

## **Comment on the compliance of COM (2013) 316 with the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality<sup>1</sup>**

### **1. Commenting region / institution**

**Please specify the region and institution that comments.**

*Thüringen State Parliament, DE*

### **2. COM - Document**

**Please specify the EU initiative the comment refers to by indicating its reference and its title.**

*COM (2013) 316*

*Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and the Council concerning type-approval requirements for the deployment of the eCall in-vehicle system and amending Directive 2007/46/EC*

### **3. Type of Comment**

**Please specify the type of comment.**

- ☒ Comment
  - ☐ on the legal basis of the EU initiative
  - ☐ on the infringement of the principle of subsidiarity
  - ☒ on the infringement of the principle of proportionality
  - ☐ on better lawmaking
- ☐ General Comment

---

<sup>1</sup> Non-official summary of the original version elaborated by the commenting region. This form has been developed in cooperation with the Thüringen State Parliament.

#### 4. Legal basis

Please specify your comment in relation to the EU competence to act regarding the initiative.

☐ No / wrong legal basis conferring on the EU the competence to act

#### 5. Subsidiarity and Proportionality

Please specify the reasons why the draft legislative act in question does not comply with the principles of subsidiarity and/or proportionality.

☐ **Infringement of the principle of *subsidiarity***<sup>2</sup>

☐ **Formal infringement**

☐ The **justification** concerning subsidiarity included in the draft legislative act does not fulfill the requirements set in article 5 of the Protocol on the application of the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality.

☐ **Substantive infringement**

☐ The proposed action is **not necessary** because

☐ the objective/s of this action can be sufficiently achieved by the Member States, either at central, regional or local level;

☐ the issue being addressed has no transnational aspects;

☐ existing EU measures and/or targeted assistance provided in this framework are sufficient to achieve the intended objective/s.

☐ The proposed action **does not provide a clear benefit** (like economies of scale, legal clarity, homogeneity in legal approaches) compared with action at central, regional or local level.

☐ Other reasons or explanations (please specify):

☒ **Infringement of the principle of *proportionality***<sup>3</sup>

☐ The proposed **form** of action (legal instrument) legislates to an extent which is not necessary to achieve the intended objective/s (e. g. a directive instead of a regulation would be sufficient).

☒ The **content** of the proposed action exceeds what is necessary to achieve the Intended

---

<sup>2</sup> Art. 5 (3) TEU

<sup>3</sup> Art. 5 (4) TEU

objective/s (e.g. too detailed directive).

☐ The proposed action does **not leave sufficient room for national decision**.

☒ Other reasons or explanations (please specify):

Infringement of the principle of proportionality for reasons of data protection. The proposal contains provisions that imply in the mandatory use of the eCall device. The driver should therefore have the choice to put the eCall system in operation and not be legally obliged to do so.

Moreover, for reasons of the sensitivity of the shared data, the proposal needs to provide detailed information regarding the data transferred by the eCall system. The limits of the data permitted to be transferred should be as well predefined.

It is also important, from the focus of data protection, to clarify who is responsible for processing the data. The creation of a database for the detection of cases of abuse of the eCall system is rejected.

## 6. Better lawmaking

**Please indicate the reasons why the EU initiative at stake does not respect the principle of better lawmaking.**

☐ Local and regional aspects are not taken properly into account.

☐ Local and regional authorities have not been properly consulted in the process leading to the EU initiative.

☐ Arguments put forward in the impact assessment in support of compliance with the subsidiarity and proportionality principals are not sufficient.

☐ The implementation of the proposed action would entail disproportionate financial/and or administrative burdens<sup>4</sup> and associated costs.

☐ In the case of a draft regulation: the proposal is not sufficiently detailed (essential elements may have to be provided for by delegated acts).

☐ Other reasons or explanations (please specify):

## 7. General comment

**Please specify your comment.**

---

<sup>4</sup> Administrative burdens are the costs borne by business, economic operators, citizens and public authorities in the process of complying with information obligations imposed by legislation which they would not have collected and provided in the absence of such legislation.