

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Trigger of This Book: A Perceived Loss of Control	1
1.2	A First Outline of Article 16 TFEU	4
1.2.1	The EU Mandate Under Article 16 TFEU to Ensure Privacy and Data Protection	4
1.2.2	Legitimacy and Effectiveness as Prerequisites for Trust	5
1.2.3	Background	6
1.3	The Structure of This Book	7
1.4	Methodology	11
1.5	Further Limitations	13
1.6	Terminology	14
	References	15
<b>2</b>	<b>Privacy and Data Protection as Values of the EU That Matter, Also in the Information Society</b>	<b>17</b>
2.1	Introduction	18
2.2	Privacy and Data Protection as Part of an EU Based on Values: A General Design	19
2.2.1	Privacy, Data Protection and the Ambitions of the EU in Promoting Its Values	19
2.3	Privacy and Data Protection as Constitutional Values That Matter, Also on the Internet	20
2.3.1	Two Elements Stand Out: There Are No Good or Bad People, and Monitoring Changes Behaviour	22
2.4	Ambitions of the EU in Promoting Democracy: Democracy Requires a Free Internet, but Not an Unprotected Internet	24
2.4.1	Democracy as Guiding Principle in Relation to the Internet	24

2.4.2	A Free Internet Does Not Mean an Unprotected Internet . . . . .	25
2.4.3	Democracy and the EU . . . . .	26
2.5	Ambitions of the EU in Promoting the Rule of Law: How to Ensure Effective Privacy and Data Protection on the Internet Under the Rule of Law. . . . .	27
2.5.1	Understanding the Concept of the Rule of Law. . . . .	27
2.5.2	The Rule of Law and Its Relation to Fundamental Rights . . . . .	29
2.5.3	Effective Legal Protection for Everyone . . . . .	29
2.5.4	The Rule of Law Has a Close Link with the Right to Data Protection. . . . .	30
2.6	Ambitions of the EU in Promoting Fundamental Rights: Understanding the Context of Privacy and Data Protection and the Internet Under EU Law . . . . .	32
2.6.1	The Broad Applicability of Fundamental Rights: Application in All Situations . . . . .	32
2.6.2	Fundamental Rights Protection and the Internet . . . . .	34
2.7	Fundamental Rights Protection Against Private Parties Acquires a New Dimension on the Internet, Particularly for Privacy and Data Protection . . . . .	35
2.7.1	Four Arguments Supporting Direct Applicability in Horizontal Situations . . . . .	36
2.8	The Right to Privacy, a Broad and Dynamic Concept on the Internet Extending to the Public Sphere . . . . .	39
2.8.1	Historical Development of Privacy, Starting with Warren and Brandeis . . . . .	39
2.8.2	Human Dignity and Personal Autonomy as Underlying Values and the Broad Scope of Privacy . . . . .	40
2.9	Understanding the Nature of the Right to Privacy Through Four Types of Qualified Interests: Information Use by Governments, Health, Vulnerable Groups and Reputation . . . . .	43
2.9.1	Four Types of Qualified Interests: Information Use by Governments, Health, Vulnerable Groups and Reputation . . . . .	44
2.9.2	Summing Up: All Use of Personal Information Falls Within the Scope of the Right to Privacy Under Article 7 Charter . . . . .	47
2.10	Historical Development of the Right to Data Protection, Starting as a Response to Technological Developments . . . . .	48
2.10.1	The Council of Europe's Role in Developing Instruments on Data Protection . . . . .	49

2.10.2	The EU: Growing Emphasis on Respecting Constitutional Values in Addition to the Objective of Market Integration . . . . .	49
2.10.3	A Separate Development in the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice, Leading to a Patchwork . . . . .	51
2.11	The Right to Data Protection: A Claim Based on Fairness Providing Safeguards Where Personal Data Are Processed . . . . .	54
2.11.1	Does the Right to Data Protection Serve to Give an Individual Control Over Personal Information? . . . . .	55
2.11.2	Is the Right to Data Protection a Claim Based on Fairness, Providing Safeguards Where Personal Data Are Processed? . . . . .	56
2.11.3	The Right to Data Protection Provides for a System of Checks and Balances Based on Fairness . . . . .	57
2.12	Data Protection as 'Rules of the Game' or 'a System of Checks and Balances' . . . . .	59
2.12.1	Diverging Views on the Legitimacy of Processing Personal Data . . . . .	59
2.12.2	Summing Up: The EU and the Member States Must Establish Checks and Balances . . . . .	61
2.13	Privacy and Data Protection: Two Sides of the Same Coin . . . . .	62
2.13.1	It Is Not Important to Distinguish Between Privacy and Data Protection on the Internet . . . . .	66
2.13.2	A Further Argument for Not Distinguishing Between Privacy and Data Protection: The Law of the United States . . . . .	67
2.14	A Proposal for a Solution Considering Both Fundamental Rights as Part of One System. . . . .	68
2.15	Conclusions . . . . .	70
	References. . . . .	73
<b>3</b>	<b>Internet and Loss of Control in an Era of Big Data and Mass Surveillance . . . . .</b>	<b>77</b>
3.1	Introduction . . . . .	78
3.2	A General Design of the Internet and the Loss of Control Over Personal Data . . . . .	79
3.3	The Internet as a Single Unfragmented Space with a Loose Governance Structure. . . . .	81
3.3.1	Interconnected and Loosely Governed by Multiple Stakeholders. . . . .	81

