lead supervisory authority shall provide the Board with all of the following documents:	2. When referring the subject-matter to dispute resolution <u>under Article 65, paragraph 1(a) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679</u> , the lead supervisory authority shall provide the Board with all of the following documents :

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 22(2), point (a)				
193	(a) the draft decision or revised draft decision subject to the relevant and reasoned objections;	(a) the draft decision or revised draft decision subject to the relevant and reasoned objections;	(a) the draft decision or revised draft decision subject to the relevant and reasoned objections;	(a) the draft decision or revised draft decision subject to the relevant and reasoned objections; Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Article 22(2), point (aa)				
193a		<u>(aa) the summary of key issues;</u>		<i>deleted</i> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 22(2), point (b)				
194	(b) a summary of the relevant facts;	(b) a summary of the relevant facts, <u>including the description of processing activities, the description of the controller's organisation and where the relevant decisions on the purposes and means of the processing of personal data are taken;</u>	(b) a summary of the relevant facts;	(b) a summary of the relevant facts; ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Article 22(2), point (c)				
195	(c) the preliminary findings;	(c) the preliminary findings;	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 22(2), point (d)				

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
196	(d) view made in writing by the parties under investigation, as the case may be, pursuant to Articles 14 and 17;	(d) view <u>views</u> made in writing by the parties under investigation, as the case may be , pursuant to Articles 14 and 17 <u>Article 14</u> ;	(d) view made in writing by the parties under investigation, as the case may be, pursuant to Articles 14 and 17 at least to the extent they relate to the subject matter submitted to the dispute resolution mechanism ;	(d) view <u>views</u> made in writing by the parties under investigation, as the case may be, pursuant to Articles 14 and 17 <u>at least to the extent they relate to the subject matter submitted to the Board</u> ; ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 22(2), point (e)				
197	(e) views made in writing by complainants, as the case may be, pursuant to Articles 11, 12, and 15;	<i>deleted</i>	(e) views made in writing by complainants, as the case may be, pursuant to Articles 11, 12, and 15 at least to the extent they relate to the subject matter submitted to the dispute resolution mechanism ;	(e) views made in writing by complainants, as the case may be, pursuant to Articles 11, 12, and 15 <u>at least to the extent they relate to the subject matter submitted to the Board</u> ; ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 22(2), point (f)				
198	(f) the relevant and reasoned objections which were not followed by the lead supervisory authority;	(f) the relevant and reasoned objections which were not followed by the lead supervisory authority, <u>and the objections that the lead supervisory authority has rejected as not relevant or reasoned</u> ;	(f) the relevant and reasoned objections which were not followed or rejected by the lead supervisory authority and the objections that the lead supervisory authority has rejected as being neither relevant nor reasoned ;	(f) the relevant and reasoned objections which were not followed by the lead supervisory authority; <u>and the objections that the lead supervisory authority has rejected as being not relevant or reasoned</u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 22(2), point (g)				

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
199	(g) the reasons on the basis of which the lead supervisory authority did not follow the relevant and reasoned objections or considered the objections not to be relevant or reasoned.	(g) the reasons on the basis of which the lead supervisory authority did not follow the relevant and reasoned objections or considered rejected the objections <u>as</u> not to be relevant or reasoned.;	(g) the reasons on the basis of which the lead supervisory authority did not follow the relevant and reasoned objections or considered the objections not to be relevant or reasoned.	(g) the reasons on the basis of which the lead supervisory authority did not follow the relevant and reasoned objections or considered rejected the objections <u>as</u> not to be relevant or reasoned. ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 22(2), point (ga)				
199a		<u>(ga) access to the joint case file.</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 22(2a)				
199b			2a. Where appropriate, the Board may request further documents from the lead supervisory authority, at least to the extent they relate to the subject matter submitted to the dispute resolution mechanism.	<u>2a. The Board may request further documents from a supervisory authority with respect to the subject matter submitted to the Board.</u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 22(3)				
200	3.The Board shall within four weeks of receiving the documents listed in paragraph 2 identify retained relevant and reasoned objections.	3.The Board shall <u>register the submission of a subject-matter to the dispute resolution mechanism</u> within four two weeks of receiving <u>all of</u> the documents listed in paragraph 2 identify retained relevant and reasoned objections or <u>it shall demand a resubmission that</u>	3.The Board shall within four weeks of receiving the documents listed in paragraph 2 identify retained relevant and reasoned objections.	3.The Board shall, within four weeks of receiving being provided with the documents listed <u>in pursuant to</u> paragraph 2 identify retained, make a preliminary determination of whether the objections referred to in Article 65(1)(a) are relevant and reasoned

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
		<i><u>includes any missing information within another week. When registering the submission, the Board shall list and structure the disputes between supervisory authorities which form the scope of the procedure before the Board, and instantly provide them to all supervisory authorities.</u></i>	PUBLIC	objections <u>as defined in Article 4(24) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and whether they comply with Article 18 of this Regulation.</u> <u>Within the same period, the Chair of the Board shall register the referral of the subject matter submitted to it. As soon as the file is registered, it shall be provided to the members of the Board.</u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 22(3a)				
200a		<i><u>3a. Once all information specified in paragraph 2 have been received, the Chair of the Board is empowered to request from the lead supervisory authority or the supervisory authorities concerned any additional information, documents or clarifications necessary for the Board to take a binding decision concerning all of the matters which are the subject of the relevant and reasoned objections. The authorities shall provide this additional information no later than one week after having received the request.</u></i>		<i><u>3a. The period for adoption of the binding decision of the Board provided for in Article 65(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 shall not run during the period provided for in paragraph 3.</u></i> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 22(3b)				
200b		<i><u>3b. The supervisory authorities concerned may, within two weeks after having been provided with the submission pursuant to paragraph</u></i>		<i>deleted</i>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
		<u>3, submit other relevant information that they have on that case which was not included in the objections, including but not limited to, facts and documentation related to their objection.</u>		ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 22(3c)				
200c		<u>3c. The “referral of the subject-matter” pursuant to Article 65(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 shall mean the moment when all of the documents referred to in Article 22(2) are available and translated in accordance with Article 2d.</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 22(3d)				
200d		<u>3d. The prohibition provided for in Article 65(4) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 for supervisory authorities to adopt a decision on the subject matter submitted to the Board during the periods referred to in Article 65(2) and (3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 shall also apply during the periods referred in paragraph 3 of this Article.</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 23				
201	Article 23 Registration in relation to a decision under Article 65(1), point (a), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679	Article 23 deleted	Article 23 Registration in relation to a decision under Article 65(1), point (a), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679	deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 23, first paragraph				

