





In view of the [amendments](#) tabled to the [Draft Report on the Prevention of radicalisation and recruitment of European citizens by terrorist organisations](#), European Digital Rights (EDRi) would like to comment on the proposed amendments that fall within our scope of work.

The left column repeats the draft report; the right column contains the amendments proposed by the members of the Civil liberties Committee (LIBE).

For ease of reading, the headings are highlighted and marked with colours and symbols as follows:

 **green** (++) for amendments we welcome;

 **yellow** (+) for amendments which pursue good aims, but could benefit from further suggested improvements;

 **red** (-) for amendments which in our view should be reconsidered;  
**grey** for amendments in which EDRi does not have a position. **Omitted** amendments must be understood as not falling within our scope of work.

A short justification is given below each amendment, when relevant.

## SUMMARY

### EDRi Support for Amendments tabled to the Draft Report on the Prevention of radicalisation and recruitment of European citizens by terrorist groups

	N	Amendments N		
		Supported	Opposed	Mixed Position
Citation	<b>15 a (new)</b>		7,8	
	<b>16 a (new)</b>	9		
	<b>10 a (new)</b>	10		
	<b>14 a (new)</b>		11,12	
Recital	<b>A</b>	17, 18		
	<b>A a (new)</b>			21
	<b>B a (new)</b>	44		
	<b>D</b>	66		67
	<b>E</b>	70		75
	<b>F</b>	77	80	
	<b>G</b>	90, 92	91, 93, 95	
	<b>G a (new)</b>	98	100	
	<b>H a (new)</b>	99		
	<b>H</b>	102, 103, 105, 106	104	101
Paragraph	<b>1</b>	120, 124		
	<b>1 a (new)</b>	131		
	<b>3</b>	157		158
	<b>3 point 1 (new)</b>			159
	<b>3 a (new)</b>	160		
	<b>3 point 3 (new)</b>	162		
Subheading	<b>III</b>	215, 217	216	218
Paragraph	<b>7 a (new)</b>		219	
	<b>8</b>	220, 221, 229, 230, 231, 236	225, 226, 228, 234, 235, 238, 241	222, 223, 224, 227, 232, 237, 239, 242
	<b>8 a (new)</b>	244		243
	<b>9</b>	245, 253, 254, 266	248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 255, 256, 258, 260, 261, 262, 263, 265	246, 247, 257, 259
	<b>9 a (new)</b>		267	

		<b>Supported</b>	<b>Opposed</b>	<b>Mixed Position</b>
	<b>10</b>	268, 269, 270, 272	279, 282	271, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 280, 283
	<b>10 subpara 1 (new)</b>	284		
	<b>11</b>	285, 286, 287, 288, 290, 291	292, 294, 295	289, 293, 296, 297, 299
	<b>12</b>	300, 301, 304, 305	302, 303	
	<b>13</b>	306, 307, 308, 309	311, 314, 316, 317, 319, 320, 321	310, 312, 313, 315, 318
	<b>13 subpara 1 (new)</b>	322		
	<b>14</b>	324, 325, 329, 334,	328, 330, 332	326, 327
	<b>14 a (new)</b>	335, 336, 337		
	<b>14 b (new)</b>	338		
	<b>17 b (new)</b>	407		
	<b>20</b>	433, 434, 436	439, 440	435, 437, 442, 443
	<b>21</b>	456, 457, 458, 459, 460	462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467	
	<b>21 a (new)</b>	469		
	<b>22</b>	476	470, 475, 477, 478, 479, 480	471, 474, 481, 482
	<b>23</b>	483, 485, 486, 487	488	490
	<b>24 b (new)</b>	506		
	<b>25</b>	507, 508, 512		
	<b>25 b (new)</b>	517		
	<b>26</b>	523, 525, 526, 527, 528	531, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538	
	<b>28</b>	556	560, 561, 562	
	<b>28 a (new)</b>		565	
	<b>29</b>	567		568
	<b>31 a (new)</b>	592		
Subheading	<b>X a (new)</b>	634		
Paragraph	<b>35</b>		638	
	<b>35 a (new)</b>		644	

## DETAILED ANALYSIS

(...)



### Amendment 7

**Caterina Chinnici, Goffredo Maria Bettini, Ana Gomes**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Citation 15 a (new)**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
	<b>- having regard to the conclusions of the Justice and Home Affairs Council of 12 and 13 March 2015,</b>
<p>Comments: Such conclusions were provisional and needed an update in June 2015. In addition, <a href="#">these conclusions</a> ask for the conclusion of the EU PNR Directive, which poses <a href="#">serious risks to fundamental rights</a>. PNR is neither necessary nor proportionate and it will not be effective for the purposes of fighting against terrorism, as <a href="#">evidence has demonstrated</a>. The Parliament, as an independent political institution, is under no obligation to uncritically accept statements from other institutions.</p>	

Or. it



### Amendment 8

**Gérard Deprez, Louis Michel, Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz, Nathalie Griesbeck, Petr Ježek**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Citation 15 a (new)**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
	<b>- having regard to the JHA Council of 12 and 13 March 2015,</b>
	<i>(At this meeting, the Ministers decided to set up within Europol a European unit tasked with flagging content on the internet).</i>
<p>Comments: Same comments as above.</p>	

Or. fr



### Amendment 9


**Gérard Deprez, Louis Michel, Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz, Nathalie Griesbeck, Petr Ježek**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Citation 16 a (new)**


SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
	<b>- having regard to the additional protocol to the Council of Europe Convention on the Prevention of Terrorism and the Council of Europe's action plan on the fight against violent extremism and radicalisation leading to terrorism adopted on 19 May 2015.</b>
<p>Comments: These documents are of importance as they refer to the need to respect human rights when implementing measures to prevent and fight against terrorism. As it is an international legal instrument, it should be acknowledged.</p>	

Or. fr

-  **Amendment 10**  
**Jean Lambert**  
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group  
**Ana Gomes**  
on behalf of the S&D Group  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Citation 10 a (new)**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
	<b>- having regard to the Additional Protocol to the Council of Europe Convention on the Prevention of Terrorism Adopted by the Committee of Ministers at its 125th Session on 19 May 2015</b>
Comments: Same comments as above.	

Or. en

-  **Amendment 11**  
**Christine Revault D'Allonnes Bonnefoy, Ana Gomes**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Citation 14 a (new)**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
	<b>- having regard to its resolution of 11 February 2015 on anti-terrorism measures (2015/2530 (RSP)),</b>
Comments: Whereas the fight against terrorism is an important public policy objective, this ambiguous resolution asks, <i>inter alia</i> , for the "finalisation" of EU PNR Directive. <a href="#">Unproven, ineffective strategies are not security.</a>	


Or. fr

-  **Amendment 12**  
**Gérard Deprez, Louis Michel, Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz, Nathalie Griesbeck, Petr Ježek**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Citation 14 a (new)**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
	<b>- having regard to its resolution of 11 February 2015 on anti-terrorism measures</b>
Comments: We refer to comments to AM 11.	

Or. fr

(...)

-  **Amendment 17**  
**Barbara Spinelli**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Recital A**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
A. whereas <b>more than</b> 5000 European citizens have joined terrorist organisations, particularly ISIS (Da'esh) in Iraq and Syria;	A. whereas <b>it is estimated that</b> 5000 European citizens have joined terrorist organisations, particularly ISIS (Da'esh) in

<b><i>whereas this phenomenon is speeding up and taking on significant proportions;</i></b>	Iraq and Syria;
Comments: It is difficult to estimate the exact number of terrorists and surely one terrorist is already significant.	

Or. en



**Amendment 18**

**Jean Lambert**

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

**Motion for a resolution**

**Recital A**

<b>SUPPORT</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
A. whereas more than 5000 European citizens have joined terrorist organisations, particularly ISIS (Da'esh) in Iraq and Syria; whereas <b><i>this phenomenon is speeding up and taking on significant proportions;</i></b>	A. whereas more than 5000 European citizens have joined terrorist organisations, particularly ISIS (Da'esh) in Iraq and Syria; whereas <b><i>such individuals are known as foreign fighters</i></b>
Comments: Same comments as above.	

Or. en

(...)



**Amendment 21**

**Jean Lambert**

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

**Ana Gomes**

on behalf of the S&D Group

**Motion for a resolution**

**Recital A a (new)**

<b>MIXED POSITION</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
	<b><i>Aa. Whereas radicalisation has become a term used to describe the phenomenon of people embracing intolerant opinions, views and ideas which could lead to violent extremism</i></b>
Comments: If the report talks about radicalisation, it is important to define it. In this sense, all references to "radicalisation" should be substituted for "violent extremism" or "terrorist radicalisation", as many amendments suggest, such as AM 67, 70 or 75.	

Or. en

(...)



**Amendment 44**

**Christine Revault D'Allonnes Bonnefoy, Ana Gomes**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Recital B a (new)**

<b>SUPPORT</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
	<b><i>Ba. whereas the European Union and its Member States have a responsibility and duty to protect European citizens while guaranteeing that their fundamental rights and individual freedoms are respected in the development and</i></b>

	<i>implementation of security policies;</i>
Comments: Human rights and fundamental freedoms are essential in a democratic society.	

Or. fr

(...)



### Amendment 66

Louis Michel, Gérard Deprez, Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz

Motion for a resolution

Recital D

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
D. whereas a number of instruments already exist in Europe to address the radicalisation of European citizens and whereas the European Union and its Member States should show they are making full use of these;	D. whereas a number of instruments already exist in Europe to address the radicalisation of European citizens and whereas the European Union and its Member States should show they are making full use of these; <b><i>whereas, given the increasing significance of terrorist radicalisation, which is in total contradiction with European values, new means must be implemented, and this must take place in compliance with the Charter of Fundamental Rights;</i></b>
Comments: Respecting human rights and fundamental freedoms is crucial.	

Or. fr



### Amendment 67

Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz, Louis Michel, Gérard Deprez

Motion for a resolution

Recital D

MIXED POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
D. whereas a number of instruments already exist in Europe to address the radicalisation of European citizens and whereas the European Union and its Member States should show they are making full use of these;	D. whereas a number of instruments already exist in Europe to address the <b><i>terrorist</i></b> radicalisation of European citizens and whereas the European Union and its Member States should show they are making full use of these;
Comments: Other amendments are more comprehensive, but it goes in the right direction. See comments to AM 21.	

Or. en

(...)



### Amendment 70

Sophia in 't Veld

Motion for a resolution

Recital E

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
E. whereas the extent to which the state assumes responsibility for the risk of <b><i>radicalisation</i></b> can vary greatly from one Member State to another; whereas, while some Member States have already taken	E. whereas the extent to which the state assumes responsibility for the risk of <b><i>violent extremism</i></b> can vary greatly from one Member State to another; whereas, while some Member States have already

effective measures, others are lagging behind in their action to tackle this phenomenon;	taken effective measures, others are lagging behind in their action to tackle this phenomenon;
Comments: See comments to AM 21.	

Or. en

(...)



**Amendment 75**

**Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz, Gérard Deprez, Louis Michel**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Recital E**

MIXED POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
E. whereas the extent to which the state assumes responsibility for the risk of radicalisation can vary greatly from one Member State to another; whereas, while some Member States have already taken effective measures, others are lagging behind in their action to tackle this phenomenon;	E. whereas the extent to which the state assumes responsibility for the risk of <b>terrorist</b> radicalisation can vary greatly from one Member State to another; whereas, while some Member States have already taken effective measures, others are lagging behind in their action to tackle this phenomenon;
Comments: Other amendments are more comprehensive, but it goes in the right direction. See comments to AM 21.	

Or. en

(...)



**Amendment 77**

**Sophia in 't Veld**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Recital F**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
F. whereas European action is required as a matter of urgency to prevent <b>the radicalisation</b> and recruitment of European citizens in order to contain this growing phenomenon so as to stem the flow of departures by European citizens to conflict zones and prevent other terrorist acts from being committed on European soil;	F. whereas European action is required as a matter of urgency to prevent <b>violent extremism</b> and recruitment of European citizens in order to contain this growing phenomenon so as to stem the flow of departures by European citizens to conflict zones and prevent other terrorist acts from being committed on European soil;
See comments to AM 21.	

Or. en

(...)



**Amendment 80**

**Emil Radev**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Recital F**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
F. whereas European action is required as a matter of urgency to prevent the radicalisation and recruitment of European citizens in order to contain this growing	F. whereas European action, <b>including greater cooperation between the Member States and with civil society organisations and IT companies</b> , is required as a matter



phenomenon so as to stem the flow of departures by European citizens to conflict zones and prevent other terrorist acts from being committed on European soil;	of urgency to prevent the radicalisation and recruitment of European citizens in order to contain this growing phenomenon so as to stem the flow of departures by European citizens to conflict zones and prevent other terrorist acts from being committed on European soil;
Comments: It is far from clear what type of “cooperation and what kinds of “IT companies” are meant in this amendment.	

Or. en

(...)

### Amendment 89

Sophia in 't Veld

Motion for a resolution

Recital G

NO POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
G. whereas <b><i>the important thing now is to put greater stress on</i></b> preventive rather than reactive measures to address <b><i>the radicalisation</i></b> of European citizens <b><i>and their recruitment</i></b> by terrorist organisations;	G. whereas <b><i>it is needed to invest in</i></b> preventive rather than reactive measures to address <b><i>violent extremism and the recruitment</i></b> of European citizens by terrorist organisations;
Comments: The amendment improves the wording of that paragraph as it changes "radicalisation" for "violent extremism". However, the amendment paragraph falls outside our scope of work.	

Or. en



### Amendment 90

Barbara Spinelli, Kostas Chrysogonos, Malin Björk

Motion for a resolution

Recital G

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
G. whereas the important thing now is to put greater stress on preventive rather than reactive measures to address the <b><i>radicalisation</i></b> of European citizens and their recruitment by terrorist organisations;	G. whereas the important thing now is to put greater stress on preventive rather than reactive measures to address the <b><i>violent extremism</i></b> of European citizens and their recruitment by terrorist organisations;
Comments: The amendment is in line with the previous one.	

Or. en



### Amendment 91

Timothy Kirkhope

on behalf of the ECR Group


Motion for a resolution

Recital G

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
G. whereas <b><i>the important thing now is to put greater stress on preventive rather than reactive measures</i></b> to address the radicalisation of European citizens and	G. whereas <b><i>a set of complimentary preventative and reactive measures are needed in order to</i></b> address the radicalisation of European citizens and


their recruitment by terrorist organisations;	their recruitment by terrorist organisations;
Comments: It is not clear to whom the compliments should be paid – it would be perhaps more logical to have complementary measures. The original wording deleted was better than the wording introduced by this amendment.	

Or. en

 **Amendment 92**  
**Christine Revault D'Allonnes Bonnefoy**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Recital G**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
G. whereas the important thing now is to put greater stress on preventive rather than <b>reactive</b> measures to address the radicalisation of European citizens and their recruitment by terrorist organisations;	G. whereas the important thing now is to put greater stress on preventive rather than <b>repressive</b> measures to address the radicalisation of European citizens and their recruitment by terrorist organisations;
Comments: This amendment makes it clearer what reactive means.	

Or. fr

 **Amendment 93**  
**Kristina Winberg**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Recital G**


OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
G. whereas the important thing now is to put greater stress on preventive <b>rather than</b> reactive measures to address the radicalisation of European citizens and their recruitment by terrorist organisations;	G. whereas the important thing now is to put greater stress on preventive <b>as well as</b> reactive measures to address the radicalisation of European citizens and their recruitment by terrorist organisations;
Comments: The Quilliam Foundation has conducted research showing that positive measures "are much more effective in challenging extremist ideologies". Cf. Hussain, G. and Saltman, E.M., Jihad Trending. A Comprehensive Analysis of Online Extremism and How to Counter it, Quilliam Foundation, available at <a href="http://www.quilliamfoundation.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/publications/free/jihad-trending-quilliam-report.pdf">http://www.quilliamfoundation.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/publications/free/jihad-trending-quilliam-report.pdf</a> .	

Or. en

**Amendment 94**  
**Anna Hedh, Soraya Post**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Recital G**

NO POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
G. whereas the important thing now is to put greater stress on preventive rather than reactive measures to address the radicalisation of European citizens and their recruitment by terrorist organisations;	G. whereas the important thing now is to put greater stress on preventive rather than reactive measures to address the radicalisation of European citizens and their recruitment by terrorist organisations; <b>whereas such preventive measures should include enhancing social inclusion and combating racism;</b>
Comments: The AM falls outside our scope of work.	

Or. en

 **Amendment 95**  
**Franz Obermayr**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Recital G**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
G. whereas the important thing <b>now</b> is to put <b>greater</b> stress <b>on preventive rather than reactive</b> measures to address the radicalisation of European citizens and their recruitment by <b>terrorist</b> organisations;	G. whereas the important thing is to put stress on <b>preventive as well as repressive</b> measures to address the radicalisation of European citizens and their recruitment by <b>Islamist</b> organisations;
Comments: The Quilliam Foundation has conducted research showing that positive measures "are much more effective in challenging extremist ideologies". Cf. Hussain, G. and Saltman, E.M., Jihad Trending. A Comprehensive Analysis of Online Extremism and How to Counter it, Quilliam Foundation, available at <a href="http://www.quilliamfoundation.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/publications/free/jihad-trending-quilliam-report.pdf">http://www.quilliamfoundation.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/publications/free/jihad-trending-quilliam-report.pdf</a> .	


Or. de

(...)

 **Amendment 98**  
**Christine Revault D'Allonnes Bonnefoy, Ana Gomes**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Recital G a (new)**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
	<b>Ga. whereas the prevention of radicalisation cannot be based on a repressive approach; whereas, on the contrary, it must be carried out on a case-by-case basis, through dialogue, trust and listening, and the condemnation of resorting to violence as opposed to the condemnation of an idea or opinion; whereas it must be based, first and foremost, on education, integration and the emancipation of individuals, as well as on the fight against discrimination;</b>
Comments: This is an <u>evidence-based</u> approach.	


Or. fr

 **Amendment 99**  
**Jean Lambert**  
 on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group  
**Ana Gomes**  
 on behalf of the S&D Group  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Recital H a (new)**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
	<b>Ha. whereas the important thing now is to put greater stress on preventive rather than reactive measures to address the active support of European citizens for</b>


	<i>illegal acts of violence and their recruitment by terrorist organisations;</i>
Comments: We agree on this approach, as <a href="#">evidence has shown</a> .	

Or. en

-  **Amendment 100**  
**Nadine Morano**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Recital G a (new)**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
	<i>Ga. Whereas certain Internet usage is conducive to radicalisation, enabling fanatics throughout the world to connect with each other and recruit vulnerable individuals without any physical contact whatsoever and in a manner that is difficult to trace.</i>
Comments: According to <a href="#">research conducted by the Quilliam Foundation</a> , radicalisation and recruitment online "with little or no relation to the outside world rarely happens". In fact, active recruitment of people on the Internet requires one-person contact. The internet could be a facilitator of "radicalisation", but to assert it happens through the Internet alone "is questionable", the report found. Thus, this amendment should be opposed.	

Or. fr

-  **Amendment 101**  
**Timothy Kirkhope**  
on behalf of the ECR Group  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Recital H**

MIXED POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
H. whereas <i>it is essential that</i> fundamental rights <i>and civil liberties be respected in all measures undertaken by the European Union</i> ; whereas <i>the security of European citizens is not incompatible with guaranteeing their freedoms</i> ; whereas, <i>indeed, these two principles are two sides of the same coin</i> ;	H. whereas <i>the Charter of Fundamental Rights guarantees the right to liberty and to security</i> ; whereas <i>these two principles must be balanced and work side by side in policies and initiatives in the prevention of radicalisation and the fight against terrorism</i> ;
Comments: Security and human rights are not mutually exclusive. However, the original wording of this paragraph is preferable, as no matter what security measure or policy is adopted, it must comply with human right standards. The contrary leads to what internet expert Bruce Schneier called "security theatre": <a href="https://www.schneier.com/essays/archives/2009/11/beyond_security_thea.html">https://www.schneier.com/essays/archives/2009/11/beyond_security_thea.html</a> .	


Or. en

-  **Amendment 102**  
**Ana Gomes, Jean Lambert, Birgit Sippel, Caterina Chinnici, Rachida Dati**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Recital H**

<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
H. whereas it is essential that fundamental	H. whereas it is essential that fundamental


rights and civil liberties be respected in all measures undertaken by the European Union; whereas the security of European citizens <b>is not incompatible with guaranteeing their freedoms</b> ; whereas, indeed, these two principles are two sides of the same coin;	rights and civil liberties be respected in all measures undertaken by the European Union <b>and Member States, namely the right to private life, the right to data protection, presumption of innocence, the right to a fair trial and due process, freedom of expression and freedom of religion</b> ; whereas the security of European citizens <b>must preserve their civil and political rights and freedoms</b> ; whereas, indeed, these two principles are two sides of the same coin;
Comments: This amendment helps to clarify which human rights and fundamental freedoms are affected by any counter-terrorism measure.	

Or. en

 **Amendment 103**  
**Barbara Spinelli, Kostas Chrysogonos**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Recital H**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
H. whereas it is essential that fundamental rights and civil liberties be respected in all measures undertaken by the European Union; whereas the security of European citizens <b>is not incompatible with guaranteeing their freedoms; whereas, indeed, these two principles are two sides of the same coin;</b>	H. whereas it is essential that fundamental rights and civil liberties be respected in all measures undertaken by the European Union <b>and the Member States</b> ; whereas the security of European citizens <b>must preserve their liberties, by respecting international standards of fundamental rights</b>
Comments: This amendment further stresses the need to respect fundamental rights. It should therefore be supported.	

Or. en

 **Amendment 104**  
**Frank Engel**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Recital H**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
H. whereas it is essential that fundamental rights and civil liberties be respected in all measures undertaken by the European Union; whereas the security of European citizens is not incompatible with guaranteeing their freedoms; <b>whereas, indeed, these two principles are two sides of the same coin;</b>	H. whereas it is essential that fundamental rights and civil liberties be respected in all measures undertaken by the European Union; whereas the security of European citizens is not incompatible with guaranteeing their freedoms;
Comments: The amendment deletes an important element of the paragraph. Security is a valid and important public policy objective. However, it cannot be used as an excuse to override fundamental rights. Otherwise, it leads to what internet expert Bruce Schneier called "security theatre": <a href="https://www.schneier.com/essays/archives/2009/11/beyond_security_thea.html">https://www.schneier.com/essays/archives/2009/11/beyond_security_thea.html</a> .	

Or. fr

**+ Amendment 105**  
**Christine Revault D'Allonnes Bonnefoy**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Recital H**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
H. whereas <b><i>it is essential that</i></b> fundamental rights and civil liberties be respected in all measures undertaken by the European Union; whereas the security of European citizens is not incompatible with guaranteeing their freedoms; whereas, indeed, these two principles are two sides of the same coin;	H. whereas <b><i>respecting the rule of law is a prerequisite for the protection of</i></b> fundamental rights and civil liberties, <b><i>and it must be inherent</i></b> in all <b><i>security</i></b> measures undertaken by the European Union <b><i>and its Member States</i></b> ; whereas the security of European citizens is not incompatible with guaranteeing their freedoms; whereas, indeed, these two principles are two sides of the same coin;
Comments: This amendment adds value to the original wording.	

Or. fr

**+ Amendment 106**  
**Anna Maria Corazza Bildt, Carlos Coelho, Monica Macovei, Barbara Matera, Traian Ungureanu, Kinga Gál, Alessandra Mussolini**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Recital H**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
H. whereas it is essential that fundamental rights and civil liberties be respected in all measures undertaken by the European Union; whereas the security of European citizens is not incompatible with guaranteeing their freedoms; whereas, indeed, these two principles are two sides of the same coin;	H. whereas it is essential that fundamental rights and civil liberties be respected in all measures undertaken by the <b><i>Member States and the</i></b> European Union; whereas the security of European citizens is not incompatible with guaranteeing their freedoms; whereas, indeed, these two principles are two sides of the same coin;
Comments: Same comment as above.	

Or. en

(...)

**+ Amendment 120**  
**Barbara Spinelli, Kostas Chrysogonos**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 1**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
1. Calls on the Commission to <b><i>establish as quickly as possible a global strategy to prevent the</i></b> radicalisation and recruitment <b><i>of European citizens</i></b> , taking into account all vectors of <b><i>radicalisation</i></b> , on the basis of the exchange of best practice within the European Union and the evaluation of measures undertaken in the Member States; takes the view that the Commission should	1. Calls on the Commission to <b><i>evaluate the effectiveness and impact of the ongoing EU Strategy for Combating</i></b> Radicalisation and Recruitment, taking into account all vectors of <b><i>violent extremism</i></b> , on the basis of the exchange of best practice within the European Union and the evaluation of measures undertaken in the Member States, <b><i>including the February</i></b>



<p>develop an intensive communication strategy on preventing the <b>radicalisation and</b> recruitment of European citizens by terrorist organisations;</p>	<p><b>2015 Washington Summit on Countering Violent Extremism</b>; takes the view that the Commission should develop an intensive communication strategy on preventing the <b>spread of violent extremism and the</b> recruitment of European citizens by terrorist organisations; <b>recommends for this purpose the significant implication of civil society organisations, religious or not, which are holding experience and expertise to prevent the spread of violent extremism. Consultation and participation of civil society should be without prejudice to those NGOs which do not want to participate in such efforts.</b></p>
<p>Comments: As <a href="#">shown by the Quilliam Foundation</a>, effective counter-terrorism measures must involve the public and private sector as well as civil society organisations.</p>	

Or. en

(...)



#### Amendment 124

Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz, Petr Ježek

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 1

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>1. Calls on the Commission to establish as quickly as possible a global strategy to prevent the radicalisation and recruitment of European citizens, taking into account all vectors of <b>radicalisation</b>, on the basis of the exchange of best practice within the European Union and the evaluation of measures undertaken in the Member States; takes the view that the Commission should develop an <b>intensive</b> communication strategy on preventing the radicalisation and recruitment of European citizens by terrorist organisations;</p>	<p>1. Calls on the Commission to establish as quickly as possible a global strategy to prevent the radicalisation and recruitment of European citizens <b>as well as non-EU nationals living in Europe</b>, taking into account all vectors of <b>this process</b>, on the basis of the exchange of best practice within the European Union and the evaluation of measures undertaken in the Member States; takes the view that the Commission should <b>promote an effective participation of civil society organisations, as well as the consultation and exchange of good practices with organisations with experience on the field of terrorist radicalisation, and</b> develop an <b>effective</b> communication strategy on preventing the radicalisation and recruitment of European citizens by terrorist organisations;</p>
<p>Comments: Same comments as for AM 120.</p>	

Or. en

**+** Amendment 131  
**Barbara Spinelli, Kostas Chrysogonos**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 1 a (new)**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
	<b><i>1a. Requests the full disclosure of the EU Council Action plans and guidelines on the ongoing EU Strategy for Combating Radicalisation and Recruitment to Terrorism;</i></b>
Comments: Transparency, which leads to enhanced public participation, is a principle of good administration.	