3.3.2	Responsibility for the Integrity of the System, the Continuity of the Services and Security Threats. . . . .	83
3.4	At the Core of the Internet, Networked Societies and Globalisation: Is Fragmentation a Threat? . . . . .	85
3.4.1	Networked Societies Are Vulnerable . . . . .	86
3.4.2	Globalisation, a Trigger for Innovation and Growth. . . . .	88
3.4.3	Is Fragmentation of the Internet a Threat? . . . . .	89
3.5	The Internet in Terms of Freedom and Powers: Is There a Shift from Freedom to Power? . . . . .	91
3.5.1	Freedom, a Free Internet as a Common Good . . . . .	91
3.5.2	Power on the Internet . . . . .	93
3.6	Big Data Justifies a Qualitative Shift in Thinking . . . . .	96
3.6.1	Big Data Is Really New and a Fundamental Change . . . . .	97
3.6.2	Big Data Is Pervasive in the Daily Life of Individuals . . . . .	99
3.7	People Can No Longer Evade Surveillance Through Electronic Means . . . . .	101
3.7.1	Surveillance from Different Perspectives . . . . .	102
3.7.2	Different Types of Surveillance, But the Distinctions Are Not Always Crystal Clear. . .	104
3.8	No Strict Distinction Between Surveillance by the State and by the Private Sector . . . . .	106
3.8.1	The Various Types of Surveillance Are Not Necessarily Different in Terms of Intrusiveness . . . . .	108
3.8.2	Democratic Legitimacy and Accountability of Surveillance, in Relation to Secrecy and Cooperation with the Private Sector . . . . .	109
3.9	The Perspective of the EU and the Member States: What Is Changing? . . . . .	110
3.9.1	The Governance of the Internet and a Declining Role for the State . . . . .	111
3.9.2	The Reality of the Internet Changes Privacy and Data Protection and the Balancing with Other Fundamental Rights and Public Interests. . . . .	112
3.9.3	The EU and the Member States Depend on Private Parties . . . . .	114
3.9.4	Conflicts of Jurisdiction Are an Inherent Phenomenon on the Internet and Should Be Addressed . . . . .	115
3.10	Introductory Ideas on How the EU and Its Member States Could Regain Control . . . . .	116
3.10.1	Three Basic Conditions . . . . .	116

3.10.2	Five Directions .....	117
3.11	Conclusions .....	119
	References .....	121
<b>4</b>	<b>The Mandate of the EU Under Article 16 TFEU and the Perspectives of Legitimacy and Effectiveness .....</b>	<b>125</b>
4.1	Introduction .....	125
4.2	A General Design of the Mandate Under Article 16 TFEU: The Member States Are Important Actors .....	126
4.2.1	The Context: Article 16 TFEU Gives a Mandate to the EU, But the Member States Remain Important Actors. ....	128
4.2.2	Legitimacy and Effectiveness: Perspectives for Understanding the Mandate of the EU .....	129
4.3	A First Specification of the Mandate Under Article 16 TFEU: Broad Powers of the EU, But a Shared Competence, and an Outline of the Three Tasks .....	130
4.3.1	Wide Powers of the EU in Privacy and Data Protection .....	130
4.3.2	Article 16 TFEU Is a Shared Competence, But in Practice Complete .....	131
4.3.3	An Outline of the Three Tasks of the EU Under Article 16 TFEU .....	133
4.4	The Exercise of the Mandate Under Article 16 TFEU Should Comply with the Principles of Subsidiarity and Proportionality. ....	135
4.4.1	Testing EU Data Protection Action on Subsidiarity and Proportionality .....	135
4.4.2	Member State Competences in Competing Areas ....	137
4.5	Security Agencies Could Be Covered by EU Data Protection Despite the Limitations to EU Competence in Respect of National Identities, National Security and Cultural Differences .....	138
4.5.1	The National Identities of the EU Member States ....	138
4.5.2	The Notion of National Security, in Relation to Public Security and State Security. ....	139
4.5.3	National Security of Third Countries. ....	143
4.5.4	Cultural Differences and Cultural Diversity .....	144
4.6	Further Limitations Due to the EU's Organisational Structure: Decentralised Implementation. ....	145
4.6.1	Decentralised Implementation and Cooperation ....	145
4.6.2	Sincere Cooperation as a Means to Regain Control Over Fundamental Rights Protection. ....	146
4.7	Enforcement and the Organisation of Judicial Protection Are Normally Tasks of the Member States .....	148

