| | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|--|--|
| 2011/2091 Infraction constatée ALLEMAGNE | Service responsable : HOME/A/03 | Etat du dossier au 06/10/2011 | Jr.Rs.: | Eq.Jr.: | Resp. Int.: CNH | Resp. Ext.: | | |
| Services associés : SGEN/X/00; SJUR/X/00 | | I. FACTS | | | | | | |
| Non-transposition of the Data Retention Directive 2006/2 | The deadline for transposition of the Data Retention Directive (2006/24/EC) was 15 September 2007. Because Germany had not communicated any national transposing measures to the Commission by the said deadline, the Commission on 27 November 2007 sent DE a letter of formal notice (reference SG(2007) D207204). On 18 January 2008, DE replied notifying the COM of Telecommunications Surveillance Law of 31 December 2007 | | | | | | | |
| Bases juridiques : Directive:32006L0024 | | (SG(2008) A/00731), which it decla | red to be the compl | ete transposition of the | Directive. | | | |
| Stade : Non-communication | On 2 March 2010, the German Constitutional Court in its judgment (ref. 1 BvR 256/08, 1BvR 263/08, 1 BvR 586/08) annualed the Telecommunications Surveillance Law in its entirety. | | | | | | | |
| Procedures en relation : dossier père -> ; dossiers fils | -> | U CORRESPONDENCE MARKET | IE MEMBER STA | , | | | | |
| Fait Incriminé : | On 16 June 2010, the Commission sent a letter to Germany through EU Pilot (file number 1174/10/3LSE) requesting clarifications with regard to the transposition of the Directive. On 23 June 2010, Germany confirmed that its Constitutional Court had declared the national law transposing the Directive to be unconstitutional in its entirety and that it had included very detailed requirements in its judgment of what such a law should include. On 27 October 2010, COM invited DE officials to meet officials from DG Home Affairs to discuss the status and timescales of preparations of the new legislation. The meeting took place on 21 January 2011. During the meeting, the German delegation undertook to keep the Commission informed about developments. Over four months later, however, no further notifications have been forthcoming from Germany. On 17 June 2011, the Commission sent Article 258 letter of formal notice to Germany (ref. SG-Greffe(2011)D/9667). It appears from Germany's reply to this letter on 16 August 2011 that the authorities in Germany are currently preparing new measures for complying with Directive 2006/24/EC. However, no draft text of these measures and no timetable for the | | | | | | | |
| Infringement case 2011/2091 - A letter of formal notice viby Germany to communicate measures in compliance wit of data generated or processed in connection with the propublic communications networks. | | | | | | | | |
| Mise en demoure 258 (ex226) : | Mise en demeure 260 (ex228): | adoption of these measures have been communicated to the Commission. Furthermore, it appears from Germany's r | | | | Germany's reply that | | |
| Décision: 16/06/2011-E/2011/4081; C(2011)4112 Envoi: 17/06/2011 SG(2011)D:9667; C(2011)4112 Réponse: 16/08/2011:INF(2011)103426 | Décision Envoi : Reponse : | the authorities in Germany are preparing measures based on a proposal by the German Minister for Justice for a system of 'quick freeze plus'. The Commission services have made clear on several occasions that, in their view, a proposal for a system of 'quick freeze plus' could not, if adopted, be considered to represent sufficient transposition of Directive 2006/24/EC. | | | | | | |
| Mise en demeure complémentaire 258 (ex226): | Mise en demeure complémentaire 260 (ex228) : | III. CONCLUSION AND PROPOSAL Since the judgment of its Constitutional Court in March 2010, DE has not indicated to COM how and when it pr | | | | | | |
| Décision : Envoi : Reponse : | Décision : Envoir Réponse : | produce new legislation to transpose the Data Retention Directive. It is therefore proposed to issue to DE Article 258 reason opinion. | | | | | | |
| Avis motivé 258 (ex226) : | Avis motivé ex228 : | In its Communication on Implemen | In its Communication on Implementation of Article 260(3) TFEU (OJ C 12, 15.01.2011, p.1), COM in exercising its discretionary power considers that the Article 260(3) instrument should be used as a matter of principle in all cases of failure | | | | | |
| Décision 27/10/2011 E/2011/7685 :C(2011)7509 Envoi : Réponse : | Décision Envoi : Réponse : | to fulfill an obligation, which concern the transposition of directives adopted under a legislative procedure. COM neverther recognised that there might be special eases in which it would not deem it appropriate to seek ponalties under Article 266. In the present case. COM considers that it is appropriate to depart from these general criteria and not to use the Article 2 instrument due to several reasons linked to the specificity of the present case. 1) Germany had notified the national transposition measures, which subsequently have been annulted by the German | | | | | | |
| Avis motivé complémentaire 258 (ex226) : | Saisine 260 (ex228) : | | | | | | | |
| Décision : Envoi : Réponse : | Décision : Dépot decision : Ref.Aff. : D.Arrêt | Constitutional Court. 2) It is not certain that the Court of Justice will follow the interpretation by the Commission of the application of Article 260(3) in an exceptional situation of annulment a posteriori of the transposition measures. 3) The transposition of the Data Retention Directive is particularly complex due to the fact that the general obligation to data requires adoption of national measures whose implementation may raise sensitive questions linked to fundamental | | | | | | |
| Saisine 258 (ex226): | | in particular the right to data protect | ieasures whose impl | ementation may raise | sensitive questions linked | to fundamental rights, | | |
| Décision : Dépot décision : Ref. Aff. : D.Arrêt : | | | | | | | | |
| Origine CDO: | Correspondance avec l'état membre (2 dern. évén.): | | | | | | | |
| 16/06/2010. | 09/11/2010:EM - Envoi lette: SG-EUPILOT-DOC-2010-5661 03/11/2010:EM - Envoi lettre SG-EUPILOT-DOC-2010-554 | _ | | | | | | |
| Historique des décisions (6 dernières décisions) : | | | | | | | | |
| 27/10/2011:E/2011/7685 :C(2011)7509: Avis motive 258 16/06/2011:E/2011/4081 :C(2011)4112 :Mise en demeure | | | | | | | | |

| Etat des consultations : | | | | | | Prop. du service responsable : | | |
|--------------------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------------------------|--|--|
| | MD258(ex226) | MDC258(ex226) | AM258(ex226) | AMC258(ex226) | MD260(ex228) | MDC260(ex228) | Prop. des chefs de cabinet : | |
| DG -> \$J | | | | | | | Prop. décision de la Commission : | |
| SJ -> DG | | | | | | | Position du service juridique : | |
| DG -> SG | | | | | | | Document généré par .e 27/10/2011 11:15 cette information est enregistré dans un fichier d'audit | |