Or. en

**+** Amendment 157  
**Barbara Spinelli, Kostas Chrysogonos**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 3**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
3. Stresses the importance of making the fullest use of existing instruments to combat the <b><i>radicalisation and</i></b> recruitment of European citizens by terrorist organisations; recommends that more use should be made of European funds to that end; stresses the major role which can be played by the Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN) in taking on this objective <b><i>of stamping out the radicalisation of European citizens;</i></b>	3. Stresses the importance of making the fullest use of existing instruments to <b><i>address the primary causes, to prevent and</i></b> combat the <b><i>spread of violent extremism and the</i></b> recruitment of European citizens by <b><i>violent extremist and</i></b> terrorist organisations; recommends that more use should be made of European funds to that end, <b><i>including an important provision of funds in order to promote social, economic, housing and living inclusion and strengthen the education system and its capacity building;</i></b> stresses the major role which can be played by the Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN) in taking on this objective; <b><i>recommends the RAN to consult and draw on the expertise and grassroots experience of different communities and especially youth NGOs across Europe and look at "radicalization" in a comprehensive way to include all forms of violent extremism, as part of a complex phenomenon.</i></b>
Comments: Although most of the amendment falls outside EDRi's scope of work, we support the recommendation for the RAN to engage with civil society.	

Or. en



**Amendment 158****Angel Dzhambazki****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 3**

<b>MIXED POSITION</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>3. Stresses the importance of making the fullest use of existing instruments to combat the radicalisation and recruitment of European citizens by terrorist organisations; recommends that more use should be made of European funds to that end; stresses the major role which can be played by the Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN) in taking on this objective of stamping out the radicalisation of European citizens;</p>	<p>3. Stresses the importance of making the fullest use of existing instruments to combat the radicalisation and recruitment of European citizens by terrorist organisations; recommends that more use should be made of European funds to that end; stresses the major role which can be played by the Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN) in taking on this objective of stamping out the radicalisation of European citizens; <b><i>calls on the Commission to further strengthen the Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN), inter alia by enhancing access to information and concrete cooperation between stakeholders on anti-radicalisation.</i></b></p>
<p>Comments: The RAN is focused on education and counter-terrorism messaging. The RAN already collaborates with stakeholders, so it is not obvious what this amendment tries to achieve.</p>	

Or. en

**Amendment 159****Caterina Chinnici, Goffredo Maria Bettini, Ana Gomes****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 3 – point 1 (new)**

<b>MIXED POSITION</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
	<p><b><i>1. Par. 4 – Feels, however, that it is vital to find a correct balance between public safety and respect for the fundamental rights of individuals, including the right to privacy, the right to the protection of sensitive personal data and the right to freedom of expression and association, especially in the light of the recent ruling by the Court of Justice concerning the Data Retention Directive;</i></b></p>
<p>Comments: This amendment may be interpreted as saying that <i>fundamental</i> rights recognised by our society can be undermined. It appears that the amendment intended to say “ensure public safety while respecting the fundamental rights... etc”. .</p>	

Or. it



**Amendment 160**  
**Tanja Fajon**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 3 a (new)**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
	<b><i>3a. Reiterates that human rights should be at the core of the counter terrorism and prevention of radicalisation policies of the Union while ensuring that security, human rights and law enforcement are not mutually exclusive but complementary; the EU policies, including development aid, should strive to promote good governance, human rights, fighting economic inequalities, poverty and providing education in order to fight the root causes of radicalisation;</i></b>
Comments: This amendment goes in line with the previous amendment.	

Or. en



**Amendment 162**  
**Caterina Chinnici, Goffredo Maria Bettini, Ana Gomes**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 3 – point 3 (new)**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
	<b><i>(3) Par. 6 – Stresses the need to involve civil society on a national and a local level with concrete initiatives to prevent and reduce the spread of extremist ideologies;</i></b>
Comments: Civil society is often not taken into consideration. For instance, civil society was neither informed nor invited to the Internet Forum. Read more: <a href="https://edri.org/launch-of-the-eu-internet-forum-behind-closed-doors-and-without-civil-society/">https://edri.org/launch-of-the-eu-internet-forum-behind-closed-doors-and-without-civil-society/</a> .	

Or. it


(...)



**Amendment 215**  
**Sophia in 't Veld**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Subheading III**


SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
III. Preventing online <b><i>radicalisation</i></b>	III. Preventing online <b><i>incitement to violent extremism</i></b>
Comments: Neither text is possible as it is impossible to “prevent” access to any content online that might lead to radicalisation, but the amendment uses wording that is more balanced.	

Or. en

 **Amendment 216**  
**Petras Auštrevičius**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Subheading III**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
III. Preventing <i>online radicalisation</i>	III. Preventing <i>radicalisation on-line and via other media channels</i>
Comments: This section of the report only focuses on online activities.	

Or. en

 **Amendment 217**  
**Barbara Spinelli, Kostas Chrysogonos**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Subheading III**


SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
III. Preventing online <i>radicalisation</i>	III. Preventing online <i>extremisation</i>
Comments: The wording is slightly clumsy, but the intention is positive.	

Or. en

 **Amendment 218**  
**Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz, Gérard Deprez, Louis Michel**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Subheading III**

MIXED POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
III. Preventing online radicalisation	III. Preventing online <i>terrorist radicalisation</i>
Comments: This amendment could be considered as a compromise between the original wording and AMs 215 and 217. However, we encourage you to support AM 215 or 217.	


Or. en

 **Amendment 219**  
**Ana Gomes**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 7 a (new)**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
	<p><b>7a. Feels that every Member State should set up a special unit tasked with flagging illicit content on the internet and with facilitating the detection and removal of content that does not conform to the host internet platform's charter and rules, within a precise legal framework and based on due legal process; proposes that such units could cooperate with a European unit responsible for dealing with flagging;</b></p> <p><i>(This is original paragraph 13, just slightly re-worded)</i></p>
Comments: This amendment should be opposed mainly for five reasons. First, there are already competent authorities which are in charge of fighting against terrorism. Second, these	


authorities would be extra-judicial and without control against power abuses. Third, by definition, there is no law due process in verifying the implementation of companies' terms of service. Fourth, there is a very clear risk that, with deletion as the only sanction, it will become possible to break the law with impunity. Finally, terms of service are usually drafted in a very vague way, which means that their rules can allow to do everything companies are required to do.

Or. en

 **Amendment 220**  
**Kristina Winberg**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 8**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p><b>8. Recalls that the internet plays a significant role in fuelling the radicalisation of European citizens, as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution of hate messages and praise for terrorism; expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; calls for a dialogue to be launched at European level with the internet giants with a view to preventing the online distribution of hate messages and to eradicating them swiftly;</b></p>	<p><b>deleted</b></p>
	<p><i>(Recalls that the internet is one of the fuelling of radicalisation of European citizens, as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution of hate messages and praise for terrorism; expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; calls for a dialogue to be launched at European level with the internet giants with a view to preventing the online distribution of hate messages and to eradicating them swiftly;)</i></p>
<p>Comments: The text proposed by the rapporteur has no basis in evidence – indeed, the evidence that does exist points in the opposite direction. E.g.  <a href="http://www.quilliamfoundation.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/publications/free/jihad-trending-quilliam-report.pdf">http://www.quilliamfoundation.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/publications/free/jihad-trending-quilliam-report.pdf</a></p>	

Or. en

 **Amendment 221**  
**Sophia in 't Veld**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 8**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>8. Recalls that <b><i>the internet plays a significant role in fuelling the</i></b></p>	<p>8. Recalls that hate messages and praise for terrorism <b><i>are distributed via the internet;</i></b></p>

<p><i>radicalisation of European citizens, as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution of hate messages and praise for terrorism; expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; calls for a dialogue to be launched at European level with the internet giants with a view to preventing the online distribution of hate messages and to eradicating them swiftly;</i></p>	<p><i>calls for an effective strategy for the detection and takedown of illegal content inciting to violent extremism;</i></p>
<p>Comments: The amendment is a clear improvement. Effective strategies are needed, although, insofar as the content is illegal, it is peculiar that the forces of law are not mentioned, but only the removal of the content.</p>	

Or. en



**Amendment 222**

**Christine Revault D'Allonnes Bonnefoy**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 8**

MIXED POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>8. Recalls that the internet <b>plays</b> a significant role in fuelling the radicalisation of European citizens, as <b>it facilitates</b> the rapid, large-scale distribution of hate messages and praise for terrorism; expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; calls for a dialogue to be launched at European level with the internet giants with a view to preventing the online distribution of hate messages <b>and to eradicating</b> them swiftly;</p>	<p>8. Recalls that the internet <b>and social networks play</b> a significant role in fuelling the radicalisation of European citizens, as <b>they facilitate</b> the rapid, large-scale distribution of hate messages and praise for terrorism <b>and constitute a recruitment platform for terrorist groups</b>; expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; calls for a dialogue to be launched at European level with the internet giants with a view to preventing the online distribution of hate messages, <b>to erasing</b> them swiftly <b>while respecting fundamental rights and the freedom of expression, and in particular to contributing to the distribution of effective discourse to counter terrorist propaganda</b>;</p>
<p>Comments: The second part of the amendment is very welcomed, as positive measures are more effective than negative measures and fundamental rights must be respected. However, the amendment leaves the call for a dialogue that is already taking place, besides its flaws. There is no evidence that the internet acts as a recruitment platform to any meaningful extent. More information about such "dialogue": <a href="https://edri.org/launch-of-the-eu-internet-forum-behind-closed-doors-and-without-civil-society/">https://edri.org/launch-of-the-eu-internet-forum-behind-closed-doors-and-without-civil-society/</a>.</p>	

Or. fr



### Amendment 223

Marine Le Pen, Edouard Ferrand, Gilles Lebreton

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 8

MIXED POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
8. Recalls that the internet plays a significant role in fuelling the radicalisation of European citizens, as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution of <b><i>hate</i></b> messages and praise for terrorism; expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; calls for <b><i>a dialogue to be launched at European level with the internet giants with a view to preventing the online distribution of hate messages and to eradicating them swiftly;</i></b>	8. Recalls that the internet plays a significant role in fuelling the radicalisation of European citizens, as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution of hate messages <b><i>inciting violence</i></b> and praise for terrorism; expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; calls for <b><i>effective monitoring to be carried out by the appropriate police services with a view to identifying the authors;</i></b>
Comments: The amendment improves the original wording. Monitoring is not needed to identify the authors, the data is available. However, as evidenced by many of these amendments, there is a preference for more superficial measures, left to the discretion of the internet platforms.	

Or. fr



### Amendment 224

Michal Boni

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 8

MIXED POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
8. Recalls that the internet plays a significant role in fuelling the radicalisation of European citizens, as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution of hate messages and praise for terrorism; expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; calls for a dialogue to be launched at European level with the internet giants with a view to preventing the online distribution of hate messages and to eradicating them swiftly;	8. Recalls that the internet plays a significant role in fuelling the radicalisation of European citizens, as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution of hate messages and praise for terrorism; expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; <b><i>underlines the role of education and public awareness campaign to prevent radicalization online;</i></b> calls for a dialogue to be launched at European level with the internet giants with a view to preventing the online distribution of hate messages and to eradicating them swiftly;
Comments: Positive measures are more effective than negative measures and thus welcome the addition suggested. However, the amendment leaves the last part of the original paragraph regarding the dialogue with internet giants (why nobody else?), which is already taking place under the name of <a href="#">Internet forum</a> .	

Or. en

**Amendment 225****Liisa Jaakonsaari****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 8**

<b>OPPOSE</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
8. Recalls that the internet plays a significant role in fuelling the radicalisation of European citizens, as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution of hate messages and praise for terrorism; expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; calls for a dialogue to be launched at European level with the internet giants with a view to preventing the online distribution of hate messages and to eradicating them swiftly;	8. Recalls that the internet plays a significant role in fuelling the radicalisation of European citizens, as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale <b>global</b> distribution of hate messages and praise for terrorism; expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; calls for a dialogue to be launched at European level with the internet giants with a view to preventing the online distribution of hate messages and to eradicating them swiftly;
Comments: This amendment does not fix the problems of the original wording mentioned above.	

Or. en

**Amendment 226****Emil Radev****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 8**

<b>OPPOSE</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
8. Recalls that the internet plays a significant role in fuelling the radicalisation of European citizens, as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution of hate messages and praise for terrorism; expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; <b>calls for a</b> dialogue to be launched at European level with the internet giants with a view to preventing the online distribution of hate messages and to eradicating them swiftly;	8. Recalls that the internet plays a significant role in fuelling the radicalisation of European citizens, as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution of hate messages and praise for terrorism; expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; <b>welcomes the</b> dialogue to be launched at European level with the internet giants with a view to preventing the online distribution of hate messages and to eradicating them swiftly;
Comments: We encourage MEPs not to welcome this forum in its current form, as its launch is being <a href="#">conducted behind closed doors and without civil society</a> .	

Or. en

**Amendment 227****Heinz K. Becker****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 8**

<b>MIXED POSITION</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
8. Recalls that the internet plays a	8. Recalls that the internet plays a



<p>significant role in fuelling the radicalisation of European citizens, as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution of hate messages and praise for terrorism; expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; calls for a dialogue to be launched at European level with the internet giants with a view to preventing the online distribution of hate messages and to eradicating them swiftly;</p>	<p>significant role in fuelling the radicalisation of European citizens, as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution of hate messages and praise for terrorism; expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; calls, <b><i>in full awareness that the internet is only a medium of radicalisation, never its cause</i></b>, for a dialogue to be launched at European level with the internet giants with a view to preventing the online distribution of hate messages and to eradicating them swiftly;</p>
<p>Comments: The statement introduced by the amendment is based on evidence. However, the amendment does not solve the issues raised by EDRI, namely the existence of the IT forum, which is however being launched <u>behind closed doors and without civil society</u>.</p>	

Or. de



**Amendment 228**

**Frank Engel**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 8**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>8. Recalls that the internet plays a significant role in fuelling the radicalisation of European citizens, as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution of hate messages and praise for terrorism; expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; calls for a <b><i>dialogue to be launched at European level</i></b> with the internet giants with a view to preventing the online distribution of hate messages and to eradicating them swiftly;</p>	<p>8. Recalls that the internet plays a significant role in fuelling the radicalisation of European citizens, as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution of hate messages and praise for terrorism; expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; calls for a <b><i>European strategy developed in cooperation</i></b> with the internet giants <b><i>to be implemented</i></b> with a view to preventing the online distribution of hate messages and to eradicating them swiftly;</p>
<p>Comments: The EU strategy that this amendment is calling for already exists: the Communication COM (2013) 941 final.</p>	

Or. fr



**Amendment 229**

**Jean Lambert**

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 8**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>8. Recalls that the internet plays a significant role in fuelling the radicalisation of European citizens, as <b><i>it</i></b> facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution</p>	<p>8. Recalls that <b><i>radicalised users of</i></b> the internet plays a significant role in fuelling the radicalisation of European citizens, as <b><i>the internet</i></b> facilitates the rapid, large-scale</p>



<p>of hate messages and <i>praise for</i> terrorism; expresses concern at the impact that such messages <i>praising</i> terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; <i>calls for a dialogue to be launched at European level with the internet giants with a view to preventing the online distribution of hate messages and to eradicating them swiftly</i>;</p>	<p>distribution of hate messages and <i>incitement to</i> terrorism; expresses concern at the impact that such messages <i>inciting to</i> terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; <i>considers that all such actions should be within an agreed legal framework; notes the plans outlined in the European agenda on security (COM(2015) 185 final of 28 April 2015 and COM(2013) 941 final of 15 January 2015) to set up an internet intermediaries forum as a measure to address terrorism</i>;</p>
<p>Comments: This amendment is welcomed, as it shapes the wording used and resorts to two Communications from the Commission regarding the IT forum.</p>	

Or. en

**+ Amendment 230**  
**Barbara Spinelli, Kostas Chrysogonos**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 8**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>8. Recalls that the internet plays a significant role in fuelling the <i>radicalisation</i> of European citizens, as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution of hate messages and praise for terrorism; expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; <i>calls for a dialogue to be launched at European level with the internet giants with a view to preventing the online distribution of hate messages and to eradicating them swiftly</i>;</p>	<p>8. Recalls that the internet plays a significant role in fuelling the <i>violent extremism</i> of European citizens, as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution of hate messages and praise for terrorism; expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have on <i>some</i> young people, who are particularly vulnerable; <i>notes the plans outlined in the European agenda on security (COM(2015) 185 final of 28 April 2015 and COM(2013) 941 final of 15 January 2015) to set up an internet intermediaries forum as a measure to address terrorism</i>;</p>
<p>Comments: This amendment to be welcomed, however, the first part of the amendment reasserts an argument for which there is no basis in evidence. The second part shapes the wording used and resorts to two Communications from the Commission regarding the IT forum.</p>	

Or. en

**+ Amendment 231**  
**Anna Hedh, Soraya Post**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 8**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>8. Recalls that the internet plays a significant role in fuelling the radicalisation of European citizens, as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution of hate messages and praise for terrorism;</p>	<p>8. Recalls that the internet plays a significant role in fuelling the radicalisation of European citizens, as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution of hate messages and praise for terrorism;</p>

expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; calls for a dialogue to be launched at European level with the internet giants with a view to preventing the online distribution of <i>hate messages</i> and to <i>eradicating them</i> swiftly;	expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; calls for a dialogue to be launched at European level with the internet giants with a view to preventing the online distribution of <i>illegal content</i> and to <i>eradicate it</i> swiftly <i>in line with national legislation</i> ;
Comments: This amendment to be welcomed, however, the first part of the amendment does not remove an assertion for which there is no basis in evidence. This amendment improves the original wording and would be in line with the e-commerce Directive (Directive 2000/31/EC). In any case, such must be "undertaken in the observance of the principle of freedom of expression and of procedures established for this purpose at national level". Cf. Recital 46 of the e-commerce Directive.	

Or. en



### Amendment 232

Kati Piri

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 8

MIXED POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
8. Recalls that the internet plays a significant role in fuelling the radicalisation of European citizens, as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution of hate messages and praise for terrorism; expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; calls for a dialogue to be launched at European level with the internet giants with a view to preventing the online distribution of hate messages and to eradicating them swiftly;	8. Recalls that the internet plays a significant role in fuelling the radicalisation of European citizens, as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution of hate messages and praise for terrorism; expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; calls for a dialogue to be launched at European level with the internet giants with a view to preventing the online distribution of hate messages and to eradicating them swiftly; <b><i>notes however that the internet must not be seen as a main cause for radicalisation but rather as a medium;</i></b>
Comments: The amendment is positive. However, the new text is in direct contradiction with the first part.	

Or. en

### Amendment 233

Petras Auštrevičius

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 8

NO POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
8. Recalls that the internet plays a significant role in fuelling the radicalisation of European citizens, as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution	8. Recalls that the internet plays a significant role in fuelling the radicalisation of European citizens, as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution

of hate messages and praise for terrorism; expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; calls for a dialogue to be launched at European level with the internet giants with a view to preventing the online distribution of hate messages and to eradicating them swiftly;	of hate messages and praise for terrorism; expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism <b>and other military actions by violent extremists</b> have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; calls for a dialogue to be launched at European level with the internet giants with a view to preventing the online distribution of hate messages and to eradicating them swiftly;
--	--

Or. en



**Amendment 234**

**Petr Ježek**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 8**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
8. Recalls that the internet plays a significant role in fuelling the radicalisation of European citizens, as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution of hate messages and praise for terrorism; expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; calls for a dialogue to be launched at European level with the internet giants with a view to preventing <b>the online distribution of</b> hate messages and <b>to eradicating them swiftly</b> ;	8. Recalls that the internet plays a significant role in fuelling the radicalisation of European citizens, as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution of hate messages and praise for terrorism; expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; calls for a dialogue to be launched at European level with the internet giants with a view to <b>legally preventing, monitoring, tracking and swiftly eradicating</b> hate messages and <b>notifying the respective authorities about them</b> ;
Comments: There's nothing that prevent companies from notifying authorities or from Member States to demand companies to inform them about alleged illegal activities (cf. Article 15 of the e-commerce Directive). However, internet companies, having followed government advice to “ban” illegal content, generally choose to take the easy option of accusing the individual of breaching terms of service rather than acting illegally. Having avoided any reference to illegality, it is in the providers interest not to notify the relevant authorities. .	

Or. en



**Amendment 235**

**Timothy Kirkhope, Timothy Kirkhope**

on behalf of the ECR Group


**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 8**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
8. Recalls that the internet plays a significant role in fuelling the radicalisation of European citizens, as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution of hate messages and praise for terrorism;	8. Recalls that the internet plays a significant role in fuelling the radicalisation of European citizens, as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution of hate messages and praise for terrorism;

<p>expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; calls for a dialogue to be launched at European level with the internet giants with a view to preventing the online distribution of hate messages and to eradicating them swiftly;</p>	<p>expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; calls for a dialogue to be launched at European level with the internet giants with a view to preventing the online distribution of hate messages and to eradicating them swiftly; <i>notes that the internet provides specific challenges given its global and cross border nature, which can create legal gaps and jurisdictional conflicts thus allowing recruiters and those that are radicalised to communicate remotely and easily from all corners of the world with no physical borders, no need to establish a base and no need to seek sanctuary in a particular country; notes that national law enforcement authorities, EUROPOL and the European Cybercrime Centre need the resources and expertise to investigate and combat the often technologically sophisticated, well-funded, difficult to detect, and well mobilised online threat posed by terrorists;</i></p>
<p>Comments: It is crucial to distinguish between risk and harm. It is possible, as the amendment says, that these things could happen. Good policy is based on evidence and not assumptions.</p>	

Or. en

 **Amendment 236**  
**Goffredo Maria Bettini, Caterina Chinnici**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 8**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>8. Recalls that the internet plays a significant role in fuelling the radicalisation of European citizens, as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution of hate messages and praise for terrorism; expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; calls for a dialogue to be launched at European level with the internet giants with a view to preventing the online distribution of hate messages and to eradicating them swiftly;</p>	<p>8. Recalls that the internet plays a significant role in fuelling the radicalisation of European citizens, as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution of hate messages and praise for terrorism; expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; calls for a dialogue to be launched at European level with the internet giants with a view to preventing the online distribution of hate messages and to eradicating them swiftly <i>by means of communication strategies aimed at promoting tolerance, non-discrimination, fundamental liberties and solidarity, including increased interfaith dialogue;</i></p>
<p>Comments: The amendment points out at a more constructive dialogue leading to effective</p>	

positive measures. Of course, dialogue is difficult or impossible if internet companies are over-enthusiastically deleting every message which could be construed as containing unwelcome views.

Or. it



#### Amendment 237

**Anna Maria Corazza Bildt, Carlos Coelho, Monica Macovei, Frank Engel, Barbara Matera, Kinga Gál, Alessandra Mussolini**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 8**

MIXED POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
8. Recalls that the internet <b>plays</b> a significant <b>role in</b> fuelling the radicalisation <b>of European citizens</b> , as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution of hate messages and praise for terrorism; expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; calls for a dialogue to be launched at European level with <b>the internet giants</b> with a view to preventing the online distribution of hate messages and to eradicating them swiftly;	8. Recalls that the internet <b>is used as</b> a significant <b>platform for</b> fuelling the radicalisation <b>and fundamentalism</b> , as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution of hate messages and praise for terrorism; expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; calls for a dialogue to be launched at European level with <b>internet companies, hotlines and experts</b> with a view to preventing the online distribution of hate messages and to eradicating them swiftly;
Comments: The amendment improves the original wording and makes the dialogue more inclusive. However, voluntary schemes bypass the rule of law and companies do not have incentives not to act in an arbitrary way because they may face liability.	

Or. en



#### Amendment 238

**Brice Hortefeux, Rachida Dati**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 8**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
8. Recalls that the internet plays a significant role in fuelling the radicalisation of European citizens, as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution of hate messages and praise for terrorism; expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; calls for a dialogue to be launched at European level with the internet giants with a view to preventing the online distribution of hate messages and to eradicating them swiftly;	8. Recalls that the internet plays a significant role in fuelling the radicalisation of European citizens, as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution of hate messages and praise for terrorism; expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; calls for a dialogue <b>and concerted action</b> to be launched at European level with the internet giants with a view to preventing the online distribution of hate messages and to eradicating them swiftly;
Comments: Member states and EU institutions are the ones which are bound by international obligations to respect the Charter of Fundamental rights. Companies are not bound by the Charter. Whereas companies are being encouraged by EU institutions and Member states to "do something" (interfering in their freedom to conduct business - which is legitimate),	

nobody is making a risk assessment (including assessing the potential for counterproductive effects) or a necessity and proportionality test on restrictions made to freedom of communication. Restrictions to freedom of communication are being imposed by companies based on their own legal exposure, public relations concerns and customer service. No counterbalancing obligations not to act arbitrarily exist.