4.7.1	Administrative Law Enforcement: Multi-level Governance or Shared Administration . . . . .	149
4.7.2	Judicial Protection: The Principle of National Procedural Autonomy. . . . .	150
4.8	Democratic Legitimacy of EU Action Under Article 16 TFEU: A Prerequisite for Trust . . . . .	151
4.8.1	Fundamental Rights and the Academic Controversy on Democratic Legitimacy . . . . .	151
4.8.2	The Legitimacy of EU Action Depends on the Subject Area . . . . .	152
4.9	The EU and Its Citizens: The Concept of EU Citizenship Contributes to the Legitimacy of the EU's Role Under Article 16 TFEU . . . . .	154
4.9.1	EU Citizenship: EU Citizens' Expectations That Their Rights Are Protected . . . . .	155
4.10	Four Arguments Relating to a Lack of Legitimacy of EU Action . . . . .	157
4.10.1	The Lack of Legitimacy Captured in Four Arguments . . . . .	157
4.10.2	Democratic Legitimacy Formally Closer to the Optimum, But Socially Not Widely Accepted . . . . .	160
4.11	The Background According to Weiler: The Crisis of Social Legitimacy. . . . .	162
4.12	The Legitimacy of EU Action in Relation to the Member States: A Broad Mandate in a Pluralist Legal Context. . . . .	164
4.12.1	Member States' Reluctance to Enhance EU Power . . . . .	164
4.12.2	A Pluralist Legal Context. . . . .	166
4.13	Primacy Is Potentially in Conflict with the Protection of Fundamental Rights by the Member States . . . . .	167
4.13.1	Different Positions Taken on the Primacy of EU Law by National Courts. . . . .	168
4.13.2	Schrems as Example of a Potential Conflict Between Primacy and Respect of Privacy and Data Protection . . . . .	170
4.14	Legitimacy Based on Output: Required to Regain Control Over Privacy and Data Protection, But Not Sufficient . . . . .	171
4.15	Effectiveness: Delivering Privacy on the Ground . . . . .	174
4.15.1	Empowerment of Individuals. . . . .	175
4.15.2	Data Controllers' Responsibility: Multi-stakeholder Solutions as an Alternative for Command-and-Control Legislation . . . . .	177
4.15.3	Enforcement as a Key Element of Effectiveness. . . . .	178
4.16	Conclusions . . . . .	179
	References. . . . .	182

<b>5</b>	<b>Understanding and Assessing the Contribution of the CJEU to the Mandate Under Article 16 TFEU</b>	<b>185</b>
5.1	Introduction	185
5.2	The General Design on the Task of the CJEU Under Article 16 TFEU: How to Cope with the Remarkable Features of This Provision?	186
5.3	The Institutional Role of the CJEU in the Constitutional Order of the EU	188
5.3.1	The CJEU Acting as a Constitutional Court with Three Functions: The Review of Fundamental Rights, Market Integration and Umpire Between the Different Powers	189
5.3.2	The Perception of an Activist CJEU	190
5.3.3	Strengths and Weaknesses in the Role of the CJEU	191
5.4	The Legitimacy of the CJEU: Compensating for the Presumed Democratic Deficit of the EU	193
5.4.1	Legitimacy: The CJEU's Constitutional Role Requires Some Nuancing	194
5.4.2	Effectiveness: The CJEU Contributes to Bridging the Gap Between Principles and Practice	196
5.5	Until the Lisbon Treaty: Emergence of Fundamental Rights in the EU Legal Order	197
5.5.1	Connection to Fundamental Rights Under National Law	197
5.5.2	A Systematic Review of EU Law, in Light of the ECHR	199
5.5.3	Before the Entry into Force of the Lisbon Treaty: An Increasing Role of Fundamental Rights, but Article 7 and 8 Charter Are Only Mentioned Once	200
5.6	The Charter Since the Entry into Force of the Lisbon Treaty: A Fundamental Change of Approach of the CJEU	202
5.6.1	A General Outline of the Fundamental Rights Assessment by the CJEU Based on Article 52 (1) Charter	203
5.6.2	The Proportionality Test Is Key in the Case Law of the CJEU	204
5.6.3	The Charter as Yardstick	205
5.6.4	The Charter Has a Wide Scope, but Does Not Extend the Competences of the EU	208

5.7	The Test Under the Charter Is Strict and Considers a Number of Factors . . . . .	209
5.7.1	Schecke, Test-Achats, and Google Spain and Google Inc: Three Cases of Stringent Testing by the CJEU . . . . .	210
5.7.2	The Same Strict Test Does Not Necessarily Extend to All Fundamental Rights Under the Charter . . . . .	211
5.8	The Notion of Fundamental Rights: Different Methods of Defining Fundamental Rights Are Useful for Understanding Fundamental Rights . . . . .	212
5.8.1	A Positivist Method of Defining Fundamental Rights . . . . .	213
5.8.2	A Definition of Fundamental Rights by Their Nature of Moral Value . . . . .	214
5.8.3	The Historical Method: Establishing the Fundamental Nature of Rights Using Their Backgrounds . . . . .	216
5.9	Distinctions Between Fundamental Rights on the Internet: Towards a Simple Taxonomy . . . . .	217
5.9.1	Towards a Simple Taxonomy . . . . .	218
5.9.2	The Taxonomy Could Enable the CJEU to Elaborate Its Case Law, Further Strengthening the Protection of Individuals on the Internet . . . . .	221
5.10	The CJEU Takes a Strict Approach on Privacy and Data Protection, Particularly When Balancing with Other Fundamental Rights, and with the Objective of Security . . . . .	222
5.10.1	The Strict Approach of the CJEU . . . . .	222
5.10.2	Privacy and Data Protection Have a Huge Impact on Human Dignity and Effective Protection is Essential in a Democratic Society Which Is Subject to the Rule of Law . . . . .	224
5.10.3	Introduction of the Following Sections . . . . .	224
5.11	Case Law of the US Supreme Court: Balancing with Free Speech and Security . . . . .	225
5.12	Article 11 Charter on Freedom of Expression and Information: An Intensified Link with Privacy and Data Protection . . . . .	228
5.12.1	An Intensifying Link: Three Reasons and Four Concepts . . . . .	229
5.12.2	Balancing Privacy and Freedom of Expression, in Light of Google Spain and Google Inc . . . . .	230
5.13	Google Spain and Google Inc. Restores a Balance, but Raises Questions of Legitimacy . . . . .	232



