



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Brussels, 14.2.2022

C(2022) 998 final

Mr Peter Teffer
Ekko Voorkamer
Bemuurde Weerd WZ 3
3513 BH Utrecht
The Netherlands

**DECISION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION PURSUANT TO ARTICLE 4 OF THE
IMPLEMENTING RULES TO REGULATION (EC) No 1049/2001¹**

**Subject: Your confirmatory application for access to documents under
Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 – GESTDEM 2021/8028**

Dear Mr Teffer,

I refer to your e-mail of 12 January 2022, registered on 14 January 2022, in which you submitted a confirmatory application in accordance with Article 7(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 regarding public access to European Parliament, Council and Commission documents² (hereafter ‘Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001’).

1. SCOPE OF YOUR REQUEST

In your initial application of 3 December 2021, addressed to the Directorate-General for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries of the European Commission (hereinafter ‘DG MARE’), you requested access to ‘documents which contain the following information: The European Commission letter with reference number Ares (2012) 722661’, specifying that ‘[a]ccording to [your] information, the letter with recommendations was dated 18 June 2012’.

In its reply of 11 January 2022, DG MARE informed you that it had identified the following document as the one falling within the scope of your initial application: ‘letter with reference number Ares (2012)722661 of 18 June 2012 “Follow up of the 2011 Annual Control Report for Operational Programme ‘Perspectieven voor een duurzame

¹ OJ L 345, 29.12.2001, p. 94.

² OJ L 145, 31.5.2001, p. 43.

visserij' (CCI2007 NL14 FPO 001)”, which consists of a letter to the EFF Certifying Authority and one Annex’.

Based on its examination under the relevant provisions of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001, DG MARE, in its initial reply, granted you wide partial access to the document concerned, deeming certain parts thereof eligible for protection under applicable exceptions to the right of access to documents, as laid down in the following provisions of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001:

- Article 4(1)(b) (protection of the privacy and integrity of the individual),
- Article 4(2), first indent (protection of commercial interests of a natural or legal person).

In your confirmatory application, you request a review of this position, claiming that ‘the exception based on article 4(2)[, first indent of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001] is overridden by [...] greater public interest’.

2. ASSESSMENT AND CONCLUSIONS UNDER REGULATION (EC) No 1049/2001

When assessing a confirmatory application for access to documents submitted pursuant to Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001, the Secretariat-General conducts a review of the reply given by the Directorate-General concerned at the initial stage, without constraint from previous statement of position by the competent services.

Following this review, I can inform you that further partial access is given to the documents requested with the exclusion of those parts that are redacted on the basis of the exception laid down in Article 4(1)(b) (protection of privacy and the integrity of the individual) of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001.

Protection of privacy and the integrity of the individual

Article 4(1)(b) of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 provides that ‘[t]he institutions shall refuse access to a document where disclosure would undermine the protection of [...] privacy and the integrity of the individual, in particular in accordance with Community legislation regarding the protection of personal data’.

In its judgment in Case C-28/08 P (*Bavarian Lager*)³, the Court of Justice ruled that when a request is made for access to documents containing personal data, Regulation (EC) No 45/2001 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2000 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data by the Community institutions and bodies and on the free movement of such data⁴ (hereafter ‘Regulation (EC) No 45/2001’) becomes fully applicable.

³ Judgment of the Court of Justice of 29 June 2010, *European Commission v The Bavarian Lager Co. Ltd* (hereafter referred to as ‘*European Commission v The Bavarian Lager* judgment’), C-28/08 P, EU:C:2010:378, paragraph 59.

⁴ OJ L 8, 12.1.2001, p. 1.

Please note that, as from 11 December 2018, Regulation (EC) No 45/2001 has been repealed by Regulation (EU) 2018/1725 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2018 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data by the Union institutions, bodies, offices and agencies and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Regulation (EC) No 45/2001 and Decision No 1247/2002/EC⁵ (hereafter ‘Regulation (EU) 2018/1725’).

However, the case law issued with regard to Regulation (EC) No 45/2001 remains relevant for the interpretation of Regulation (EU) 2018/1725.

In the above-mentioned judgment, the Court stated that Article 4(1)(b) of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 ‘requires that any undermining of privacy and the integrity of the individual must always be examined and assessed in conformity with the legislation of the Union concerning the protection of personal data, and in particular with [...] [the Data Protection] Regulation’⁶.