Or. fr



### Amendment 239

Ana Gomes, Birgit Sippel, Caterina Chinnici, Sylvia-Yvonne Kaufmann

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 8

MIXED POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>8. Recalls that the internet <b>plays a significant role in</b> fuelling the radicalisation of <b>European</b> citizens, as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution of hate messages and praise for terrorism; expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have <b>on young</b> people, who are particularly vulnerable; calls for a dialogue to be launched at European level with the internet <b>giants</b> with a view to preventing the online distribution of hate messages and <b>to eradicating them swiftly</b>;</p>	<p>8. Recalls that the internet <b>can be a platform for</b> fuelling the radicalisation of citizens, as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution of hate messages and praise for terrorism; expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have <b>especially on younger</b> people, who are particularly vulnerable; calls for a dialogue to be launched at European level with the internet <b>industry</b> with a view to preventing the online distribution of hate messages and <b>incitement to violence at the request of the responsible law enforcement authority</b>;</p>
<p>Comments: While the modifications introduced help fixing the original paragraph, the last sentence do not solve the problem risen in our comment to AM 238.</p>	

Or. en

### Amendment 240

Franz Obermayr

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 8

NO POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>8. Recalls that the internet plays a significant role in fuelling the radicalisation of European citizens, as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution of hate messages and praise for terrorism; expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; calls for a dialogue to be launched at European level with the internet giants with a view to preventing the online distribution of hate messages and to eradicating them swiftly;</p>	<p>8. Recalls that the internet plays a significant role in fuelling the radicalisation of European citizens, as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution of hate messages and praise for <b>Islamist</b> terrorism; expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising <b>Islamist</b> terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; calls for a dialogue to be launched at European level with the internet giants with a view to preventing the online distribution of <b>Islamist</b> hate messages and to eradicating them swiftly;</p>

Or. de





**Amendment 241**  
**Louis Michel, Gérard Deprez**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 8**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>8. Recalls that the internet plays a significant role in fuelling the radicalisation of European citizens, as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution of hate messages and praise for terrorism; expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; calls for <b><i>a dialogue to be launched</i></b> at European level with the internet <b><i>giants</i></b> with a view to preventing the online distribution of hate messages and to <b><i>eradicating</i></b> them swiftly;</p>	<p>8. Recalls that the internet plays a significant role in fuelling the radicalisation of European citizens, as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution of hate messages and praise for terrorism; expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; calls for <b><i>action to be taken</i></b> at European level with the internet <b><i>operators</i></b> with a view to preventing the online distribution of hate messages and to <b><i>detecting and erasing</i></b> them swiftly;</p>
<p>Comments: Member states and EU institutions are the ones which are bound by international obligations to respect the Charter of Fundamental rights. Companies do not abide by them. Whereas companies are being encouraged by EU institutions and Member states to "do something" (interfering in their freedom to conduct business - which is legitimate), nobody is making a necessity and proportionality test on restrictions made to freedom of communication. Restrictions to freedom of communication are being imposed by companies based on their own legal exposure, public relations concerns and customer service. No counterbalancing obligations not to act arbitrarily exist.</p>	

Or. fr



**Amendment 242**  
**Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz, Gérard Deprez, Louis Michel**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 8**

MIXED POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>8. Recalls that the internet <b><i>plays a significant role in fuelling the</i></b> radicalisation of European citizens, as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution of hate messages and praise for terrorism; expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; calls for a dialogue to be launched at European level with the internet giants with a view to <b><i>preventing</i></b> the online distribution of hate messages and to eradicating them swiftly;</p>	<p>8. Recalls that the Internet <b><i>serves as well as a platform for terrorist</i></b> radicalisation of European citizens, as it facilitates the rapid, large-scale distribution of hate messages and praise for terrorism; expresses concern at the impact that such messages praising terrorism have on young people, who are particularly vulnerable; calls for a dialogue to be launched at European level with the internet giants with a view to <b><i>analysing</i></b> the online distribution of hate messages and to eradicating them swiftly;</p>
<p>Comments: Whereas the amendment nuances the original wording and that is welcome, it leaves the concerns regarding companies' involvement in public policy objectives outside the rule of law and counterbalancing obligations not to arbitrarily interfere in fundamental rights and freedoms online.</p>	

**Amendment 243****Barbara Spinelli****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 8 a (new)****MIXED POSITION***Motion for a resolution**Amendment*

***8a. Is against any State control or surveillance policy of internet, and against any cooperation between States and internet providers***

Comments: Terrorism does need to be addressed. Blanket mass surveillance measures are also a serious problem. When states impose companies to "do something" on a "voluntary" basis without companies having a direct obligation to adequately balance between security and fundamental rights, there is a problem. The key is to have cooperation that respects the rule of law and human rights standards. It is crucial that actions taken are done within a clear legal framework, activating the responsibilities of States under international law, as necessary.

Or. en

**Amendment 244****Sylvie Guillaume****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 8 a (new)****SUPPORT***Motion for a resolution**Amendment*

***8a. Supports the implementation of youth awareness programmes on online hate speech and the risks that it represents and of programmes promoting media and internet education; supports the implementation of training programmes with a view to mobilising, training and creating networks of young activists to defend human rights online;***

Comments: Positive measures are proven to be more effective than repressive measures. Prevention is essential.

Or. fr

**Amendment 245****Marine Le Pen, Edouard Ferrand, Gilles Lebreton****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 9****SUPPORT***Motion for a resolution**Amendment*

***9. Feels that the internet giants should be made aware of their responsibilities so that they delete illegal content as quickly as possible; believes that the Member States should plan for the possibility of bringing criminal prosecutions against digital actors who do not take action in response to the spread of illicit messages or messages praising terrorism on their***

***deleted***



<p><i>internet platforms; believes that refusal or failure to cooperate on the part of internet platforms which allow such messages to circulate should be considered an act of complicity with praising terrorism and should consequently be punished;</i></p>	
<p>Comments: We support the deletion of this paragraph for three reasons. First, Internet industry's responsibilities are already set forth in the e-commerce Directive (Directive 2000/31/EC) and providers are, therefore, already aware. Second, criminal negligence is already an established principle and does not need to be reformed. Third, when internet platforms refuse or fail to cooperate, they should only be sanctioned if they have not taken expeditious measures, after having become aware of illegal material. Otherwise, this would represent active coercion of private companies.</p>	

Or. fr



**Amendment 246**

**Kati Piri**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 9**

MIXED POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>9. Feels that the internet giants should be made aware of their responsibilities so that they delete illegal content as quickly as possible; <i>believes that the Member States should plan for the possibility of bringing criminal prosecutions against digital actors who do not take action in response to the spread of illicit messages or messages praising terrorism on their internet platforms; believes that refusal or failure to cooperate on the part of internet platforms which allow such messages to circulate should be considered an act of complicity with praising terrorism and should consequently be punished;</i></p>	<p>9. Feels that the internet giants should be made aware of their responsibilities so that they delete illegal content as quickly as possible;</p>
<p>Comments: Whereas we welcome the deletion brought by this amendment (see previous comment), the responsibilities of the internet industry were established by the e-commerce Directive (Directive 2000/31/EC) so industry players are already aware.</p>	

Or. en



**Amendment 247**

**Péter Niedermüller**


**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 9**

MIXED POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>9. Feels that the internet giants should be made aware of their responsibilities <i>so that they delete illegal content as quickly as possible; believes that the Member States should plan for the possibility of bringing criminal prosecutions against digital</i></p>	<p>9. Feels that the internet giants should be made aware of their responsibilities <i>to cooperate with Member States' authorities in fighting against any form of extremism and delete illegal content as quickly as possible if it is so required by the legal</i></p>


<p><i>actors who do not take action in response to the spread of illicit messages or messages praising terrorism on their internet platforms; believes that refusal or failure to cooperate on the part of internet platforms which allow such messages to circulate should be considered an act of complicity with praising terrorism and should consequently be punished;</i></p>	<p><i>framework of the Member State in which they operate;</i></p>
<p>Comments: The amendment is much better than the original wording. However, the amendment paragraph would not have much meaning, since internet industry's responsibilities are outlined since the entry into force of the e-commerce Directive, in 2001. Most of these "Internet giants" were set up after 2001 so the E-commerce Directive was preexisting legislation they had to comply with since. E.g. Facebook was launched in 2004.</p>	

Or. en

 **Amendment 248**  
**Emil Radev**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 9**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>9. Feels that the internet giants should be made aware of their responsibilities so that they delete illegal content as quickly as possible; <i>believes that the Member States should plan for the possibility of bringing criminal prosecutions against digital actors who do not take action in response to the spread of illicit messages or messages praising terrorism on their internet platforms; believes that refusal or failure to cooperate on the part of internet platforms which allow such messages to circulate should be considered an act of complicity with praising terrorism and should consequently be punished;</i></p>	<p>9. Feels that the internet giants should be made aware of their responsibilities so that they delete illegal content as quickly as possible, <i>and urges them to step up efforts to prevent</i> the spread of illicit messages or messages <i>spreading</i> terrorism on their platforms;</p>
<p>Comments: In addition to comments to AM 247, "illegal messages <i>or</i>" means that legal material would be deleted. This unequivocally means that it would become a criminal offence to fail to delete material that is not illegal. This is unacceptable.</p>	

Or. en

 **Amendment 249**  
**Kinga Gál**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 9**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>9. <i>Feels</i> that the internet <i>giants should be made aware of their responsibilities so that they delete</i> illegal content <i>as quickly as possible</i>; believes that the Member States should plan for the possibility of</p>	<p>9. <i>Underlines</i> that the internet <i>industry has to take shared responsibility in deleting</i> illegal content; believes that the Member States should plan for the possibility of bringing criminal</p>

<p>bringing criminal prosecutions against digital actors who do not take action in response to the spread of illicit messages or messages praising terrorism on their internet platforms; <i>believes that refusal or failure to cooperate on the part of internet platforms which allow such messages to circulate should be considered an act of complicity with praising terrorism and should consequently be punished;</i></p>	<p>prosecutions against digital actors who do not take action in response to the spread of illicit messages or messages praising terrorism on their internet platforms; <i>in respect of freedom of expression the refusal should be punished;</i></p>
<p>Comments: The internet industry has the obligation to remove content expeditiously once it becomes aware of "illegal content" under the e-commerce Directive. However, what is the experience in Europe that suggests that Internet platforms are leaving illegal terrorist material online? What is the experience that is so severe that criminal sanctions are necessary? What is the experience that shows that, in any European country, the existing sanctions are not adequate? In a democratic society, is it appropriate to use coercive measures to persuade private companies to delete content in the complete absence of any counterbalancing obligations to leave legitimate (even if unwelcome) speech online?</p>	

Or. en



**Amendment 250**

**Ana Gomes**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 9**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>9. Feels that the internet <b>giants</b> should be made aware of their responsibilities so that they delete illegal content as quickly as possible; believes that the Member States should <b>plan for</b> the possibility of bringing criminal prosecutions against digital <b>actors who</b> do not take action in <b>response to the spread of illicit</b> messages or messages praising terrorism <b>on</b> their internet platforms; <i>believes that refusal or failure to cooperate on the part of internet platforms which allow such messages to circulate should be considered an act of complicity with praising terrorism and should consequently be punished;</i></p>	<p>9. Feels that the internet <b>industry and service providers</b> should be made aware of their responsibilities so that they delete illegal content as quickly as possible, <b>at the request of the competent law enforcement authority;</b> believes that the Member States should <b>consider</b> the possibility of bringing criminal prosecutions against digital <b>operators who, verifiably and to the best of their human and technical ability,</b> do not take action in <b>identifying and deleting illegal</b> messages or messages praising terrorism <b>from</b> their internet platforms; <b>stresses that all measures limiting fundamental rights on the internet need to be necessary and proportionate, in line with the Union and Member State law;</b></p>
<p>Comments: This AM should also be opposed for four reasons. First, the responsibilities of the internet industry were established by the 2000/31/EC Directive, so a reminder isn't needed. Second, criminal negligence is already an established principle and criminal charges cannot be brought against someone if the offence is not verifiable. Third, is it inappropriate and out of step with CJEU case law to put all the pressure on internet companies to delete content (protected by unregulated, often meaningless, terms of service) and none at all for leaving legitimate (even if unwelcome) content online in respect of fundamental rights. Finally, restrictions on fundamental rights do not need to be "in line" with EU or national law. They need to be prescribed by law, as required by ALL relevant international legal instruments –</p>	

the Charter of Fundamental Rights, the Convention on Human Rights and the International Convention on Civil and Political Rights.

Or. en

**Amendment 251**  
**Frank Engel**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 9**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>9. Feels that the internet giants should be made aware of their responsibilities so that they <b>delete illegal</b> content <b>as quickly as possible</b>; believes that the Member States should plan for the possibility of bringing criminal prosecutions against digital actors who do not take action in response to the spread of illicit messages or messages praising terrorism on their internet platforms; <b>believes that refusal or failure to cooperate on the part of internet platforms which allow such messages to circulate should be considered an act of complicity with praising terrorism and should consequently be punished</b>;</p>	<p>9. Feels that the internet giants should be made aware of their responsibilities so that they <b>notify the competent authorities of</b> content <b>that may praise terrorism</b>; believes that the Member States should plan for the possibility of bringing criminal prosecutions against digital actors who do not take action in response to the spread of illicit messages or messages praising terrorism on their internet platforms;</p>
<p>Comments: Member States can establish obligations for companies to inform the competent authority of alleged illegal activities (cf. Article 15 of the e-commerce Directive). However, what is the experience in Europe that suggests that Internet platforms are leaving illegal terrorist material online? What is the experience that is so severe that criminal sanctions are necessary? What is the experience that shows that, in any European country, the existing sanctions are not adequate? In a democratic society, is it appropriate to use coercive measures to persuade private companies to delete content in the complete absence of any counterbalancing obligations to leave legitimate (even if unwelcome) speech online?</p>	

Or. fr

**Amendment 252**  
**Christine Revault D'Allonnes Bonnefoy**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 9**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>9. Feels that the internet giants should be made aware of their responsibilities so that they delete <b>illegal</b> content as quickly as possible; <b>believes that the Member States should plan for the possibility of bringing criminal prosecutions against digital actors who do not take action in response to the spread of illicit messages or messages praising terrorism on their internet platforms; believes that refusal or failure to cooperate on the part of internet platforms which allow such messages to</b></p>	<p>9. Feels that the internet giants should be made aware of their responsibilities so that they delete <b>or at least de-index illicit</b> content <b>that does not comply with the policy and rules of the internet platform hosting it, as quickly as possible and with full respect for the rule of law, fundamental rights and the freedom of expression; believes that the Member States should plan for the possibility of bringing criminal prosecutions against digital actors who do not take action in</b></p>

<i>circulate should be considered an act of complicity with praising terrorism and should consequently be punished;</i>	<i>response to the spread of illicit messages or messages praising terrorism on their internet platforms;</i>
<p>Comments: If content is illegal, de-indexing it would fall below the minimum standards required by the e-commerce Directive. In addition, de-indexing is ineffective as <a href="#">evidence shows</a> that people usually reach these sites through links from other sites or through direct recommendation.</p> <p>In addition, it's inappropriate to ask online companies to search for what THEY believe <i>might</i> be illegal content and deleting it on the basis of blackmail that, if they guess wrong and fail to delete something that they believe to be illegal, they will be criminally liable. Most platforms use their terms of service to "ban" "illegal" content and also ban content that might be offensive. That way, they don't need to justify whether the deletion is on the basis of illegality (law) or terms of service ("offensive" in some "we are the sole arbiter of what is offensive" understanding of the word). E.g. <a href="http://www.telegraph.co.uk/technology/facebook/9118778/The-dark-side-of-Facebook.html">http://www.telegraph.co.uk/technology/facebook/9118778/The-dark-side-of-Facebook.html</a></p> <p>This is against the rule of law and fundamental rights. Finally, the amendment refers to "fundamental rights AND freedom of expression", but freedom of expression is a fundamental right.</p>	

Or. fr



**Amendment 253**

**Barbara Spinelli**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 9**

<b>SUPPORT</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p><b>9. Feels that the internet giants should be made aware of their responsibilities so that they delete illegal content as quickly as possible;</b> believes that the Member States should <i>plan for the possibility of bringing criminal prosecutions</i> against <i>digital actors who do not take action in response to the spread of illicit messages or messages praising terrorism on their internet platforms</i>; believes that refusal or failure to cooperate on the part of internet platforms which allow <i>such</i> messages to <i>circulate</i> should be <i>considered an act of complicity with praising terrorism</i> and should <i>consequently be punished</i>;</p>	<p><b>9. Recalls the EU's legal framework for internet provider liability,</b> believes that the Member States should <i>take all necessary measures to take action</i> against <i>internet intermediaries who fail to act expeditiously upon receiving knowledge of clearly illegal information being hosted on their servers</i>; believes that refusal or failure to cooperate on the part of internet platforms which allow messages to <i>remain online</i> should be <i>subject to sanctions if expeditious measures are not taken by the intermediary, upon gaining actual knowledge of the illegality of the material; these measures should be based on the applicable legislation</i> and should <i>undergo judicial oversight</i>;</p>
<p>Comments: This amendment reflects EU legislation and is more moderate than the original wording and previous amendments related to this paragraph.</p>	

Or. en



**Amendment 254****Jean Lambert**

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

**Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 9****SUPPORT**

<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>9. <b>Feels that the internet giants should be made aware of their responsibilities so that they delete illegal content as quickly as possible</b>; believes that the Member States should <b>plan for the possibility of bringing criminal prosecutions</b> against <b>digital actors who do not take action in response to the spread of illicit messages or messages praising terrorism</b> on their <b>internet platforms</b>; believes that refusal or failure to cooperate on the part of internet platforms which allow <b>such</b> messages to <b>circulate</b> should be <b>considered an act of complicity with praising terrorism and should consequently be punished</b>;</p>	<p>9. <b>Recalls the EU's legal framework for internet provider liability</b>; believes that the Member States should <b>take all necessary measures to take action</b> against <b>internet intermediaries who fail to act expeditiously upon receiving knowledge of illegal information being hosted</b> on their <b>servers</b>; believes that refusal or failure to cooperate on the part of internet platforms which allow messages to <b>remain online</b> should be <b>subject to sanctions if expeditious measures are not taken by the intermediary, upon gaining actual knowledge of the illegality of the material</b>;</p>
<p>Comments: This amendment is almost identical to AM 253. It just misses "<b>these measures should be based on the applicable legislation</b> and should <b>undergo judicial oversight</b>";. Either of them should be supported.</p>	


Or. en

**Amendment 255****Mariya Gabriel****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 9****OPPOSE**

<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>9. Feels that the internet giants should be made aware of their responsibilities so that they delete illegal content as quickly as possible; believes that the Member States should plan for the possibility of bringing criminal prosecutions against digital actors who do not take action in response to the spread of illicit messages or messages praising terrorism on their internet platforms; believes that refusal or failure to cooperate on the part of internet platforms which allow such messages to circulate should be considered an act of complicity with praising terrorism and should consequently be punished;</p>	<p>9. Feels that the internet giants should be made aware of their responsibilities so that they delete illegal content as quickly as possible; believes that the Member States should plan for the possibility of bringing criminal prosecutions against digital actors who do not take action in response to the spread of <b>manifestly</b> illicit messages or messages praising terrorism on their internet platforms; believes that refusal or failure to cooperate on the part of internet platforms which allow such messages to circulate should be considered an act of complicity with praising terrorism and should consequently be punished; <b>to that effect, calls on the Commission to address, in the context of the European Forum with the IT sector, the question of training and forming teams that will be tasked, within internet platforms, for</b></p>

	<i>deciding whether to delete manifestly illicit content;</i>
<p>Comments: First, internet industry responsibilities are established already in the e-commerce Directive. Also, why only "internet giants" should be "made aware" of their responsibilities to delete illegal content and nobody else – particularly as the giants, with their big legal teams, are the most likely to be aware of their obligations? The second part of this paragraph would create an overwhelming pressure on any company, organisation or individual whose online presence could be considered to be an "Internet platform" – particularly smaller ones that could not afford any litigation – to delete <i>any</i> content that risked subsequently being considered illegal. The last part of the amendment paragraph could only be applicable to big companies, but what about small companies? How can they afford that? Finally, it would normally be understood that companies are already under an obligation to delete "manifestly illegal content". As a result, there is no need to set up teams to decide "whether" or not to do this.</p>	

Or. fr

 **Amendment 256**  
**Heinz K. Becker**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 9**

<b>OPPOSE</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>9. Feels that the internet giants should be made aware of their responsibilities so that they delete illegal content as quickly as possible; believes that the Member States should plan for the possibility of bringing criminal prosecutions against digital actors who do not take action in response to the spread of illicit messages or messages praising terrorism on their internet platforms; believes that refusal or failure to cooperate on the part of internet platforms which allow such messages to circulate should be considered an act of complicity with praising terrorism and should consequently be punished;</p>	<p>9. Feels that the internet giants should be made aware of their responsibilities so that they delete illegal content <b><i>or other content that incites hatred</i></b> as quickly as possible; believes that the Member States should plan for the possibility of bringing criminal prosecutions against digital actors who do not take <b><i>appropriate</i></b> action <b><i>as internet companies</i></b> in response to the spread of illicit messages, <b><i>other messages that incite hatred</i></b> or messages praising terrorism on their internet platforms; believes that refusal or failure to cooperate on the part of internet platforms which allow such messages to circulate should be considered an act of complicity with praising terrorism and should consequently be punished, <b><i>taking due account of the technical feasibility of responding thereto;</i></b></p>

Comments: This AM should be rejected mainly for three reasons. First, "or other content that incites hatred" and "other messages that incite hatred" mean that legal content would be deleted. In a democratic society it is not appropriate that companies be pressured to delete legal content without any counterbalancing obligation to leave legitimate content online. Second, what is the experience in Europe that suggests that Internet platforms are leaving illegal terrorist material online that is so severe that criminal sanctions are necessary? What is the experience that shows that, in any European country, the existing sanctions are not adequate?

Or. de

**Amendment 257**

Anna Hedh, Soraya Post

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 9

MIXED POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
9. Feels that the internet giants should be made aware of their responsibilities so that they delete illegal content as quickly as possible; believes that the Member States should plan for the possibility of bringing <b>criminal</b> prosecutions against digital actors who do not take action in response to the spread of illicit messages <b>or messages praising terrorism</b> on their internet platforms; believes that refusal or failure to cooperate on the part of internet platforms which allow such messages to circulate <b>should</b> be considered an act of complicity <b>with praising terrorism</b> and should consequently be punished;	9. Feels that the internet giants should be made aware of their responsibilities so that they delete illegal content as quickly as possible <b>in line with national legislation</b> ; believes that the Member States should plan for the possibility of bringing prosecutions against digital actors who do not take action in response to the spread of illicit messages on their internet platforms; believes that refusal or failure to cooperate on the part of internet platforms which allow such messages to circulate <b>may</b> be considered an act of complicity and should consequently be punished;
Comments: The AM improves the original text, although has little added value as it essentially describes the current situation in Europe. The logic behind use of the word “illegal” at the beginning of the text and “illicit” at the end is not clear. .	

Or. en

**Amendment 258**

Petras Auštrevičius

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 9

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
9. Feels that the internet giants should be made aware of their responsibilities so that they delete illegal content as quickly as possible; believes that the Member States should plan for the possibility of bringing criminal prosecutions against digital actors who do not take action in response to the spread of illicit messages or messages praising terrorism on their internet platforms; believes that refusal or failure to cooperate on the part of internet platforms which allow such messages to circulate should be considered an act of complicity with praising terrorism and should consequently be punished;	9. Feels that the internet giants should be made aware of their responsibilities so that they <b>identify, carefully assess and</b> delete illegal content as quickly as possible; believes that the Member States should plan for the possibility of bringing criminal prosecutions against digital actors who do not take action in response to the spread of illicit messages or messages praising terrorism on their internet platforms; believes that refusal or failure to cooperate on the part of internet platforms which allow such messages to circulate should be considered an act of complicity with praising terrorism and should consequently be punished;
Comments: The AM improves the original text, but the issues EDRi has identified are not resolved by this amendment. We refer to what we stated above regarding paragraph 9.	

Or. en





### Amendment 259

Anna Maria Corazza Bildt, Carlos Coelho, Monica Macovei, Barbara Matera,

Alessandra Mussolini

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 9

#### MIXED POSITION

<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
9. <i>Feels</i> that the internet <b>giants</b> should <b>be made aware of</b> their <b>responsibilities so that they delete</b> illegal content as quickly as possible; believes that the Member States should plan for the possibility of bringing criminal prosecutions against digital actors who do not take action in response to the spread of illicit messages or messages praising terrorism on their internet platforms; <b>believes that refusal or failure to cooperate on the part of internet platforms which allow such messages to circulate should be considered an act of complicity with praising terrorism and should consequently be punished;</b>	9. <b>Believes</b> that the internet <b>industry</b> should <b>take</b> their <b>shared responsibility in deleting</b> illegal content as quickly as possible; believes that the Member States should plan for the possibility of bringing criminal prosecutions against digital actors who do not take action in response to the spread of illicit messages or messages praising terrorism on their internet platforms, <b>in respect of freedom of expression;</b>
Comments: The AM improves the original wording. However, we are sceptical on why criminal sanctions would be needed. What is the experience in Europe that suggests that Internet platforms are leaving illegal terrorist material online that is so severe that criminal sanctions are necessary? What is the experience that shows that, in any European country, the existing sanctions are not adequate?	

Or. en



### Amendment 260

Eleftherios Synadinos

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 9

#### OPPOSE

<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
9. Feels that the internet giants should be made aware of their responsibilities so that they delete illegal content as quickly as possible; believes that the Member States should plan for the possibility of bringing criminal prosecutions against digital actors who do not take action in response to the spread of illicit messages or messages praising terrorism on their internet platforms; believes that refusal or failure to cooperate on the part of internet platforms which allow such messages to circulate should be considered an act of complicity with praising terrorism and should consequently be punished;	9. Feels that the internet giants should be made aware of their responsibilities so that they delete illegal content as quickly as possible; believes that the Member States should plan for the possibility of bringing criminal prosecutions against digital actors who do not take action in response to the spread of illicit messages or messages praising terrorism on their internet platforms; believes that refusal or failure to cooperate on the part of internet platforms which allow such messages to circulate should be considered an act of complicity with praising terrorism and should consequently be punished, <b>stresses the need to create an appropriate legal framework, so that radicalisation and recruitment posts be added to the other</b>

	<i>electronic crimes;</i>
Comments: We refer to previous comments regarding this paragraph.	

Or. el



**Amendment 261**

**Timothy Kirkhope**

on behalf of the ECR Group

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 9**

<b>OPPOSE</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
9. Feels that the internet giants should be made aware of their responsibilities so that they delete illegal content as quickly as possible; believes that the Member States should plan for the possibility of bringing criminal prosecutions against digital actors who do not take action in response to the spread of illicit messages or messages praising terrorism on their internet platforms; believes that refusal or failure to cooperate on the part of internet platforms which allow such messages to circulate should be considered an act of complicity with praising terrorism and should consequently be punished;	9. Feels that the internet giants should be made aware of their responsibilities so that they delete illegal content as quickly as possible; believes that the Member States should plan for the possibility of bringing criminal prosecutions against digital actors who do not take action in response to the spread of illicit messages or messages praising terrorism on their internet platforms; believes that refusal or failure to cooperate on the part of internet platforms which allow such messages to circulate should be considered an act of complicity with praising terrorism and should consequently be punished; <b><i>notes that it is important that there is constructive and regular dialogue between social media companies, IT companies, community leaders, experts in radicalisation, law enforcement authorities and Governments in order to find solutions and cooperate;</i></b>
Comments: Communication between all actors involved in the fight against terrorism are needed, but these "dialogues" could be a means of pressure for companies to act arbitrarily against fundamental rights because they may fear to be criminally liable. Currently, several dialogues have taken place without being transparent or inclusive. E.g. <a href="https://edri.org/launch-of-the-eu-internet-forum-behind-closed-doors-and-without-civil-society/">https://edri.org/launch-of-the-eu-internet-forum-behind-closed-doors-and-without-civil-society/</a> .	