5.13.1	The CJEU No Longer Takes a Deferential Approach .....	234
5.13.2	Democratic Legitimacy Is Not Necessarily Guaranteed .....	234
5.14	Article 42 Charter on the Right of Access to Documents: A Strict Scrutiny but Not When Balancing with Privacy and Data Protection .....	235
5.14.1	Access to Documents as a Promotor of Transparency and Good Governance.....	236
5.14.2	Balancing Privacy and Transparency, in the Light of Bavarian Lager.....	238
5.15	Article 17 Charter on the Right to Property and Intellectual Property: Do These Rights Represent Essential Values in a Democratic Society? .....	239
5.15.1	Intellectual Property Becomes Complicated in the Information Society and Copyright Is the Example of a Right Difficult to Enforce .....	241
5.15.2	Does the Right to Property Represent Human Dignity in the Same Way as Privacy and Data Protection? .....	243
5.16	A Strict Review of Measures Aiming at a High Level of Security with an Impact on Privacy and Data Protection ....	244
5.16.1	Privacy and Security: A Trade-Off.....	244
5.16.2	The Case Law of the ECtHR Helps Understanding Privacy, in Its Relation to Security ...	245
5.17	The Contribution of the CJEU, with a Focus on Digital Rights Ireland and Seitlinger.....	247
5.17.1	Indiscriminate Retention of Data May Be Appropriate, but Remains Disproportionate.....	247
5.17.2	A New Dimension to the Relation Between Security and Privacy After Digital Rights Ireland and Seitlinger? Four Considerations .....	249
5.18	The CJEU Also Promotes Integration and Acts as an Umpire Where Other Public Interests or Other Governmental Actors Have an Impact on the Exercise of Article 16 (1) TFEU.....	251
5.18.1	Market Integration: An Additional Interest to Be Taken into Account by the CJEU .....	252
5.18.2	The CJEU as an Umpire Between Different Powers: Precise Answers by the CJEU Are Required, Where the CJEU Adjudicates on Article 16 TFEU and Relating Competences.....	254
5.19	Conclusions .....	255
	References.....	259

<b>6</b>	<b>Understanding the Scope and Limits of the EU Legislator's Contribution to the Mandate Under Article 16 TFEU</b>	<b>263</b>
6.1	Introduction	263
6.2	A General Design of the Legislator's Contribution: What Needs to Be Done?	264
6.2.1	The Scope of the Mandate: Article 16(2) TFEU Contains a Duty to Adopt EU Legislation	265
6.2.2	The Mandate of the EU Legislator Has Two Remarkable Features	267
6.2.3	What About the Competence of the Member States?	268
6.2.4	All in All, the EU Legislator Operates in a Complex Reality	269
6.3	The EU Legislator's Institutional Role, Institutional Balance and the Contributions of the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission	270
6.3.1	There Is One EU Legislator, But Composed of Three Institutions	271
6.3.2	The European Parliament as a Supporter of Strong Privacy and Data Protection	272
6.3.3	The Council of the European Union Representing National Concerns	274
6.3.4	The European Commission, Committed to Integration	275
6.4	Involving Other Stakeholders: Member States, Private Sector and Civil Society	276
6.4.1	Involvement of Actors Within the Member States Takes Various Forms	277
6.4.2	Involvement of the Private Sector and Civil Society	278
6.4.3	What Do We Learn, in Relation to Tasks, Limitations, Legitimacy and Effectiveness?	278
6.5	A Comparison with the Similar, but Not Equal Mandate of the EU Legislator Under Articles 18 and 19 TFEU on Equal Treatment and Non-discrimination	279
6.6	Elements of Privacy and Data Protection Where Member States Should Exercise Competence: Five Categories	281
6.7	The EU Legislator's Mandate and Its Interfaces with Competences of the EU and the Member States in Related Areas	284
6.7.1	Freedom of Expression and Information: An Area Where the EU Only Has Limited Competence, But Where Developments in the Information Society Have a Big Effect	285

6.7.2	Open Data and the Interface Between Transparency and Data Protection . . . . .	287
6.7.3	Legislative Measures for Internet Monitoring with the Aim of Enforcing Intellectual Property Rights . . . . .	288
6.8	Security: An Area Where the EU and the Member States Have Significant Competence . . . . .	289
6.9	Synergies with Public Interests Relating to the Internal Market: The Economic Dimension of Privacy and Data Protection . . . . .	292
6.9.1	Not Conflicting, But Interfacing and Creating Synergies . . . . .	293
6.9.2	Synergies Between Privacy and Data Protection and Economic Interests . . . . .	295
6.10	Two Illustrations for Synergies: The Legal Frameworks for Electronic Communications and Consumer Protection . . . . .	296
6.10.1	The Legal Framework for Electronic Communications Makes Governments Responsible for Network Governance . . . . .	297
6.10.2	Consumer Protection . . . . .	299
6.11	Competition Law, a Specific Challenge for Creating Synergies . . . . .	302
6.12	Privacy Rules in the US: An Introduction to the Importance of Multi-stakeholder Solutions . . . . .	306
6.12.1	General Features of Privacy Legislation in the US . . . . .	306
6.12.2	US Privacy Legislation Has a Limited Scope . . . . .	307
6.12.3	Non-legislative Instruments in the US, a Key Element in Consumer Privacy . . . . .	309
6.12.4	The Fair Information Practice Principles, Substantive Standards of Protection Comparable to the Principles in the EU . . . . .	310
6.13	Effectiveness and Conditions for Good Legislation: Engaging the Private Sector . . . . .	311
6.13.1	Introductory Remarks on Engaging with the Private Sector . . . . .	312
6.13.2	Multi-stakeholder Solutions or Multi-level Governance . . . . .	313
6.14	Accountability as an Overarching Solution for Delivering Privacy and Data Protection . . . . .	314
6.15	Conclusions . . . . .	319
	References . . . . .	322

