



Council of the  
European Union

Brussels, 11 July 2014  
(OR. en)

---

**Interinstitutional File:**  
**2013/0139 (COD)**

---

**11729/14**  
**ADD 1**

**CODEC 1604**  
**EF 196**  
**ECOFIN 741**  
**CONSOM 145**

**"I/A" ITEM NOTE**

---

From:	General Secretariat of the Council
To:	Permanent Representatives Committee/Council
Subject:	Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the comparability of fees related to payment accounts, payment account switching and access to payment accounts with basic features <b>(first reading)</b> - Adoption of the legislative act <b>(LA + S)</b> = Statements

---

**Statements by the Commission**

On the recourse to EBA regulatory technical standards for the adoption of the EU standardised terminology

“The Commission considers that the recourse to EBA regulatory technical standards for the adoption of the EU standardised terminology is inconsistent with Article 10 of Regulation (EU) No 1093/2010 (OJ L 331/12 of 15.12.2010) since determining the list of the most representative services at EU level, together with corresponding common terms and definitions, cannot be regarded as a purely technical matter but entails strategic decisions or policy choices.”

### On the transposition of the provisions on access to a payment account with basic features

"The Commission considers that the reference to a "binding" framework in Article 16 (10) of the Directive should be interpreted in compliance with the Court's case-law on the transposition of directives in the legal order of Member States, according to which the provisions of directives must be implemented with unquestionable binding force."

### On the longer implementation period for Member States where the equivalents of a fee information document and statement of fees already exist at national level

"The Commission considers that the introduction of a longer implementation period for Member States to adopt the common format and symbol of the fee information document and statement of fees where the equivalents of these documents already exist at national level, introduces an unjustified difference in the treatment between Member States. The Commission also notes that the Directive does not contain any explanation on the objective reasons identified for such a difference in treatment."

### **Statement by the Czech Republic**

The Czech Republic considers that the inclusion of comparison websites in the Directive represents a significant intervention in a market that seems to work efficiently. Moreover, the obligation of the Member States to ensure the operation of comparison websites, even through public authorities, is likely to expose the Member States to unnecessary public expenses and legal risks.

---