



EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2009 - 2014

---

*Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs*

---

**2010/0074(COD)**

27.9.2010

## **DRAFT OPINION**

of the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs

for the Committee on Constitutional Affairs

on the proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council  
on the citizens' initiative  
(COM(2010)0119 – C7-0089/2010 – 2010/0074(COD))

Draftswomen: Kinga Göncz, Cecilia Wikström

PA\_Legam

## SHORT JUSTIFICATION

Article 11(4) of the Treaty on European Union introduces an important innovation in the democratic functioning of the Union by providing a new concrete tool for civic participation and pan-European debate:

"Not less than one million citizens who are nationals of a significant number of Member States may take the initiative of inviting the European Commission, within the framework of its powers, to submit any appropriate proposal on matters where citizens consider that a legal act of the Union is required for the purpose of implementing the Treaties."

The European Citizens' Initiative (ECI) introduces a new concept of trans-national democracy and brings participatory democracy to the EU. Through the ECI, EU citizens can appeal directly to the European Commission to initiate a legal act. In a way, the Lisbon Treaty has created a fourth institutional body of the EU: one million citizens.

The proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the citizens' initiative sets out the procedures and conditions for how the citizens' initiative will function in practice.

Your rapporteurs welcome the Commission proposal, as involving civil society in policy shaping and preparations of decisions strengthens the democratic legitimacy of public institutions and brings the European Union closer to its citizens.

However, your rapporteurs believe that the citizens' initiative should be designed as pragmatically as possible, and complicated administrative procedures should be avoided. They would also like to see that as many launched initiatives as possible will be granted admissibility. In order to do that the procedural rules must be as facilitated as possible. The rapporteurs have the following main concerns and suggestions to change the proposal:

According to the rapporteurs, **the minimum age for supporting an initiative** should be 16 years in all Member States. Article 9 TEU states that all Union's citizens should receive equal attention. Active citizenship, social inclusion and solidarity of young people are crucial for the future of Europe, and decreasing the age limit would help raise awareness towards European issues among young people. Moreover, the ECI is not a decision-making instrument but only an agenda-setting initiative, and supporting an initiative is completely different from the act of voting. Furthermore, linking the minimum age to national voting age requirements would create inequality due to differences in national requirements, which is why your rapporteurs prefer the age of 16 years to be applicable in all Member States.

As for **the scope of collection**, your rapporteurs consider that it should be enough to collect signatures in one fourth of the Member States instead of one third, as in every Member State where signatures shall be collected, a lot of time and resources are required for administration and translation. Since the rapporteurs want to eliminate the risk of initiatives falling due to time limits or lack of financial support, they suggest that one fourth of the Member States should be sufficient since that number still covers a big part of the EU.

Considering that the Commission requested in its proposal a period of two months to investigate if an initiative is admissible, the time limit of one year for collecting signatures seems to be too short. Your rapporteurs suggest that **the time limit for the collection of signatures** should be extended to four years in order to ensure that also initiatives without financial support have a chance to reach one million signatures.

Regarding **the issue of admissibility**, your rapporteurs consider that there is no need to collect 300.000 signatures before the admissibility is checked by the Commission. Your rapporteurs firmly believe that 5.000 signatures should be sufficient and signatories should not need to come from more than one Member State. It takes time and resources to start collecting signatures in several Member States and before knowing if an initiative has been considered admissible, it shall not be necessary to start the process in more than one Member State. Nonetheless, in order to act as a filter for unserious initiatives, your rapporteurs reckon that the requested 5.000 signatures should be collected within 6 months; by setting this time limit, it would be possible to eliminate initiatives that are registered but never get the specified number of signatures.

Your rapporteurs also suggest that the Commission shall investigate the admissibility of an initiative within one month instead of two, so that the momentum of collecting signatures is not slowed down.

Your rapporteurs also believe that **proposals either manifestly or covertly against the values of the European Union should be considered inadmissible**.

As far as the **online collection of signatures is concerned**, your rapporteurs suggest that the Commission shall launch a central website named "citizensinitiative.eu", where all initiatives should be registered and all initiatives can be found and signed by citizens. This solution would be highly desirable for several reasons.

Firstly, because of data protection concerns, i.e. if the Commission set up and operated a central website, it would be guaranteed that rules and regulations concerning personal data protection are respected. Your rapporteurs firmly believe that it cannot be expected from any initiator of a citizens' initiative to set up and operate an online signature-collecting system, which meets all the relevant data-privacy regulations.