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
202	The Chair of the Board shall register the referral of a subject-matter to dispute resolution under Article 65(1), point (a), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 no later than one week after having received all of the following documents:	<i>deleted</i>	1. The Chair of the Board shall register the referral of a subject-matter to dispute resolution under Article 65(1), point (a), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 no later than one week after having received all of the following documents: referred to in Article 22, paragraph 2 and 2a, and the retained relevant and reasoned objections.	<i>deleted</i> <i>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</i>
<i>Article 23, first paragraph, point (a)</i>				
203	(a) the draft decision or revised draft decision subject to the relevant and reasoned objections;	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i> <i>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</i>
<i>Article 23, first paragraph, point (b)</i>				
204	(b) a summary of the relevant facts;	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i> <i>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</i>
<i>Article 23, first paragraph, point (c)</i>				
205	(c) view made in writing by the parties under investigation, as the case may be, pursuant to Articles 14 and 17;	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i> <i>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</i>
<i>Article 23, first paragraph, point (d)</i>				
206	(d) views made in writing by complainants, as the case may be, pursuant to Articles 11, 12 and 15;	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 23, first paragraph, point (e)				
207	(e) the retained relevant and reasoned objections;	deleted	deleted	deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 23, first paragraph, point (f)				
208	(f) the reasons on the basis of which the lead supervisory authority did not follow the retained relevant and reasoned objections.	deleted	deleted	deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 23, first paragraph a				
208a			2. As soon as the file is registered by the Chair of the Board, it shall be provided to the members of the Board.	deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 24				
209	Article 24 Statement of reasons prior to adoption of decision under Article 65(1), point (a), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679	Article 24 deleted	Article 24 Statement of reasons prior to adoption of decision under Article 65(1), point (a), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679	Article 24 Statement of reasons <u>Hearing the party under investigation and the complainant</u> prior to adoption of decision under Article 65(1), point (a), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Article 24(1)				

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
210	<p>1. Prior to adopting the binding decision pursuant to Article 65(1), point (a), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, the Chair of the Board shall, through the lead supervisory authority, provide the parties under investigation and/or, in the case of full or partial rejection of a complaint, the complainant, with a statement of reasons explaining the reasoning the Board intends to adopt in its decision. Where the Board intends to adopt a binding decision requiring the lead supervisory authority to amend its draft decision or revised draft decision, the Board shall decide whether such statement of reasons should be accompanied by the retained relevant and reasoned objections on the basis of which the Board intends to adopt its decision.</p>	<p><i>deleted</i></p>	<p>1. Prior to adopting the binding decision pursuant to Article 65(1), point (a), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, the Chair of the Board shall, through where the Board intends to adopt a decision requiring the lead supervisory authority to amend its draft decision or revised draft decision, it shall assess whether the adoption of such decision relies on elements on which, provide the parties under investigation and/or, in the case of full or partial rejection of a complaint, the complainant, have been provided with an opportunity to express their views with a statement of reasons explaining the reasoning the Board intends to adopt in its decision. Where the Board intends to adopt a binding decision requiring the lead supervisory authority to amend its draft decision or revised draft decision, the Board shall decide whether such statement of reasons should be accompanied by the retained relevant and reasoned objections on the basis of which the Board intends to adopt its decision.</p>	<p><u>1.1. Prior to adopting the binding decision pursuant to Article 65(1), point (a), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, the Board shall provide the party under investigation, or, in case where the Board decision could result in the rejection of a complaint, the complainant, with the opportunity to make their views known in writing on any new factual or legal elements on which its decision is to be based, including on the relevant and reasoned objections which it intends to follow in its decision.</u> Prior to adopting the binding decision pursuant to Article 65(1), point (a), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, the Chair of the Board shall, through the lead supervisory authority, provide the parties under investigation and/or, in the case of full or partial rejection of a complaint, the complainant, with a statement of reasons explaining the reasoning the Board intends to adopt in its decision. Where the Board intends to adopt a binding decision requiring the lead supervisory authority to amend its draft decision or revised draft decision, the Board shall decide whether such statement of reasons should be accompanied by the retained relevant and reasoned objections on the basis of which the Board intends to adopt its decision.</p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 24(1a)				
6	210a		1bis. Where the Board considers that the parties under investigation and/or, in the case of full or partial rejection of a complaint, the complainant, have not been provided with an opportunity to express their views on the elements referred to in paragraph 1, the Board shall provide the parties under investigation and/or, in the case of full or partial rejection of a complaint, the complainant, with a statement of reasons explaining the reasoning the Board intends to adopt in its decision.	deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 24(1b)				
6	210b		1ter. The Board shall assess and decide whether such statement of reasons should be accompanied by the retained relevant and reasoned objections on the basis of which the Board intends to adopt its decision.	deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 24(2)				
6	211	2. The parties under investigation and/or, in the case of full or partial rejection of a complaint, the	deleted	2. The <u>Where parties under investigations or the complainant, as applicable, are provided with an</u>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	complainant, shall have one week from receipt of the statement of reasons referred to in paragraph 1 to make their views known.		rejection of a complaint, the complainant, shall have one week from receipt of the statement of reasons referred to in paragraph 1 to make their views known.	<p><u>opportunity to make their views known in accordance with paragraph 1, the Board shall set an appropriate time limit not longer than 2 weeks.</u> parties under investigation and/or, in the case of full or partial rejection of a complaint, the complainant, shall have one week from receipt of the statement of reasons referred to in paragraph 1 to make their views known.</p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
Article 24(3)				
212	3. The deadline in paragraph 2 shall be extended by one week where the Board extends the period for adoption of the binding decision in accordance with Article 65(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>	<p>3. The deadline in paragraph 2 shall be extended by one week where the Board extends <u>The period for adoption of the binding decision of the Board provided for in Article 65(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 shall be suspended until the parties under investigation or the complainant, as applicable, have made their views known or until the expiry of the time limit referred to in paragraph 2 of this Article, whichever is earlier.</u> The period for adoption of the binding decision in accordance with Article 65(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 24(4)				
213	4. The period for adoption of the binding decision of the Board provided for in Article 65(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 shall not run during the periods provided for in paragraphs 2 and 3.	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 25				
214	Article 25 Procedure in relation to decision under Article 65(1), point (b), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679	Article 25 <i>deleted</i>	Article 25 Procedure in relation to decision under Article 65(1), point (b), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679	Article 25 Procedure in relation to decision under Article 65(1), point (b), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 25(1)				
215	1. When referring a subject-matter to the Board under Article 65(1), point (b), of Regulation 2016/679, the supervisory authority referring the subject-matter regarding the competence for the main establishment shall provide the Board with all of the following documents:	<i>deleted</i>	1. When referring a subject-matter to the Board under Article 65(1), point (b), of Regulation 2016/679, the supervisory authority referring the subject-matter regarding the competence for the main establishment shall provide the Board with all of the following documents:	1. When referring a subject-matter to the Board under Article 65(1), point (b), of Regulation 2016/679, the supervisory authority referring the subject-matter regarding the competence for the main establishment shall provide the Board with all of the following documents: ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 25(1), point (a)				

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
216	(a) a summary of the relevant facts;	<i>deleted</i>	(a) a summary of the relevant facts, including regarding the processing at stake ;	(a) a summary of the relevant facts, <u>including regarding the processing at stake</u> ; ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 25(1), point (b)				
217	(b) the assessment of these facts as far as the conditions of Article 56(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 are concerned;	<i>deleted</i>	(b) the assessment of these facts as far as the conditions of Article 56(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 are concerned, in particular the assessment as to whether the processing is to be considered as a cross-border processing and as to where the main establishment of the controller or processor is located ;	(b) the assessment of these facts as far as the conditions of Article 56(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 are concerned, <u>in particular the assessment as to whether the processing is to be considered as a cross-border processing and as to where the main establishment of the controller or processor is located</u> ; ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 25(1), point (c)				
218	(c) views made by the controller or processor whose main establishment is the subject of the referral;	<i>deleted</i>	(c) views made by the controller or processor whose main establishment is the subject of the referral;	(c) views made by the controller or processor whose main establishment is the subject of the referral; ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 25(1), point (d)				