Or. en



**Amendment 262**

**Nadine Morano**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 9**

<b>OPPOSE</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
9. Feels that the internet giants should be made aware of their responsibilities so that they delete illegal content as quickly as possible; believes that the Member States should plan for the possibility of bringing criminal prosecutions against digital actors who do not take action in response to the	9. Feels that the internet giants should be made aware of their responsibilities so that they <b><i>block and</i></b> delete illegal content as quickly as possible; believes that the Member States should plan for the possibility of bringing criminal prosecutions against digital actors who do

spread of illicit messages or messages praising terrorism on their internet platforms; believes that refusal or failure to cooperate on the part of internet platforms which allow such messages to circulate should be considered an act of complicity with praising terrorism and should consequently be punished;	not take action in response to the spread of illicit messages or messages praising terrorism on their internet platforms; believes that refusal or failure to cooperate on the part of internet platforms which allow such messages to circulate should be considered an act of complicity with praising terrorism and should consequently be punished;
<p>Comments: It is not obvious whether this covers blocking by access providers (who are not the subject of the paragraph, and therefore irrelevant) or it refers to the removal from public view of offending content. Blocking of offending content can indeed be better when dealing with illegal material, as it allows the evidence to be preserved. However, one can either block OR delete content. If the content has been deleted, it cannot be blocked. The amendment therefore does not make logical sense.</p> <p>Regarding the rest of the paragraph, we refer to comments made previously on paragraph 9.</p>	

Or. fr



**Amendment 263**

**Monika Hohlmeier, Rachida Dati**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 9**


OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>9. Feels that the internet <b>giants</b> should be made aware of their responsibilities so that they delete illegal content as quickly as possible; believes that the Member States should plan for the possibility of bringing criminal prosecutions against digital actors who do not take action in response to the spread of illicit messages or messages praising terrorism on their internet platforms; believes that refusal or failure to cooperate on the part of internet platforms which allow such messages to circulate should be considered an act of complicity with praising terrorism and should consequently be punished;</p>	<p>9. Feels that the internet <b>industry</b> should be made aware of their responsibilities so that they delete illegal content as quickly as possible; believes that the Member States should plan for the possibility of bringing criminal prosecutions against digital actors who do not take action in response to the spread of illicit messages or messages praising terrorism on their internet platforms; believes that refusal or failure to cooperate on the part of internet platforms which allow such messages to circulate should be considered an act of complicity with praising terrorism and should consequently be punished; <b>welcomes the cooperation between Europol, national law enforcement and judiciary bodies with private actors to swiftly remove illicit content and to prosecute perpetrators; calls on the European Commission and Member States to promote and support the further institutionalisation of such working groups;</b></p>
<p>Comments: Changing "internet giants" for "internet industry" seems reasonable. Similarly, where content is/has been made illegal on the basis of necessary and proportionate legal instruments, it is clearly preferable to involve state authorities and not leave it up to companies to do so..</p>	

Or. en

**Amendment 264**  
**Franz Obermayr**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 9**

<b>NO POSITION</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>9. Feels that the internet giants should be made aware of their responsibilities so that they delete illegal content as quickly as possible; believes that the Member States should plan for the possibility of bringing criminal prosecutions against digital actors who do not take action in response to the spread of illicit messages or messages praising terrorism on their internet platforms; believes that refusal or failure to cooperate on the part of internet platforms which allow such messages to circulate should be considered an act of complicity with praising terrorism and should consequently be punished;</p>	<p>9. Feels that the internet giants should be made aware of their responsibilities so that they delete illegal content as quickly as possible; believes that the Member States should plan for the possibility of bringing criminal prosecutions against digital actors who do not take action in response to the spread of illicit messages or messages praising <b>Islamist</b> terrorism on their internet platforms; believes that refusal or failure to cooperate on the part of internet platforms which allow such messages to circulate should be considered an act of complicity with praising terrorism and should consequently be punished;</p>

Or. de

 **Amendment 265**  
**Louis Michel, Gérard Deprez**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 9**

<b>OPPOSE</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>9. Feels that the internet <b>giants</b> should be made aware of their responsibilities so that they delete illegal content as quickly as possible; believes that the Member States should plan for the possibility of bringing criminal prosecutions against digital actors who do not take action in response to the spread of illicit messages or messages praising terrorism on their internet platforms; believes that refusal or failure to cooperate on the part of internet platforms which allow such messages to circulate should be considered an act of complicity with praising terrorism and should consequently be punished;</p>	<p>9. Feels that the internet <b>operators</b> should be made aware of their responsibilities so that they delete illegal content as quickly as possible; believes that the Member States should plan for the possibility of bringing criminal prosecutions against digital actors who do not take action in response to the spread of illicit messages or messages praising terrorism on their internet platforms; believes that refusal or failure to cooperate on the part of internet platforms which allow such messages to circulate should be considered an act of complicity with praising terrorism and should consequently be punished;</p>
<p>Comments: Changing "internet giants" to "operators" seems reasonable. However, this change is not sufficient to make this AM in line with the E-commerce Directive or the Charter of Fundamental Rights. We refer to our previous comments for more details.</p>	

Or. fr

**Amendment 266****Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz, Petr Ježek, Gérard Deprez, Louis Michel****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 9**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>9. Feels that the internet giants should be made aware of their responsibilities so that they delete illegal content as quickly as possible; believes that the Member States should plan <b><i>for the possibility of bringing criminal prosecutions against digital actors who do not take action in response to the spread of illicit messages or messages praising terrorism on their internet platforms</i></b>; believes that refusal or failure to cooperate on the part of internet platforms which allow such messages to <b><i>circulate</i></b> should be <b><i>considered an act of complicity with praising terrorism and should consequently be punished</i></b>;</p>	<p>9. Feels that the internet giants should be made aware of their responsibilities so that they delete illegal content as quickly as possible; believes that the Member States should plan <b><i>to take measures to closely cooperate with Internet servers/providers and to act against companies not reacting when having acknowledgement of the distribution of</i></b> messages praising terrorism; believes that refusal or failure to cooperate on the part of internet platforms which allow such messages to <b><i>remain online</i></b> should be <b><i>sanctioned if the agreed previous measures to withdraw this messages are not put in action</i></b>;</p>
<p>Comments: This amendment would make this paragraph to be compliant with the e-commerce Directive. It is regrettable that the amendment did not make clear that it was referring to illegal messages.</p>	

Or. en

**Amendment 267****Louis Michel, Gérard Deprez****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 9 a (new)**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
	<p><b><i>9a. Calls on the competent authorities to ensure that websites that incite hatred are monitored more strictly</i></b>;</p>
<p>Comments: The meaning of this amendment is not clear. What does “monitor” mean? Who should do the “monitoring”? Does this refer to sites that contain illegal material? .</p>	

Or. fr

**Amendment 268****Marine Le Pen, Edouard Ferrand, Gilles Lebreton****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 10**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p><b><i>10. Feels, however, that the internet is an effective platform for spreading discourse opposed to hate speech and praise for terrorism; calls on the digital giants to cooperate with the Member States in order to take part in the spread of prevention messages calling for the development of critical thinking and for a</i></b></p>	<p><b><i>deleted</i></b></p>

*process of deradicalisation;*

Comments: We support this amendment as it can be a way to encourage excessive liability on intermediaries, leading to arbitrary human rights and fundamental freedoms' online restrictions.

Or. fr



### Amendment 269

Sophia in 't Veld

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 10

#### SUPPORT

*Motion for a resolution*

10. Feels, however, that the internet **is an** effective platform for spreading discourse **opposed to** hate speech and praise for terrorism; calls on **the digital giants to cooperate with the** Member States **in order to take part in the spread of prevention messages calling for the development of critical thinking and for a process of deradicalisation;**

*Amendment*

10. Feels, however, that the internet **could be an** effective platform for spreading discourse **opposing** hate speech and praise for terrorism; calls on Member States **to** spread messages **that develop** critical thinking **and help to prevent violent extremism;**

Comments: Positive measures are more effective than negative measures. We thus welcome this amendment.

Or. en



### Amendment 270

Anna Maria Corazza Bildt, Carlos Coelho, Monica Macovei, Frank Engel, Barbara Matera, Traian Ungureanu, Kinga Gál, Alessandra Mussolini

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 10

#### SUPPORT

*Motion for a resolution*

10. **Feels, however,** that the internet is an effective platform for spreading discourse **opposed to hate speech and praise for terrorism;** calls on the digital **giants** to cooperate with the Member States in order to **take part in the spread of prevention messages calling for the development of critical thinking and for a process of deradicalisation;**

*Amendment*

10. **Stresses** that the internet is an effective platform for spreading discourse **of respect of human rights and fundamental freedoms and opposed to violence;** calls on the digital **platforms** to cooperate with the Member States in order to **identify innovative legal ways for countering praise of terrorism and hate speech, thereby making online radicalisation more difficult;**

Comments: The amendment is self-explanatory. It is worth remembering, however, that this strategy relies on internet companies not being over-enthusiastic in their deletion of content that is not illegal..

Or. en



### Amendment 271

Monika Hohlmeier, Rachida Dati

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 10

#### MIXED POSITION

*Motion for a resolution*

10. **Feels, however,** that the internet is an

*Amendment*

10. **Is convinced** that the internet is an



effective platform <i>for spreading</i> discourse <b>opposed</b> to hate speech and praise for terrorism; calls on the <i>digital giants</i> to cooperate with the Member States in order to take part in the spread of prevention messages calling for the development of critical thinking and for a process of deradicalisation;	effective platform <i>to spread</i> discourse to <b>counter</b> hate speech and praise for terrorism; <b>recalls that such counter discourse should be based on the charter of fundamental rights</b> ; calls on the <i>internet industry</i> to cooperate with the Member States in order to take part in the spread of prevention messages calling for the development of critical thinking and for a process of deradicalisation;
Comments: This paragraph (even in its amendment form) underestimates citizens' ability to understand and respond to extremist messages. Within the context of the draft report and its paragraph 9 in particular, this amendment could lead to over-censorship.	

Or. en



**Amendment 272**

**Barbara Spinelli**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 10**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
10. <b>Feels</b> , however, that the internet is an effective platform for spreading discourse opposed to hate speech and praise for terrorism; calls on <i>the digital giants to cooperate with the Member States in order to take part in</i> the spread of prevention messages calling for the development of critical thinking and for a process of <b>deradicalisation</b> ;	10. <b>Notes</b> , however, that the internet is an effective platform for spreading discourse opposed to hate speech and praise for terrorism; calls on <i>Member States to ensure that excessive liability is not imposed on internet intermediaries, which could lead to arbitrary restrictions that would undermine</i> the spread of prevention messages calling for the development of critical thinking and for a process of <b>disengagement</b> ;
Comments: This amendment is welcomed intermediaries are often face excessive liability if they conduct their assessment incorrectly. Moreover, changing "deradicalisation" for "disengagement" is better, as the concept does not have a clear meaning and risks being misleading.	

Or. en



**Amendment 273**

**Christine Revault D'Allonnes Bonnefoy**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 10**

MIXED POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
10. Feels, however, that the internet is an effective platform for spreading discourse opposed to hate speech and praise for terrorism; calls on the digital giants to cooperate with the Member States in order to take part in the spread of prevention messages calling for the development of critical thinking and for a process of deradicalisation;	Feels, however, that the internet is an effective platform for spreading discourse opposed to hate speech and praise for terrorism, <b>which must hinge on the promotion of European values, tolerance, social inclusion and peaceful coexistence</b> ; calls on the digital giants to cooperate with the Member States in order to take part in the spread of prevention messages calling



	for the development of critical thinking, <b><i>for the unequivocal condemnation of the use of violence</i></b> and for a process of deradicalisation;
Comments: Whereas the first part of the amendment is very welcomed, the second part, read in conjunctions with the many amendments to paragraph 9, could lead to a situation where internet companies would be asked both to police hate speech/terrorist content AND ensure the spread of counter-messaging. This wholesale shaping of online communications by private, profit-inspired companies, seems a very dangerous suggestion in a democratic society.	

Or. fr



**Amendment 274**

**Mariya Gabriel**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 10**

MIXED POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
10. Feels, however, that the internet is an effective platform for spreading discourse opposed to hate speech and praise for terrorism; calls on the digital giants to cooperate with the Member States in order to take part in the spread of prevention messages calling for the development of critical thinking and for a process of deradicalisation;	10. Feels, however, that the internet is an effective platform for spreading discourse opposed to hate speech and praise for terrorism; calls on the digital giants to cooperate with the Member States in order to take part in the spread of prevention messages calling for the development of critical thinking and for a process of deradicalisation; <b><i>calls on the European Commission and the Member States to work closely with civil society organisations for the purposes of reinforcing the channels for distributing discourse and to propose adequate training for key persons and opinion makers at the local level;</i></b>
Comments: Whereas the addition is welcomed, as civil society is often ignored (e.g. in the <a href="#">EU Internet forum</a> ). However, the paragraph does not take into account the excessive liability under which companies are subject to, which sometimes leads to arbitrary human rights' online restrictions. Ultimately, why only "internet giants" are called upon?	

Or. fr



**Amendment 275**

**Liisa Jaakonsaari**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 10**

MIXED POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
10. Feels, however, that the internet is an effective platform for spreading discourse opposed to hate speech and praise for terrorism; calls on the digital giants to cooperate with the Member States in order to take part in the spread of prevention messages calling for the development of	10. Feels, however, that the internet is an effective platform for spreading discourse opposed to hate speech and praise for terrorism; calls on the digital giants to cooperate with the Member States in order to take part in the spread of prevention messages <b><i>by organizing campaigns on</i></b>

critical thinking and for a process of deradicalisation;	<i>social media and discussion forums as well as</i> calling for the development of critical thinking and for a process of deradicalisation;
Comments: Whereas positives measures like the ones described in the amendment are more effective than repressive measures, the paragraph would need to be matched with a more flexible approach to liability/responsibility of intermediaries, to prevent the shutting down of legitimate discussions by “internet giants”.	

Or. en



**Amendment 276**

**Tomáš Zdechovský, Andrey Novakov, Eva Paunova**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 10**

MIXED POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
10. <b>Feels, however,</b> that the internet is an effective platform for spreading discourse opposed to hate speech and praise for terrorism; calls on the digital giants to cooperate with the Member States in order to take part in the spread of prevention messages calling for the development of critical thinking and for a process of deradicalisation;	10. <b>Stresses</b> that the internet is an effective platform for spreading discourse opposed to hate speech and praise for terrorism; calls on the digital giants <b>and other actors on the internet</b> to cooperate with the Member States in order to take part in the spread of prevention messages calling for the development of critical thinking and for a process of deradicalisation;
Comments: Whereas taking into account "other actors on the internet" is very welcomed, the paragraph does not take into account the excessive liability under which companies are subject to, which sometimes leads to arbitrary human rights' online restrictions.	

Or. en



**Amendment 277**

**Anna Hedh, Soraya Post**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 10**

MIXED POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
10. Feels, however, that the internet is an effective platform for spreading discourse opposed to hate speech and praise for terrorism; calls on the digital giants to cooperate with the Member States in order to take part in the spread of prevention messages calling for the development of critical thinking and for a process of deradicalisation;	10. Feels, however, that the internet is an effective platform for spreading discourse opposed to hate speech and praise for terrorism; calls on the digital giants to cooperate with the Member States <b>and civil society</b> in order to take part in the spread of prevention messages calling for the development of critical thinking and for a process of deradicalisation;
Comments: Whereas including civil society is very welcomed, the paragraph does not take into account the excessive liability under which companies are subject to, which sometimes leads to arbitrary human rights' online restrictions.	

Or. en

**Amendment 278****Petras Auštrevičius****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 10**

MIXED POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
10. Feels, however, that the internet is an effective platform for spreading discourse opposed to hate speech and praise for terrorism; calls on the digital giants to cooperate with the Member States in order to <b>take part in the spread of prevention messages calling for the development of critical thinking and for a process of deradicalisation</b> ;	10. Feels, however, that the internet is an effective platform for spreading discourse opposed to hate speech and praise for terrorism <b>and increasing public resilience to radicalisation</b> ; calls on the digital giants to cooperate with the Member States in order to <b>improve communication with the public on counter-terrorism</b> ;
Comments: What does the amendment mean by "resilience to radicalisation"? Why only "digital giants" are called upon? The second part of the amendment improves the original wording, but it underestimates citizens' ability to react against terrorism.	

Or. en

**Amendment 279****Brice Hortefeux, Rachida Dati****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 10**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
10. Feels, however, that the internet is an effective platform for spreading discourse opposed to hate speech and praise for terrorism; calls on the digital giants to cooperate with the Member States in order to take part in the spread of prevention messages calling for the development of critical thinking and for a process of deradicalisation;	10. Feels, however, that the internet is an effective platform for spreading discourse opposed to hate speech and praise for terrorism; calls on the digital giants to cooperate with the Member States in order to <b>work on developing discourse and to take part in the spread of prevention messages calling for the development of critical thinking and for a process of deradicalisation</b> ;
Comments: Why should private, generally American companies, be involved in developing discourse with/between European citizens?	

Or. fr

**Amendment 280****Ana Gomes, Birgit Sippel, Caterina Chinnici, Sylvia-Yvonne Kaufmann****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 10**

MIXED POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
10. Feels, however, that the internet is an effective platform for spreading discourse opposed to hate speech and praise for terrorism; calls on the digital <b>giants</b> to cooperate with the Member States in order to take part in the spread of prevention messages calling for the development of	10. Feels, however, that the internet is an effective platform for spreading discourse opposed to hate speech and praise for terrorism; <b>considers that the internet industry and service providers should develop powerful and attractive narratives to counter hate speech and radicalisation</b>


critical thinking and for <i>a process of</i> deradicalisation;	<i>online and calls on the Commission and Member States to assist them in that effort;</i> calls on the digital <i>companies and corporations</i> to cooperate with the <i>EU and</i> Member States in order to take part in the spread of prevention messages calling for the development of critical thinking and for deradicalisation;
Comments: The amendment improves the original wording. However, EDRi believes the emphasis should be put on ensuring that Member States do not impose excessive liability on internet intermediaries because that can lead to excessive restrictions which can undermine positive measures undertaken to prevent the spread of terrorist messages. Furthermore, what qualifies internet companies, generally US companies, to be given the responsibility of jointly developing narratives for European citizens?	

Or. en

**Amendment 281**  
**Franz Obermayr**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 10**

NO POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
10. Feels, however, that the internet is an effective platform for spreading discourse opposed to hate speech and praise for terrorism; calls on the digital giants to cooperate with the Member States in order to take part in the spread of prevention messages calling for the development of critical thinking and for a process of deradicalisation;	10. Feels, however, that the internet is an effective platform for spreading discourse opposed to hate speech and praise for <i>Islamist</i> terrorism; calls on the digital giants to cooperate with the Member States in order to take part in the spread of prevention messages calling for the development of critical thinking and for a process of deradicalisation <i>of Islamists</i> ;
Comments: It falls outside of EDRi's scope of work.	

Or. de

 **Amendment 282**  
**Louis Michel, Gérard Deprez**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 10**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
10. Feels, however, that the internet is an effective platform for spreading discourse opposed to hate speech and praise for terrorism; calls on the digital <i>giants</i> to cooperate with the Member States in order to take part in the spread of prevention messages calling for the development of critical thinking and for a process of deradicalisation;	10. Feels, however, that the internet is an effective platform for spreading discourse opposed to hate speech and praise for terrorism; calls on the digital <i>operators</i> to cooperate with the Member States <i>and European agencies and bodies</i> in order to take part in the spread of prevention messages calling for the development of critical thinking and for a process of deradicalisation;
Comments: Whereas changing "digital giants" to "digital operators" is welcomed, the paragraph does not take into account the excessive liability under which companies are subject to, which sometimes leads to arbitrary human rights' online restrictions.	

**Amendment 283**

Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz, Petr Ježek, Gérard Deprez, Louis Michel

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 10

MIXED POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
10. Feels, however, that the internet is an effective platform for spreading discourse opposed to hate speech and praise for terrorism; calls on the digital giants to cooperate with the Member States in order to take part in the spread of prevention messages calling for the development of critical thinking and for a process of deradicalisation;	10. Feels, however, that the internet is an effective platform for spreading discourse opposed to hate speech and praise for terrorism; calls on the digital giants to cooperate with the Member States <b><i>and with organisations whose fields of expertise are terrorist deradicalisation or evaluation of hate speeches</i></b> in order to take part in the spread of prevention messages calling for the development of critical thinking and for a process of deradicalisation;
Comments: We welcome MEPs' calls for Member States to involve civil society organisations which expertise on the field. However, the use of internet companies in <i>ad hoc</i> projects to shape the views of European citizens carries significant risk and the value of this approach is far from clear. See a recent example: <a href="http://www.dw.com/en/facebook-must-ban-abusive-content-says-german-justice-minister-maas/a-18676705">http://www.dw.com/en/facebook-must-ban-abusive-content-says-german-justice-minister-maas/a-18676705</a> .	

Or. en

**Amendment 284**

Barbara Spinelli

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 10 – subparagraph 1 (new)

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
	<b><i>Believes indeed that, although governments are increasingly relying on censorship and filtering methods to counter online extremism, these measures are not only ineffective and costly but potentially counter-productive;</i></b>
Comments: This is indeed important. This amendment is based on evidence.	

Or. en

**Amendment 285**

Heinz K. Becker

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 11

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<b><i>11. States that the internet giants, through internet referencing, have the power to promote radicalisation prevention messages aimed at countering messages that praise terrorism; feels that it is thus their duty to highlight messages that</i></b>	<b><i>deleted</i></b>


<i>oppose hate speech and praise for terrorism, thereby making online radicalisation more difficult;</i>	
Comments: There is no provision in the e-commerce Directive which states companies have a general duty to be non-neutral or to discriminate on the basis of content. This "obligation" would imply a vigilante action by companies. Intermediaries do not have neither the democratic legitimacy nor the motivation to carry out a safe review process. Therefore, we support the deletion of this paragraph. The same comment applies to AMs 286-288.	

Or. de

 **Amendment 286**  
**Marine Le Pen, Edouard Ferrand, Gilles Lebreton**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 11**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<i>11. States that the internet giants, through internet referencing, have the power to promote radicalisation prevention messages aimed at countering messages that praise terrorism; feels that it is thus their duty to highlight messages that oppose hate speech and praise for terrorism, thereby making online radicalisation more difficult;</i>	<i>deleted</i>

Or. fr

 **Amendment 287**  
**Sophia in 't Veld**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 11**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<i>11. States that the internet giants, through internet referencing, have the power to promote radicalisation prevention messages aimed at countering messages that praise terrorism; feels that it is thus their duty to highlight messages that oppose hate speech and praise for terrorism, thereby making online radicalisation more difficult;</i>	<i>deleted</i>

Or. en

 **Amendment 288**  
**Anna Maria Corazza Bildt, Carlos Coelho, Monica Macovei, Barbara Matera**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 11**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<i>11. States that the internet giants, through internet referencing, have the power to promote radicalisation prevention messages aimed at countering messages</i>	<i>deleted</i>



*that praise terrorism; feels that it is thus their duty to highlight messages that oppose hate speech and praise for terrorism, thereby making online radicalisation more difficult;*

Or. en



#### Amendment 289

Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz, Gérard Deprez, Louis Michel

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 11

#### MIXED POSITION

<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
11. States that the internet giants, through internet referencing, have the power to promote radicalisation prevention messages aimed at countering <b>messages that praise terrorism; feels that it is thus their duty to highlight messages that oppose</b> hate speech and praise for terrorism, <b>thereby making online radicalisation more difficult;</b>	11. States that the internet giants, through internet referencing, have the power to promote <b>terrorist</b> radicalisation prevention messages aimed at countering hate speech and praise for terrorism;
Comments: This amendment tries to clarify what they mean by "radicalisation" and acknowledges the risks and infeasibility of the proposal referred to in the second sentence of the original wording. However, it would be a major and very dangerous step for the EU to urge "internet giants" to manipulate online discourse in Europe, even if the aim is a legitimate one.	

Or. en



#### Amendment 290

Barbara Spinelli

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 11

#### SUPPORT

<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
11. States that the internet <b>giants</b> , through internet referencing, have the power to promote <b>radicalisation</b> prevention messages <b>aimed at countering messages that praise terrorism; feels that it is thus their duty to highlight messages that oppose hate speech and praise for terrorism, thereby making online radicalisation more difficult;</b>	11. States that the <b>major</b> internet <b>companies</b> , through internet referencing, have the power to promote prevention messages <b>against violent extremism; notes however that, in a very complex environment, vigilante action by such companies could be, or could suddenly become, counterproductive and violate the right to privacy; notes that such companies have neither the democratic legitimacy nor the motivation to implement diligent ongoing review processes necessary for such activities to be carried out safely;</b>
Comments: While the amendment acknowledges companies can promote anti-terrorist speech, it highlights the risks of adopting the policy option outlined in the second sentence of paragraph 11 of the original draft report. We believe this amendment is balanced and thus support it. As the amendment implies, it would be a major and very dangerous step for the EU	



to urge internet giants to manipulate online discourse in Europe, even if the aim is a legitimate one.

Or. en

**+ Amendment 291**

**Jean Lambert**

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 11**

**SUPPORT**

<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
11. States that the internet <b>giants</b> , through internet referencing, have the power to promote radicalisation prevention messages <b>aimed at countering messages that praise terrorism; feels that it is thus their duty to highlight messages that oppose hate speech and praise for terrorism, thereby making online radicalisation more difficult;</b>	11. States that the internet <b>companies</b> , through internet referencing, have the power to promote radicalisation prevention messages; <b>notes however that, in a very complex environment, vigilante action by such companies could be, or could suddenly become, counterproductive; notes that such companies have neither the democratic legitimacy nor the motivation to implement diligent ongoing review processes necessary for such activities to be carried out safely;</b>
Comments: We refer to comments to AM 290, which is similar to this amendment.	

Or. en

**- Amendment 292**

**Christine Revault D'Allonnes Bonnefoy**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 11**

**OPPOSE**

<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
11. States that <b>the internet giants, through</b> internet referencing, <b>have the power to</b> promote radicalisation prevention messages aimed at countering messages that praise terrorism; feels that <b>it is thus their duty</b> to highlight messages that oppose hate speech and praise for terrorism, thereby making online radicalisation more difficult;	11. States that internet referencing <b>must henceforth make it possible</b> to promote radicalisation prevention messages aimed at countering messages that praise terrorism; feels that <b>a special European cooperation unit should be put in place within Europol with a view to sharing goods practices in the Member States, while permanently cooperating with the internet operators, in order</b> to highlight messages that oppose hate speech and praise for terrorism, thereby making online radicalisation more difficult;
Comments: While internet referencing can help promoting preventive measures, the amended paragraph suggests companies would have to arbitrarily seek to shape online discourse. This precedent would have major consequences for a democratic society and would almost certainly be counterproductive. Companies do not have the democratic legitimacy or the motivation to implement the suggested measure with a diligent review process. In addition, there are already collaboration units on terrorist matters within the EU. E.g. the "Radicalisation Awareness Network" (RAN) or the Internet Referral Unit, which was set up by Europol in July 2015.	