<b>7</b>	<b>Understanding the Role of Independent, Effective and Accountable DPAs: New Branches of Government in Between the Union and the Member States . . . . .</b>	<b>325</b>
7.1	Introduction . . . . .	325
7.2	The General Design of the DPAs: Expert Bodies with Constitutional Status and with Importance in the Information Society . . . . .	327
7.2.1	The Embedding of the Role of DPAs in Primary Law Gives Them Constitutional Status . . .	327
7.2.2	Information Society . . . . .	329
7.3	The Institutional Background: Six Reasons for the Existence of DPAs . . . . .	330
7.3.1	The History of DPAs in the EU . . . . .	330
7.3.2	Six Reasons Behind Their Existence . . . . .	330
7.4	The Competences of DPAs: A Variety of Roles . . . . .	333
7.4.1	The First Limitation: Article 16(2) TFEU and Article 8(3) Charter Are Imprecise, But Privacy and Data Protection Are Meant in a Wide Sense . . . . .	333
7.4.2	The Second Limitation: Ensuring Control of Compliance Is Not Limited to Enforcement Strictu Sensu. . . . .	334
7.4.3	The Third Limitation: The Remedy Before a DPA Is Not Exclusive . . . . .	335
7.4.4	Further Tasks of DPAs: The Attribution of Powers Must Be Sufficient to Ensure Control. . . . .	336
7.4.5	A Variety of Roles Raising Questions . . . . .	337
7.5	Enforcement in the US: An Alternative System with a Strong Role for the FTC in Consumer Privacy. . . . .	339
7.6	The DPAs as a New Branch of Government: Non-majoritarian Expert Bodies, Different But Similar to EU Agencies. . . . .	341
7.6.1	Independent DPAs as New Branches of Government, to Be Distinguished from Autonomous Agencies. . . . .	341
7.6.2	The Example of Electronic Communications: Two Main Differences Between the Regulatory Authorities and DPAs. . . . .	342
7.6.3	DPAs: Two Main Similarities with Other Non-majoritarian Expert Bodies . . . . .	344
7.7	General Theory on Expert Bodies: The Rise of the Unelected . . . . .	346
7.7.1	Are Expert Bodies a New Branch of Government? . . . . .	347

7.7.2	DPAs Are a New Branch of Government: Towards Good Governance . . . . .	351
7.8	EU Agencies and DPAs Are Expert Bodies with a Hybrid Position in Between the EU and National Levels . . . . .	352
7.9	Independence of DPAs Under the Case Law of the CJEU: A Strong Requirement . . . . .	354
7.9.1	The Meaning of Acting with Complete Independence: No External Influence Allowed . . . . .	355
7.9.2	The Relation Between the Principle of Democracy and the Broad Notion of Independence . . . . .	357
7.9.3	Four Observations Based on This Case Law . . . . .	357
7.10	Independence of DPAs: An Analysis . . . . .	360
7.10.1	Different Degrees of Independence Under EU Law, Parallels with the ECB and with Courts . . . . .	360
7.10.2	High Degree of Independence for DPAs, Confirming Their Status as New Branch of Government . . . . .	362
7.10.3	The Appointment of Members of a DPA: A Critical Factor Potentially Influencing Independence . . . . .	363
7.10.4	The DPAs Have an Obligation to Safeguard Their Independence, Under the Principle of Democracy. . . . .	364
7.10.5	Independence in Relation to Effectiveness and Accountability . . . . .	365
7.11	Effectiveness of DPAs: A Presumed Lack of Effectiveness and the Struggle for Resources . . . . .	366
7.11.1	The Presumed Lack of Effectiveness of DPAs . . . . .	367
7.11.2	Resources of DPAs. . . . .	368
7.12	Effective Powers of DPAs, Proximity and the Developing Information Society . . . . .	370
7.12.1	Member States Must Ensure Effective Powers . . . . .	370
7.12.2	Proximity of DPAs Enhancing Effectiveness. . . . .	371
7.12.3	Effective DPAs in a Developing Information Society . . . . .	372
7.13	DPAs Are Accountable to the Judiciary and Not Totally Free from Parliamentary Influence. . . . .	374
7.13.1	Judicial Accountability as Compensation for the Loss of Full Parliamentary Control . . . . .	375
7.14	Democratic Accountability: Independence Should Not Mean That Expert Bodies Act in a Non-controllable and Arbitrary Manner. . . . .	377

