

Draft of the

**Second State Treaty Amending the 2021 State Treaty on Gambling
(2.. GlüÄndStV 2021)¹**

The Federal State of Baden-Württemberg,
the Free State of Bavaria,
the Federal State of Berlin,
the Federal State of Brandenburg,
the Free Hanseatic City of Bremen,
the Free Hanseatic City of Hamburg,
the Federal State of Hessen,
the Federal State of Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania,
the Federal State of Lower Saxony,
the Federal State of North Rhine-Westphalia,
the Federal State of Rhineland-Palatinate,
the Saarland,
the Free State of Saxony,
the Federal State of Saxony-Anhalt,
the Federal State of Schleswig-Holstein and
the Free State of Thuringia
(hereinafter 'the Länder')
hereby conclude the following State Treaty:

¹ Notified in accordance with Directive (EU) 2015/1535 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 9 September 2015 laying down a procedure for the provision of information in the field of technical regulations and of rules on Information Society services (OJ L 241, 17/9/2015, p. 1).

Article 1

The 2021 State Treaty on Gambling of 29 October 2020, as amended by the State Treaty of 24 March 2022,

is amended as follows:

1. Section 4b(2) is amended as follows:

- a. The second sentence is replaced by the following sentences:

‘In order to remove any doubts as to trustworthiness, it has the authority, unless other grounds for granting a licence already preclude it, to request information from national and foreign law enforcement and security authorities, in particular under the conditions laid down in Section 4a(1)(1)(c).’
- b. The following sentence is inserted after the second sentence:

‘The data of unsuccessful applicants collected in accordance with the second sentence shall be deleted no later than the end of the calendar year following the entry into force of the rejection of the licensing application.’

2. The following sentences are inserted after the first sentence of Section 8(3):

‘A query can only be made by using the access code assigned to the relevant physical establishment or, in the case of online gambling, to the relevant web domain. Disclosure of and authorising third parties to use the access codes is prohibited.’

3. Section 9 is amended as follows:

a) Paragraph 1 is amended as follows:

- aa) Subparagraph 5 in the third sentence is replaced by the following subparagraph 5:

‘5. after prior notification of unauthorised gambling offerings, take measures to remove or block such offerings against providers of intermediary services within the meaning of

Article 3(g) of Regulation (EU) 2022/2065, including in cases of mere hosting, in the event that measures against an organiser or intermediary of such gambling prove to be impracticable or unlikely to bring results; such measures may also be taken where the unauthorised gambling offering is inextricably linked to further content.'

bb) In the fifth sentence, the words 'Section 88(3)(3) of the Telecommunications Law' are replaced by 'Section 3(3)(3) of the Telecommunications Digital Services Data Protection Law of 23 June 2021 (BGBI. I p. 1982; 2022 I p. 1045), as last amended by Article 44 of the Law of 12 July 2024 (BGBI. 2024 I no. 234).'

b) Paragraph 3a shall be worded as follows:

'(3a) The responsible gambling authorities shall collaborate with the law enforcement authorities, the federal state media authorities, the Federal Network Agency, the Federal Financial Supervisory Authority and the Federal Cartel Office in performance of their duties and may, to the extent necessary, exchange data for this purpose. This applies mutatis mutandis to collaboration by the state media authorities with the gambling supervisory authorities. Data exchange with the law enforcement and security authorities pursuant to the first sentence, where carried out as part of an authorisation procedure to check trustworthiness, is only necessary if there are no other grounds for refusal to issue a licence. Section 4b(2), third sentence, applies mutatis mutandis.'

4. In Section 9a(1)(4), after the wording 'Section 12(3)' the wording 'first sentence' is inserted.

5. Section 27h is amended as follows:

a) The second sentence of paragraph 3 is amended as follows:

in subparagraph 11, the words 'with a duration of more than two years' and 'and the conclusion of contracts with a duration of more than five years' are deleted;

b) The following paragraph 6a is inserted after paragraph 6:

'(6a) The meetings, deliberations and other dealings of the Governing Board shall be confidential. Parliamentary rights to information or the right to information of public authorities shall remain unaffected.'

6. Section 27m is replaced by the following Section 27m:

'(1) The budgetary and economic management of the Agency is subject to assessment by the courts of auditors of the host states.

(2) Section 53 of the Budgetary Principles Law

[Haushaltsgrundsätzgesetz] shall apply mutatis mutandis to the audit of annual accounts. The competent authority referred to in Section 53(1) of the Haushaltsgrundsätzgesetz shall exercise its rights in the election or appointment of auditors under Section 53(1)(1) thereof in agreement with the Court of Auditors of the state in which it is established.'