**Amendment 293**


Kati Piri

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 11

MIXED POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
11. States that the internet giants, through internet referencing, have the power to promote radicalisation prevention messages aimed at countering messages that praise terrorism; feels that <b><i>it is thus their duty to highlight messages that oppose hate speech and praise for terrorism, thereby making</i></b> online radicalisation more difficult;	11. States that the internet giants, through internet referencing, have the power to promote radicalisation prevention messages aimed at countering messages that praise terrorism; feels that <b><i>more needs to be done to make</i></b> online radicalisation more difficult;
Comments: The amendment substituted a controversial sentence from the original draft report. However, it still leaves concepts which should be shaped, namely, "internet giants" and "radicalisation". In addition, it is not clear what more needs to be done. What needs to be done is something necessary, effective and proportionate to the aim pursued.	

Or. en


**Amendment 294**

Mariya Gabriel

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 11

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
11. States that the internet giants, through internet referencing, have the power to promote radicalisation prevention messages aimed at countering messages that praise terrorism; feels that it is thus their duty to highlight messages that oppose hate speech and praise for terrorism, thereby making online radicalisation more difficult;	11. States that the internet giants, through internet referencing, have the power to promote radicalisation prevention messages aimed at countering messages that praise terrorism; feels that it is thus their duty to highlight messages that oppose hate speech and praise for terrorism, thereby making online radicalisation more difficult; <b><i>believes that the technique of blocking may be circumvented and must therefore be accompanied by the de-indexing of websites inciting terrorism, which makes it possible for these websites not to be shown on the first pages of search engine results, thus considerably reducing the frequency with which the website is visited;</i></b>
Comments: Both blocking and de-indexing are ineffective. As <a href="#">research shows</a> , hiding extremist content lacks of effectiveness because people usually reach websites through links from other websites or through direct recommendation. This amendment does not solve the concerns raised as regards the second sentence of the original paragraph.	

Or. fr

**Amendment 295****Petr Ježek****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 11**

<b>OPPOSE</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
11. States that the internet giants, through internet referencing, have the power to promote radicalisation prevention messages aimed at countering messages that praise terrorism; feels that it is thus their duty to highlight messages that oppose hate speech and praise for terrorism, thereby making online radicalisation more difficult;	11. States that the internet giants, through internet referencing, have the power to <b><i>cooperate with Member States and their respective online counter-terrorism units</i></b> to promote radicalisation prevention messages aimed at countering messages that praise terrorism; feels that it is thus their duty to highlight messages that oppose hate speech and praise for terrorism, thereby making online radicalisation more difficult;
<p>Comments: While "internet giants" may have power (money), that does not mean companies can act as policy makers. What about "non-giant" companies? What does it mean for democracy if we accept the principle that internet companies can arbitrarily interfere with online discourse?</p> <p>Member States have the obligation to respect human rights online. However, such obligation does not apply to companies. We believe this (<i>de facto</i> forced) cooperation is a way for Member States to evade their responsibilities. A balanced approach must be put in place.</p>	

Or. en

**Amendment 296****Ana Gomes, Birgit Sippel, Sylvia-Yvonne Kaufmann****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 11**

<b>MIXED POSITION</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
11. States that the internet <b><i>giants</i></b> , through internet referencing, <b><i>have the power to</i></b> promote radicalisation prevention messages aimed at countering messages that praise terrorism; feels that it is thus their duty to highlight messages that oppose hate speech and praise for terrorism, thereby making online radicalisation more difficult;	11. States that the internet <b><i>industry and service providers</i></b> , through internet referencing, <b><i>may</i></b> promote radicalisation prevention messages aimed at countering messages that praise terrorism; feels that it is thus their duty to highlight messages that oppose hate speech and praise for terrorism, thereby making online radicalisation more difficult;
<p>Comments: This amendment improves the original wording. Companies do not have a general duty to be non-neutral or to discriminate on the basis of content. This "obligation" would imply an arbitrary action by companies. Intermediaries do not have the democratic legitimacy or the motivation to carry out a safe review process.</p>	

Or. en

**Amendment 297****Monika Hohlmeier, Rachida Dati****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 11**

MIXED POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
11. States that the internet <b>giants</b> , through internet referencing, have the power to promote radicalisation prevention messages aimed at countering messages that praise terrorism; feels that it is thus their duty to highlight messages that oppose hate speech and praise for terrorism, thereby making online radicalisation more difficult;	11. States that the internet <b>industry</b> , through internet referencing, have the power to promote radicalisation prevention messages aimed at countering messages that praise terrorism; feels that it is thus their duty to highlight messages that oppose hate speech and praise for terrorism, thereby making online radicalisation more difficult; <b><i>calls on the Commission and on Member States to support the effective use of counter narratives and mitigation measures through the internet;</i></b>
Comments: This amendment improves the original wording, however it should be noted that companies do not have a general duty to be non-neutral or to discriminate on the basis of content. This "obligation" would imply a vigilante action by companies. Intermediaries do not have the democratic legitimacy or the motivation to carry out a safe review process.	

Or. en

**Amendment 298****Franz Obermayr****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 11**

NO POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
11. States that the internet giants, through internet referencing, have the power to promote radicalisation prevention messages aimed at countering messages that praise terrorism; feels that it is thus their duty to highlight messages that oppose hate speech and praise for terrorism, thereby making online radicalisation more difficult;	11. States that the internet giants, through internet referencing, have the power to promote radicalisation prevention messages aimed at countering messages that praise <b><i>Islamist</i></b> terrorism; feels that it is thus their duty to highlight messages that oppose hate speech and praise for <b><i>Islamist</i></b> terrorism, thereby making online radicalisation more difficult;

Or. de

**Amendment 299****Louis Michel, Gérard Deprez****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 11**

MIXED POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
11. States that the internet <b>giants</b> , through internet referencing, have the power to promote radicalisation prevention messages aimed at countering messages that praise terrorism; feels that it is thus	11. States that the internet <b>operators</b> , through internet referencing, have the power to promote radicalisation prevention messages aimed at countering messages that praise terrorism; feels that it is thus

their duty to highlight messages that oppose hate speech and praise for terrorism, thereby making online radicalisation more difficult;	their duty to highlight messages that oppose hate speech and praise for terrorism, thereby making online radicalisation more difficult;
Comments: Changing "internet giants" for "internet operators" is welcome. However, it should be noted that companies do not have a general duty to be non-neutral or to discriminate for ideological/political reasons. This "obligation" would imply arbitrary action by companies. Intermediaries do not have the democratic legitimacy or the motivation to carry out a safe review process.	

Or. fr

**+ Amendment 300**  
**Christine Revault D'Allonnes Bonnefoy**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 12**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<b><i>12. Supports the introduction of measures enabling all internet users to flag illegal content circulating on the internet and on social media networks easily and quickly, while respecting basic freedoms and freedom of expression;</i></b>	<b><i>deleted</i></b>
Comments: The solution to the problem this amendment is trying to solve already exists. There are no barriers to flagging content. Thus, its deletion could be supported. The same comment applies to AM 301.	

Or. fr

**+ Amendment 301**  
**Marine Le Pen, Edouard Ferrand, Gilles Lebreton**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 12**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<b><i>12. Supports the introduction of measures enabling all internet users to flag illegal content circulating on the internet and on social media networks easily and quickly, while respecting basic freedoms and freedom of expression;</i></b>	<b><i>deleted</i></b>
Comments: See comments to AM 300.	


Or. fr

**⊖ Amendment 302**  
**Liisa Jaakonsaari**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 12**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
12. Supports the introduction of measures enabling all internet users to flag illegal content circulating on the internet and on social media networks easily and quickly, while respecting basic freedoms and	12. Supports the introduction of measures enabling all internet users to flag illegal content circulating on the internet and on social media networks easily and quickly, while respecting basic freedoms and


freedom of expression;	freedom of expression; <i>reminds the important role of journalists who have major responsibility in strengthening democracy and freedom of speech, but should avoid unethical practices and sensationalism;</i>
Comments: This amendment raises an incongruous element and does not fix the existing problems with the text..	

Or. en

 **Amendment 303**  
**Anna Hedh, Soraya Post**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 12**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
12. Supports the introduction of measures enabling all internet users to flag illegal content circulating on the internet and on social media networks easily and quickly, while respecting <i>basic freedoms</i> and freedom of expression;	12. Supports the introduction of measures enabling all internet users to flag illegal content circulating on the internet and on social media networks easily and quickly, while respecting <i>fundamental rights</i> and freedom of expression <i>and national legislation;</i>
Comments: Freedom of expression is a fundamental right. National legislation must be compliant with international human rights standards, so it is implicit in the original draft. Arbitrary deletion of content by internet companies is not covered by fundamental rights or national legislation.	

Or. en

 **Amendment 304**  
**Anna Maria Corazza Bildt, Carlos Coelho, Monica Macovei, Frank Engel, Barbara Matera, Traian Ungureanu, Kinga Gál, Alessandra Mussolini**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 12**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
12. Supports the introduction of measures enabling all internet users to flag illegal content circulating on the internet and on social media networks <i>easily and quickly</i> , while respecting basic freedoms and freedom of expression;	12. Supports the introduction of measures enabling all internet users to <i>easily and quickly</i> flag illegal content circulating on the internet and on social media networks <i>and to report it to competent authorities, including through hotlines</i> , while respecting basic freedoms and freedom of expression;
Comments: We see no opposition for people to directly report illegal content to competent authorities.	

Or. en

**Amendment 305****Ana Gomes, Barbara Spinelli, Caterina Chinnici, Sylvia-Yvonne Kaufmann, Rachida Dati****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 12**

<b>SUPPORT</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
12. Supports the introduction of measures enabling all internet users to flag illegal content circulating on the internet and on social media networks easily and quickly, while respecting <b><i>basic freedoms and freedom of expression</i></b> ;	12. Supports the introduction of measures enabling all internet users to flag illegal content circulating on the internet and on social media networks easily and quickly, while respecting <b><i>fundamental rights, especially freedom of expression</i></b> ;
Comments: We welcome the amendment because freedom of expression is also a human right recognised by the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU, the European Convention of Human Rights, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, among other international instruments.	

Or. en

**Amendment 306****Marine Le Pen, Edouard Ferrand, Gilles Lebreton****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 13**

<b>SUPPORT</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<b><i>13. Feels that every Member State should set up a special unit tasked with flagging illicit content on the internet and with facilitating the detection and removal of content that does not conform to the host internet platform's charter and rules; proposes that such units could cooperate with a European unit responsible for dealing with flagging;</i></b>	<b><i>deleted</i></b>
Comments: Content should only be removed if it is illegal. Most internet platforms use their terms of service to "ban" allegedly illegal content, but also content that might be offensive in their view. That way they do not need to justify whether the deletion is based on its illegality (law) or their terms and conditions. Internet platform's "charter and rules" are very broad that anything can be removed if they deemed it appropriate. It would be highly inappropriate and undemocratic for a Member State/an EU authority to order the deletion of legal content.	

Or. fr

**Amendment 307****Kati Piri****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 13**

<b>SUPPORT</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<b><i>13. Feels that every Member State should set up a special unit tasked with flagging illicit content on the internet and with facilitating the detection and removal of content that does not conform to the host</i></b>	<b><i>deleted</i></b>



<i>internet platform's charter and rules; proposes that such units could cooperate with a European unit responsible for dealing with flagging;</i>	
Comments: Same comments as for AM 306.	

Or. en



### Amendment 308

**Jean Lambert**

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 13**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
13. Feels that every Member State should set up a special unit tasked with flagging <b>illicit</b> content on the internet and with facilitating the detection and <b>removal</b> of content that <b>does not conform to the host internet platform's charter and rules; proposes that such units could cooperate with a European unit responsible for dealing with flagging;</b>	13. Feels that every Member State should set up a special unit tasked with flagging <b>illegal</b> content on the internet and with facilitating the detection and <b>taking down</b> of content that <b>may be illegal, thereby ensuring that investigations can be undertaken without undue delay;</b>
Comments: Public authorities cannot be tasked to flag (uncomfortable) legal content. If the policy option outlined in this paragraph were to be adopted, it would need to conform to the law, not to companies' (vague) terms of service, which are broad enough to allow practically any deletion.	

Or. en



### Amendment 309

**Barbara Spinelli**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 13**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
13. <b>Feels</b> that every Member State should set up a special unit tasked with flagging illicit content on the internet and with facilitating the detection and removal of content that <b>does not conform to the host internet platform's charter and rules; proposes that such units could cooperate with a European unit responsible for dealing with flagging;</b>	13. <b>Affirms</b> that every Member State should set up a special unit tasked with flagging illicit content on the internet and with facilitating the detection and removal of content that <b>is clearly illegal, thereby ensuring that investigations can be undertaken without undue delay;</b>
Comments: We support this amendment. See comments to AM 308.	

Or. en



### Amendment 310

**Christine Revault D'Allonnes Bonnefoy**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 13**

MIXED POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
13. Feels that every Member State should	Feels that every Member State should set

<p>set up a special unit tasked with flagging illicit content on the internet and with facilitating the detection and removal of content that does not conform to the host internet platform's charter and rules; proposes that such units <i>could</i> cooperate with a European unit responsible for dealing with flagging;</p>	<p>up a special unit tasked with flagging illicit content on the internet and with facilitating the detection, <i>de-indexing</i> and removal of content that does not conform to the host internet platform's charter and rules, <i>this procedure being accompanied by appropriate monitoring and solid guarantees in relation to fundamental rights</i>; proposes that such units cooperate with a European unit responsible for dealing with flagging, <i>established within Europol; supports, with a view to assisting the work of these units, the possibility for all internet users to flag content that is circulating on the internet and on social media networks, and that they believe to be illegal, easily and quickly, while respecting basic freedoms and freedom of expression</i>;</p>
<p>Comments: We support the fundamental rights safeguards introduced by this amendment. However, both de-indexing and removing content should not be based on companies' terms and conditions, but on the law. Terms of service are very broad and can permit practically any deletion. MEPs should adopt a balanced approach.</p>	

Or. fr



**Amendment 311**

**Emil Radev**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 13**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>13. Feels that every Member State should set up a special unit tasked with flagging illicit content on the internet and with facilitating the detection and removal of content that does not conform to the host internet platform's charter and rules; proposes that such units could cooperate with <i>a European unit responsible for dealing with flagging</i>;</p>	<p>13. Feels that every Member State should set up a special unit tasked with flagging illicit content on the internet and with facilitating the detection and removal of content that does not conform to the host internet platform's charter and rules; proposes that such units could cooperate with <i>the EU Internet Referral Unit to be established within Europol</i>;</p>
<p>Comments: The EU Internet Referral Unit was <a href="#">set up by Europol in July 2015</a>, so this amendment is outdated. In any case, it does not solve the abovementioned concerns of the original draft. Public authorities cannot be tasked to flag (uncomfortable) legal content. If the policy option outlined in this paragraph were to be adopted, it would need to conform to the law, not to companies' (vague) terms of service, which are broad enough to allow practically any deletion.</p>	

Or. en

**Amendment 312****Kinga Gál****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 13**

MIXED POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
13. Feels that every Member State should set up a special unit tasked with flagging illicit content on the internet and with facilitating the detection and removal of content that does not conform to the host internet platform's charter and rules; proposes that such units could cooperate with a European unit responsible for dealing with flagging;	13. Feels that every Member State should set up a special unit tasked with flagging illicit content on the internet and with facilitating the detection and removal of content that does not conform to the host internet platform's charter and rules; proposes that such units could cooperate with a European unit responsible for dealing with flagging; <b><i>recommends that such unit should also cooperate with civil society organisations active in this field;</i></b>
Comments: Whereas the added sentence is welcomed, this amendment does not solve the problems outlined above. Public authorities cannot be tasked to flag (uncomfortable) legal content. If the policy option outlined in this paragraph were to be adopted, it would need to conform to the law, not to companies' (vague) terms of service, which are broad enough to allow practically any deletion.	

Or. en

**Amendment 313****Frank Engel****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 13**

MIXED POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
13. Feels that every Member State should set up a special unit tasked with flagging illicit content on the internet and with facilitating the detection and removal of content that does not conform to the host internet platform's charter and rules; <b><i>proposes that such units could cooperate with a European unit responsible for dealing with flagging;</i></b>	13. Feels that every Member State should set up a special unit tasked with flagging illicit content on the internet and with facilitating the detection and removal of content that does not conform to the host internet platform's charter and rules; <b><i>emphasises the effective coordination role played by Europol and the need to increase its staffing and other resources;</i></b>
Comments: This amendment does not solve the abovementioned issues. Also, there is no evidence that Europol's staffing/resources are inadequate.	

Or. fr

**Amendment 314****Petras Auštrevičius****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 13**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
13. Feels that every Member State should set up a special unit tasked with flagging illicit content on the internet and with facilitating the detection and removal of	13. Feels that every Member State should set up a special unit tasked with flagging illicit content <b><i>and identifying critical situations</i></b> on the internet and with

content that does not conform to the host internet platform's charter and rules; proposes that such units could cooperate with a European unit responsible for dealing with flagging;	facilitating the detection and removal of content that does not conform to the host internet platform's charter and rules; proposes that such units could cooperate with a European unit responsible for dealing with flagging;
Comments: The amendment does not solve the inherent problems with the initial proposal. There is little evidence that “critical situations” could reasonably be identified in the mass of information online.	

Or. en



### Amendment 315

**Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz, Petras Auštrevičius**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 13**

MIXED POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
13. Feels that every Member State should set up a special unit tasked with flagging illicit content on the internet and with facilitating the detection and removal of content that does not conform <i>to the host internet platform's charter and rules</i> ; <i>proposes that such units could cooperate with a European unit responsible for dealing with flagging</i> ;	13. Feels that every Member State should set up a special unit tasked with flagging illicit content on the internet and with facilitating the detection and removal of content that does not conform <i>the law</i> ; <i>suggests that these units cooperate from a EU level so that the investigations are fast and safeguarding the legal procedures</i> ;
Comments: This amendment is welcomed as what is important is to comply with the law, not with Internet platform's terms and conditions, which are generally vague. However, the need for such a unit has not been demonstrated.	

Or. en



### Amendment 316

**Goffredo Maria Bettini, Caterina Chinnici**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 13**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
13. Feels that every Member State should set up a special unit tasked with flagging illicit content on the internet and with facilitating the detection and <i>removal</i> of content that does not conform to the host internet platform's charter and rules; proposes that such units could cooperate with a European unit responsible for dealing with flagging;	13. Feels that every Member State should set up a special unit tasked with flagging illicit content on the internet and with facilitating the detection and <i>blocking</i> of content that does not conform to the host internet platform's charter and rules; proposes that such units could cooperate with a European unit responsible for dealing with flagging;
Comments: As the text refers to the “host platform”, this amendment must refer to the blocking (i.e. making unavailable) of content by the host provider. This would tend to be a more effective approach, as it permits retention of evidence in a way that deletion of content would not. However, this amendment does not resolve the deeper problems with the original text.	

Or. it

**Amendment 317****Anna Maria Corazza Bildt, Carlos Coelho, Monica Macovei, Frank Engel, Barbara Matera, Traian Ungureanu, Kinga Gál, Alessandra Mussolini****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 13**


<b>OPPOSE</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>13. <b><i>Feels that every Member State should</i></b> set up a special unit tasked with flagging <b><i>illicit content</i></b> on the internet and with facilitating the detection and removal of content that does not conform to the host internet platform's charter and rules; proposes that such units could cooperate with <b><i>a European unit responsible for dealing with flagging;</i></b></p>	<p>13. <b><i>Encourages Member States to</i></b> set up a special unit tasked with flagging <b><i>hate speech and praise and recruitment for terrorism</i></b> on the internet and with facilitating the detection and removal of content that does not conform to the host internet platform's charter and rules; proposes that such units could cooperate with <b><i>the EU-anti terrorism coordinator and the European Counter-Terrorism Centre within Europol;</i></b></p>
<p>Comments: Public authorities cannot be tasked to flag (uncomfortable) legal content because it may breach the contract between two other parties (platform user and platform). If the policy option outlined in this paragraph were to be adopted, it would need to conform to the law, not to companies' (vague) terms of service, which are broad enough to allow practically any deletion. However, we believe references to existing EU units are welcomed rather than inventing a new one.</p>	

Or. en

**Amendment 318****Caterina Chinnici, Goffredo Maria Bettini, Ana Gomes****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 13**


<b>MIXED POSITION</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>13. Feels that every Member State should set up a special unit tasked with flagging illicit content on the internet and with facilitating the detection and removal of content that does not conform to the host internet platform's charter and rules; <b><i>proposes that such units could</i></b> cooperate with <b><i>a European unit responsible for dealing with flagging;</i></b></p>	<p>13. Feels that every Member State should set up a special unit tasked with flagging illicit content on the internet and with facilitating the detection and removal of content that does not conform to the host internet platform's charter and rules; <b><i>welcomes the decision of the Justice and Home Affairs Council of 12 and 13 March 2015 to establish the EU Internet Referral Unit (IRU) within Europol, and encourages the national authorities to cooperate closely with Europol, while fully respecting the fundamental rights of all parties involved;</i></b></p>
<p>Comments: We welcome the addition introduced by this amendment. However, we strongly discourage MEPs to support a text which calls for public authorities to flag content that is legal and simply a potential breach of an unclear content between two third parties. Legal content should not be flagged. Do we really want to replace law with terms of service and replace judges with low-paid staff in developing countries?</p>	

Or. it

 **Amendment 319**  
**Monika Hohlmeier, Rachida Dati**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 13**

<b>OPPOSE</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>13. Feels that every Member State should set up a special unit tasked with flagging illicit content on the internet and with facilitating the detection and removal of content that does not conform to the host internet platform's charter and rules; proposes that such units could cooperate with a European unit responsible for dealing with flagging;</p>	<p>13. <b><i>Welcomes the creation of the Internet Referral Unit (IRU) by Europol to detect illicit content and supporting Member States in this regard;</i></b> feels that every Member State should set up a special unit tasked with flagging illicit content on the internet and with facilitating the detection and removal of content that does not conform to the host internet platform's charter and rules; proposes that such units could cooperate with a European unit responsible for dealing with flagging;</p>
<p>Comments: The additional text introduced contradicts the last sentence of the paragraph. In any case, this amendment does not solve the abovementioned concerns. Do we want to replace law with terms of service and replace judges with low-paid staff in developing countries?</p>	

Or. en

 **Amendment 320**  
**Franz Obermayr**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 13**

<b>OPPOSE</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>13. Feels that every Member State should set up a special unit tasked with flagging <b><i>illicit</i></b> content on the internet and with facilitating the detection and removal of content that does not conform to the host internet platform's charter and <b><i>rules</i></b>; proposes that such units could cooperate with a European unit responsible for dealing with flagging;</p>	<p>13. Feels that every Member State should set up a special unit tasked with flagging <b><i>Islamist</i></b> content on the internet and with facilitating the detection and removal of content that does not conform to the host internet platform's charter and <b><i>its terms and conditions</i></b>; proposes that such units could cooperate with a European unit responsible for dealing with flagging;</p>
<p>Comments: Only illegal content should be flagged. It is irresponsible for public authorities to base their decision in Internet platform's terms of service as it would be a way not to justify whether the deletion is on the basis of illegality (law) or terms of service. Do we want to replace law with terms of service and replace judges with low-paid staff in developing countries?</p>	

Or. de



**Amendment 321****Gérard Deprez, Louis Michel, Nathalie Griesbeck, Petr Ježek, Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 13**

<b>OPPOSE</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>13. Feels that every Member State should set up a special unit tasked with flagging illicit content on the internet and with facilitating the detection and removal of content that does not conform to the host internet platform's charter and rules; <b><i>proposes that such units could cooperate with a European unit responsible for dealing with flagging;</i></b></p>	<p>13. Feels that every Member State should set up a special unit tasked with flagging illicit content on the internet and with facilitating the detection and removal of content that does not conform to the host internet platform's charter and rules; <b><i>welcomes the decision by the Council of Ministers of 12 and 13 March to create within Europol a European unit (EU IRU), tasked with flagging content on the internet, and encourages national bodies responsible for flagging and actors in the digital world to cooperate closely with Europol for this purpose.</i></b></p>
	<p><i>(The terms of reference of the Unit are set out in a note adopted by the Council of Ministers on 12 March 2015 (Doc 6606/15) They are: to coordinate the identification of terrorist and extremist content circulating on the Internet, in cooperation with the appropriate partners; support and deliver rapid and effective flagging, in close collaboration with the internet industry; support the work of the competent national authorities by providing them with strategic and operational analyses; act as a European centre of excellence for the activities set out above.</i></p>
<p>Comments: The amendment improves the original wording, as it refers to facts. However, the amendment does not address the big problem of this paragraph: do we want to replace law with terms of service and replace judges with low-paid staff in developing countries? Public authorities should only flag content that is allegedly illegal, not (maybe) offensive material in accordance with companies' terms and conditions.</p>	

Or. fr

**Amendment 322****Barbara Spinelli****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 13 – subparagraph 1 (new)**

<b>SUPPORT</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
	<p><b><i>These special units should not become a centralized censorship centre</i></b></p>
<p>Comments: Whatever public authority entrusted with safeguarding citizens' security should</p>	



not employ blanket mass surveillance measures. Any measure intruding people's fundamental rights and freedoms must be prescribed by law and pass the necessity and proportionate tests.