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
219	(d) the views of other supervisory authorities concerned by the referral;	<i>deleted</i>	(d) the views of other supervisory authorities concerned by the referral;	(d) the views of other supervisory authorities concerned by the referral; ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 25(1), point (e)				
220	(e) any other document or information the referring supervisory authority considers relevant and necessary in order to find a resolution on the subject-matter.	<i>deleted</i>	(e) any other document or information the referring supervisory authority considers relevant and necessary in order to find a resolution on the subject-matter.	(e) any other document or information the referring supervisory authority considers relevant and necessary in order to find a resolution on the subject-matter. ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 25(1a)				
220a			1a. Where appropriate, the Board may request further documents from the lead supervisory authority.	<u>1a. The Board may request further documents from a supervisory authority with respect to the subject matter submitted to the Board.</u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 25(2)				
221	2. The Chair of the Board shall register the referral no later than one week after having received the	<i>deleted</i>	2. The Chair of the Board shall register the referral no later than one week after having received the	2. <u>Within one week of being provided with the documents pursuant to paragraph 2., the Chair of the Board shall register</u>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	documents referred to in paragraph 1.		documents referred to in paragraph 1-paragraphs 1 and 1a.	<p><u><i>the referral of the subject matter submitted to it. As soon as the file is registered, it shall be provided to the members of the Board.</i></u>the <i>Chair of the Board shall register the referral no later than one week after having received the documents referred to in paragraph 1.</i></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p> <p>Text Origin: Council Mandate</p>
Article 25(2a)				
6	221a		3.As soon as the file is registered by the Chair of the Board, it shall be provided to the members of the Board.	<p><i>deleted</i></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p> <p>Text Origin: Council Mandate</p>
Article 25(2b)				
6	221b		4.Where a decision is adopted by the Board under Article 65 (1) (b) of Regulation 2016/679, in accordance with Article 65(6) of Regulation 2016/679, the competent supervisory authority designated by the Board shall acknowledge receipt of the binding decision and of its competence within one month as foreseen under Article 65(6) of Regulation 2016/679.	<p><i>deleted</i></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
Article 26				

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
222	Article 26 Procedure in relation to decision under Article 65(1), point (c), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679	Article 26 Procedure in relation to decision under Article 65(1), point (c), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679	Article 26 Procedure in relation to decision under Article 65(1), point (c), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679	Article 26 Procedure in relation to decision under Article 65(1), point (c), of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Article 26(1)				
223	1. When referring a subject-matter to the Board under Article 65(1), point (c), of Regulation 2016/679, the supervisory authority referring the subject-matter or the Commission shall provide the Board with all of the following documents:	1. When referring a subject-matter to the Board under Article 65(1), point (c), of Regulation 2016/679, the supervisory authority referring the subject-matter or the Commission shall provide the Board with all of the following documents:	1. When referring a subject-matter to the Board under Article 65(1), point (c), of Regulation 2016/679, the supervisory authority referring the subject-matter or the Commission shall provide the Board with all of the following documents:	1. When referring a subject-matter to the Board under Article 65(1), point (c), of Regulation 2016/679, the supervisory authority referring the subject-matter or the Commission shall provide the Board with all of the following documents: Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Article 26(1), point (a)				
224	(a) a summary of the relevant facts;	(a) a summary of the relevant facts;	(a) a summary of the relevant facts;	(a) a summary of the relevant facts; Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Article 26(1), point (b)				
225	(b) the opinion, as the case may be, issued by the Board pursuant to Article 64 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679;	(b) the opinion, as the case may be, issued by the Board pursuant to Article 64 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679;	(b) the opinion, as the case may be, issued by the Board pursuant to Article 64 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679;	(b) the opinion, as the case may be, issued by the Board pursuant to Article 64 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679; Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Article 26(1), point (ba)				
225a			(ba) the decision, as the case may be, adopted by the competent supervisory authority following	<u>(ba) the decision, as the case may be, adopted by the competent supervisory authority following the</u>


	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
			the opinion issued by the Board pursuant to Article 64 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679	<u>opinion issued by the Board pursuant to Article 64 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679</u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 26(1), point (c)				
226	(c) the views of the supervisory authority referring the subject-matter or the Commission as to whether, as the case may be, a supervisory authority was required to communicate the draft decision to the Board pursuant to Article 64(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, or a supervisory authority did not follow an opinion of the Board issued pursuant to Article 64 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.	(c) the views of the supervisory authority referring the subject-matter or the Commission as to whether, as the case may be, a supervisory authority was required to communicate the draft decision to the Board pursuant to Article 64(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, or a supervisory authority did not follow an opinion of the Board issued pursuant to Article 64 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, <u>including an explanation of which points were not followed and a reference to the relevant part of the adopted decision.</u>	(c) the views of the supervisory authority referring the subject-matter or the Commission as to whether, as the case may be, a supervisory authority was required to communicate the draft decision to the Board pursuant to Article 64(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, or a supervisory authority did not follow an opinion of the Board issued pursuant to Article 64 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.	(c) the views of the supervisory authority referring the subject-matter or the Commission as to whether, as the case may be, a supervisory authority was required to communicate the draft decision to the Board pursuant to Article 64(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, or a supervisory authority did not follow an opinion of the Board issued pursuant to Article 64 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, <u>including an indication of which points were not followed and a reference to the relevant part of the adopted decision.</u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: EP Mandate
Article 26(1a)				
226a		<u>1a The Chair of the Board shall inform all supervisory authorities of the referral made to the Board under paragraph 1, so as to allow</u>	1a. Where appropriate, the Board may request further documents from the lead supervisory authority.	<i>deleted</i> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
		<u>the supervisory authorities to make their views known.</u>		<i>Text Origin: Council Mandate</i>
Article 26(2), first subparagraph				
6	227 2. The Chair of the Board shall request the following documents:	2. The Chair of the Board shall request the following documents:	2. The Chair of The Board shall request the following documents:	2. The Chair of The Board shall request the following documents: ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level <i>Text Origin: Council Mandate</i>
Article 26(2), first subparagraph, point (a)				
6	228 (a) the views of the supervisory authority alleged to have breached the requirement to communicate a draft decision to the Board or to have failed to follow an opinion of the Board;	(a) the views of the supervisory authority alleged to have breached the requirement to communicate a draft decision to the Board or to have failed to follow an opinion of the Board;	(a) the views of the supervisory authority alleged to have breached the requirement to communicate a draft decision to the Board or to have failed to follow an opinion of the Board;	(a) the views of the supervisory authority alleged to have breached the requirement to communicate a draft decision to the Board or to have failed to follow an opinion of the Board; <i>Text Origin: Commission Proposal</i>
Article 26(2), first subparagraph, point (b)				
6	229 (b) any other document or information the supervisory authority considers relevant and necessary in order to find a resolution on the subject-matter.	(b) any other document or information the supervisory authority considers relevant and necessary in order to find a resolution on the subject-matter.	(b) any other document or information the supervisory authority considers relevant and necessary in order to find a resolution on the subject-matter.	(b) any other document or information the supervisory authority considers relevant and necessary in order to find a resolution on the subject-matter. <i>Text Origin: Commission Proposal</i>
Article 26(2), second subparagraph				
6	230 If any supervisory authority declares a need to submit its views on the referred subject-matter, it shall submit those views within two	If any supervisory authority declares a need to submit its views on the referred subject-matter, it shall submit those views within two	If any supervisory authority declares a need to submit its views on the referred subject-matter, it shall submit those views within two	If any supervisory authority declares a need to submit its views on the referred subject-matter, it shall submit those views within two

