

# **EDRI-FFII-PI**

## **VOTING LIST 14 DECEMBER 2005 (DATA RETENTION)**

Report: ALVARO (A6-0365/2005) [\*\*\*I]  
Data retention

Committee: Civil Liberties

Subject of the amendment	Am No	Author	RCV etc.	Vote	Remarks
<i>Proposal for a directive</i>					
<b>Proposal to reject the proposal for a directive</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>Greens/EFA+ EUL/NGL</b>	<b>RCV</b>	<b>+</b>	<b>First prove necessity and proportionality of data retention, only then propose a directive.</b>
<b><i>Block No. 1 - compromise</i></b>	51-68 70-74 76-80 82-84 86-92	PES+EPP-ED		<b>-</b>	<p>52 and 65 directly contradict the European Data Protection Supervisor's conclusions.</p> <p>54 misrepresents studies (e.g. Erasmus study concluded "<i>impossible to say if retained data were of importance as proof in criminal cases</i>")</p> <p>55 removes follow-up committee; 58 reintroduces it without civil society members.</p> <p>57 &amp; 77 need content Internet data (which 78 again forbids).</p> <p>60 removes safeguards.</p> <p>64 misrepresents the Council of Europe Conventions.</p> <p>70 extends directive reach beyond impact assessment.</p> <p>72 enables <i>constant tracking of every mobile phone location</i>.</p> <p>76 says no harmonisation of safeguards needed.</p> <p><i>87 allows extension of retention period beyond what Directive says.</i></p> <p>89 turns review of necessity &amp; proportionality into review solely to extend reach.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>adoption Block No. 1 = Block No. 2A falls</b></p>

Subject of the amendment	Am No	Author	RCV etc.	Vote	Remarks
<p><i>Compromise amendments - separate votes</i></p>	69	P ES+EPP-ED	RCV	-	<p><b>Removes</b> Commission requirement that data must be used for serious criminal offences <b><i>such as terrorism and organised crime</i></b>, without providing a list of what the data can be used for.</p> <p>In the UK traffic data can already be accessed in any investigation, and authorised by a variety of public agencies beyond policing. If we want harmonisation, this must be prevented. Otherwise, as the Commission has noted, <b><i>only partial harmonisation will be achieved and variations in practice, as the Council notes, will cause problems.</i></b></p>
	75	PES+EPP-ED	RCV	-	<p>Requires the retention of unsuccessful calls for both telephone and internet. This is <b><i>burdensome and unnecessary</i></b>. Even the Council was unable to come to an agreement on this issue so it is best that discretion is left to Member States, upon extensive national consultation with industry and consumer organisations.</p> <p><b><i>We support the LIBE amendments (Am. 29)</i></b> that ensure that Member States can choose whether it is necessary to collect and retain unsuccessful call attempts. The less data that is required to be retained the better as this will reduce the costs for consumers and industry.</p>

Subject of the amendment	Am No	Author	RCV etc.	Vote	Remarks
	81	PES+EPP-ED	RCV	-	<p>The Commission's proposed <b>6-12 months was argued to be the maximum acceptable period by the European Data Protection Supervisor</b>. Research on data retention has shown that a three month retention period was adequate, though six months was considered optimal. Even for its Framework Decision the Council was unable to settle on a period of retention because of legal and technological constraints. The UK Presidency's 'case for data retention' outlined a number of situations (terrorism, kidnapping, murder, etc.) and <b>none of these situations required a retention period more than a few months</b>.</p> <p>This will require keeping all records of our locations over a two-year period as well as records of all of our contacts and travels over that time. Never have the police had access to such data on our lives. <b>In accordance with legal advice from the Article 29 Working Party, the EDPS, and industry consultations, the proposed two year period is disproportionate.</b></p>
<b>Block No. 2A - amendments by the committee responsible</b>	6 8 10 12-13 23-25 27 29-34 36 40 42-43 46	<b>committee</b>		+	<p>Especially 27 is very important: minimum requirements for access and security of the retained data.</p> <p><b>Don't harmonise retention without also harmonising safeguards!</b></p>

Subject of the amendment	Am No	Author	RCV etc.	Vote	Remarks
<b><i>Block No. 2B - amendments by the committee responsible</i></b>	1-5 7 9 11 14-22 26 28 35 37-39 44-45	<b><i>committee</i></b>		<b>+</b>	<p>1-5 are common sense (limit privacy interference, respect data protection principles, etc.)</p> <p>14 and 17 mention concerns of the EDPS and civil society.</p> <p>18: <b><i>industry consultation before implementation.</i></b></p> <p>21 <b><i>harmonises who can access retained data</i></b>, 26 demands public list of these entities.</p> <p>28 <b><i>harmonises data access safeguards.</i></b></p> <p>39: statistics of security breaches.</p> <p>44 asks for <b><i>consultation with the EDPS in the future.</i></b></p> <p>45 concerns <b><i>revision of necessity and proportionality.</i></b></p>

Subject of the amendment	Am No	Author	RCV etc.	Vote	Remarks
Article 10	85	PES+EPP-ED	RCV	-	<p>Removes harmonisation of reimbursement of costs of telecom providers, which <b>removes the legal basis of this directive (TEU art 95)</b>.</p> <p>Only EU industry and consumers will be forced to bear the costs of retention. Other countries have already rejected data retention, e.g. U.S. industry is not obliged to keep data for any period of time and instead have to adhere to 'preservation' requests for specific data on specific individuals in specific investigations.</p> <p>This places EU industry and consumers at a disadvantage, <b>putting the Lisbon strategy at risk</b>. Only European consumers and companies will have to bear these costs, <b>damaging both consumer confidence and global competitiveness</b>. For instance, European companies that provide web-based mail services will lose out to competitors from the U.S. (Hotmail, Gmail) who may operate at lesser costs and <b>European consumers will be compelled to use these American English-language services instead</b>.</p> <p>Finally, if Member States are compelled to cover the costs, they are more likely to introduce reduced-retention regimes (e.g. 6-months, no unsuccessful calls) because governments will have to bear the costs. <b>Costs-recovery is a balancing mechanisms on government over-reaching</b>.</p> <p>adoption 85 = 41/93 fall</p>
	41= 93=	<i>committee</i> Cederschiöld ao		RCV	+
<i>vote: amended proposal</i>			RCV	+/-	<b>YES if 85 <u>failed</u></b> <b>NO otherwise</b>
<b>Draft legislative resolution</b>					

Subject of the amendment	Am No	Author	RCV etc.	Vote	Remarks
§ 2	48	PES+EPP-ED		-	<b>Removes</b> requirement that <b>impact assessment</b> is done by an <b>independent</b> body.
After § 2	49	PES+EPP-ED		-	Says this directive is a “necessary first step”, while <b>necessity has not been demonstrated according to even the EDPS</b> .
	50	EPP-ED		-	Exception for retention of client-lawyer data. This is <b>impossible to implement in practice</b> .
<b>vote: legislative resolution</b>			RCV	-	<b>First prove necessity and proportionality of data retention, only then propose directive.</b>

Requests for roll-call votes

IND/DEM: ams 47 and 93

EPP-ED: am 93 and amended proposal

Greens/EFA: ams 41, 47, 69, 75, 81, 85, amended proposal and legislative resolution

EUL/NGL: ams 41, 69, 75, 85 and final vote

PES: amended proposal and legislative resolution

Requests for separate votes

ALDE: ams 1-5, 7, 9, 11, 14-22, 26, 28, 35, 37-39, 44-45 to be taken as a block as an addition to the compromise package (Block 1)