Moreover, by making each initiator launch his/her own website, the collection of signatures would not be uniform from a data protection point of view.

Secondly, the Commission's proposal would also be problematic as it would impose an extra burden not only on the initiators, but on Member States as well, as they should verify the conformity of the online collection systems with the regulations set out by the Commission, and they should also issue a certificate confirming the conformity concerning each website.

Thirdly, having all citizens' initiatives on one single website would make the accessibility of the initiatives much easier, as interested citizens could find, sign and follow the progress of all the initiatives quickly and without any difficulties.

Thus, your rapporteurs believe that the Commission should set up a central website, in the task of which it should involve relevant authorities of Member States in order to decide what data they need to identify and verify the identity of signatories later. The website should be constructed in such a way that when signing an initiative online the signatory would be first asked about his/her nationality, then only those fields should be filled in which are required by the relevant authorities. The reason behind this solution is that different Member States have different types of identification numbers and need different data to verify the identity of the signatories.

## AMENDMENTS

The Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs calls on the Committee on Constitutional Affairs, as the committee responsible, to incorporate the following amendments in its report:

### Amendment 1

#### Proposal for a regulation Recital 5

##### *Text proposed by the Commission*

(5) It is necessary to establish the minimum number of Member States from which citizens must come. In order to ensure that a citizens' initiative is representative of a Union interest, this number should be set at **one third** of Member States.

##### *Amendment*

(5) It is necessary to establish the minimum number of Member States from which citizens must come. In order to ensure that a citizens' initiative is representative of a Union interest, this number should be set at **one fourth** of Member States.

Or. en

##### *Justification*

*We consider that it should be enough to collect signatures in one fourth of the Member States instead of one third. In every Member State where signatures shall be collected, a lot of time and resources are required for administration and translation. Since the rapporteurs want to eliminate the risk of initiatives falling due to time limits or lack of financial support, they suggest that one fourth of the Member States should be sufficient since that number still covers a big part of the EU.*

## Amendment 2

### Proposal for a regulation

#### Recital 7

*Text proposed by the Commission*

(7) It is appropriate to fix a minimum age for supporting a citizens' initiative. This should be set *as* the age ***at which citizens are entitled to vote in the European Parliament elections.***

*Amendment*

(7) It is appropriate to fix a minimum age for supporting a citizens' initiative. This should be set ***at*** the age ***of 16 years.***

Or. en

#### *Justification*

*Article 9 TEU states that all Union's citizens should receive equal attention. Active citizenship, social inclusion and solidarity of young people are crucial for the future of Europe. Moreover, supporting an initiative is completely different from the act of voting, therefore, it would be appropriate to involve also young people. Furthermore, linking the minimum age to national voting age would create inequality due to differences in national requirements.*

## Amendment 3

### Proposal for a regulation

#### Recital 8

*Text proposed by the Commission*

(8) In order to ensure coherence and transparency in relation to proposed citizens' initiatives, it should be mandatory to register such initiatives on a website made available by the Commission prior to collecting the necessary statements of support from citizens; proposals that are abusive or devoid of seriousness should not be registered and the Commission should reject the registration of proposals which would be manifestly against the values of the Union. The Commission should deal with registration in accordance with the general principles of good administration.

*Amendment*

(8) In order to ensure coherence and transparency in relation to proposed citizens' initiatives, it should be mandatory to register such initiatives on a website made available by the Commission prior to collecting the necessary statements of support from citizens; proposals that are abusive or devoid of seriousness should not be registered and the Commission should reject the registration of proposals which would be manifestly ***or covertly*** against the values of the Union. The Commission should deal with registration in accordance with the general principles of good administration.

#### Amendment 4

##### Proposal for a regulation

##### Recital 10

*Text proposed by the Commission*

(10) It is appropriate to provide for statements of support to be collected in paper form as well as online. Online collection systems should have adequate security features in place in order to ensure, *inter alia*, that the person can be identified and that the data are securely stored. For this purpose, the Commission should be required to set out detailed technical specifications for online collection systems.