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	weeks of the referral referred to in paragraph 1.	weeks of the referral referred to in paragraph 1.	weeks of the referral referred to in paragraph 1.	weeks of the referral referred to in paragraph 1. Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Article 26(2a)				
6	230a			<u>2a. The Board may request further documents from a supervisory authority with respect to the subject matter submitted to the Board.</u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 26(3)				
6	231	3. The Chair of the Board shall register the referral no later than one week after having received the documents referred to in paragraphs 1 and 2.	3. The Chair of the Board shall register the referral no later than one week after having received <u>all of</u> the documents referred to in paragraphs 1 and 2.	3. <u>Within one week of being provided with the documents pursuant to paragraph 2, the Chair of the Board shall register the referral of the subject matter submitted to it. As soon as the file is registered, it shall be provided to the members of the Board.</u> <i>the Chair of the Board shall register the referral no later than one week after having received the documents referred to in paragraphs 1 and 2.</i> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 26(3a)				
6	231a		4. As soon as the file is registered by the Chair of the Board, it shall be provided to the members of the Board.	<i>deleted</i> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 26a				
231b		<u>Article 26a</u> <u>Procedural determinations by the Board</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 26a(1)				
231c		<u>1. Pursuant to Article 66 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, a supervisory authority may request from the Board to take an urgent binding decision in the form of a procedural determination on any procedural dispute arising between supervisory authorities in cases foreseen by this Regulation.</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 26a(2)				
231d		<u>2. Where the lead supervisory authority is of the view that it cannot possibly comply with a deadline pursuant to Article 4(1b) or Article 5a(3), especially because of the need for exceptionally complex factual investigations, it shall request from the Board an urgent binding decision pursuant to paragraph 1, regarding an extension of the deadline of up to nine more months. The supervisory authority shall demonstrate that despite its compliance with Article</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
		<u>2c(1), the extension sought is inevitable.</u>		
Article 26a(3)				
g	231e	<u>3. Requests under paragraph 1 and 2 shall at least contain:</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 26a(3), point (a)				
g	231f	<u>(a) the facts relied upon and any evidence available to the authority or party;</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 26a(3), point (b)				
g	231g	<u>(b) the legal grounds for the request;</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 26a(3), point (c)				
g	231h	<u>(c) the determination pursuant to paragraph 1 or the deadline extension pursuant to paragraph 2 that the authority or party requests from the Board;</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 26a(4)				
g	231i	<u>4. Within two weeks, the Board shall determine the matter based on the information before it or it shall reject the application.</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level



	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
		<u>Determinations are binding on the supervisory authorities.</u>		
Article 26b				
231j		<u>Article 26b</u> <u>Right to an effective judicial remedy against a supervisory authority</u>		
Article 26b(1)				
231k		<u>1. Without prejudice to existing remedies under Article 78 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and any other administrative or non-judicial remedy, each party to the procedure shall have the right to an effective judicial remedy:</u>		ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 26b(1), point (a)				
231l		<u>(a) where the supervisory authority with which the complaint has been lodged does not use its powers to ensure that another supervisory authority progresses the procedure;</u>		
Article 26b(1), point (b)				
231m		<u>(b) where a lead supervisory authority does not comply with deadlines as provided for in Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and this Regulation; or</u>		
Article 26b(1), point (c)				
231n		<u>(c) where a supervisory authority does not comply with a binding decision of the Board.</u>		
Article 26b(2)				

PUBLIC

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
231o		<u>2. Any party to the procedure or a not-for-profit body under Article 80 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 may bring an action under paragraph 1, point (c) if it considers that the rights of a data subject under Regulation (EU) 2016/679 have been infringed as a result of the processing.</u>	PUBLIC	
Article 26b(3)				
231p		<u>3. Where a court or tribunal exercising the review pursuant to paragraph 1 finds that a supervisory authority has not fulfilled its duties, it shall have the power to order that supervisory authority to take the necessary action.</u>		
Chapter VI				
232	Chapter VI Urgency procedure	Chapter VI Urgency procedure	Chapter VI Urgency procedure	Chapter VI Urgency procedure Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Article 27				
233	Article 27 Urgent opinions under Article 66(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679	Article 27 Urgent opinions under Article 66(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679	Article 27 Urgent opinions under Article 66(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679	Article 27 Urgent opinions <u>opinion</u> under Article 66(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Article 27(1)				

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
234	1.A request for an urgent opinion of the Board pursuant to Article 66(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 shall be made no later than three weeks prior to the expiry of provisional measures adopted under Article 66(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and shall contain all of the following items:	1.A request for an urgent opinion of the Board pursuant to Article 66(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 shall be made no later than three weeks prior to the expiry of provisional measures adopted under Article 66(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and shall contain all of the following items:	1.A request for an urgent opinion of the Board pursuant to Article 66(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 shall be made no later than three four weeks prior to the expiry of provisional measures adopted under Article 66(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and shall contain all of the following items:	1.A request for an urgent opinion of the Board pursuant to Article 66(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 shall be made no later than three four weeks prior to the expiry of provisional measures adopted under Article 66(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and shall contain all of the following items: ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 27(1), point (a)				
235	(a) a summary of the relevant facts;	(a) a summary of the relevant facts, <u>including evidence of an infringement of Regulation EU 2016/679</u> ;	(a) a summary of the relevant facts;	(a) a summary of the relevant facts, <u>including an allegation of an infringement of Regulation EU 2016/679</u> ; ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: EP Mandate
Article 27(1), point (b)				
236	(b) a description of the provisional measure adopted on its own territory, its duration and the reasons for adopting it, including the justification of the urgent need to act in order to protect the rights and freedoms of data subjects;	(b) a description of the provisional measure adopted on its own <u>the territory of the Member State of the supervisory authority requesting the opinion</u> , its duration and the reasons for adopting it, including the justification of the urgent need to act in order to protect the rights and freedoms of data subjects;	(b) a description of the provisional measure adopted on its own territory, its duration and the reasons for adopting it, including the justification of the urgent need to act in order to protect the rights and freedoms of data subjects;	(b) a description of the provisional measure adopted on its own <u>the territory of the Member State of the supervisory authority requesting the opinion</u> , its duration and the reasons for adopting it, including the justification of the urgent need to act in order to protect the rights and freedoms of data subjects;

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: EP Mandate
Article 27(1), point (c)				
237	(c) a justification of the urgent need for final measures to be adopted on the territory of the Member State of the requesting supervisory authority, including an explanation of the exceptional nature of circumstances requiring the adoption of the measures concerned.	(c) a justification of the urgent need for final measures to be adopted on the territory of the Member State of the requesting supervisory authority , including an explanation of the exceptional nature of circumstances requiring the adoption of the measures concerned.	(c) a justification of the urgent need for final measures to be adopted on the territory of the Member State of the requesting supervisory authority, including an explanation of the exceptional nature of circumstances requiring the adoption of the measures concerned.	(c) a justification of the urgent need for final measures to be adopted on the territory of the Member State of the requesting supervisory authority , including an explanation of the exceptional nature of circumstances requiring the adoption of the measures concerned. ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 27(1), point (ca)				
237a		<u>(ca) where the requesting authority is not the lead supervisory authority, the views of the lead supervisory authority.</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 27(1a)				
237b			1a. Where appropriate, the Board may request further documents from the lead supervisory authority.	<u>1a. The Board may request further documents from a supervisory authority with respect to the subject matter submitted to the Board.</u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 27(1b)				