Or. en

**Amendment 323**

**Gérard Deprez, Louis Michel, Petr Ježek**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 13 a (new)**

NO POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
	<p><b><i>13a. Welcomes the establishment with effect from 1 January 2016 of the European Counter-Terrorism Centre (ECTC), of which the European unit tasked with flagging content will be a part. Stresses the need to provide the financial resources required to deliver the additional tasks conferred on Europol in connection with the establishment of the European Counter-Terrorism Centre. Calls for the European Parliament to be duly involved in the composition of the Centre, its terms of reference, tasks and finance.</i></b></p>
<p>Comments: This amendment falls outside of our scope of work.</p>	

Or. fr



**Amendment 324**


**Marine Le Pen, Edouard Ferrand, Gilles Lebreton**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 14**


SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p><b><i>14. Believes that online radicalisation cannot be stamped out without reinforcing the tools available to the EU to combat cybercrime; recommends that the European Union strengthen the mandate of the European Cybercrime Centre so that it can play an effective role in better protecting European citizens against online threats and detecting the digital processes used by terrorist organisations;</i></b></p>	<p><b><i>deleted</i></b></p>
<p>Comments: Member States and the EU would need first to assess their policies and tools to counter-terrorism instead of strengthen them. We thus support this amendment.</p>	

Or. fr

 **Amendment 325**  
**Sophia in 't Veld**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 14**


SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p><b>14. Believes that online radicalisation cannot be stamped out without reinforcing the tools available to the EU to combat cybercrime; recommends that the European Union strengthen the mandate of the European Cybercrime Centre so that it can play an effective role in better protecting European citizens against online threats and detecting the digital processes used by terrorist organisations;</b></p>	<p><b>deleted</b></p>
<p>Comments: Same comments as above.</p>	

Or. en

 **Amendment 326**  
**Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz, Petras Auštrevičius**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 14**

MIXED POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p><b>14. Believes that online radicalisation cannot be stamped out without reinforcing the tools available to the EU to combat cybercrime; recommends that the European Union strengthen the mandate of the European Cybercrime Centre so that it can play an effective role in better protecting European citizens against online threats and detecting the digital processes used by terrorist organisations;</b></p>	<p>14. Recommends that the European Union strengthen the mandate of the European Cybercrime Centre so that it can play an effective role in better protecting European citizens against online threats and detecting the digital processes used by terrorist organisations;</p>
<p>Comments: We welcome the deletion introduced by this amendment. However, Member States and the EU would need first to assess their policies and tools to counter-terrorism instead of strengthen them. The mandate of the European Cybercrime Centre should also be reassessed.</p>	

Or. en

 **Amendment 327**  
**Anna Hedh, Soraya Post**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 14**

MIXED POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>14. Believes <b>that online radicalisation cannot be stamped out without reinforcing</b> the tools available to the EU to combat cybercrime; recommends that the</p>	<p>14. Believes the tools available to the EU to combat cybercrime <b>should be reinforced</b>; recommends that the European Union <b>strengthens</b> the mandate of the</p>

European Union <b>strengthen</b> the mandate of the European Cybercrime Centre so that it can play an effective role in better protecting European citizens against online threats and detecting the digital processes used by terrorist organisations;	European Cybercrime Centre so that it can play an effective role in better protecting European citizens against online threats and detecting the digital processes used by terrorist organisations;
Comments: While the changes introduced by this amendment improve the original wording, Member States and the EU would need first to assess their policies and tools to counter-terrorism instead of strengthen them. The mandate of the European Cybercrime Centre should also be reassessed.	

Or. en



**Amendment 328**

**Michal Boni**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 14**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
14. Believes that online radicalisation cannot be stamped out without reinforcing the tools available to the EU to combat cybercrime; recommends that the European Union strengthen the mandate of the European Cybercrime Centre so that it can play an effective role in better protecting European citizens against online threats and detecting the digital processes used by terrorist organisations;	14. Believes that online radicalisation cannot be stamped out without reinforcing the tools available to the EU to combat cybercrime; recommends that the European Union strengthen the mandate <b>and resources</b> of the European Cybercrime Centre so that it can play an effective role in better protecting European citizens against online threats and detecting the digital processes used by terrorist organisations;
Comments: This amendment does not solve the abovementioned problems.	

Or. en



**Amendment 329**

**Jean Lambert**

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 14**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
14. Believes that online radicalisation cannot be <b>stamped out</b> without <b>reinforcing</b> the tools available to the EU to combat cybercrime; recommends that the European Union <b>strengthen</b> the mandate of the European Cybercrime Centre so that it can play an effective role in better protecting European citizens against online threats and detecting the digital processes used by terrorist organisations;	14. Believes that online radicalisation cannot be <b>addressed comprehensively</b> without <b>assessing</b> the tools available to the EU to combat cybercrime; recommends that the European Union <b>reassess</b> the mandate of the European Cybercrime Centre so that it can play an effective role in better protecting European citizens against online threats and detecting the digital processes used by terrorist organisations;
Comments: This amendment is key for an effective counter-terrorism strategy for the reasons outlined above.	

Or. en

**Amendment 330****Monika Hohlmeier, Rachida Dati****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 14**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
14. Believes that online radicalisation cannot be stamped out without reinforcing the tools available to the EU to combat cybercrime; recommends that the <b>European Union strengthen the</b> mandate of the European Cybercrime Centre so that it can play an effective role in better <b>protecting European citizens against</b> online threats and <b>detecting the digital processes</b> used by terrorist organisations;	14. Believes that online radicalisation cannot be stamped out without reinforcing the tools available to the EU to combat cybercrime; recommends that the mandate of the European Cybercrime Centre <b>should be strengthened</b> so that it can play an effective role in better <b>detecting and tackling</b> online threats and <b>better identifying the ways</b> used by terrorist organisations; <b>recalls the necessity of sufficiently trained experts at Europol as well as in Member States to respond to this specific threat;</b>
Comments: While it is true that experts should be well trained (and in that sense improves the original wording), why did the rapporteur decide to support an amendment which deletes "protecting European citizens against online threats" from her original text? Rather than strengthening the current tools available in the EU, Member States and the EU itself should first review the effectiveness, necessity and proportionality of the tools they use to combat terrorism.	

Or. en

**Amendment 331****Franz Obermayr****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 14**

NO POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
14. Believes that online radicalisation cannot be stamped out without reinforcing the tools available to the EU to combat cybercrime; recommends that the European Union strengthen the mandate of the European Cybercrime Centre so that it can play an effective role in better protecting European citizens against online threats and detecting the digital processes used by <b>terrorist</b> organisations;	14. Believes that online radicalisation cannot be stamped out without reinforcing the tools available to the EU to combat cybercrime; recommends that the European Union strengthen the mandate of the European Cybercrime Centre so that it can play an effective role in better protecting European citizens against online threats and detecting the digital processes used by <b>Islamist</b> organisations;
Comments: The AM falls outside of our scope of work.	

Or. de

**Amendment 332****Gérard Deprez, Louis Michel, Petr Ježek****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 14**

<b>OPPOSE</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>14. Believes that online radicalisation cannot be stamped out without reinforcing the tools available to the EU to combat cybercrime; recommends that the European Union strengthen the mandate of the European Cybercrime Centre so that it can play an effective role in better protecting European citizens against online threats and detecting the digital processes used by terrorist organisations;</p>	<p>14. Believes that online radicalisation cannot be stamped out without reinforcing the tools available to the EU to combat cybercrime; recommends that that the European Union strengthen the mandate of the European Cybercrime Centre (<b>EC3</b>) <b>particularly by facilitating exchanges between Europol and private sector bodies</b> so that it can play an effective role in better protecting European citizens against online threats and detecting the digital processes used by terrorist organisations;</p> <p><i>(Given the role played by the internet in radicalisation and as over 80% of ICT infrastructure belongs to the private sector, it would appear essential that Europol and the European Cybercrime Centre should be able to exchange information with the internet giants in order to be able to successfully deliver on their responsibilities.</i></p>
<p>Comments: It is wholly unclear that the amendment seeks to achieve – is it exchanges of information, exchanges of intelligence, exchanges of information or something else?</p>	

Or. fr

**Amendment 333****Ana Gomes, Christine Revault D'Allonnes Bonnefoy, Rachida Dati****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 14**

<b>NO POSITION</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>14. Believes that online radicalisation cannot be stamped out without reinforcing the tools available to the EU to combat cybercrime; recommends that the European Union strengthen the mandate of the European Cybercrime Centre so that it can play an effective role in better protecting European citizens against online threats and detecting the digital processes used by terrorist organisations;</p>	<p>14. Believes that online radicalisation cannot be stamped out without reinforcing the tools available to the EU to combat cybercrime; recommends that the European Union strengthen the mandate of the European Cybercrime Centre, <b>Europol and Eurojust</b> so that it can play an effective role in better protecting European citizens against online threats and detecting the digital processes used by terrorist organisations; <b>calls also on the HR/VP to reorganise the EU Situation Centre (SitCen) and the Intelligence Centre (IntCen) and ensure their coordination</b></p>

	<i>with the Anti-Terrorism Coordinator to better track online criminal activities, the spread of hate speech related to radicalisation and terrorism; urges Member States, on the other hand, to significantly increase information sharing amongst each other and with the relevant EU structures and agencies;</i>
--	--

Or. en

**+** Amendment 334  
**Barbara Spinelli, Kostas Chrysogonos**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 14**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
14. Believes that online <b>radicalisation</b> cannot be <b>stamped out</b> without <b>reinforcing</b> the tools available to the EU to combat cybercrime; recommends that the European Union <b>strengthen</b> the mandate of the European Cybercrime Centre so that it can play an effective role in better protecting European citizens against online threats and detecting the digital processes used by terrorist organisations;	14. Believes that online <b>violent extremism</b> cannot be <b>addressed comprehensively</b> without <b>assessing</b> the tools available to the EU to combat cybercrime; recommends that the European Union <b>reassess</b> the mandate of the European Cybercrime Centre so that it can play an effective role in better protecting European citizens against online threats and detecting the digital processes used by terrorist organisations;
Comments: Recent terrorist events have proven the current system is not effective. Conducting impact assessments and reviewing the current framework should be a priority.	

Or. en

**+** Amendment 335  
**Barbara Spinelli, Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 14 a (new)**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
	<b>14a. Observes the very limited scope of that efforts made by Member States in the deployment of counter-discourse, since they lack of legitimacy in the eyes of their targeted public; notes the financial means and the considerable resources of violent extremist speech perpetrators on internet, recommends that the European Commission and the Member States provide civil society organisations with the necessary financial and structural means in order to lead the fight of counter-discourse with efficiency, legitimacy and on the long term.</b>
Comments: Civil society organisations should be supported and included in whatever dialogue/meeting Member States and/or the EU organise(s). NGOs are often outsourced and	



not given the role they should play as experts in this field.

Or. en



**Amendment 336**

**Ana Gomes, Christine Revault D'Allonnes Bonnefoy, Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz, Jean Lambert, Barbara Spinelli, Birgit Sippel, Rachida Dati**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 14 a (new)**

<b>SUPPORT</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
	<b><i>14a. Urges Member States to make sure that educational programmes on the use of internet exist in every school (primary education through secondary education) aiming at educating and training responsible, critical and law-abiding internet users;</i></b>
Comments: Positive measures are <u>proven</u> to be more effective than repressive measures.	

Or. en



**Amendment 337**

**Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz, Petras Auštrevičius, Jean Lambert**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 14 a (new)**

<b>SUPPORT</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
	<b><i>14a. Urges Member States to ensure that academic programmes on the use of the Internet are implemented in schools (both for primary and secondary education), aiming to educate and raise responsible, critical and law-respectful Internet users.</i></b>
Comments: The previous amendment is very similar. Same comments apply.	

Or. en



**Amendment 338**

**Ana Gomes, Christine Revault D'Allonnes Bonnefoy, Jean Lambert, Barbara Spinelli, Birgit Sippel, Sylvia-Yvonne Kaufmann**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 14 b (new)**

<b>SUPPORT</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
	<b><i>14b. Considers that all measures and new policy making on the part of the EU and of the Member States must obey the proportionality principle and be compliant with fundamental rights and EU values and principles; is of the view that judicial checks must be introduced in all new legislation on the matter, especially in areas where this might impact on freedom of expression and freedom of the media;</i></b>
Comments: Absolutely agree. The amendment is self-explanatory.	

(...)

**+ Amendment 407**  
**Barbara Spinelli**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 17 b (new)**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
	<p><b><i>17b. Recalls that social inclusion and non-discrimination programmes should not be linked to funding/institutions involved in surveillance/counter-terrorism/disengagement activities. Imams, religious leaders, social workers, educators, youth educators, sport educators, or health professionals should not become agents of surveillance.</i></b></p>
<p>Comments: The amendment is self-explanatory, in line with the last part of Amendment 396.</p>	

Or. en

(...)

**+ Amendment 433**  
**Aldo Patriciello**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 20**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p><b><i>20. Considers it vital to set up an alert system in each Member State which would allow families and community members to easily and swiftly flag the development of radical behaviour or a European citizen's departure to join a terrorist organisation;</i></b></p>	<p><b><i>deleted</i></b>  <i>(amendment to be deleted due to potential conflict with the fundamental principles underlying democracy and with legal imperatives, including the presumption of innocence until proven guilty.)</i></p>
<p>Comments: We agree with the explanation for deleting it.</p>	

Or. it

**+ Amendment 434**  
**Sophia in 't Veld**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 20**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p><b><i>20. Considers it vital to set up an alert system in each Member State which would allow families and community members to easily and swiftly flag the development of radical behaviour or a European citizen's departure to join a terrorist organisation;</i></b></p>	<p><b><i>deleted</i></b></p>

Comments: Same comments as above.

Or. en



#### Amendment 435

Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz, Gérard Deprez, Louis Michel

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 20

#### MIXED POSITION

*Motion for a resolution*

20. Considers it vital ***to set up an alert system in each Member State*** which ***would*** allow families and community members to easily ***and swiftly flag the development of radical behaviour or a European citizen's departure to join a terrorist organisation;***

*Amendment*

20. Considers it vital ***that in every Member State there is a transmission of practical advice*** which allow families and community members to easily ***warn the recruitment of their relatives by terrorist networks and organisations;***

Comments: The proposed amendment greatly improves the original wording, but if somebody believes one of her/his family members has been recruited by a terrorist organisation/network, they can resort to, e.g. the police. What it would be important is for family members to be reminded of the importance of doing so. There is no need for a new "transmission".

Or. en



#### Amendment 436

Sylvie Guillaume

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 20

#### SUPPORT

*Motion for a resolution*

20. Considers it vital to set up an ***alert system in each Member State*** which would allow ***families and community members to easily and swiftly flag the development of radical behaviour or a European citizen's departure to join a terrorist organisation;***

*Amendment*

20. Considers it vital to set up a system ***of assistance and guidance*** in each Member State which would allow ***families and friends of those concerned to be heard, to benefit from advice and to flag worrying situations;*** ***considers it vital to set up provision of support for families taking a whole-family approach, not focusing assistance solely on the parents but on the entire family;*** ***notes in this connection that gender is an important issue in family support, with each parent and family member having different responsibilities and roles;***

Comments: This amendment improves the original paragraph and could be an acceptable compromise.

Or. fr



#### Amendment 437

Anna Hedh, Soraya Post

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 20

#### MIXED POSITION

*Motion for a resolution*

20. Considers it vital to set up an alert system in each Member State which would

*Amendment*

20. Considers it vital to set up an alert system in each Member State which would

allow families and community members to easily and swiftly flag the development of radical behaviour or a European citizen's departure to join a terrorist organisation;	allow families and community members to <b>get support and to</b> easily and swiftly flag the development of radical behaviour or a European citizen's departure to join a terrorist organisation <b>to the appropriate authority</b> ;
Comments: The amendment improves the original paragraph. However, an alert system is not necessary because other mechanism are available and human rights and fundamental freedoms can be infringed.	

Or. en

**Amendment 438**  
**Petras Auštrevičius**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 20**

NO POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
20. Considers it vital to set up an alert system in each Member State which would allow families and community members to easily and swiftly flag the development of radical behaviour or a European citizen's departure to join a terrorist organisation;	20. Considers it vital to set up an alert system in each Member State which would allow families and community members to easily and swiftly flag the development of radical behaviour or a European citizen's departure to join a terrorist organisation <b>or a military formation</b> ;
Comment: The amendment falls outside our scope of work.	

Or. en



**Amendment 439**  
**Ana Gomes, Christine Revault D'Allonnes Bonnefoy, Birgit Sippel**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 20**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
20. Considers it vital to set up an alert system in each Member State which would allow families and community members to easily and swiftly flag the development of <b>radical behaviour</b> or a European citizen's departure to join a terrorist organisation;	20. Considers it vital to set up an alert system in each Member State which would allow families and community members to easily and swiftly flag the development of <b>sudden behavioural change that might signal a process of radicalisation</b> or a European citizen's <b>or an EU resident</b> departure to join a terrorist organisation;
Comments: What would constitute a "sudden behavioural change" that could be considered as a "radicalisation" sign? Certainly, the <a href="#">French model</a> is not an example of best practice. For the reasons mentioned above, we encourage you to reconsider and oppose this amendment.	

Or. en

**Amendment 440****Timothy Kirkhope**

on behalf of the ECR Group

**Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 20**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
20. Considers it vital to set up an alert system in each Member State which would allow families and community members to easily and swiftly flag the development of radical behaviour or a European citizen's departure to join a terrorist organisation;	20. Considers it vital to set up an alert system in each Member State which would allow families and community members to easily and swiftly flag the development of radical behaviour or a European citizen's departure to join a terrorist organisation; <i>notes that in this regard, "hotlines" have been successful in this endeavour; and are encouraging the reporting of persons amongst friends and families suspected of being radicalised; and asks that Member States look into the possibility of establishing such a system;</i>
Comments: Reporting is not an end in itself and non-specific references to “hotlines” that, on some unspecified basis can be defined as “successful” are unhelpful – the support elements of several other amendments make them preferable .	

Or. en

**Amendment 441****Franz Obermayr****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 20**

NO POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
20. Considers it vital to set up an alert system in each Member State which would allow families and community members to easily and swiftly flag the development of <i>radical</i> behaviour or a European citizen's departure to join a terrorist organisation;	20. Considers it vital to set up an alert system in each Member State which would allow families and community members to easily and swiftly flag the development of <i>Islamist</i> behaviour or a European citizen's departure to join a terrorist organisation;

Or. de

**Amendment 442****Jean Lambert**

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

**Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 20**

MIXED POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
20. Considers it vital to set up an alert system in each Member State which would allow families and community members to easily and swiftly flag the development of radical behaviour <i>or a European citizen's</i> departure to join a terrorist organisation;	20. Considers it vital to set up an alert system in each Member State which would allow families and community members to easily and swiftly flag the development of radical behaviour <i>indicating affinity with violent extremism or an individual's</i> departure to join a terrorist organisation;
Comments: The amendment improves the original wording, as it explains what "radical	

behaviour" the report would be talking about in this paragraph. However, we disagree with the practical value of establishing an alert system. Available means should be used, without needing to allocate resources in something that already exists. If available means are unusable in this context, there are deeper problems that need to be addressed.

Or. en



**Amendment 443**  
**Barbara Spinelli, Kostas Chrysogonos**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 20**

MIXED POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
20. Considers it vital to set up <b><i>an alert</i></b> system in each Member State which would allow families and community members to easily and swiftly flag the development of <b><i>radical</i></b> behaviour or a European citizen's departure to join a terrorist organisation;	20. Considers it vital to set up <b><i>a support</i></b> system in each Member State which would allow families and community members to easily and swiftly flag the development of <b><i>violent extremist</i></b> behaviour or a European citizen's departure to join a terrorist organisation;
Comments: This amendment introduces positive changes. However, as pointed out above, the need for specific reporting systems has not been demonstrated.	

Or. en

(...)



**Amendment 456**  
**Jean Lambert**  
on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 21**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<b><i>21. Reiterates its desire to see the so-called 'EU PNR' directive swiftly adopted before the end of 2015 in order to enable the movements of European citizens likely to adopt a terrorist ideology to be tracked; recalls, however, that the EU PNR will not be enough to prevent the recruitment of European citizens by terrorist organisations;</i></b>	<b><i>deleted</i></b>
Comments: AM 456 is identical to AMs 457-459. This is the subject of an ongoing legislative process – the Parliament does not need to pass a resolution to ask itself to do something.	

Or. en



**Amendment 457**  
**Sophia in 't Veld**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 21**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<b><i>21. Reiterates its desire to see the so-called 'EU PNR' directive swiftly adopted before the end of 2015 in order to enable</i></b>	<b><i>deleted</i></b>



*the movements of European citizens likely to adopt a terrorist ideology to be tracked; recalls, however, that the EU PNR will not be enough to prevent the recruitment of European citizens by terrorist organisations;*

Or. en



**Amendment 458**

**Kati Piri**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 21**

**SUPPORT**

<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<i>21. Reiterates its desire to see the so-called 'EU PNR' directive swiftly adopted before the end of 2015 in order to enable the movements of European citizens likely to adopt a terrorist ideology to be tracked; recalls, however, that the EU PNR will not be enough to prevent the recruitment of European citizens by terrorist organisations;</i>	<i>deleted</i>

Or. en



**Amendment 459**

**Birgit Sippel, Sylvia-Yvonne Kaufmann**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 21**

**SUPPORT**

<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<i>21. Reiterates its desire to see the so-called 'EU PNR' directive swiftly adopted before the end of 2015 in order to enable the movements of European citizens likely to adopt a terrorist ideology to be tracked; recalls, however, that the EU PNR will not be enough to prevent the recruitment of European citizens by terrorist organisations;</i>	<i>deleted</i>

Or. en



**Amendment 460**

**Barbara Spinelli**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 21**

**SUPPORT**

<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<i>21. Reiterates its desire to see the so-called 'EU PNR' directive swiftly adopted before the end of 2015 in order to enable the movements of European citizens likely to adopt a terrorist ideology to be tracked; recalls, however, that the EU PNR will not</i>	<i>21. Does not agree with the adoption of the so-called "EU PNR" directive believing it will lead to discriminatory practices, based on the supposed belonging to a religion, recalls moreover that the EU PNR won't be efficient enough</i>

<i>be</i> enough to prevent the recruitment of European citizens by terrorist organisations;	to prevent the recruitment of European citizens by terrorist organisations, <b><i>underlines that if used in a discriminatory and stigmatizing way, effects can be counter-productive to its purported goals.</i></b>
Comments: The proposed EU PNR Directive poses <a href="#">serious risks to fundamental rights</a> . PNR is neither necessary nor proportionate and it will not be effective for the purposes of fighting against terrorism, as <a href="#">evidence has demonstrated</a> . We therefore encourage you to support this amendment, failing which we encourage you to delete the original paragraph 21 from the report.	

Or. en

**Amendment 461**  
**Marine Le Pen, Gilles Lebreton**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 21**

NO POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
21. <i>Reiterates its desire to see the so-called 'EU PNR' directive swiftly adopted before the end of 2015 in order to enable the movements of European citizens likely to adopt a terrorist ideology to be tracked; recalls, however, that the EU PNR will not be enough to prevent the recruitment of European citizens by terrorist organisations;</i>	21. <i>emphasises the fundamental importance of controlling the internal and external borders of the European Union;</i>

Or. fr



**Amendment 462**  
**Ana Gomes, Christine Revault D'Allonnes Bonnefoy, Caterina Chinnici**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 21**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
21. <i>Reiterates its desire to see the so-called 'EU PNR' directive swiftly adopted before the end of 2015 in order to enable the movements of European citizens likely to adopt a terrorist ideology to be tracked; recalls, however, that the EU PNR will not be enough to prevent the recruitment of European citizens by terrorist organisations;</i>	21. <i>Takes note of the preparation of a Directive on EU PNR , which should harmonise current practices by Member States and enable the travelling to the EU and from the EU to third countries of terrorist suspects to be tracked; warns of the utmost importance of making PNR fully compliant with fundamental rights, namely anti-discrimination, EU data protection rules and with EU principles and values in general; recalls, however, that the EU PNR will not be enough to prevent the recruitment of European citizens by terrorist organisations and should only be considered as one piece of a toolbox, which should involve foreign policy, social policy, education policy, law</i>

<i>enforcement and justice;</i>
Comments: Despite the improvements in the proposed amendment, EDRI opposes the establishment of a PNR system for many reasons: <a href="https://edri.org/files/PNR2015/PNRbrief-EDRI.pdf">https://edri.org/files/PNR2015/PNRbrief-EDRI.pdf</a> . We cannot support this amendment, but consider it could be a compromise across parties. Indiscriminate profiling of individuals, without any suspicion of wrongdoing on their part, is antithetical to fundamental rights.

Or. en



**Amendment 463**

**Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz, Petr Ježek, Gérard Deprez, Louis Michel**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 21**

<b>OPPOSE</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
21. Reiterates its desire to see the so-called 'EU PNR' directive <i>swiftly adopted before the end of 2015 in order to enable the movements</i> of European citizens <i>likely to adopt a terrorist ideology to be tracked</i> ; recalls, however, that the EU PNR will not be enough to prevent the recruitment of European citizens by terrorist <i>organisations</i> ;	21. Reiterates its desire to see the so-called 'EU PNR' directive adopted <i>in full compliance with fundamental rights and freedoms</i> of European citizens <i>and free from discriminatory practices or any ideological, religious or ethnic stigmatization</i> ; recalls, however, that the EU PNR will not be enough to prevent the recruitment of European citizens by terrorist <i>organizations</i>
Comments: EDRI opposes the establishment of a PNR system for many reasons: <a href="https://edri.org/files/PNR2015/PNRbrief-EDRI.pdf">https://edri.org/files/PNR2015/PNRbrief-EDRI.pdf</a> . Indiscriminate profiling of individuals, without any suspicion of wrongdoing on their part, is antithetical to fundamental rights.	

Or. en



**Amendment 464**

**Eleftherios Synadinos**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 21**

<b>OPPOSE</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
21. Reiterates its desire to see the so-called 'EU PNR' directive swiftly adopted before the end of 2015 in order to enable the movements of European citizens likely to adopt a terrorist ideology to be tracked; recalls, however, that the EU PNR <i>will not be enough</i> to prevent the recruitment of European citizens by terrorist organisations;	21. Reiterates its desire to see the so-called 'EU PNR' directive swiftly adopted before the end of 2015 in order to enable the movements of European citizens likely to adopt a terrorist ideology to be tracked; recalls, however, that the EU PNR, <i>as well as the API, will not be enough</i> to prevent the recruitment of European citizens by terrorist organisations;
Comments: This paragraph is fundamentally incorrect – the planned tracking/profiling of citizens will be entirely indiscriminate and does not aim to only track "European citizens likely to adopt a terrorist ideology". EDRI opposes the establishment of a PNR system for many reasons: <a href="https://edri.org/files/PNR2015/PNRbrief-EDRI.pdf">https://edri.org/files/PNR2015/PNRbrief-EDRI.pdf</a> .	