*Amendment*

(10) It is appropriate to provide for statements of support to be collected in paper form as well as online. Online collection systems should have adequate security features in place in order to ensure, *inter alia*, that the person can be identified and that the data are securely ***collected and*** stored. For this purpose, the Commission should be required to set out detailed technical specifications for online collection systems, ***and, in doing so, should involve the European Data Protection Supervisor and the relevant authorities of Member States. The Commission should also be responsible for the operation of the online collection system.***

*Justification*

*The Commission should set up a central website in order to guarantee the protection of personal data. All initiatives should be registered and possible to sign on this website. Otherwise, an extra burden would be put on the initiators.*

#### Amendment 5

##### Proposal for a regulation

##### Recital 11

*Text proposed by the Commission*

***(11) It is appropriate for Member States to verify the conformity of online collection systems with the requirements of this***

*Amendment*

***deleted***

**Regulation.**

Or. en

*Justification*

*Since the Commission should set up and manage a central website, the verification of conformity by Member States is no longer required.*

**Amendment 6**

**Proposal for a regulation**

**Recital 12**

*Text proposed by the Commission*

(12) It is appropriate to ensure that statements of support for a citizens' initiative are collected within a specific time-limit. In order to ensure that proposed citizens' initiatives remain relevant, whilst taking account of the complexity of collecting statements of support across the European Union, that time-limit should not be longer than **12 months** from the date of registration of the proposed initiative.

*Amendment*

(12) It is appropriate to ensure that statements of support for a citizens' initiative are collected within a specific time-limit. In order to ensure that proposed citizens' initiatives remain relevant, whilst taking account of the complexity of collecting statements of support across the European Union, that time-limit should not be longer than **48 months** from the date of registration of the proposed initiative.

Or. en

*Justification*

*The time limit for collection of signatures should be extended to four years in order to ensure that also initiatives without financial support will have a chance to reach one million signatures.*

**Amendment 7**

**Proposal for a regulation**

**Recital 13**

*Text proposed by the Commission*

(13) It is appropriate that the Commission should take a decision on the admissibility of proposed initiatives at a sufficiently

*Amendment*

(13) It is appropriate that the Commission should take a decision on the admissibility of proposed initiatives at a sufficiently

early stage. The organiser should therefore request such a decision after it has collected **300 000** statements of support for the proposed initiative from signatories coming from *at least three* Member **States**.

early stage. The organiser should therefore request such a decision after it has collected **5 000** statements of support for the proposed initiative from signatories coming from *one* Member **State or more**. ***The 5 000 statements of support should be collected within 6 months.***

Or. en

#### *Justification*

*It takes time and resources to start collecting signatures in several Member States and before knowing if an initiative has been considered admissible, it shall not be necessary to start the process in more than one Member State. Nonetheless, in order to act as a filter for unserious initiatives, the requested 5.000 signatures should be collected within 6 months; by setting this time limit, it would be possible to eliminate initiatives that are registered but never get the specified number of signatures.*

### **Amendment 8**

#### **Proposal for a regulation** **Recital 14**

##### *Text proposed by the Commission*

(14) The Commission should, within a period of **two months** after receiving a request from the organiser, adopt a decision on its admissibility. A proposed citizens' initiative should be considered admissible if it falls within the framework of the powers of the Commission and concerns a matter where a legal act of the Union can be adopted for the purpose of implementing the Treaties.

##### *Amendment*

(14) The Commission should, within a period of **one month** after receiving a request from the organiser, adopt a decision on its admissibility. A proposed citizens' initiative should be considered admissible if it falls within the framework of the powers of the Commission and concerns a matter where a legal act of the Union can be adopted for the purpose of implementing the Treaties.

Or. en

#### *Justification*

*The Commission should investigate the admissibility of an initiative within one month instead of two, so that the momentum of collecting signatures is not slowed down.*

## Amendment 9

### Proposal for a regulation Recital 18

#### *Text proposed by the Commission*

(18) Directive 95/46/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 1995 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data is fully applicable to the processing of personal data carried out in application of this Regulation. In this respect, it is appropriate to clarify that the organiser of a citizens' initiative and the competent authorities of the Member States are the data controllers within the meaning of Directive 95/46/EC and to specify the maximum period within which the personal data collected for the purposes of a citizens' initiative may be retained. In **their** capacity as data **controllers, organisers need** to take all the appropriate measures to comply with the obligations imposed by Directive 95/46/EC, in particular those relating to the lawfulness of the processing, the security of the processing activities and the provision of information and the rights of data subject to access to his/her personal data as well as the correction and erasure of his/her personal data.