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
237c			1bis. The Chair of the Board shall register the referral no later than one week after having received the documents referred to in paragraphs 1 and 1a.	<u><i>1b. Within one week of being provided with the documents pursuant to paragraph 1, the Chair of the Board shall register the referral of the subject matter submitted to it. As soon as the file is registered, it shall be provided to the members of the Board.</i></u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 27(1c)				
237d			1ter. As soon as the file is registered by the Chair of the Board, it shall be provided to the members of the Board.	<i>deleted</i> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 27(2)				
238	2. The urgent opinion of the Board shall be addressed to the supervisory authority that submitted the request. It shall be similar to an opinion within the meaning of Article 64(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and enable the requesting authority to maintain or amend its provisional measure in line with the obligations of Article 64(7) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.	2. The urgent opinion of the Board shall be addressed to the <u>all</u> supervisory authority that submitted the request <u>authorities</u> . It shall be similar to an opinion within the meaning of Article 64(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and enable the requesting authority <u>authorities</u> to maintain or amend its provisional measure in line with the obligations of Article 64(7) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 28				
239	Article 28 Urgent decisions under Article 66(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679	Article 28	Article 28	Article 28


	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
		Urgent binding decisions under Article 66(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679	Urgent binding decisions under Article 66(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679	Urgent decisions binding decision under Article 66(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 28(1)				
240	1. A request for an urgent decision of the Board pursuant to Article 66(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 shall be made no later than three weeks prior to the expiry of provisional measures adopted under Articles 61(8), 62(7) or 66(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. That request shall contain all of the following items:	1. A request for an urgent binding decision of the Board pursuant to Article 66(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 shall be made no later than three weeks prior to the expiry after the adoption of provisional measures adopted under Articles 61(8), 62(7) or 66(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. That request shall contain all of the following items:	1. A request for an urgent binding decision of the Board pursuant to Article 66(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 shall be made no later than three four weeks prior to the expiry of provisional measures adopted under Articles 61(8), 62(7) or 66(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. That request shall contain all of the following items:	1. A request for an urgent binding decision of the Board pursuant to Article 66(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 shall be made no later than three four weeks prior to the expiry of provisional measures adopted under Articles 61(8), 62(7) or 66(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. That request shall contain all of the following items: ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 28(1), point (a)				
241	(a) a summary of the relevant facts;	(a) a summary of the relevant facts, including evidence of an infringement of Regulation EU 2016/679 ;	(a) a summary of the relevant facts;	(a) a summary of the relevant facts, including allegation of an infringement of Regulation EU 2016/679 ; ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: EP Mandate
Article 28(1), point (b)				

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
242	(b) the provisional measure adopted on the territory of the Member State of the supervisory authority requesting the decision, its duration and the reasons for adopting the provisional measures, in particular the justification of the urgent need to act in order to protect the rights and freedoms of data subjects;	(b) the provisional measure adopted on the territory of the Member State of the supervisory authority requesting the decision, its duration and the reasons for adopting the provisional measures <u>it</u> , in particular the justification of the urgent need to act in order to protect the rights and freedoms of data subjects;	(b) the provisional measure adopted on the territory of the Member State of the supervisory authority requesting the decision, its duration and the reasons for adopting the provisional measures, in particular the justification of the urgent need to act in order to protect the rights and freedoms of data subjects;	(b) the provisional measure adopted on the territory of the Member State of the supervisory authority requesting the decision, its duration and the reasons for adopting the provisional measures, in particular the justification of the urgent need to act in order to protect the rights and freedoms of data subjects; ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Article 28(1), point (c)				
243	(c) information on any investigatory measures taken on its own territory and replies received from the local establishment of the parties under investigation or any other information in the possession of the requesting supervisory authority;	(c) information on any investigatory measures taken on its own territory and replies received from the local establishment of the parties under investigation or any other information in the possession of the requesting supervisory authority;	(c) information on any investigatory measures taken on its own territory and replies received from the local establishment of the parties under investigation or any other information in the possession of the requesting supervisory authority;	(c) information on any investigatory measures taken on its own territory and replies received from the local establishment of the parties under investigation or any other information in the possession of the requesting supervisory authority; ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: EP Mandate
Article 28(1), point (d)				
244	(d) a justification of the urgent need for final measures to be adopted on the territory of the requesting supervisory authority, bearing in mind the exceptional nature of circumstances requiring the	(d) a justification of the urgent need for final measures to be adopted on the territory of the requesting supervisory authority , bearing in mind the exceptional nature of circumstances requiring the	(d) a justification of the urgent need for final measures to be adopted on the territory of the requesting supervisory authority , bearing in mind the exceptional nature of circumstances requiring the	(d) a justification of the urgent need for final measures to be adopted on the territory of the requesting supervisory authority , bearing in mind the exceptional nature of circumstances requiring the

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	adoption of the final measure, or proof that a supervisory authority failed to respond to a request under Article 61(3) or 62(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679;	adoption of the final measure, or proof that a supervisory authority failed to <u>provide the information requested under Article 61(5) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 or failed to</u> respond to a request <u>underpursuant to</u> Article 61(3) <u>61(8)</u> or 62(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679;	adoption of the final measure, or proof that a supervisory authority failed to respond to a request under Article 61(3) <u>61(5)</u> or 62(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679;	adoption of the final measure, or proof that a supervisory authority failed to respond to a request under <u>comply with</u> Article 61(3) <u>61(5)</u> or 62(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679; ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 28(1), point (e)				
245	(e) where the requesting authority is not the lead supervisory authority, the views of the lead supervisory authority;	(e) where the requesting authority is not the lead supervisory authority, the views of the lead supervisory authority;	(e) where the requesting authority is not the lead supervisory authority, the views of the lead supervisory authority;	(e) where the requesting authority is not the lead supervisory authority, the views of the lead supervisory authority; Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Article 28(1), point (f)				
246	(f) where applicable, the views of the local establishment of the parties under investigation against which provisional measures were taken pursuant to Article 66(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.	(f) where <u>applicableavailable</u> , the views of the local establishment of parties. In case the requesting authority is not the lead supervisory authority, the requesting authority shall grant the right to be heard to the parties under investigation against which provisional measures were taken pursuant to Article 66(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.	(f) where applicable, the views of the local establishment of the parties under investigation against which provisional measures were taken pursuant to Article 66(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.	(f) where applicable, the views of the local establishment of the parties under investigation against <u>to</u> which <u>the</u> provisional measures were taken <u>addressed</u> pursuant to Article 66(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Article 28(1a)				
246a			1a. Where appropriate, the Board may request further documents from the lead supervisory authority.	<u>1a. The Board may request further documents from a supervisory authority with respect to the subject matter submitted to the Board.</u>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				<p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p> <p>Text Origin: Council Mandate</p>
Article 28(1b)				
246b			<p>1bis. The Chair of the Board shall register the referral no later than one week after having received the documents referred to in paragraphs 1 and 1a. As soon as the file is registered by the Chair of the Board, it shall be provided to the members of the Board</p>	<p><u><i>1bis. Within one week of being provided with the documents pursuant to paragraph 1, the Chair of the Board shall register the referral of the subject matter submitted to it. As soon as the file is registered, it shall be provided to the members of the Board.</i></u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p> <p>Text Origin: Council Mandate</p>
Article 28(1c)				
246c			<p>1ter. Prior to the adoption of the urgent binding decision pursuant to Article 66(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, the Board shall assess whether the adoption of such decision relies on elements on which the parties under investigation have not been provided with an opportunity to express their views and, where necessary, provide the parties under investigation or the complainant, as the case may be, with an opportunity to make their views known.</p>	<p><i>deleted</i></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
Article 28(2)				