7. Section 28a(1) is amended as follows:

a) After subparagraph 31, the following subparagraphs 32 and 33 are inserted:

'32. contrary to the sixth sentence of Section 8(3), as organisers or intermediaries in games in which blocked players are prohibited from participating, fail to query the blacklist exclusively via the access code assigned to the respective physical establishment or to the respective Internet domain in the case of online gambling,

33. by derogation from the seventh sentence of Paragraph 8(3), as organisers or intermediaries in games in which blacklisted players are not allowed to participate, pass on the access code to third parties or permit its use by third parties;'
- b) The previous subparagraphs 32 to 58 become subparagraphs 34 to 60.

Article 2

Entry into force

- (1) This State Treaty shall enter into force on DD.MM.YYYY. In the event that not all of the ratification documents are filed with the state chancellery or with the chairpersons of the Ministerial Conference of the Federal States by DD.MM.YYYY, the State Treaty shall become invalid.
- (2) The State Chancellery or the chairperson of the Ministerial Conference of the Federal States shall inform the Länder that it has received the ratification documents.

EU Acts

Regulation (EU) 2022/2065 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 October 2022 on a single market for digital services and amending Directive 2000/31/EC (DSA), OJ L 277, 27.10.2022, p. 1).

Explanatory notes:

I. Current situation

The 2021 State Treaty on Gambling, which entered into force on 1 July 2021, is intended to provide legal certainty and uniform standards of protection for the population throughout Germany as a common legal framework for regulating gambling in the Länder, in particular for cross-border offerings. Achieving the objectives set out in Section 1 requires, in

addition to enabling sufficiently attractive legal offerings with high standards of protection for players, the effective elimination of unauthorised gambling offerings, which are associated with additional and obvious dangers for players.

The 2021 State Treaty on Gambling therefore improved the options for enforcement. In addition to other instruments, the previous authority for blocking arrangements (network blocking or IP blocking) has been reintroduced.

However, implementation of that instrument proved to be problematic, as the previous legal foundation of Section 9(1), third sentence, subparagraph 5, provides for blocking measures against such offerings to be taken against the responsible service providers within the meaning of Sections 8 to 10 of the Telemedia Law [Telemediengesetz], while the administrative case-law raised legal concerns with regard to these addressees, thus preventing the instrument from being applied with legal certainty in the foreseeable future. Furthermore, the amendment to the legal framework that came into force in 2024 with the entry into force of the Digital Services Act, which was directly applicable to the Member States of the European Union, led to the repeal of the Telemedia Law, which was replaced by the Digital Services Law [Digitale-Dienste-Gesetz]. A timely revision of the legal basis had thus become necessary if this essential instrument of enforcement was to be applied in a legally sound manner.

Furthermore, the interim report of the Länder in the context of the evaluation of the 2021 State Treaty on Gambling revealed that further changes in the context of substantive law were required, which need to be implemented before the completion of the evaluation with submission of the summary report on 31 December 2026. Finally, further adaptations are made to streamline and improve procedural arrangements.

II. Solution

A specific amendment to the 2021 State Treaty on Gambling in **Section 9(1)**, adapts the reference in the legal basis to the legal situation

that has existed since 2024, while at the same time taking into account existing concerns with regard to the addressees.

The authority of the licensing and supervisory authorities to submit queries is extended by supplementing the provisions of **Section 4b and Section 9(3a)**.

The amendment to **Section 8(3) and Section 28a(1)** clarifies that only the access code assigned to a particular permanent establishment may be used to match the player blocking system for that permanent establishment and that disclosing that access code to third parties and authorising them to use it is prohibited.

The amendment to **Section 27h(3)** makes it possible to make comprehensive provisions in the statutes of the Joint Gambling Authority of the Länder with regard to contracts which are subject to final decision by the Governing Board. The introduction of the new **Section 27h(6a)** ensures the confidentiality of the meetings of the Governing Board of the Joint Gambling Authority of the Länder, while respecting parliamentary and official rights to information.

By supplementing **Section 27m**, a simplification is made to the effect that in the context of the annual audit, the rights to elect or appoint auditors are now exercised solely by the competent supervisory authority for the Joint Gambling Authority of the Länder in agreement with the Court of Auditors of the Land of Saxony-Anhalt.

III. Re the individual provisions:

Re Article 1

Re subparagraph 1

The existing authority to make inquiries is extended to include national law enforcement authorities as well as to foreign law enforcement and security authorities.