#### *Amendment*

(18) Directive 95/46/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 1995 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data is fully applicable to the processing of personal data carried out in application of this Regulation. In this respect, it is appropriate to clarify that **in the event of paper-based collection** the organiser of a citizens' initiative and the competent authorities of the Member States are the data controllers within the meaning of Directive 95/46/EC and to specify the maximum period within which the personal data collected for the purposes of a citizens' initiative may be retained. **In the event of online collection, in its** capacity as data **controller, the Commission needs** to take all the appropriate measures to comply with the obligations imposed by Directive 95/46/EC, in particular those relating to the lawfulness of the processing, the security of the processing activities and the provision of information and the rights of data subject to access to his/her personal data as well as the correction and erasure of his/her personal data.

Or. en

#### *Justification*

*The Commission should set up a central website in order to guarantee the protection of personal data in case of online collection. All initiatives should be registered and possible to sign on this website. Otherwise, an extra burden would be put on the initiators.*

## Amendment 10

### Proposal for a regulation

#### Article 2 – paragraph 1

*Text proposed by the Commission*

1. "Citizens' initiative" means an initiative, submitted to the Commission in accordance with the present Regulation, inviting the Commission, within the framework of its powers, to submit any appropriate proposal on matters where citizens consider that a legal act of the Union is required for the purpose of implementing the Treaties, which has received the support of at least one million eligible signatories coming from at least **one third** of all Member States;

*Amendment*

1. "Citizens' initiative" means an initiative, submitted to the Commission in accordance with the present Regulation, inviting the Commission, within the framework of its powers, to submit any appropriate proposal on matters where citizens consider that a legal act of the Union is required for the purpose of implementing the Treaties, which has received the support of at least one million eligible signatories coming from at least **one fourth** of all Member States;

Or. en

*Justification*

*We consider that it should be enough to collect signatures in one fourth of the Member States instead of one third. In every Member State where signatures shall be collected, a lot of time and resources are required for administration and translation. Since the rapporteurs want to eliminate the risk of initiatives falling due to time limits or lack of financial support, they suggest that one fourth of the Member States should be sufficient since that number still covers a big part of the EU.*

## Amendment 11

### Proposal for a regulation

#### Article 3 – paragraph 1 – subparagraph 1

*Text proposed by the Commission*

1. Where the organiser is a natural person, that person shall be a citizen of the Union and be **of the age to be entitled to vote in the European elections**.

*Amendment*

1. Where the organiser is a natural person, that person shall be a citizen of the Union and be **at least 16 years old**.

Or. en

### *Justification*

*Article 9 TEU states that all Union's citizens should receive equal attention. Active citizenship, social inclusion and solidarity of young people are crucial for the future of Europe. Moreover, supporting an initiative is completely different from the act of voting, therefore, it would be appropriate to involve also young people. Furthermore, linking the minimum age to national voting age would create inequality due to differences in national requirements.*

### **Amendment 12**

#### **Proposal for a regulation Article 3 – paragraph 2**

##### *Text proposed by the Commission*

2. In order to be eligible to support a proposed citizens' initiative, signatories shall be citizens of the Union and shall be ***of the age to be entitled to vote in the European elections.***

##### *Amendment*

2. In order to be eligible to support a proposed citizens' initiative, signatories shall be citizens of the Union and shall be ***at least 16 years old.***

Or. en

### *Justification*

*Article 9 TEU states that all Union's citizens should receive equal attention. Active citizenship, social inclusion and solidarity of young people are crucial for the future of Europe. Moreover, supporting an initiative is completely different from the act of voting, therefore, it would be appropriate to involve also young people. Furthermore, linking the minimum age to national voting age would create inequality due to differences in national requirements.*

### **Amendment 13**

#### **Proposal for a regulation Article 4 – paragraph 2**

##### *Text proposed by the Commission*

2. Except in the cases foreseen in paragraphs 3 and 4, the Commission shall register without delay the proposed initiative under a unique registration number and send a confirmation to the

##### *Amendment*

2. Except in the cases foreseen in paragraphs 3 and 4, the Commission shall register without delay the proposed initiative under a unique registration number and send a confirmation to the organiser ***in the language used by***

organiser.

*him/her.*

Or. en

#### **Amendment 14**

##### **Proposal for a regulation Article 4 – paragraph 4**

*Text proposed by the Commission*

*Amendment*

4. The Commission shall reject the registration of proposed citizens' initiatives which are manifestly against the values of the Union.

4. The Commission shall reject the registration of proposed citizens' initiatives which are manifestly ***or covertly*** against the values of the Union.