7.14.1	The Wider Context of Accountability of Public Bodies: Three Perspectives .....	378
7.14.2	Instruments for Democratic Accountability: Explaining and Justifying Conduct .....	380
7.15	Conclusions and a Model for Good Governance by DPAs .....	381
	References .....	385
<b>8</b>	<b>Understanding the Role of Cooperation Mechanisms of DPAs: Towards a Layered Model of Horizontal Cooperation Between DPAs, a Structured Network of DPAs and a European DPA .....</b>	<b>389</b>
8.1	Introduction .....	390
8.2	A General Design of DPAs Cooperating with Each Other and in Composite Administrations or Trans-governmental Networks. ....	390
8.2.1	DPAs Operating in Multiple Jurisdictions: A Challenge to Reconcile Independence, Effectiveness and Accountability, as Illustrated by the GDPR. ....	393
8.3	Cross-Border Enforcement and Mutual Cooperation Between DPAs: The State of Play .....	395
8.3.1	The EU-Wide Component of Control by National DPAs and the Task of the Member States to Secure the Effectiveness and Uniformity of EU Law .....	395
8.3.2	The State of Play in Data Protection Law .....	395
8.3.3	Three Types of Enforcement Cooperation of DPAs .....	396
8.4	Institutional Arrangements: Article 29 Working Party and Other Mechanisms for Institutional Cooperation Between DPAs .....	398
8.4.1	Other Mechanisms for Institutional Cooperation, Mainly in the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice .....	400
8.4.2	The European Data Protection Supervisor .....	402
8.5	Two Main Novelties in the GDPR: A One-Stop Shop Mechanism and a Consistency Mechanism .....	403
8.5.1	A One-Stop Shop Mechanism with a Lead Supervisory Authority Cooperating with Its Peers. ...	403
8.5.2	A Consistency Mechanism, but Diverging Views on Its Rationale .....	405
8.5.3	From the Citizens' Perspective: The Rationale Behind a Consistency Mechanism Is Not Clear. ....	407

8.6	Experience in a Related Area: Governance in Electronic Communications Through a Network of Authorities with a Task for BEREC to Ensure Consistent Application . . . . .	408
8.6.1	Conditions for Effective Cooperation Inspired by the Parallel with Cooperation in EU Competition Law . . . . .	412
8.7	Cooperation Between DPAs in a Composite Administration, Against the Background of Developing EU Administrative Law . . . . .	413
8.7.1	Administrative Cooperation Under EU Law as a Matter of Common Interest. . . . .	413
8.7.2	Material Aspects of the Composite Administration: Mutual Cooperation and Mutual Trust. . . . .	415
8.7.3	Procedural Standards Applied in the Composite Administration Should Ensure Accountability. . . . .	417
8.7.4	Fragmentation of Areas of Law as a Further Complication, also in View of the Special Status of DPAs . . . . .	419
8.8	Three Models to Organise Cooperation Between DPAs, Against the Background of the GDPR. . . . .	419
8.8.1	Introduction of the Three Models of Cooperation . . . . .	420
8.9	The First Cooperation Layer: Horizontal Cooperation Between DPAs . . . . .	421
8.9.1	The Essence of Horizontal Cooperation . . . . .	421
8.9.2	Developments Towards a Closer Regime for Horizontal Cooperation with Precisely Formulated Rules . . . . .	422
8.9.3	Procedural Guarantees as Compensation for Democratic Accountability. . . . .	424
8.9.4	How to Ensure That DPAs Give Sufficient Priority to Horizontal Cooperation . . . . .	425
8.10	The Second Cooperation Layer: A Structured Network of DPAs, Taking the Article 29 Working Party as an Inspiration to Move Ahead . . . . .	425
8.10.1	Development Towards a Closer Structured Network of DPAs . . . . .	426
8.10.2	The Relation Between the Duties and Powers of a Structured Network and the Requirements for Composition and Decision-Making Structures . . . . .	427
8.10.3	Composition of Structured Networks with Senior Representatives of DPAs and Consensual Decision-Making Enhances Legitimacy . . . . .	428
8.10.4	The Role of the Commission in the Structured Network: How to Combine Two Contradicting Demands. . . . .	430

	8.10.5	Procedural Guarantees .....	432
8.11		The Third Layer Where Independence Must Be Ensured: Cooperation Within a European DPA .....	432
	8.11.1	The Essence of Cooperation Within a European DPA .....	432
	8.11.2	Towards a Closer Cooperation Within a European DPA .....	434
	8.11.3	And the Role of the Commission? .....	436
	8.11.4	Procedural Guarantees .....	436
	8.11.5	Further Conditions .....	437
8.12		Cooperation Between DPAs: Ensuring Independence, Effectiveness and Accountability of DPAs and the Cooperation Mechanisms, a Final Assessment and a Proposal .....	438
	8.12.1	The Layered Structure of Cooperation Mechanisms Should Not Compromise the Independence of DPAs .....	438
	8.12.2	The Layered Structure Should Contain Incentives for Effective Protection and Should Not Result in an Incomplete – or Extremely Complex – System of Remedies .....	438
	8.12.3	Democratic Accountability: The European Parliament Has a Role to Play .....	439
	8.12.4	Judicial Accountability: Effective Redress Mechanisms, Not Necessarily Proximity .....	440
	8.12.5	The Final Assessment and a Proposal .....	441
8.13		Conclusions .....	443
		References .....	447
<b>9</b>		<b>Understanding the EU Mandate Under Article 16 TFEU in the External Domain: Towards a Mix of Unilateral, Bilateral and Multilateral Strategies. ....</b>	<b>449</b>
	9.1	Introduction .....	449
	9.2	A General Design of EU Data Protection on a Global Internet and the Relationship with Third Countries and International Organisations .....	450
	9.2.1	Externally, the EU Operates in a Pluralist Legal Context .....	452
	9.3	The Institutional Component of EU Privacy and Data Protection in the External Domain, Focusing on the DPAs and Their Cooperation .....	453
	9.3.1	A Specific Issue: The Representation of the EU in the International Context and the Role of Cooperating DPAs .....	454