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
247	2. The urgent decision referred to in paragraph 1 shall be addressed to the supervisory authority that submitted the request and shall enable the requesting authority to maintain or amend its provisional measure.	2. The urgent <u>binding</u> decision referred to in paragraph 1 shall be addressed to the <u>lead</u> supervisory authority that submitted the request <u>and all the supervisory authorities concerned</u> and shall enable the requesting authority to maintain or amend its provisional measure <u>specify the supervisory authorities that would need to adopt final measures, if applicable, in light of the urgent opinion or decision of the Board pursuant to Article 66(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</u>	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 28(3)				
248	3. Where the Board adopts an urgent binding decision indicating that final measures should be adopted, the supervisory authority to which the decision is addressed shall adopt such measures prior to the expiry of the provisional measures adopted under Article 66(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.	3. Where the Board adopts an urgent binding decision indicating that final measures should be adopted, the supervisory authority <u>or authorities</u> to which the decision is addressed shall adopt such measures prior to the expiry of the provisional measures adopted under Article 66(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.	3. Where the Board adopts an urgent binding decision indicating that final measures should be adopted, the supervisory authority to which the decision is addressed shall adopt such measures prior to the expiry of the provisional measures adopted under Article 66(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.	3. Where the Board adopts an urgent binding decision indicating that final measures should be adopted, the supervisory authority to which the decision is addressed shall adopt such measures prior to the expiry of the provisional measures adopted under Article 66(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 28(4)				
249	4. The supervisory authority that submitted the request referred to in paragraph 1 shall notify its decision on the final measures to the	4. The <u>A</u> supervisory authority that submitted the request referred to in paragraph 1 <u>is responsible to adopt final measures</u> shall notify its	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	establishment of the controller or processor on the territory of its Member State and inform the Board. Where the lead supervisory authority is not the requesting authority, the requesting authority shall inform the lead supervisory authority of the final measure.	decision on the final measures to the establishment of the controller or processor on the territory of its Member State <u>parties under investigation</u> and inform the Board. Where the lead supervisory authority is not the requesting authority, the requesting authority shall inform the <u>parties under investigation against which the provisional measures were adopted about the Board's decision and the final measures adopted by the</u> lead supervisory authority. <u>The complaint-receiving supervisory authority shall inform the complainant about the Board's decision and</u> of the final measure <u>measures adopted by the lead supervisory authority.</u>		<i>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</i>
Article 28(5)				
250	5. Where the urgent binding decision indicates that final measures do not urgently need to be adopted, the lead and supervisory authorities concerned shall follow the procedure in Article 60 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.	5. Where the urgent binding decision indicates that final measures do not urgently need to be adopted, the lead and supervisory authorities concerned shall follow the procedure in Article 60 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.	5. Where the urgent binding decision indicates that final measures do not urgently need to be adopted, the lead and supervisory authorities concerned shall follow the procedure in Article 60 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.-	5. Where the urgent binding decision indicates that final measures do not urgently need to be adopted, the lead and supervisory authorities concerned shall follow the procedure in Article 60 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679. Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Article 28a				
250a		<u>Article 28a</u> <u>Remedies against procedural determinations</u>	Article 28bis (new) Urgent decisions under Article 66(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679	<u>Article 28bis (new)</u>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				<p><u>Urgent opinion or urgent binding decision under Article 66(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679</u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p> <p>Text Origin: Council Mandate</p>
Article 28a(1)				
250b		<p><u>Remedies against procedural determinations by a supervisory authority under national law shall only be brought together with the remedy against the final material decision. Deadlines for remedies against procedural determinations under applicable national law are prolonged for the duration of the procedure before the supervisory authority.</u></p>	<p>1.A request for an binding urgent decision of the Board pursuant to Article 66(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 shall contain all of the following items:</p>	<p><u>1.A request for an urgent opinion or an urgent binding decision of the Board pursuant to Article 66(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 shall contain all of the following items:</u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p> <p>Text Origin: Council Mandate</p>
Article 28a(1), point (a)				
250c			<p>(a) a summary of the relevant facts;</p>	<p><u>(a) a summary of the relevant facts;</u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p> <p>Text Origin: Council Mandate</p>
Article 28a(1), point (b)				
250d			<p>(b) the justification of the urgent need to take appropriate measures in order to protect the rights and freedoms of data subjects, bearing in mind the exceptional nature of</p>	<p><u>(b) the justification of the urgent need to take appropriate measures in order to protect the rights and freedoms of data subjects, bearing in mind the exceptional circumstances requiring the</u></p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
			circumstances requiring the adoption of such measures, in particular elements which the competent authority should have taken into account in order to protect the rights and freedoms of data subjects;	<p><u><i>adoption of such measures, in particular elements which the competent authority should have taken into account in order to protect the rights and freedoms of data subjects;</i></u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p> <p>Text Origin: Council Mandate</p>
Article 28a(1), point (c)				
6	250e		(c) where relevant and available, information on any investigatory measures taken by the requesting supervisory authority on its own territory and replies received from the local establishment of the parties under investigation or any other information in the possession of the requesting supervisory authority;	<p><u><i>(c) where relevant and available, information on any investigatory measures taken by the requesting supervisory authority on its own territory and replies received from the parties under investigation or any other information in the possession of the requesting supervisory authority;</i></u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p> <p>Text Origin: Council Mandate</p>
Article 28a(1), point (d)				
6	250f		(d) where the requesting authority is not the lead supervisory authority, the views of the lead supervisory authority.	<p><u><i>(d) the views of the competent supervisory authority referred to in Article 66(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</i></u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p> <p>Text Origin: Council Mandate</p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
Article 28a(2)				
6	250g		2. Where appropriate, the Board may request further documents from the supervisory authority concerned or the lead supervisory authority.	<p><u>2. The Board may request further documents from a supervisory authority with respect to the subject matter submitted to the Board.</u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
Article 28a(3)				
6	250h		3. The Chair of the Board shall register the referral no later than one week after having received the documents referred to in paragraphs 1 and 2. As soon as the file is registered by the Chair of the Board, it shall be provided to the members of the Board.	<p><u>3. Within one week of being provided with the documents pursuant to paragraph 1, the Chair of the Board shall register the referral of the subject matter submitted to it. As soon as the file is registered, it shall be provided to the members of the Board.</u></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>
Article 28a(4)				
6	250i		4. Prior to the adoption of the urgent binding decision pursuant to Article 66(3) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, the Board shall assess whether the adoption of such decision relies on elements on which the parties under investigation have not been provided with an opportunity to express their views and, where necessary, provide the parties under investigation or the complainant, as the case may be,	<p><i>deleted</i></p> <p>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
			with an opportunity to make their views known.	
<i>Article 28a(5)</i>				
250j			5. Where the Board adopts an urgent binding decision indicating that appropriate measures should be adopted, the supervisory authority to which the decision is addressed shall adopt such measures as soon as possible and within a maximum of one month as provided under Article 65(6) of Regulation 2016/679.	<i>deleted</i> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
<i>Chapter VII</i>				
250k		<u><i>Chapter VII</i></u> <u><i>General and final provisions</i></u>		<u><i>Chapter VII</i></u> <u><i>General and final provisions</i></u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: EP Mandate
<i>Article 28b</i>				
250l		<u><i>Article 28b</i></u> <u><i>Enforcement Statistics</i></u>		<u><i>Article 28b</i></u> <u><i>Enforcement Statistics on cross-border cases</i></u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: EP Mandate
<i>Article 28b(1)</i>				
250m		<u><i>Supervisory authorities shall report the following numbers in</i></u>		<u><i>1. As part of the annual report to be drawn up under Article 71 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, the</i></u>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
		<u><i>their activity report under Article 59 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679;</i></u>		<u><i>European Data Protection Board shall provide statistics on the enforcement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 in cases falling under the scope of this Regulation, and in particular:</i></u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 28b(1), point (a)				
g	250n	<u><i>(a) the number of ex officio investigations initiated by the supervisory authority;</i></u>		<u><i>(a) the number of complaint-based and ex officio procedures initiated;</i></u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 28b(1), point (b)				
g	250o	<u><i>(b) the number of ex officio investigations initiated by other supervisory authorities;</i></u>		<u><i>(b) the number of complaint-based and ex officio procedures concluded;</i></u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 28b(1), point (c)				
g	250p	<u><i>(c) the number of complaints received, including the number that were rejected, dismissed, withdrawn, partly upheld, fully upheld or otherwise closed;</i></u>		<u><i>(c) the number of investigations requested by concerned supervisory authorities pursuant to Article 61(1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679;</i></u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 28b(1), point (d)				