Or. en

#### **Amendment 15**

##### **Proposal for a regulation Article 4 – paragraph 5**

*Text proposed by the Commission*

*Amendment*

5. A proposed citizens' initiative that has been registered shall be made public in the register.

5. A proposed citizens' initiative that has been registered shall be made public in the register ***and on the website provided by the Commission.***

Or. en

#### *Justification*

*The Commission should set up a central website in order to guarantee the protection of personal data. All initiatives should be registered and possible to sign on this website. Otherwise, an extra burden would be put on the initiators.*

## Amendment 16

### Proposal for a regulation Article 5 – paragraph 4

*Text proposed by the Commission*

4. All statements of support shall be collected after the date of registration of the proposed initiative and within a period that shall not exceed **12 months**.

*Amendment*

4. All statements of support shall be collected after the date of registration of the proposed initiative and within a period that shall not exceed **48 months**.

Or. en

*Justification*

*The time limit for collection of signatures should be extended to four years in order to ensure that also initiatives without financial support will have a chance to reach one million signatures.*

## Amendment 17

### Proposal for a regulation Article 6 – paragraph 1

*Text proposed by the Commission*

1. Where statements of support are collected electronically, the data obtained through the online collection system shall be stored **in the territory of a Member State**. The model for the statement of support forms may be adapted for the purpose of the electronic collection.

*Amendment*

1. Where statements of support are collected electronically, the data obtained through the online collection system shall be stored **by the Commission centrally**. The model for the statement of support forms may be adapted for the purpose of the electronic collection.

Or. en

*Justification*

*The Commission should set up a central website in order to guarantee the protection of personal data. All initiatives should be registered and possible to sign on this website. Otherwise, an extra burden would be put on the initiators.*

## Amendment 18

### Proposal for a regulation Article 6 – paragraph 2

*Text proposed by the Commission*

2. Prior to initiating the collection of statements of support from signatories, the **organiser** shall ensure that the online collection system used for that purpose complies with the provisions of paragraph 4. ***The organiser may, at any time, ask the relevant competent authority of the Member State in which the data collected is or will be stored, to certify that the online collection system complies with those provisions. The organiser shall, in any case, request that certification prior to submitting statements of support for verification in accordance with Article 9.***

*Amendment*

2. Prior to initiating the collection of statements of support from signatories, the **Commission** shall ensure that the online collection system used for that purpose complies with the provisions of paragraph 4.

Or. en

*Justification*

*The Commission should set up a central website in order to guarantee the protection of personal data. All initiatives should be registered and possible to sign on this website. Otherwise, an extra burden would be put on the initiators.*

## Amendment 19

### Proposal for a regulation Article 6 – paragraph 3

*Text proposed by the Commission*

***3. Where the online collection system complies with the provisions referred to in paragraph 4, the relevant competent authority shall within one month issue a certificate in accordance with the model set out in Annex IV. Until such a time as the technical specifications mentioned in paragraph 5 have been adopted, the competent authority shall apply the appropriate national technical***

*Amendment*

*deleted*

*specifications for assessing the conformity of the online collection system with paragraph 4.*

*Member States shall recognize the certificates issued by the competent authorities of other Member States.*

Or. en

#### *Justification*

*Since the Commission should set up and manage a central website, the verification of conformity by Member States is no longer required.*

#### **Amendment 20**

##### **Proposal for a regulation Article 6 – paragraph 4**

###### *Text proposed by the Commission*

4. Online collection **systems** shall have adequate security and technical features in place in order to ensure that:
- a. only natural persons may submit a statement of support form online;
  - b. the identity of the person can be verified;
  - c. the data provided online is securely stored, in order to ensure, inter alia, that it may not be modified or used for any other purpose than its indicated support of the given citizens' initiative and to protect personal data against accidental or unlawful destruction or accidental loss, alteration or unauthorized disclosure or access;
  - d. the system can generate individual statements of support in a form complying with the model set out in Annex III, in order to allow for the control by *the Member States*, in accordance with Article 9(2).