- 9.4 The EU and Third Countries, Particularly the US:  
A Difference in Approach ..... 455
  - 9.4.1 The Background: The US and the Fundamental Rights Protection of EU Residents..... 458
  - 9.4.2 Complexities of Dealing with Other Third Countries That Have Different Values ..... 459
- 9.5 Two of the Most Relevant International Organisations:  
The United Nations Do Not Play a Prominent Role and the OECD Underlines the Free Flow of Information ..... 460
  - 9.5.1 The United Nations: Should They Play a More Prominent Role? ..... 460
  - 9.5.2 The OECD and Its Revised Privacy Guidelines: Privacy and Free Flow of Information on Equal Footing ..... 462
- 9.6 The Closest Ally, the Council of Europe: The Inspiration for EU Privacy and Data Protection, but Institutionally Difficult. .... 464
- 9.7 A Pluralist Legal Context in the External Domain:  
The Relation Between EU Law and International Law ..... 466
  - 9.7.1 International Competence of the EU: Similar but Not Equal to a State. .... 467
  - 9.7.2 Division of Powers Within the EU: Implied Powers and Exclusive Competence ..... 468
  - 9.7.3 The Charter Is Silent on Territorial Application. .... 470
- 9.8 Primacy of International Law, Subject to the Specific Characteristics and the Autonomy of EU Law. .... 471
  - 9.8.1 Legal Effect of International Law Within the EU Legal Order and the Respect of EU Fundamental Rights in the Kadi Case Law. . . . 472
- 9.9 Jurisdictional Issues: Public International Law and the Internet. .... 473
  - 9.9.1 EU Jurisdiction Under Public International Law: A Wide Power to Prescribe ..... 474
  - 9.9.2 The Respect of Territorial Sovereign Rights: Overlapping Jurisdictions in Cyberspace but a Wide Discretion for the EU Legislator ..... 476
- 9.10 Jurisdiction Should Be Based on a Meaningful Link with the Protection of Individuals in the EU:  
The Effect of an Act on the Internet on Individuals Residing in a Jurisdiction ..... 478
- 9.11 Articles 3(5) and 21 TEU as the Starting Point for EU Action on the International Scene in Privacy and Data Protection ..... 482
  - 9.11.1 Introductory Remarks. .... 482
  - 9.11.2 Strategies for the EU in the International Domain. . . . 484

9.12	Unilateral Strategy: A Potentially Successful Approach .....	485
9.13	Bilateral Strategy: Joining Forces with Like-Minded Jurisdictions Such as the US .....	487
9.14	Multilateral Strategy: Towards Global Protection in the Framework of the UN .....	490
9.14.1	However, There Are Incentives for the EU to Pursue the Multilateral Strategy.....	492
9.15	The Meaning of the Three Strategies for the CJEU: Google Spain as an Illustration of the Unilateral Strategy Under Article 16 TFEU .....	493
9.15.1	How Would the CJEU Deal with Bilateral and Multilateral Strategies? .....	496
9.16	The Meaning of the Three Strategies for the EU Legislator: Giving Wide External Effect with the Unilateral Strategy as a Composing Element .....	497
9.16.1	The EU Legislator Gives Wide External Effect: The Unilateral Strategy Plays a Key Role .....	497
9.16.2	The Regime of Data Transfers: A Typical Example of a Unilateral Strategy .....	498
9.16.3	Article 48 of the GDPR, a Unilateral Solution for a Conflict of Law .....	499
9.16.4	The Bilateral and Multilateral Strategies: External Action by the EU Legislator on Privacy and Data Protection as a Promising Avenue, Not Necessarily Harmonising the Level of Protection.....	500
9.17	The Meaning of the Three Strategies for the DPAs and the Cooperation Between Them: Extending Cooperation to Authorities in Third Countries. ....	501
9.17.1	Regulators and External Action: The Basis Is a Unilateral Strategy, Ensuring the Control of EU Law .....	501
9.17.2	The Cooperation Between DPAs and Regulatory Agencies in Third Countries as an Exponent of the Bilateral and Multilateral Strategy.....	502
9.18	Conclusions .....	504
	References.....	508
<b>10</b>	<b>Making Article 16 TFEU Work: Analysis and Conclusions .....</b>	<b>511</b>
10.1	Introduction .....	511
10.2	General Design of Article 16 TFEU: Recalling the Main Challenges and the Outline of the Governance Under This Provision .....	513