	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
g	250q	<u>(d) the number of legally binding decisions currently on appeal;</u>		<u>(d) the number of complaints lodged;</u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 28b(1), point (e)				
g	250r	<u>(e) the number and average duration of open and decided procedures under (a) to (d) to date;</u>		<u>(e) the number of complaints fully or partially rejected or dismissed;</u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 28b(1), point (f)				
g	250s	<u>(f) the number of each type of measure taken in accordance with Article 58(2) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 or applicable national law;</u>		<u>(f) the average duration of ex officio and complaint-based procedures concluded;</u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 28b(1), point (g)				
g	250t	<u>(g) the number and the amount of fines issued and collected under Article 83 and 84 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 or relevant national law; and</u>		<u>(g) the number and amounts of administrative fines imposed pursuant to Article 83 and 84 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 28b(1), point (h)				
g	250u	<u>(h) the annual budget and the number of staff, by training, tasks and organizational units.</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 28b(2)				

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
g	250v	<u>2. Supervisory authorities shall publish the activity report for the past year without undue delay, but no later than by 30 June.</u>	PUBLIC	<u>2. Where the statistics referred to in paragraph 1 are not directly available to the Board, the supervisory authorities shall, upon request, provide them to the Board in a timely manner.</u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 28b(3)				
g	250w	<u>3. The Board shall make the information of all supervisory authorities in paragraph 1 available to the public no later than 31 July of each year for the previous year.</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Chapter VII				
g	251	Chapter VII General and final provisions <i>Chapter VII</i> <i>deleted</i> Heading "Chapter VII General and final provisions" is placed before Article 28 b - see line 250k.	Chapter VII General and final provisions	<i>Chapter VII</i> <i>deleted</i> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 29				
g	252	Article 29 Beginning of time periods and definition of working day <i>Article 29</i> <i>deleted</i>	Article 29 <i>deleted</i>	deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 29(1)				
g	253	1. Time-limits provided for in or fixed by the supervisory authorities <i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	<p>pursuant to Regulation (EU) 2016/679 shall be calculated in accordance with Regulation (EEC, Euratom) No 1182/71 of the Council¹.</p> <p>¹ Regulation (EEC, Euratom) No 1182/71 of the Council of 3 June 1971 determining the rules applicable to periods, dates and time limits (OJ L 124, 8.6.1971, p. 1).</p>			<p><i>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</i></p>
<i>Article 29(2)</i>				
6	<p>254</p> <p>2. Time periods shall begin on the working day following the event to which the relevant provision of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 or this Regulation refers.</p>	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>	<p><i>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</i></p>
<i>Article 29a</i>				
6	<p>254a</p>		<p>Article 29bis Commission report</p>	<p><u>Article 29bis</u> <u>Commission report</u></p> <p><i>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</i></p> <p>Text Origin: Council Mandate</p>
<i>Article 29a, first paragraph</i>				
6	<p>254b</p>		<p>The Commission, as part of its report on the evaluation and review of the Regulation (EU) 2016/679 under Article 97 Regulation (EU) 2016/679 , shall also report on the application and functioning of this regulation.</p>	<p><u>The Commission, as part of its report on the evaluation and review of the Regulation (EU) 2016/679 under Article 97 Regulation (EU) 2016/679 , shall also report on the application and functioning of this regulation.</u></p> <p><i>ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level</i></p>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 30				
255	Article 30 Transitional provisions	Article 30 Transitional provisions	Article 30 Transitional provisions	Article 30 Transitional provisions Text Origin: Commission Proposal
Article 30, first paragraph				
256	Chapters III and IV shall apply to ex officio investigations opened after the entry into force of this Regulation and to complaint-based investigations where the complaint was lodged after the entry into force of this Regulation.	Chapters III and IV , <u>I, II and III</u> shall apply to ex officio investigations opened after the entry into force of this Regulation and to complaint-based investigations where the complaint was lodged after the entry into force of this Regulation.	Chapters III and IV shall apply to ex officio investigations opened after 18 months after the date of the entry into force of this Regulation and to complaint-based investigations where the complaint was lodged after 18 months after the date of the entry into force of this Regulation.	Chapters III and IV shall apply to ex officio investigations opened after <u>15 months after the date of</u> the entry into force of this Regulation and to complaint-based investigations where the complaint was lodged after <u>15 months after the date of</u> the entry into force of this Regulation. ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 30, second paragraph				
257	Chapter V shall apply to all cases submitted to dispute resolution under Article 65 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 after the entry into force of this Regulation.	Chapter V <u>Chapters V and VI</u> shall apply to all cases submitted to dispute resolution under Article 65 <u>and urgency procedure under Article 66(2) and (3)</u> of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 after the entry into force of this Regulation.	Chapter V shall apply to all cases submitted to dispute resolution under Article 65 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 after 18 months after the date of the entry into force of this Regulation. .	Chapter V <u>Chapters V and VI</u> shall apply to all cases submitted to dispute resolution under Article 65 <u>and urgency procedure under Article 66(2) and (3)</u> of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 after <u>15 months after the date of</u> the entry into force of this Regulation. ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
				Text Origin: EP Mandate
Article 30, second paragraph a				
6	257a	<u>Until ... [six months from the date of application of this Regulation], the lead supervisory authority shall, upon request, provide all documents in its own file to other supervisory authorities by other electronic means.</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 30a				
6	257b	<u>Article 30a Evaluation and review</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 30a, first paragraph				
6	257c	<u>The Commission shall evaluate and review this Regulation as part of its reports to the European Parliament and to the Council under Article 97 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679.</u>		deleted ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 31				
6	258	Article 31 Entry into force	Article 31 Entry into force <u>and application</u>	Article 31 Entry into force <u>and application</u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level Text Origin: Council Mandate
Article 31, first paragraph				
6	259	This Regulation shall enter into force on the twentieth day following	<u>1.</u> This Regulation shall enter into force on the twentieth day following	<u>1.</u> This Regulation shall enter into force on the twentieth day following