###### *Amendment*

4. **The** online collection **system provided by the Commission** shall have adequate security and technical features in place in order to ensure that:
- a. only natural persons may submit a statement of support form online;
  - b. the identity of the person can be verified;
  - c. the data provided online is securely **collected and** stored, in order to ensure, inter alia, that it may not be modified or used for any other purpose than its indicated support of the given citizens' initiative and to protect personal data against accidental or unlawful destruction or accidental loss, alteration or unauthorized disclosure or access;
  - d. the system can generate individual statements of support in a form complying with the model set out in Annex III **and fulfilling the verification requirements stated by the relevant authorities of Member States**, in order to allow for the control by **those authorities**, in accordance

with Article 9(2).

Or. en

*Justification*

*The Commission should set up a central website in order to guarantee the protection of personal data. All initiatives should be registered and possible to sign on this website. Otherwise, an extra burden would be put on the initiators.*

**Amendment 21**

**Proposal for a regulation**

**Article 7 – paragraph 1**

*Text proposed by the Commission*

1. The signatories of a citizens' initiative shall come from at least ***one third*** of Member States.

*Amendment*

1. The signatories of a citizens' initiative shall come from at least ***one fourth*** of Member States.

Or. en

*Justification*

*We consider that it should be enough to collect signatures in one fourth of the Member States instead of one third. In every Member State where signatures shall be collected, a lot of time and resources are required for administration and translation. Since the rapporteurs want to eliminate the risk of initiatives falling due to time limits or lack of financial support, they suggest that one fourth of the Member States should be sufficient since that number still covers a big part of the EU.*

**Amendment 22**

**Proposal for a regulation**

**Article 7 – paragraph 3**

*Text proposed by the Commission*

3. Signatories shall be considered as coming from the Member State ***which issued the identification document indicated in their statement of support.***

*Amendment*

3. Signatories shall be considered as coming from the Member State ***whose citizenship they hold.***

*Justification*

*Some EU Member States do not issue identity cards for their citizens, therefore, the usage of citizenship would be more suitable.*

**Amendment 23****Proposal for a regulation  
Article 8 – paragraph 1***Text proposed by the Commission*

1. After having collected **300 000** statements of support in accordance with Article 5 from signatories coming from *at least three* Member *States*, the organiser shall submit to the Commission a request for a decision on the admissibility of the proposed citizens' initiative. For this purpose the organiser shall use the form set out in Annex V.

*Amendment*

1. After having collected **5 000** statements of support in accordance with Article 5 from signatories coming from *one* Member *State or more and as far as the collection has been completed within 6 months*, the organiser shall submit to the Commission a request for a decision on the admissibility of the proposed citizens' initiative. For this purpose the organiser shall use the form set out in Annex V.

*Justification*

*It takes time and resources to start collecting signatures in several Member States and before knowing if an initiative has been considered admissible, it shall not be necessary to start the process in more than one Member State. Nonetheless, in order to act as a filter for unserious initiatives, the requested 5.000 signatures should be collected within 6 months; by setting this time limit, it would be possible to eliminate initiatives that are registered but never get the specified number of signatures.*

**Amendment 24****Proposal for a regulation  
Article 8 – paragraph 2 – introductory part***Text proposed by the Commission*

2. The Commission shall, within a period of **two months** from the receipt of the

*Amendment*

2. The Commission shall, within a period of **one month** from the receipt of the

request referred to in paragraph 1, take a decision on admissibility. The proposed citizens' initiative shall be considered admissible if it satisfies the following conditions:

request referred to in paragraph 1, take a decision on admissibility. The proposed citizens' initiative shall be considered admissible if it satisfies the following conditions:

Or. en

#### *Justification*

*The Commission should investigate the admissibility of an initiative within one month instead of two, so that the momentum of collecting signatures is not slowed down.*

### **Amendment 25**

#### **Proposal for a regulation**

##### **Article 8 – paragraph 3**

###### *Text proposed by the Commission*

3. The decision referred to in paragraph 2 shall be notified to the organiser of the proposed citizens' initiative and shall be made public.

###### *Amendment*

3. The decision referred to in paragraph 2 shall be notified to the organiser of the proposed citizens' initiative and shall be made public ***on the website provided by the Commission.***

Or. en

#### *Justification*

*The Commission should set up a central website in order to guarantee the protection of personal data. All initiatives should be registered and possible to sign on this website. Otherwise, an extra burden would be put on the initiators.*

### **Amendment 26**

#### **Proposal for a regulation**

##### **Article 9 – paragraph 1 – subparagraph 2**

###### *Text proposed by the Commission*

The organiser shall submit statements of support to the Member ***State that issued the identification document indicated***

###### *Amendment*

The organiser shall submit statements of support to the Member ***States of which the signatories are citizens.***