Or. el

**Amendment 465****Timothy Kirkhope**

on behalf of the ECR Group

**Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 21**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
21. Reiterates its desire to see the so-called 'EU PNR' directive swiftly adopted before the end of 2015 in order to enable the movements of European citizens likely to adopt a terrorist ideology to be tracked; recalls, however, that the EU PNR <b><i>will not be enough</i></b> to prevent the recruitment of European citizens by terrorist organisations;	21. Reiterates its desire to see the so-called 'EU PNR' directive swiftly adopted before the end of 2015 in order to enable the movements of European citizens likely to adopt a terrorist ideology to be tracked; recalls, however, that the EU PNR <b><i>is just one measure in the fight against terrorism; but that a holistic, ambitious and comprehensive strategy is required at both law enforcement and community level in order</i></b> to prevent the recruitment of European citizens by terrorist organisations;
Comments: EDRI opposes the establishment of a PNR system for many reasons: <a href="https://edri.org/files/PNR2015/PNRbrief-EDRI.pdf">https://edri.org/files/PNR2015/PNRbrief-EDRI.pdf</a>	

Or. en

**Amendment 466****Franz Obermayr****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 21**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
21. Reiterates its desire to see the so-called 'EU PNR' directive swiftly adopted before the end of 2015 in order to enable the movements of <b><i>European citizens likely to adopt a terrorist ideology</i></b> to be tracked; recalls, however, that the EU PNR will not be enough to prevent the recruitment of European citizens by <b><i>terrorist</i></b> organisations;	21. Reiterates its desire to see the so-called 'EU PNR' directive swiftly adopted before the end of 2015 in order to enable the movements of <b><i>potential Islamist terrorists</i></b> to be tracked; recalls, however, that the EU PNR will not be enough to prevent the recruitment of European citizens by <b><i>Islamist</i></b> organisations;
Comments: EDRI opposes the establishment of a PNR system for many reasons: <a href="https://edri.org/files/PNR2015/PNRbrief-EDRI.pdf">https://edri.org/files/PNR2015/PNRbrief-EDRI.pdf</a>	

Or. de

**Amendment 467****Gérard Deprez, Louis Michel, Petr Ježek****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 21**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
21. Reiterates its desire to see the so-called 'EU PNR' directive swiftly adopted before the end of 2015 in order to enable the movements of European citizens <b><i>likely to</i></b>	21. Reiterates its desire to see the so-called 'EU PNR' directive swiftly adopted before the end of 2015 in order to enable the movements of European citizens <b><i>suspected</i></b>

<i>adopt a terrorist ideology</i> to be tracked; recalls, however, that the EU PNR will not be enough to prevent the recruitment of European citizens by terrorist organisations;	<i>of serious terrorist or transnational offences</i> to be tracked; recalls, however, that the EU PNR will not be enough to prevent the recruitment of European citizens by terrorist organisations;
Comments: This paragraph is fundamentally incorrect – the planned tracking/profiling of citizens will be entirely indiscriminate and does not aim to only track "European citizens suspected of serious terrorist or transnational offences". EDRI opposes the establishment of a PNR system for many reasons: <a href="https://edri.org/files/PNR2015/PNRbrief-EDRI.pdf">https://edri.org/files/PNR2015/PNRbrief-EDRI.pdf</a> . Thus, we encourage you to oppose this amendment.	

Or. fr

**Amendment 468**

**Teresa Jiménez-Becerril Barrio, Rachida Dati**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 21 a (new)**

NO POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
	<b>21a. Calls on the Commission to step up EU's expertise on preventing radicalisation by establishing a European network that incorporates the information provided by the Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN) and the Policy Planner's Network on Polarisation and Radicalisation (PPN) and the information coming from experts specialised in a large array of disciplines across social sciences;</b>
Comments: This falls outside EDRI's scope.	

Or. en



**Amendment 469**

**Barbara Spinelli, Kostas Chrysogonos**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 21 a (new)**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
	<b>21a. Recalls the "Data Retention" judgment (Joined Cases C-293/12 and C-594/12) where the European Court of Justice found that an act of EU legislature had exceeded the limits imposed by compliance with the principle of proportionality in the light of Articles 7, 8 and 52(1) of the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights</b>
Comments: This judgement represents a landmark decision of the ECJ which must be respected.	

Or. en

**Amendment 470****Christine Revault D'Allonnes Bonnefoy****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 22**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
22. Insists on the absolute necessity of stepping up the exchange of information between the law enforcement authorities in the Member States; stresses that stepping up the exchange of information between law enforcement authorities will also entail reinforcing the role of European Union agencies, such as Europol and Eurojust;	22. Insists on the absolute necessity of stepping up the exchange of information between the law enforcement authorities in the Member States, <b><i>coordinated by Europol, in particular through improved use of existing databases such as the SIS and VIS</i></b> ; stresses that stepping up the exchange of information between law enforcement authorities will entail <b><i>increasing trust between Member States</i></b> and also reinforcing the role of European Union agencies, such as Europol and Eurojust;
<p>Comments: Both the Schengen Information System (SIS) and the Visa Information system (VIS) contain several deficiencies (for a detailed explanation, read <a href="http://www.aedh.eu/plugins/fckeditor/userfiles/file/AEDH_EuropeanMonograph_PublicDataCollection_Final.pdf">http://www.aedh.eu/plugins/fckeditor/userfiles/file/AEDH_EuropeanMonograph_PublicDataCollection_Final.pdf</a>). The solution does not come by sharing more information, but through effectively using existing tools while respecting fundamental rights and freedoms, including the principles of necessity and proportionality. Of course, efficient data sharing is welcome in the context of necessary, proportionate, efficient and reliable data.</p>	

Or. fr

**Amendment 471****Jean Lambert**

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

**Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 22**

MIXED POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
22. Insists on the absolute necessity of stepping up the exchange of information between the law enforcement authorities in the Member States; stresses that stepping up the exchange of information between law enforcement authorities will also entail <b><i>reinforcing the role</i></b> of European Union agencies, such as Europol and Eurojust;	22. Insists on the absolute necessity of stepping up the <b><i>effective</i></b> exchange of information between the law enforcement authorities in the Member States; stresses that stepping up the exchange of information between law enforcement authorities will also entail <b><i>the effective resourcing</i></b> of European Union agencies, such as Europol and Eurojust;
<p>Comments: While this amendment improves the original wording, it lacks a reference to safeguards. We suggest supporting AM 476 instead.</p>	

Or. en



**Amendment 472**  
**Kinga Gál**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 22**

<b>NO POSITION</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
22. Insists on the absolute necessity of stepping up the exchange of information between the law enforcement authorities in the Member States; stresses that stepping up the exchange of information between law enforcement authorities will also entail reinforcing the role of European Union agencies, such as Europol <b>and Eurojust</b> ;	22. Insists on the absolute necessity of stepping up the exchange of information between the law enforcement authorities in the Member States; stresses that stepping up the exchange of information between law enforcement authorities will also entail reinforcing the role of European Union agencies, such as Europol, <b>Eurojust and Cepol</b> ;

Or. en

**Amendment 473**  
**Monica Macovei, Rachida Dati, Traian Ungureanu, Csaba Sógor, Agustín Díaz de Mera García Consuegra, Elissavet Vozemberg, Brice Hortefeux**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 22**

<b>NO POSITION</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
22. Insists on the absolute necessity of stepping up the exchange of information between the law enforcement authorities in the Member States; stresses that stepping up the exchange of information between law enforcement authorities will also entail reinforcing the role of European Union agencies, such as Europol <b>and Eurojust</b> ;	22. Insists on the absolute necessity of stepping up the exchange of information between the law enforcement authorities in the Member States; stresses that stepping up the exchange of information between law enforcement authorities will also entail reinforcing the role of European Union agencies, such as Europol, <b>Eurojust and the establishment of the European Public Prosecutor's office as a matter of urgency</b> ;

Or. en



**Amendment 474**  
**Timothy Kirkhope**  
on behalf of the ECR Group  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 22**

<b>MIXED POSITION</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
22. Insists on the absolute necessity of stepping up the exchange of information between the law enforcement authorities in the Member States; stresses that stepping up the exchange of information between law enforcement authorities will also entail reinforcing the role of European Union agencies, such as Europol and Eurojust;	22. Insists on the absolute necessity of stepping up the <b>expedient and effective</b> exchange of information between the law enforcement authorities in the Member States; stresses that stepping up the exchange of information between law enforcement authorities will also entail reinforcing the role of European Union agencies, such as Europol and Eurojust;


Comments: While this amendment improves the original wording, it lacks a reference to safeguards. We suggest supporting AM 476 instead.

Or. en

 **Amendment 475**  
**Caterina Chinnici, Goffredo Maria Bettini**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 22**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>22. Insists on the absolute necessity of stepping up the exchange of information between the <b>law enforcement</b> authorities <b>in the Member States</b>; stresses that stepping up the exchange of information between <b>law enforcement</b> authorities will also entail reinforcing the role of European Union agencies, such as Europol and Eurojust;</p>	<p>22. Insists on the absolute necessity of stepping up the exchange of information between the <b>national</b> authorities <b>and on the need to optimise the use of Europol analysis projects such as 'Focal Point Travellers' and those concerning foreign fighters and related terrorist networks</b>; stresses that stepping up the exchange of information between <b>national</b> authorities will also entail reinforcing the role of European Union agencies, such as Europol and Eurojust;</p>
<p>Comments: While this amendment improves the original wording, it lacks a reference to safeguards. We suggest supporting AM 476 instead.</p>	

Or. it

 **Amendment 476**  
**Birgit Sippel, Sylvia-Yvonne Kaufmann**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 22**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>22. Insists on the absolute necessity of stepping up the exchange of information between the law enforcement authorities in the Member States; stresses that stepping up the exchange of information between law enforcement authorities will also entail reinforcing the role of European Union agencies, such as Europol and Eurojust;</p>	<p>22. Insists on the absolute necessity of stepping up the exchange of <b>relevant</b> information between the law enforcement authorities in the Member States <b>and the relevant EU agencies, subject to the appropriate data protection and privacy safeguards</b>; stresses that stepping up the exchange of information between law enforcement authorities will also entail reinforcing the role of European Union agencies, such as Europol and Eurojust;</p>
<p>Comments: The amendment raises concerns related to the fundamental rights to privacy and data protection, which should be supported, as <a href="#">evidence shows</a> there are not enough safeguards in place.</p>	

Or. en

**Amendment 477****Monika Hohlmeier, Rachida Dati****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 22**

<b>OPPOSE</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
22. Insists on the absolute necessity of stepping up the exchange of information between the law enforcement authorities in the Member States; stresses that stepping up the exchange of information between law enforcement authorities will also entail reinforcing the role of European Union agencies, such as Europol and Eurojust;	22. Insists on the absolute necessity of stepping up the exchange of information between the law enforcement authorities in the Member States; stresses that stepping up the exchange of information between law enforcement authorities will also entail reinforcing the role of European Union agencies, such as Europol and Eurojust; <b><i>highlights in this regard the importance of Europol's secure information exchange network application (SIENA);</i></b>
Comments: According to EUROPOL's website, SIENA has not been used for ANY terrorist case. Therefore, it seems irrelevant to this report. Cf. <a href="https://www.europol.europa.eu/content/page/siena-1849">https://www.europol.europa.eu/content/page/siena-1849</a> .	

Or. en

**Amendment 478****Gérard Deprez, Louis Michel, Petr Ježek****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 22**

<b>OPPOSE</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
22. Insists on the absolute necessity of stepping up the exchange of information between the law enforcement authorities <b><i>in</i></b> the Member States; stresses that stepping up the exchange of information between law enforcement authorities will also entail reinforcing the role of European Union agencies, such as Europol and Eurojust;	22. Insists on the absolute necessity of stepping up the exchange of information between the law enforcement authorities of the Member States, <b><i>in particular by optimising the use of and contributions to the Schengen Information System and Europol's 'Focal Point Travellers' on European citizens who have been radicalised;</i></b> stresses that stepping up the exchange of information between law enforcement authorities will also entail reinforcing the role of European Union agencies, such as Europol and Eurojust; ( <i>'Focal Point Travellers' is a file for the collection and analysis of information on foreign terrorist fighters and related terrorist networks. Set up in May 2014 by EUROPOL's counter-terrorism unit, it collects information from all Member States and holds over 6,000 names of individuals associated with terrorism (facilitators, recruiters, funders, those likely to leave, fighters etc.)</i> )
Comments: This amendment lacks of enough safeguards. We suggest supporting AM 476	


instead.

Or. fr

 **Amendment 479**  
**Ana Gomes, Caterina Chinnici, Rachida Dati**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 22**


<b>OPPOSE</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
22. Insists on the absolute necessity of stepping up the exchange of information between the law enforcement authorities in the Member States; stresses that stepping up the exchange of information between law enforcement authorities will also entail reinforcing the role of European Union agencies, such as Europol and Eurojust;	22. Insists on the absolute necessity of stepping up the exchange of information between the law enforcement authorities in the Member States <b>and between Member States and the relevant EU agencies and structures</b> ; stresses that stepping up the exchange of information between law enforcement authorities will also entail reinforcing the role of European Union agencies, such as Europol and Eurojust;
Comments: This amendment lacks of enough safeguards. We suggest supporting AM 476 instead.	

Or. en

 **Amendment 480**  
**Marek Jurek**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 22**

<b>OPPOSE</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
22. Insists on the absolute necessity of stepping up the exchange of information between the law enforcement authorities in the Member States; stresses that stepping up the exchange of information between law enforcement authorities will also entail reinforcing the role of European Union agencies, such as Europol and Eurojust;	22. Insists on the absolute necessity of stepping up the exchange of information between the law enforcement authorities <b>and intelligence agencies</b> authorities in the Member States; stresses that stepping up the exchange of information between law enforcement authorities will also entail reinforcing the role of European Union agencies, such as Europol and Eurojust;
Comments: This amendment lacks of enough safeguards. We suggest supporting AM 476 instead.	

Or. pl

 **Amendment 481**  
**Barbara Spinelli, Kostas Chrysogonos**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 22**

<b>MIXED POSITION</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
22. Insists on the <b>absolute</b> necessity of stepping up the exchange of information between the law enforcement authorities in the Member States; stresses <b>that</b> stepping up the exchange of information between law enforcement authorities	22. Insists on the necessity of stepping up the exchange of information between the law enforcement authorities in the Member States; stresses <b>the importance of</b> stepping up the exchange of information between law enforcement authorities <b>and</b>

<i>will also entail reinforcing the role of</i> European Union agencies, such as Europol and Eurojust;	<i>cooperation with</i> European Union agencies, such as Europol and Eurojust;
Comments: This amendment improves the original wording. However, AM 476 offers more safeguards.	

Or. en



#### Amendment 482

**Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz, Gérard Deprez, Louis Michel**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 22**

MIXED POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
22. Insists on the absolute necessity of stepping up the exchange of information between the law enforcement authorities in the Member States; stresses that stepping up the exchange of information between law enforcement authorities will also entail <b><i>reinforcing the role</i></b> of European Union agencies, such as Europol and Eurojust;	22. Insists on the absolute necessity of stepping up the <b><i>efficient</i></b> exchange of information between the law enforcement authorities in the Member States; stresses that stepping up the <b><i>efficient</i></b> exchange of information between law enforcement authorities will also entail <b><i>a constant increase in quality</i></b> of European Union agencies, such as Europol and Eurojust;
Comments: This amendment lacks of enough safeguards. We suggest supporting AM 476 instead.	

Or. en



#### Amendment 483

**Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz**

**Motion for a resolution**


**Paragraph 23**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
23. Stresses that improved cooperation between the Member States aimed at countering the radicalisation and recruitment of European citizens is also characterised by intensive exchanges between the judicial authorities; <b><i>Notes that better reporting at European level on the criminal records of European citizens at risk of being radicalised would help speed up their detection and make it easier for them to be properly monitored, either when they leave or when they return; encourages, therefore, the reform of the ECRIS system;</i></b>	23. Stresses that improved cooperation between the Member States aimed at countering the radicalisation and recruitment of European citizens is also characterised by intensive exchanges between the judicial authorities;
Comments: The European Criminal Records Information System (ECRIS) was created for Member States' Judicial authorities to exchange criminal records' information. However, this system has led to "serious gaps in data protection, a reliance on potentially untrustworthy automated translation, and a significant lack of oversight". In addition, its scope of utilisation has gone beyond its legal basis. Therefore, the EU does not need "better reporting", but safeguards in place to address its flaws. For a detailed analysis of the ECRIS system, please read <a href="http://www.statewatch.org/analyses/no-145-ecris-epris-ixp.pdf">http://www.statewatch.org/analyses/no-145-ecris-epris-ixp.pdf</a> .	

**Amendment 484**  
**Christine Revault D'Allonnes Bonnefoy**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 23**

NO POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>23. Stresses that <b><i>improved cooperation between</i></b> the Member States aimed at countering the radicalisation and recruitment of European citizens <b><i>is also characterised by intensive exchanges between the judicial authorities</i></b>; Notes that better reporting at European level on the criminal records of European citizens at risk of being radicalised would help speed up their detection and make it easier for them to be properly monitored, either when they leave or when they return; encourages, therefore, the reform of the ECRIS system;</p>	<p>23. Stresses <b><i>that the response of the</i></b> Member States to the radicalisation and recruitment of European citizens <b><i>would be all the more effective if it was also based on enhanced judicial cooperation under the aegis of Eurojust, with shared minimum standards; therefore calls for further harmonisation at European level of criminal law applicable to acts of terrorism</i></b>; Notes that better reporting at European level on the criminal records of European citizens at risk of being radicalised would help speed up their detection and make it easier for them to be properly monitored, either when they leave or when they return; encourages, therefore, the reform of the ECRIS system;</p>
<p>Comments: The call for a harmonisation of criminal law in EU member states is outside of EDRI's scope. As for the rest, we resort to comments to AM 483.</p>	

Or. fr

 **Amendment 485**  
**Sophia in 't Veld**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 23**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>23. Stresses that improved cooperation between the Member States aimed at countering <b><i>the radicalisation</i></b> and recruitment of European citizens is also characterised by intensive exchanges between the judicial authorities; Notes that better reporting at European level on <b><i>the criminal records of European citizens at risk of being radicalised</i></b> would help speed up <b><i>their</i></b> detection and make it easier for them to be properly monitored, <b><i>either when they leave or when they return; encourages, therefore, the reform of the ECRIS system</i></b>;</p>	<p>23. Stresses that improved cooperation between the Member States aimed at countering <b><i>violent extremism</i></b> and recruitment of European citizens <b><i>by terrorist organisations</i></b> is also characterised by intensive exchanges between the judicial authorities; Notes that better reporting <b><i>and information sharing</i></b> at European level on <b><i>cases of violent extremism</i></b> would help speed up <b><i>its</i></b> detection and make it easier for them to be properly monitored;</p>
<p>Comments: This amendment narrows the scope for action to the important issues EU judicial authorities should tackle and cooperate.</p>	

Or. en



**+ Amendment 486**  
**Eleftherios Synadinos**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 23**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>23. Stresses that improved cooperation between the Member States aimed at countering the radicalisation and recruitment of European citizens is also characterised by intensive exchanges between the judicial authorities; Notes that better reporting at European level on the criminal records of European citizens at risk of being radicalised would help speed up their detection and make it easier for them to be properly monitored, either when they leave or when they return; encourages, therefore, the reform of the ECRIS system;</p>	<p>23. Stresses that improved cooperation between the Member States aimed at countering the radicalisation and recruitment of European citizens is also characterised by intensive exchanges between the judicial authorities; Notes that better reporting at European level on the criminal records of European citizens at risk of being radicalised would help speed up their detection and make it easier for them to be properly monitored, either when they leave or when they return; encourages, therefore, the reform of the ECRIS system, <b><i>underlines that fundamental rights, and in particular Article 8 on the protection of personal data, should be respected when exchanging information;</i></b></p>
<p>Comments: This amendment is welcomed as the ECRIS system presents serious data protection gaps. EDRi-member Statewatch published a detailed analysis about it: <a href="http://www.statewatch.org/analyses/no-145-ecris-epris-ixp.pdf">http://www.statewatch.org/analyses/no-145-ecris-epris-ixp.pdf</a>.</p>	


Or. el

**+ Amendment 487**  
**Ana Gomes, Jean Lambert, Barbara Spinelli, Caterina Chinnici**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 23**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>23. Stresses that improved cooperation between the Member States aimed at countering the radicalisation and recruitment of European citizens is also characterised by intensive exchanges between the judicial authorities; Notes that better reporting at European level on the criminal records of <b><i>European citizens at risk of being radicalised</i></b> would help speed up their detection and make it easier for them to be properly monitored, either when they leave or when they return; encourages, therefore, the reform of the ECRIS system;</p>	<p>23. Stresses that improved cooperation between the Member States aimed at countering the radicalisation and recruitment of European citizens is also characterised by intensive exchanges between the judicial authorities; Notes that better reporting at European level on the criminal records of <b><i>terrorist suspects</i></b> would help speed up their detection and make it easier for them to be properly monitored, either when they leave or when they return; encourages, therefore, the reform of the ECRIS system; <b><i>warns, however, of the importance of all EU and Members States action and policies being compliant with EU data protection and privacy rules, enshrined in the EU Charter on Fundamental Rights, EU secondary law and international treaties,</i></b></p>

	<i>covenants and conventions which Member States are party to;</i>
Comments: Same comments as above. If one had to choose between this amendment and AM 486, we encourage you to choose AM 487, as it is more complete.	

Or. en

 **Amendment 488**  
**Emil Radev, Rachida Dati**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 23**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
23. Stresses that improved cooperation between the Member States aimed at countering the radicalisation and recruitment of European citizens is also characterised by intensive exchanges between the judicial authorities; Notes that better reporting at European level on the criminal records of European citizens at risk of being radicalised would help speed up their detection and make it easier for them to be properly monitored, either when they leave or when they return; encourages, therefore, the reform of the ECRIS system;	23. Stresses that improved cooperation between the Member States aimed at countering the radicalisation and recruitment of European citizens is also characterised by intensive exchanges <b>and cooperation</b> between the judicial authorities <b>and with Eurojust</b> ; Notes that better reporting at European level on the criminal records of European citizens at risk of being radicalised would help speed up their detection and make it easier for them to be properly monitored, either when they leave or when they return; encourages, therefore, the reform <b>and better use</b> of the ECRIS system; <b>urges the Commission to assess the feasibility and added value of establishing EPRIS</b> ;
Comments: Both the ECRIS and the European Police Records Index System (EPRIS) presents issues. As stated by EDRI-member Statewatch, "The insistence of the Commission and a small group of states for its development has been already been questioned, partly due to concerns for the potential establishment of an EU-wide police database. Greater scrutiny of this measure is urgent." Cf. <a href="http://www.statewatch.org/analyses/no-145-ecris-epris-ixp.pdf">http://www.statewatch.org/analyses/no-145-ecris-epris-ixp.pdf</a>	

Or. en

**Amendment 489**  
**Louis Michel, Gérard Deprez**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 23**

NO POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
23. Stresses that improved cooperation between the Member States aimed at countering the radicalisation and recruitment of European citizens <i>is</i> also characterised by intensive exchanges between the judicial authorities; Notes that better reporting at European level on the criminal records of European citizens at risk of being radicalised would help speed up their detection and make it easier for them to be properly monitored, either when	23. Stresses that improved cooperation between the Member States aimed at countering the radicalisation and recruitment of European citizens is also characterised by intensive exchanges between the judicial authorities; Notes that better reporting at European level on the criminal records of European citizens at risk of being radicalised would help speed up their detection and make it easier for them to be properly monitored, either when

they leave or when they return; encourages, therefore, the reform of the ECRIS system;

they leave or when they return; encourages, therefore, the reform of the ECRIS system; ***calls for full use of Eurojust in this respect;***

Or. fr



#### Amendment 490

Barbara Spinelli, Kostas Chrysogonos

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 23

#### MIXED POSITION

##### *Motion for a resolution*

23. Stresses that improved cooperation between the Member States aimed at countering the ***radicalisation and*** recruitment of European citizens is also characterised by intensive exchanges between the judicial authorities; Notes that better reporting at European level on the criminal records of European citizens at risk of ***being radicalised*** would help speed up their detection and make it easier for them to be properly monitored, either when they leave or when they return; encourages, therefore, ***the reform*** of the ECRIS system;

##### *Amendment*

23. Stresses that improved cooperation between the Member States aimed at countering the ***spread of violent extremism and the*** recruitment of European citizens is also characterised by intensive exchanges between the judicial authorities; Notes that better reporting at European level on the criminal records of European citizens at risk of ***becoming violent extremists*** would help speed up their detection and make it easier for them to be properly monitored, either when they leave or when they return; encourages, therefore, ***a re-evaluation*** of the ECRIS system;

Comments: The changes introduced improve the original wording. However, the basis for exchange of information is less clear than in amendment 487.

Or. en

(...)



#### Amendment 506

Barbara Spinelli, Kostas Chrysogonos

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 24 b (new)

#### SUPPORT

##### *Motion for a resolution*

##### *Amendment*

***24b. All EU and national policies aimed at preventing the spread of violent extremism of European citizens and their recruitment by terrorist organisations should be fully compliant with States' other human rights obligations, including in particular respect for freedom of expression, freedom of movement, the prohibition of arbitrary arrest or detention, the principle of non-refoulement, and should include accountability mechanisms to protect individuals against abusive application of such policies and to ensure the right to an effective remedy against violations.***

Comments: The amendment should be supported as policies to counter terrorism often

arbitrarily violate human rights and fundamental freedoms, which is unacceptable and also likely to be counterproductive.

Or. en



**Amendment 507**

**Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz, Petr Ježek, Gérard Deprez, Louis Michel**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 25**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>25. <b>Believes that criminalising terrorist acts carried out by foreign fighters requires the collection of evidence in</b> third countries <b>to be possible; calls, therefore, on the European Union to work on establishing judicial cooperation agreements with third countries in order to facilitate such processes;</b></p>	<p>25. <b>Hence invites the European Union to work on the set-up of judicial cooperation agreements with</b> third countries <b>to facilitate the collection of evidence in said countries as long as the Fundamental Rights, especially those regarding effective due process, are ensured by all parts;</b></p>
<p>Comments: Respecting fundamental rights and the rule of law is essential.</p>	

Or. en



**Amendment 508**

**Ana Gomes, Barbara Spinelli, Birgit Sippel, Sylvia-Yvonne Kaufmann**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 25**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>25. Believes that criminalising terrorist acts carried out by <b>foreign fighters requires</b> the collection of evidence in third countries <b>to be possible; calls, therefore, on the European Union to work on establishing judicial cooperation agreements with third countries in order to facilitate such processes;</b></p>	<p>25. Believes that criminalising terrorist acts carried out by <b>European citizens and foreigners residing in the EU who join terrorist groups abroad may require</b> the collection of evidence in third countries; <b>recalls, however, that the collection of evidence, interrogation and other such investigative techniques must be carried out within strict legal standards, must respect EU laws, principles and values and international human rights; in this regard, warns that the use of cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment, torture, extra-judicial renditions, kidnapping is prohibited under international law and shall not take place for the purpose of collecting evidence of criminal offences committed inside the territory of the EU or outside of its territory by EU nationals;</b> calls, therefore, on the European Union to work on establishing judicial cooperation agreements with third countries in order to facilitate such processes, <b>with clear human rights safeguards under judicial control; additionally, stresses that it is</b></p>

	<i>also of vital importance to support victim groups and communities to collect evidence, as part of justice and of future reconciliation;</i>
Comments: The amendment is self-explanatory of why it should be supported.	

Or. en

(...)