Article 3(1) of Regulation (EU) 2018/1725 provides that personal data ‘means any information relating to an identified or identifiable natural person [...]’.

As the Court of Justice confirmed in Case C-465/00 (*Rechnungshof*), ‘there is no reason of principle to justify excluding activities of a professional [...] nature from the notion of private life’⁷.

The documents concerned contains personal data such as the names and initials of persons who do not form part of the senior management of the European Commission.

The names⁸ of the persons concerned as well as other data from which their identity can be deduced undoubtedly constitute personal data in the meaning of Article 3(1) of Regulation (EU) 2018/1725.

Pursuant to Article 9(1)(b) of Regulation (EU) 2018/1725, ‘personal data shall only be transmitted to recipients established in the Union other than Union institutions and bodies if ‘[t]he recipient establishes that it is necessary to have the data transmitted for a specific purpose in the public interest and the controller, where there is any reason to assume that the data subject’s legitimate interests might be prejudiced, establishes that it is proportionate to transmit the personal data for that specific purpose after having demonstrably weighed the various competing interests’.

Only if these conditions are fulfilled and the processing constitutes lawful processing in accordance with the requirements of Article 5 of Regulation (EU) 2018/1725, can the transmission of personal data occur.

⁵ OJ L 295, 21.11.2018, p. 39.

⁶ *European Commission v The Bavarian Lager* judgment, cited above, paragraph 59.

⁷ Judgment of the Court of Justice of 20 May 2003, *Rechnungshof and Others v Österreichischer Rundfunk*, Joined Cases C-465/00, C-138/01 and C-139/01, EU:C:2003:294, paragraph 73.

⁸ *European Commission v The Bavarian Lager* judgment, cited above, paragraph 68.

In Case C-615/13 P (*ClientEarth*), the Court of Justice ruled that the institution does not have to examine by itself the existence of a need for transferring personal data⁹. This is also clear from Article 9(1)(b) of Regulation (EU) 2018/1725, which requires that the necessity to have the personal data transmitted must be established by the recipient.

According to Article 9(1)(b) of Regulation (EU) 2018/1725, the European Commission has to examine the further conditions for the lawful processing of personal data only if the first condition is fulfilled, namely if the recipient establishes that it is necessary to have the data transmitted for a specific purpose in the public interest. It is only in this case that the European Commission has to examine whether there is a reason to assume that the data subject's legitimate interests might be prejudiced and, in the affirmative, establish the proportionality of the transmission of the personal data for that specific purpose after having demonstrably weighed the various competing interests.

In your confirmatory application, you do not put forward any arguments to establish the necessity to have the data transmitted for a specific purpose in the public interest. Therefore, the European Commission does not have to examine whether there is a reason to assume that the data subjects' legitimate interests might be prejudiced.

Notwithstanding the above, there are reasons to assume that the legitimate interests of the data subjects concerned would be prejudiced by the disclosure of the personal data reflected in the documents, as there is a real and non-hypothetical risk that such public disclosure would harm their privacy and subject them to unsolicited external contacts.

Consequently, I conclude that, pursuant to Article 4(1)(b) of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001, access cannot be granted to the personal data, as the need to obtain access thereto for a purpose in the public interest has not been substantiated and there is no reason to think that the legitimate interests of the individuals concerned would not be prejudiced by the disclosure of the personal data concerned.

3. OVERRIDING PUBLIC INTEREST IN DISCLOSURE

The exceptions laid down in Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 must be waived if there is an overriding public interest in disclosure. Such an interest must, firstly, be public and, secondly, outweigh the harm caused by disclosure. However, Article 4(1)(b) of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 does not include the possibility for the exception defined therein to be set aside by an overriding public interest.

4. PARTIAL ACCESS


In accordance with Article 4(6) of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001, further partial access has been granted to the documents requested. No further partial access can be granted without undermining the interest protected by Article 4(1)(b) (protection of privacy and the integrity of the individual) of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001.

⁹ Judgment of the Court of Justice of 16 July 2015, *ClientEarth v European Food Safety Agency*, C-615/13 P, EU:C:2015:489, paragraph 47.

5. MEANS OF REDRESS

Finally, I draw your attention to the means of redress available against this decision. You may either bring proceedings before the General Court or file a complaint with the European Ombudsman under the conditions specified respectively in Articles 263 and 228 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.

Yours sincerely,



For the Commission
Ilze JUHANSONE
Secretary-General

Enclosures: 2 (letter to the EFF Certifying Authority and the Annex)