*therein.*

Or. en

#### **Amendment 27**

##### **Proposal for a regulation Article 13 – point b**

*Text proposed by the Commission*

*Amendment*

***b. non-conformity with the requirements  
for online collection systems;***                      ***deleted***

Or. en

#### *Justification*

*We support the idea of one single, central website operated by the Commission instead of websites set up by each initiator; like this data protection regulations will always be met.*

#### **Amendment 28**

##### **Proposal for a regulation Annex II – point 4**

*Text proposed by the Commission*

*Amendment*

***4. The legal base of the Treaties which  
would allow the Commission to act;***                      ***deleted***

Or. en

#### *Justification*

*Expecting citizens launching an initiative to know the legal base of the Treaties, which would allow the Commission to act is not realistic.*

## Amendment 29

### Proposal for a regulation Annex III – Box 3

#### *Text proposed by the Commission*

Box 3: (to be completed by signatory)

1. Name of signatory:

First name\*:.....Family name\*:

2. Address:

Street:

Postcode: City\*:

Country\*:

3. E-mail address:

4. Date and place of birth\*:

Date of birth: Place and country:

5. **Nationality\***:

6. Personal identification number\*:

Type of identification number/identity document:

National identity card: Passport: Social security:

Member State, which issued the identification number/identity document:

7. I hereby certify that the information provided in this form is correct and that I have only supported this proposed citizens' initiative once\*.

Date and signature of the signatory\* ♦:

.....

#### *Amendment*

Box 3: (to be completed by signatory)

1. **Nationality\***:

2. Name of signatory:

First name\*:.....Family name\*:

3. Address:

Street:

Postcode: City\*:

Country\*:

4. E-mail address:

5. Date and place of birth\*:

Date of birth: Place and country:

6. Personal identification number (**if applicable**):

Type of identification number/identity document:

National identity card: Passport: Social security:

Member State, which issued the identification number/identity document:

7. I hereby certify that the information provided in this form is correct and that I have only supported this proposed citizens' initiative once\*.

Date and signature of the signatory\* ♦:

.....

Or. en

#### *Justification*

*The website provided by the Commission should be constructed in such a way that when signing an initiative online the signatory would be first asked about his/her nationality, then only those fields should be filled in which are required by the relevant authorities. The reason behind this solution is that different Member States have different types of identification numbers and need different data to verify the identity of the signatories.*

## Amendment 30

### Proposal for a regulation Annex IV

*Text proposed by the Commission*

*Amendment*

*Annex deleted*

Or. en

#### *Justification*

*The Commission's proposal that each initiator should set up his/her own website would place an extra burden not only on the initiators, but on Member States as well, as they should verify the conformity of the online collection systems with the regulations set out by the Commission, and they should also issue a certificate confirming the conformity concerning each website. To avoid this burden, we believe that the Commission should launch a central website to store all the initiatives.*

## Amendment 31

### Proposal for a regulation Annex VI

*Text proposed by the Commission*

*Amendment*

Form for the submission of statements of support to the Member States' competent authorities

1. Full name, postal address and e-mail address of the organiser or, in the case of a legal entity or organisation, its legal representative\*:
2. Title of citizens' initiative\*:
3. Commission registration number\*:
4. Date of registration\*:
5. Date of request for a decision on admissibility\*:
6. Number of signatories coming from [name of MS]\*:
7. Annexes\*:  
(Include all statements of support from signatories ***having specified a personal identification number issued by the same Member State. If applicable, include the***

Form for the submission of statements of support to the Member States' competent authorities

1. Full name, postal address and e-mail address of the organiser or, in the case of a legal entity or organisation, its legal representative\*:
2. Title of citizens' initiative\*:
3. Commission registration number\*:
4. Date of registration\*:
5. Date of request for a decision on admissibility\*:
6. Number of signatories coming from [name of MS]\*:
7. Annexes\*:  
(Include all statements of support from signatories)

*relevant certificate(s) certifying that the conformity of the online collection system with Regulation xxxx/xxxx)*

8. Date and signature of the organiser\*:  
\*: mandatory fields

8. Date and signature of the organiser\*:  
\*: mandatory fields

Or. en

*Justification*

*Some EU Member States do not issue identity cards for their citizens, therefore, the usage of citizenship would be more suitable. Moreover, since the Commission should set up and manage a central website, the verification of conformity by Member States is no longer required.*