10.2.1	The Values of Privacy and Data Protection and the Qualitative Changes in the Information Society . . . . .	513
10.2.2	Article 16 TFEU as an Adequate Mandate Guaranteeing the Privacy and Data Protection of EU Citizens on the Internet: The Stakes Are High . . . . .	514
10.2.3	The Governance Model Under Article 16 TFEU . . . . .	516
10.3	The Main Components for Analysis . . . . .	517
10.3.1	The First Component: Article 16 TFEU Defines a Broad Mandate . . . . .	517
10.3.2	The Second Component: Constitutional Safeguards Under EU Law . . . . .	518
10.3.3	The Third Component: Legitimacy as a Factor for Success . . . . .	519
10.3.4	The Fourth Component: Effectiveness as a Factor for Success . . . . .	520
10.4	The Contribution of Article 16 TFEU to Legitimate and Effective Privacy and Data Protection on the Internet: An Appropriate Mandate Is Provided . . . . .	520
10.4.1	Article 16 TFEU Brings Privacy and Data Protection by Definition Within the Scope of EU Law and Makes Ambitious Approaches Possible (The First Component) . . . . .	520
10.4.2	The Constitutional Safeguards Under EU Law: The Member States Play and Should Play an Important Role (The Second Component) . . . . .	521
10.4.3	Legitimacy as a Factor for Success for EU Action (The Third Component) . . . . .	522
10.4.4	Effectiveness as a Factor for Success for EU Action (The Fourth Component) . . . . .	523
10.4.5	Final Recommendation . . . . .	524
10.5	The CJEU Interprets the Law in Cases Brought Before It and Acts as Constitutional Court . . . . .	525
10.5.1	Article 16(1) TFEU and the Guidance in Final Instance by the CJEU (The First Component) . . . . .	525
10.5.2	The Constitutional Safeguards Under EU Law: A Judiciary Explaining the Boundaries with Other Mandates in an Information Society (The Second Component) . . . . .	526
10.5.3	Legitimacy as a Factor for Success of the CJEU (The Third Component) . . . . .	529
10.5.4	Effectiveness as a Factor for Success of the CJEU (The Fourth Component) . . . . .	530
10.5.5	Final Recommendation . . . . .	531

10.6	The European Parliament and the Council Lay Down the Rules, Whilst Respecting the Role of the Member States Under Article 16(2) TFEU .....	531
10.6.1	Article 16(2) TFEU and the Exhaustive Nature of the EU Legislator's Task (The First Component) .....	531
10.6.2	The Constitutional Safeguards Under EU Law: A Regulation as the Appropriate Instrument and a Legislator Confronted with Interfaces with Other Competences (The Second Component) ..	532
10.6.3	Legitimacy as a Factor for Success of the EU Legislator (The Third Component) .....	533
10.6.4	Effectiveness as a Factor for Success of the EU Legislator (The Fourth Component) .....	535
10.6.5	Final Recommendation .....	537
10.7	Independent DPAs Exercise Control as Expert Bodies with Full Independence, but Are Not Exempted from Democratic Accountability .....	537
10.7.1	Article 16(2) TFEU and the Variety of Roles of the DPAs (The First Component) .....	537
10.7.2	The Constitutional Safeguards Under EU Law: DPAs as Non-majoritarian Expert Bodies (The Second Component) .....	538
10.7.3	Legitimacy as a Factor for Success for the DPAs (The Third Component) .....	539
10.7.4	Effectiveness as a Factor for Success for the DPAs (The Fourth Component) .....	541
10.7.5	Final Recommendation .....	542
10.8	Cooperation as an Element of Control, with a Layered Structure of Cooperation Mechanisms .....	543
10.8.1	Article 16(2) TFEU and the Strengthened Cooperation Mechanisms Under the GDPR (The First Component) .....	543
10.8.2	The Constitutional Safeguards Under EU Law: Cooperation Mechanisms of DPAs, Legal Requirements for Cooperation and a Cooperation Structure (The Second Component) .....	544
10.8.3	Legitimacy as a Factor for Success for Cooperation Mechanisms (The Third Component) .....	546
10.8.4	Effectiveness as a Factor for Success for Cooperation Mechanisms (The Fourth Component) .....	547
10.8.5	Final Recommendation .....	548

10.9	External EU Action on the Internet: Solving Conflicting Jurisdictional Claims and Substantive Divergences, with a Powerful EU in the International Domain. . . . .	549
10.9.1	Article 16 TFEU and the Claim of Extraterritorial Jurisdiction (The First Component) . . . . .	549
10.9.2	The Constitutional Safeguards Under EU Law Where the EU Acts as an Organisation Sui Generis in the External Domain (The Second Component) . . .	549
10.9.3	Legitimacy as a Factor for Success for the EU Acting in the External Domain (The Third Component) . . . . .	551
10.9.4	Effectiveness as a Factor for Success for the EU Acting in the External Domain (The Fourth Component) . . . . .	552
10.9.5	Final Recommendation . . . . .	554
10.10	The Prospect of a GDPR . . . . .	554
10.10.1	The Legislative Process . . . . .	555
10.10.2	General Remarks on the GDPR, on Effectiveness and Legitimacy . . . . .	556
10.10.3	Observations on the Ambitions of the GDPR to Ensure a Successful Exercise of the Roles Under Article 16 TFEU . . . . .	558
10.11	Final Conclusions. . . . .	560
	Matrix . . . . .	562
	References. . . . .	563
	<b>Annex: Consulted Documents . . . . .</b>	<b>565</b>
	Legislation and Proposed Legislation. . . . .	565
	Case Law. . . . .	569
	Court of Justice of the European Union . . . . .	569
	General Court/Court of First Instance. . . . .	573
	European Court of Human Rights. . . . .	573
	Permanent Court of International Justice . . . . .	574
	US Supreme Court . . . . .	574
	Other National Courts. . . . .	574
	Policy Documents. . . . .	575
	Other References. . . . .	583