### Amendment 512

**Jean Lambert**

on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 25**

<b>MIXED POSITION</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
25. Believes that criminalising terrorist acts carried out by foreign fighters requires the collection of evidence in third countries to be possible; calls, therefore, on the European Union to work on establishing judicial cooperation agreements with third countries in order to facilitate such processes;	25. Believes that criminalising terrorist acts carried out by foreign fighters requires the collection of evidence in third countries to be possible <i>in full compliance with fundamental rights</i> <sup>2a</sup> ; calls, therefore, on the European Union to work on establishing judicial cooperation agreements with third countries in order to facilitate such processes <i>where those countries offer sufficient safeguards concerning the rule of law and human rights</i> ;  <sup>2a</sup> <i>We do not want to see intelligence obtained through torture and illegal mass surveillance</i>
Comments: This Amendment should be supported. Its justification says it all.	

Or. en

(...)

### Amendment 514

**Ana Gomes, Christine Revault D'Allonnes Bonnefoy, Rachida Dati**

**Motion for a resolution**


**Paragraph 25 a (new)**

<b>NO POSITION</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
	<i>25a. Encourages, therefore, the establishment of cooperation agreements between Eurojust with third countries, as those already established with the USA, Norway and Switzerland, stressing, nevertheless, the need to ensure full compliance with EU data protection and privacy rules; points out that priority to establish these agreements should be given to countries that are also particularly hit by terrorism, such as MENA countries; additionally, is of the</i>

	<i>view that the deployment of Eurojust liaison prosecutors in the relevant countries, namely in the southern neighbourhood, would foster more exchange of information and enable better cooperation to effectively fight terrorism;</i>
Comments: Some aspects of this amendment, specially the part on the deployment of prosecutors abroad, fall out of EDRi's scope.	

Or. en


(...)

 **Amendment 517**  
**Barbara Spinelli, Kostas Chrysogonos**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 25 b (new)**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
	<i>25b. This includes the obligation not to share intelligence or other information where there is a real risk that it may directly or indirectly lead to violation of international human rights law, or has or may have been directly or indirectly obtained in violation of the same human rights law, including the absolute prohibition on torture and other ill-treatment and the right to privacy;</i>
Comments: Any human right violation which do not respect the principles of necessity and proportionality must be avoided. This amendment reflects this concern and should therefore be supported.	

Or. en

(...)


 **Amendment 523**  
**Sophia in 't Veld**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 26**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<i>26. Reiterates its belief that <b>the European Union must step up its external border controls as a matter of urgency; stresses that it will be impossible to effectively track the departures or arrivals of European citizens unless mandatory and systematic controls are introduced on the European Union's external borders; states that, to this end, one of the European Union's priorities must be reforming the Schengen Code;</b></i>	<i>26. Reiterates its belief that <b>Member States should file an alert in the Schengen Information System on citizens that have travelled to a third country to join a terrorist organisation;</b></i>
Comments: The SIS II could be used in this way when there is evidence showing somebody's involvement in a terrorist organisation.	




**Amendment 524**  
**VickyMaeijer**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 26**

NO POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>26. Reiterates its belief that the <b>European Union</b> must <b>step up its external border controls</b> as a matter of urgency; <b>stresses that it will be impossible to effectively track the departures or arrivals of European citizens unless mandatory and systematic controls are introduced on the European Union's external borders; states that, to this end, one of the European Union's priorities must be reforming the Schengen Code;</b></p>	<p>26. Reiterates its belief that the <b>Schengen countries</b> must close the borders as a matter of urgency;</p>
<p>Comments: It falls outside our scope of work.</p>	

 **Amendment 525**  
**Jean Lambert**  
 on behalf of the Verts/ALE Group  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 26**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>26. <b>Reiterates its belief that the European Union must step up its external border controls as a matter of urgency; stresses that it will be impossible to effectively track the departures or arrivals of European citizens unless mandatory and systematic controls are introduced on the European Union's external borders; states that, to this end, one of the European Union's priorities must be reforming the Schengen Code;</b></p>	<p>26. <b>Believes that measures implemented to tackle radicalization must not be used in order to limit immigration. Additional controls at external borders, as agreed by Member States, should not lead to racial or ethnic profiling.</b></p>
<p>Comments: Profiling is used to make assumptions about individuals and their future behaviour. By profiling people, inequalities and racial, ethnic or other type of discrimination are possible. This amendment takes those risks into account.</p>	

 **Amendment 526**  
**Anna Hedh, Soraya Post**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 26**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>26. Reiterates its belief that the European Union must step up its <b>external border controls as a matter of urgency; stresses</b></p>	<p>26. Reiterates its belief that the European Union must step up its <b>efforts for social inclusion and the rule of law to prevent</b></p>

<i>that it will be impossible to effectively track the departures or arrivals of European citizens unless mandatory and systematic controls are introduced on the European Union's external borders; states that, to this end, one of the European Union's priorities must be reforming the Schengen Code;</i>	<i>citizens from travelling to other countries to join terrorist organisations;</i>
Comments: Preventive measures must respect the rule of law.	

Or. en



**Amendment 527**

Ana Gomes

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 26

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
26. Reiterates its belief that the European Union must <b>step up</b> its external border controls <b>as a matter of urgency</b> ; stresses that <b>it will be impossible to effectively track the departures or arrivals of European citizens unless mandatory and systematic controls are introduced on the European Union's external borders; states that, to this end, one of the European Union's priorities must be reforming the Schengen Code;</b>	26. Reiterates its belief that the European Union must <b>make</b> its external border controls <b>more effective and recalls that this should be done in line with fundamental rights</b> ; Stresses that <b>Member States do not make sufficient use of existing Schengen legal and technical tools such as SIS II or proper verification if travel documents are valid or falsified or counterfeit at external borders; emphasises however that the existing Schengen rules already ensure a high level of safety for European citizens if properly implemented;</b>
Comments: The Schengen Information System II (SIS II) was introduced in April 2013 to incorporate the anti-terrorism policy and involve more states. It gathers an important amount of sensitive data, including biometric data. It is already difficult to verify whether the principles of legality or proportionality are respected with this system, so the EU should first review the application and utility of current systems, not to make them more restrictive.	

Or. en



**Amendment 528**

Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz, Angelika Mlinar

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 26

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
26. Reiterates its belief that the European Union must step up its external border controls as a matter of urgency; <b>stresses that it will be impossible to effectively track the departures or arrivals of European citizens unless mandatory and systematic controls are introduced on the European Union's external borders; states that, to this end, one of the</b>	26. Reiterates its belief that the European Union must step up its external border controls as a matter of urgency <b>in full compliance with Fundamental Rights in every action regarding citizens recruited by terrorist organizations;</b>

***European Union's priorities must be reforming the Schengen Code;***

Comments: In whatever action the EU decides to undertake regarding its external borders, fundamental rights must be respected.

Or. en

**Amendment 529**

**Sylvie Guillaume**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 26**

**NO POSITION**

*Motion for a resolution*

*Amendment*

Reiterates its belief ***that the European Union must step up its external border controls as a matter of urgency; stresses that it will be impossible to effectively track the departures or arrivals of European citizens unless mandatory and systematic controls are introduced*** on the European Union's external borders; ***states that, to this end, one of the European Union's priorities must be reforming the Schengen Code;***

26. Reiterates its belief that the ***effectiveness*** of European Union's external border controls ***must be improved; stresses that the Member States should therefore make full use of the existing Schengen framework and the opportunities for control which it offers;***

Comments: The proposed amendment falls out of EDRI's scope. For this paragraph, we suggest to support amendment 528.

Or. fr

**Amendment 530**

**Barbara Spinelli**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 26**

**NO POSITION**

*Motion for a resolution*

*Amendment*

26. Reiterates its belief that the European Union ***must step up*** its external border controls as a matter of urgency; ***stresses that it will be impossible to effectively track the departures or arrivals of European citizens unless mandatory and systematic controls are introduced on the European Union's external borders; states that, to this end, one of the European Union's priorities must be reforming the Schengen Code;***

26. Reiterates its belief that the European Union ***should reorganize and diversify*** its external border controls as a matter of urgency; ***in order not only to guarantee a better control but also and with the same diligence to facilitate the return of European foreign fighters and facilitate their rehabilitation which permits their free circulation in the Schengen area;***

Comments: The proposed amendment falls out of EDRI's scope. For this paragraph, we suggest to support amendment 528.

Or. en

**Amendment 531****Emil Radev****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 26**

<b>OPPOSE</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>26. Reiterates its belief that the European Union must step up its external border controls as a matter of urgency; stresses that it will be impossible to effectively track the departures or arrivals of European citizens unless mandatory and systematic controls are introduced on the European Union's external borders; states that, to this end, one of the European Union's priorities must be reforming the Schengen Code;</p>	<p>26. Reiterates its belief that the European Union must step up its external border controls as a matter of urgency; stresses that it will be impossible to effectively track the departures or arrivals of European citizens unless mandatory and systematic controls are introduced on the European Union's external borders; states that, to this end, one of the European Union's priorities must be reforming the Schengen Code; <b><i>stresses, however, that such a reform should not jeopardise the free movement of persons who benefit from it within the EU;</i></b></p>
<p>Comments: The original and the proposed amendment includes an intention to track people which, unless it is done under the sufficient guarantees foreseen in the Charter of Fundamental Rights, the Convention on Human Rights, and the jurisprudence of both the CJEU and the ECtHR it will not be in accordance with EU law. Therefore, for this paragraph, we suggest to support amendment 528.</p>	

Or. en

**Amendment 532****Marine Le Pen, Gilles Lebreton****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 26**

<b>NO POSITION</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>Reiterates its belief that the European Union must step up its external border controls as a matter of urgency; stresses that it will be impossible to effectively track the departures or arrivals of European citizens unless mandatory and systematic controls are introduced on the European Union's external borders; states that, to this end, one of the European Union's priorities must be <b><i>reforming</i></b> the Schengen Code;</p>	<p>26. Reiterates its belief that the European Union must step up its external border controls as a matter of urgency <b><i>and that the Member States must also be able to guard and control the internal borders;</i></b> stresses that it will be impossible to effectively track the departures or arrivals of European citizens unless mandatory and systematic controls are introduced on the European Union's external borders; states that, to this end, one of the European Union's priorities must be <b><i>repealing</i></b> the Schengen Code;</p>
<p>Comments: The proposed amendment falls out of EDRI's scope. For this paragraph, we suggest to support amendment 528.</p>	

Or. fr

**Amendment 533****Anna Maria Corazza Bildt, Carlos Coelho, Monica Macovei, Frank Engel, Barbara Matera, Traian Ungureanu, Alessandra Mussolini****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 26**

<b>OPPOSE</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
26. Reiterates its belief that the European Union must step up its external border controls as a matter of urgency; stresses that it will be impossible to effectively track <i>the departures or arrivals of European citizens unless</i> mandatory and systematic controls <i>are introduced</i> on the European Union's external borders; states that, to this end, one of the European Union's priorities must be <i>reforming</i> the Schengen Code;	26. Reiterates its belief that the European Union must step up its external border controls as a matter of urgency; stresses that it will be impossible to effectively track <i>entry and exit in the EU unless Member States implement the</i> mandatory and systematic controls <i>foreseen</i> on the European Union's external borders; <i>calls on the Member States to make a good use of existing instruments such as SIS and VIS, including in reference to stolen, lost and falsified passports</i> ; states that, to this end, one of the European Union's priorities must be <i>to better enforce</i> the Schengen Code;
<p>Comments: The original and the proposed amendment includes an intention to track people, which unless it is done under the sufficient guarantees foreseen in the Charter of Fundamental Rights, the Convention on Human Rights, and the case law of both the CJEU and the ECtHR, it will not be in accordance with EU law. Therefore, for this paragraph, we suggest to support amendment 528. In addition, the SIS and VIS present flaws and dangers to fundamental rights. These systems should be reviewed. For a detailed analysis, please read <a href="http://www.aedh.eu/plugins/fckeditor/userfiles/file/AEDH_EuropeanMonograph_PublicData_Collection_Final.pdf">http://www.aedh.eu/plugins/fckeditor/userfiles/file/AEDH_EuropeanMonograph_PublicData_Collection_Final.pdf</a>.</p>	

Or. en

**Amendment 534****Timothy Kirkhope**

on behalf of the ECR Group

**Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 26**

<b>OPPOSE</b>	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
26. Reiterates its belief that the European Union must step up its external border controls as a matter of urgency; stresses that it will be impossible to effectively track the departures or arrivals of European citizens unless mandatory and systematic controls are introduced on the European Union's external borders; states that, to this end, one of the European Union's priorities must be reforming the Schengen Code;	26. Reiterates its belief that the European Union must step up its external border controls as a matter of urgency; stresses that it will be impossible to effectively track the departures or arrivals of European citizens unless mandatory and systematic controls are introduced on the European Union's external borders; states that, to this end, one of the European Union's priorities must be reforming the Schengen Code <i>and in adopting the Smart Borders Package</i> ;
<p>Comments: The original and the proposed amendment includes an intention to track people, which unless it is done under the sufficient guarantees foreseen in the Charter of Fundamental</p>	

Rights, the Convention on Human Rights, and the jurisprudence of both the CJEU and the ECtHR it will not be in accordance with EU law. In addition, the Smart Borders Package is currently being subject to consultation, which makes this reference premature. As it stands, we believe the Smart Borders Package "fails to ensure the protection of travellers' personal data and right to privacy". Cf. <https://www.accessnow.org/blog/2015/08/25/passports-and-profiles-please-eu-may-exact-digital-toll-at-its-borders>.


For this paragraph, we suggest to support amendment 528.

Or. en

 **Amendment 535**  
**Caterina Chinnici, Goffredo Maria Bettini**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 26**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>26. Reiterates its belief that the European Union must step up its external border controls as a matter of urgency; stresses that it will be impossible to effectively track the departures or arrivals of European citizens <b><i>unless</i></b> mandatory and systemic controls <b><i>are introduced</i></b> on the European Union's external borders; <b><i>states that, to this end, one of the European Union's priorities must be reforming the Schengen Code;</i></b></p>	<p>26. Reiterates its belief that the European Union must step up its external border controls as a matter of urgency; stresses that it will be impossible to effectively track the departures or arrivals of European citizens <b><i>without close cooperation between the competent national authorities and the introduction of</i></b> mandatory and systemic controls on the European Union's external borders;</p>
<p>Comments: The original and the proposed amendment includes an intention to track people, which unless it is done under the sufficient guarantees foreseen in the Charter of Fundamental Rights, the Convention on Human Rights, and the jurisprudence of both the CJEU and the ECtHR it will not be in accordance with EU law. Therefore, for this paragraph, we suggest to support amendment 528.</p>	

Or. it

 **Amendment 536**  
**Monika Hohlmeier, Rachida Dati**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 26**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>26. Reiterates its <b><i>belief</i></b> that the European Union must step up its external border controls as a matter of urgency; stresses that it will be impossible to effectively track the departures or arrivals of European citizens unless mandatory and systematic <b><i>controls are</i></b> introduced on the European Union's external borders; states that, to this end, one of the European Union's priorities must be <b><i>reforming</i></b> the Schengen Code;</p>	<p>26. Reiterates its <b><i>conviction</i></b> that the European Union must step up its external border controls as a matter of urgency; stresses that it will be impossible to effectively track the departures or arrivals of European citizens unless <b><i>a</i></b> mandatory and systematic <b><i>entry-exit-system is</i></b> introduced on the European Union's external borders; states that, to this end, one of the European Union's priorities must be <b><i>to swiftly adopt the Smart Borders package, including an adaptation of the</i></b> Schengen Code;</p>



Comments: The Smart Borders Package is currently being subject to consultation, which makes this reference premature. As it stands, we believe the Smart Borders Package "fails to ensure the protection of travellers' personal data and right to privacy". Cf.

<https://www.accessnow.org/blog/2015/08/25/passports-and-profiles-please-eu-may-exact-digital-toll-at-its-borders>.

Or. en



### Amendment 537

Gérard Deprez, Louis Michel

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 26

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>26. Reiterates its belief that the European Union must step up its external border controls as a matter of urgency; stresses that it will be impossible to effectively track the departures or arrivals of European citizens unless <b>mandatory and</b> systematic controls are introduced on the European Union's external borders; <b>states that</b>, to this end, <b>one of the European Union's priorities must be reforming</b> the Schengen Code;</p>	<p>26. Reiterates its belief that the European Union must step up its external border controls as a matter of urgency; stresses that it will be impossible to effectively track the departures or arrivals of European citizens <b>recruited by terrorist organisations</b> unless systematic controls are introduced on the European Union's external borders; <b>Insists that</b> to this end <b>the Member States should implement the Commission's recommendations for a more flexible interpretation of the Schengen Code, so that external border controls for citizens of the Union no longer consist only of 'a minimal level of checks' but normally involve the consultation of national and European databases.</b></p>
<p>Comments: The original and the proposed amendment includes an intention to track people, which unless it is done under the sufficient guarantees foreseen in the Charter of Fundamental Rights, the Convention on Human Rights, and the jurisprudence of both the CJEU and the ECtHR it will not be in accordance with EU law. Therefore, for this paragraph, we suggest to support amendment 528.</p>	

Or. fr



### Amendment 538

Morten Messerschmidt

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 26

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<p>26 Reiterates its belief that the European Union must step up its external border controls as a matter of urgency; stresses that it will be impossible to effectively track the departures or arrivals of European citizens unless mandatory and systematic controls are introduced on the European Union's external borders; states that, to this end, one of the European Union's priorities</p>	<p>26. Reiterates its belief that the European Union must step up its external <b>and internal</b> border controls as a matter of urgency; stresses that it will be impossible to effectively track the departures or arrivals of European citizens unless mandatory and systematic controls are introduced on the European Union's external borders; states that, to this end,</p>

must be reforming the Schengen Code;	one of the European Union's priorities must be reforming the Schengen Code; <i>as a priority, this reform should enable Member States, in the event of a threat to internal security, to re-establish fixed controls at national borders, in a rigorous, flexible, random and non-systematic manner, not interfering with people's movements but exercising a significant dissuasive effect on illegal immigrants, terrorists, traffickers and other criminal networks;</i>
Comments: Same comments as above.	

Or. fr

(...)



**Amendment 556**

**Barbara Spinelli**

**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 28**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
<b>28. Reiterates that making good use of existing instruments such as the SIS and VIS systems constitutes the first step in stepping up external border security in order to identify EU citizens who may be leaving for conflict zones;</b>	<i>deleted</i>
Comments: Making good use of the SIS and VIS systems is not enough. These systems must be reformed to solve data protection problems. For more information, please read <a href="http://www.aedh.eu/plugins/fckeditor/userfiles/file/AEDH_EuropeanMonograph_PublicData_Collection_Final.pdf">http://www.aedh.eu/plugins/fckeditor/userfiles/file/AEDH_EuropeanMonograph_PublicData_Collection_Final.pdf</a> .	

Or. en

(...)



**Amendment 560**

**Kati Piri**


**Motion for a resolution**

**Paragraph 28**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
28. Reiterates that making good use of existing instruments such as the SIS and VIS systems constitutes the first step in stepping up external border security in order to identify EU citizens who may be leaving for conflict zones;	28. Reiterates that making good use of existing instruments such as the SIS and VIS systems constitutes the first step in stepping up external border security in order to identify EU citizens who may be leaving for conflict zones; <b><i>these existing instruments should also be used set up a list, based on a set of criteria, in order to prevent hate preachers and extremist recruiters from entering the European Union;</i></b>
Comments: The concepts of “hate preachers” and “extremist recruiters” is too broad. If this	


text is adopted, it could be understood in a far broader sense than the Parliament may envisage.

Or. en

 **Amendment 561**  
**Eleftherios Synadinos**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 28**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
28. Reiterates that making good use of existing instruments such as the SIS and VIS systems constitutes the first step in stepping up external border security in order to identify EU citizens who may be leaving for conflict zones;	28 Reiterates that making good use of existing instruments such as the SIS, <b>SIS II</b> and VIS systems constitutes the first step in stepping up external border security in order to identify EU citizens who may be leaving for conflict zones;
Comments: It is very important to use the means already available in a wise way. Making good use of the SIS and VIS systems is not enough. These systems must be reformed to solve data protection problems. For more information, please read <a href="http://www.aedh.eu/plugins/fckeditor/userfiles/file/AEDH_EuropeanMonograph_PublicDataCollection_Final.pdf">http://www.aedh.eu/plugins/fckeditor/userfiles/file/AEDH_EuropeanMonograph_PublicDataCollection_Final.pdf</a> .	

Or. el

 **Amendment 562**  
**Emil Radev, Rachida Dati**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 28**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
28. Reiterates that making good use of existing instruments such as the SIS and VIS systems constitutes the first step in stepping up external border security in order to identify EU citizens who may be leaving for conflict zones;	28. Reiterates that making good use of existing instruments such as the <b>EU's</b> SIS and VIS systems, <b>Interpol's SLTD system, and Europol's Focal Point TRAVELLERS</b> constitutes the first step in stepping up external border security in order to identify EU citizens who may be leaving for <b>or returning from</b> conflict zones; <b>urges Member States to improve cooperation and sharing of information regarding suspected foreign fighters with Member States at the external EU borders;</b>
Comments: The safeguards regarding the sharing of information has already been covered in other parts of the Report in a most comprehensive way which also contemplates safeguards to data protection and other fundamental rights.	

Or. en

(...)

**Amendment 565****Louis Michel, Gérard Deprez, Maite Pagazaurtundúa Ruiz****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 28 a (new)**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
	<b>28a. Invites the Member States to ensure effective monitoring , particularly psychological, of foreign fighters on their return to Europe;</b>
Comments: It is difficult to understand how the “psychological monitoring” is supposed to take place. For any other attempts to monitor citizens, this should only be done with the sufficient safeguards that we have mentioned above in our comments to other amendments.	

Or. fr

(...)

**Amendment 567****Barbara Spinelli, Kostas Chrysogonos****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 29**

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
29. Stresses <b>once more the vital</b> importance of the European Union establishing <b>close</b> cooperation with non-EU countries, notably transit countries and those to which foreign fighters are heading, <b>insofar as this is possible, in order to be able to identify EU citizens leaving to fight for terrorist organisations or returning thereafter;</b>	29. Stresses <b>the</b> importance of the European Union establishing cooperation with non-EU countries, notably transit countries and those to which foreign fighters are heading, <b>only if this cooperation doesn't violate the principles of the European Charter of Fundamental Rights and if this does not mean cooperating with dictatorial regimes;</b>
Comments: The Charter must always be respected. In the compromise negotiations, it would be worth broadening the text to refer to international law in general.	

Or. en

**Amendment 568****Christine Revault D'Allonnes Bonnefoy, Sylvie Guillaume****Motion for a resolution****Paragraph 29**

MIXED POSITION	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
29. Stresses once more the vital importance of the European Union establishing close cooperation with non-EU countries, notably transit countries and those to which <b>foreign</b> fighters are heading, insofar as this is possible, in order to be able to identify EU citizens leaving to fight for terrorist organisations or returning thereafter;	29. Stresses once more the vital importance of the European Union establishing close cooperation with non-EU countries, notably transit countries and those to which <b>European</b> fighters are heading, insofar as this is possible, <b>and while respecting the Charter of Fundamental Rights</b> , in order to be able to identify EU citizens leaving to fight for terrorist organisations or returning thereafter;
Comments: Despite the mention to the Charter, the term “terrorist suspect” is more accurate than the term “European fighter” included in this amendment.	

(...)

**Amendment 592**

Aldo Patriciello

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 31 a (new)

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
	<p><b>31a. Recalls, however, that the aim is not to instigate a 'witch hunt', and urges partner countries and the EU to adopt sensible methods for identifying individuals that may have been radicalised, without resorting to generalisations which could have the opposite effect to that intended and in particular without creating a sense of insecurity and general panic among the public;</b></p>
<p>Comments: Generalised mass surveillance is contrary to Human rights and European values.</p>	

Or. it

(...)

**Amendment 634**

Anna Hedh, Soraya Post

Motion for a resolution


Subheading X a (new)

SUPPORT	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
	<p><b>X a. XI. Promoting fundamental rights and social inclusion</b></p> <p><b>38. Expresses concern over prevailing racism and social segregation in all of Europe that cause increased polarisation, violence and extremism; calls on Member states to take measures to strengthen values of equality, democracy and human rights in order to prevent conflict and social exclusion</b></p> <p><b>39. Emphasizes that human rights should be at the core of all cooperation countering terrorism and radicalization, and that countering terrorism and radicalization needs to ensure that security, human rights and law enforcement are not mutually exclusive but complementary.</b></p> <p><b>40. Encourages the development of preventive measures against terrorism on Member state, EU- and international level that in the long run can counteract the mechanisms leading to exclusion, conflict and violence, including the combat</b></p>

	<i>against racism and promoting social inclusion within the EU.</i>
Comments: Human rights are at the core of the EU.	

Or. en


(...)

 **Amendment 638**  
**Monika Hohlmeier, Rachida Dati**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 35**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
35. Supports measures to weaken terrorist organisations from the inside and <b>lessen</b> their <b>potential</b> influence on EU citizens; urges the European <b>Union</b> to look into ways of dismantling jihadist networks and identifying how they are funded; encourages the Commission to propose a regulation on identifying terrorism funding channels;	35. Supports measures to weaken terrorist organisations from the inside and <b>limit</b> their <b>current</b> influence on EU citizens; urges the European <b>Commission</b> to look into ways of dismantling jihadist networks and identifying how they are funded; encourages the Commission to propose a regulation on identifying terrorism funding channels; <b>notes that SWIFT covers global financial transactions to a large extent however recalls that alternative forms of payments, also online, also pose a considerable risk of terrorist financing; highlights the importance of a terrorist finance tracking programme in this regard; calls on the Commission to re-evaluate the creation of a common European terrorist finance tracking system;</b>
Comments: The Terrorist Finance Tracking Programme poses a serious threat to fundamental rights, which is why the European Parliament called for its suspension in 2013. Any attempt to introduce an even broader programme does not seem to be needed at this stage, given the serious risks this implies.	

Or. en

(...)

 **Amendment 644**  
**Monika Hohlmeier, Rachida Dati**  
**Motion for a resolution**  
**Paragraph 35 a (new)**

OPPOSE	
<i>Motion for a resolution</i>	<i>Amendment</i>
	<b>35a. Welcomes the recent adoption of the European Agenda on Security with proposes important steps towards a better fight against terrorism and radicalisation such as the creation of the European Anti-Terrorism Centre at Europol; calls upon Member States to make full use of existing measures and calls upon the Commission to flag sufficient financial</b>



*and human resources to effectively deliver on its proposed actions;*

Comments: The European Agenda on Security includes a number of initiatives, such as the PNR agreements, which pose serious questions regarding the necessity, effectiveness and proportionality of these surveillance measures. The European Data Protection Supervisor (EDPS) recently criticised this measure: <https://euobserver.com/justice/129776>. For a more detailed analysis of our concerns on PNR, see our briefing paper: <https://edri.org/files/PNR2015/PNRbrief-EDRi.pdf>

Or. en

(...)