	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	that of its publication in the Official Journal of the European Union.	that of its publication in the Official Journal of the European Union.	that of its publication in the Official Journal of the European Union.	that of its publication in the Official Journal of the European Union. <small>Text Origin: EP Mandate</small>
Article 31, first paragraph a				
259a		<u><i>1a. It shall apply from ... [one year from the date of entry into force of this Regulation].</i></u> <u><i>However, Article 2b(1), point(c), Article 2b(3), last sentence, Article 2c(2), last sentence, and (5), Article 2d(3) and (6), Articles 8(1) and 18(1), point (a) shall apply from ... [six months from the date of application of this Regulation].</i></u>		<i>deleted</i> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level
Article 31, second paragraph				
260	This Regulation shall be binding in its entirety and directly applicable in all Member States.	This Regulation shall be binding in its entirety and directly applicable in all Member States.	2. This Regulation shall be binding in its entirety and directly applicable in all Member States apply from 18 months after its date of entry into force.	2. This Regulation shall be binding in its entirety and directly applicable in all Member States apply from 15 months after its date of entry into force. ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level <small>Text Origin: Council Mandate</small>
Article 31, second paragraph a				
260a			This Regulation shall be binding in its entirety and directly applicable in all Member States.	<u><i>This Regulation shall be binding in its entirety and directly applicable in all Member States.</i></u> ITM Proposal - to be agreed at political level <small>Text Origin: Council Mandate</small>

	Commission Proposal	EP Mandate	Council Mandate	Draft Agreement
	Formula			
261	Done at Brussels,	Done at Brussels,	Done at Brussels,	Done at Brussels, <small>Text Origin: Commission Proposal</small>
	Formula			
262	For the European Parliament	For the European Parliament	For the European Parliament	For the European Parliament <small>Text Origin: Commission Proposal</small>
	Formula			
263	The President	The President	The President	The President <small>Text Origin: Commission Proposal</small>
	Formula			
264	For the Council	For the Council	For the Council	For the Council <small>Text Origin: Commission Proposal</small>
	Formula			
265	The President	The President	The President	The President <small>Text Origin: Commission Proposal</small>
	Annex			
266	Annex	Annex	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>
	Annex, Table 1			
267	<i>Table 1</i>	<i>Table 1</i>	<i>deleted</i>	<i>deleted</i>

Commission Proposal Table 1

Complaint submitted on the basis of Article 3 ¹
Part A: Mandatory information
1. Identification of person or entity filing the complaint Where the complainant is a natural person, submit a form of identification. ² Where the complaint is submitted by a body referred to in Article 80 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, submit proof that the body has been properly constituted in accordance with the law of a Member State. Where the complaint is submitted on the basis of Article 80(1) of Regulation 2016/679, proof that the body lodging the complaint is acting on the basis of the mandate of a data subject.
2. Contact details ³ Where the complaint is submitted electronically, email address. Where the complaint is submitted by post, postal address. Telephone number.
3. Entity whose processing of your personal data infringes Regulation (EU) 2016/679 Provide all information in your possession to facilitate the identification of the entity which is the subject of your complaint.
4. Subject of complaint Please set out the facts from which, in your opinion, there is or was processing of your personal data which infringes Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (the GDPR). Indicate in particular the context in which your personal data were processed.
Part B: Supplementary information
If possible, indicate the provisions of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (the GDPR) which you consider have been breached by the entity processing your personal data. Please specify whether you have contacted the entity mentioned in point 3 of Part A prior to your complaint and outline the result of any such actions. If possible, please attach any relevant correspondence between you and the entity. Please specify whether you have started other administrative and/or judicial proceedings regarding the subject matter of your complaint. If so, please provide an explanation of the status, and, where relevant, outcome of such actions. Submit all documentation in your possession relating to the facts set out in the complaint (for example, copy of the documents attesting the relationship with the data controller (e.g. invoices, contracts); copy of any marketing messages or e-mails; pictures, photographs or screenshots; expert reports; witness reports; inspection reports).
Part C: Declaration and signature
Please confirm that the information given in this form is given entirely in good faith. Date and signature.

1. The complaint should be completed and submitted electronically or completed and submitted to the supervisory authority by post.

2. For example, passport, driving licence, national ID.

3. In the case a complaint is submitted by a body referred to in Article 80 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, all of the information in point 2 should be provided.

EP Mandate Table 1

Complaint submitted on the basis of Article 3 ¹
Part A: Mandatory information
1. Identification of person or entity filing the complaint Where the complainant is a natural person, submit a form of identification. ² Where the complaint is submitted by a body, <u>organisation or association</u> referred to in Article 80 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, submit proof that the body, <u>organisation or association</u> has been properly constituted in accordance with the law of a Member State. Where the complaint is submitted on the basis of Article 80(1) of Regulation 2016/679, proof that the body, <u>organisation or association</u> lodging the complaint is acting on the basis of the mandate of a data subject.
2. <u>Contact details</u> ² <u>The name, address and any other available</u> contact details ³ <u>of the complainant, including,</u> where the complaint is submitted electronically, email address. Where the complaint is submitted by post, postal address. Telephone number.
3. Entity whose processing of your personal data infringes Regulation (EU) 2016/679 Provide all information in your possession to facilitate the identification of the entity which is the subject of your complaint, <u>including the name, address and any other contact details of that entity.</u>
4. Subject of complaint Please set out the facts from which, in your opinion, there is or was processing of your personal data which infringes Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (the GDPR). Indicate in particular the context in which your personal data were processed.
Part B: Supplementary information
If possible, indicate the provisions of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (the GDPR) which you consider have been breached by the entity processing your personal data. Please specify whether you have contacted the entity mentioned in point 3 of Part A prior to your complaint and outline the result of any such actions. If possible, please attach any relevant correspondence between you and the entity. Please specify whether you have started other administrative and/or judicial proceedings regarding the subject matter of your complaint. If so, please provide an explanation of the status, and, where relevant, outcome of such actions. Submit all documentation in your possession relating to the facts set out in the complaint (for example, copy of the documents attesting the relationship with the data controller (e.g. invoices, contracts); copy of any marketing messages or e-mails; pictures, photographs or screenshots; expert reports; witness reports; inspection reports).
Part C: Declaration and signature
Please confirm that the information given in this form is given entirely in good faith. Date and signature.

1. The complaint should be completed and submitted electronically or completed and submitted to the supervisory authority by post.

2. ~~For example, passport, driving licence, national ID~~ In the case a complaint is submitted by a body referred to in Article 80 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, all of the information in point 2 should be provided.

3. ~~In the case a complaint is submitted by a body referred to in Article 80 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, all of the information in point 2 should be provided.~~