The extension to foreign law enforcement and security authorities takes into account the fact that applicants often belong to business groups that are active internationally. In particular, the examination of extended trustworthiness under Section 4a(1)(1)(d) presupposes that investigations will be made both of the applicant and its related undertakings. In the case of applicants established abroad or applicants associated with foreign companies, it is accordingly necessary to be able to make enquiries with foreign law enforcement and security authorities for the relevant information. This includes, in particular, the extended trustworthiness criteria laid down in Section 4a(1)(1).

Previously, law enforcement was not explicitly mentioned when referring to the security authorities, although findings from ongoing investigations, from discontinued investigations or from criminal proceedings that have led to a conviction below the threshold for entry in the Federal Central Register can be important for the assessment of an applicant's trustworthiness. This is therefore aligned with Section 9(3a), which explicitly names law enforcement authorities.

At the same time, in constitutional terms, data retrieval needs to comply with the requirements of proportionality. For this purpose, the provision needs to regulate the grounds, purpose and scope (BVerfGE 155, 119, 208). Querying sensitive data from security authorities should be particularly carefully evaluated with regard to the principle of proportionality. The characteristic of trustworthiness and, consequently, a well-founded investigation in this regard has great significance. From the point of view of gambling law, it forms the basis for ensuring the proper operation of gambling activities and is a consequence of the fight against attendant and associated crime (Section 1, first sentence, subparagraph 4), which can attend gambling. The same applies to the fight against money laundering. In accordance with the recommendations of the Financial Action Task Force (FATF), the supervisory authority should take the necessary measures to prevent criminal persons or the employees fronting them from obtaining gambling permits or from being beneficial owner of a substantial holding or controlling interest in a company holding

a gambling licence (FATF Methodology for Assessing Compliance with the FATF Recommendations and the Effectiveness of AML/CFT Systems, Updated June 2023, Recommendations 28.1(b) and 28.4(b)). Money laundering undermines trust in the rule of law, meritocracy and the integrity of Germany as a business and financial location. The criterion of good repute is intended to prevent criminals from successfully channelling illegal profits from crime into the legal economic cycle as gambling operators, and thus also to remove incentives for further criminal activity.

At the same time, the intensity of intervention is limited to the required extent. These provisions, which are clearer in comparison with the previous regulation, ensure that corresponding queries are made for the purpose of verifying trustworthiness and not for other purposes. Additionally, consultation with law enforcement and security authorities is only a last step before a licence is granted. If the licence is to be refused on other grounds in any case, such a query may no longer be made. Finally, a provision on data deletion is inserted.

The admissibility of data transfer under data protection law is additionally governed by the respective legal provisions covering the respective law enforcement or security authorities. According to the 'double door model' developed by the Federal Constitutional Court (BVerfG, decision of 24 January 2012 – 1 BvR 1299/05 –, recital 123, Juris; BVerfG, decision of 27 May 2020 – 1 BvR 1873/13 –, recital 93, Juris), both the data inquiry and the subsequent data transmission, as independent interventions in the right to informational self-determination (Article 2(1) in conjunction with Article 1(1) GG), require a clear and proportionate legal basis, which needs to be established by the respective responsible legislator. Data transmission powers for authorities other than gambling supervisory authorities are therefore to be regulated in the relevant special laws.

Re subparagraph 2

The intention of the explicit inclusion of the obligation to use only the identification code assigned to the local permanent establishment (in the case of physical premises) or the Internet domain (in the case of gambling

on the Internet) for checking the blacklist is to allow the competent supervisory authorities an exact match and to improve traceability.

While in the current legal situation, access codes may only be used for a specific permanent establishment or Internet domain, in practice, this requirement has not been sufficiently respected, making further detail necessary. Any abuse in the form of transferring, or allowing the transfer of access codes to third parties will now be better preventable by the introduction of a corresponding prohibition under the State Treaty.

Re subparagraph 3a:

In Section 9(1), third sentence, subparagraph 5, the reference to Sections 8 to 10 of the Telemedia Law (TMG) is replaced by a reference to Regulation (EU) 2022/2065 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 October 2022 on a Single Market for Digital Services and amending Directive 2000/31/EC ('the Digital Services Act'). Since 17 February 2024, the DSA has been directly applicable in all Member States of the European Union. To transpose it into national law, the Digital Services Law (DDG) entered into force on 14 May 2024, providing for the abrogation of the TMG in Article 37(3). The DSA has incorporated the provisions of Articles 12 to 15 of the e-commerce Directive 2000/31/EC in its Sections 4 et seq., thus making Sections 7 to 10 of the Telemedia Law largely redundant. Moreover, the regulatory content of Sections 7 et seq. of the TMG (and in particular Sections 7(4) and 8(4)) is maintained and partly extended in Sections 7 and 8 of the DDG.

The intermediate services defined in Article 3(g) of the DSA cover a wide range of economic activities that take place online and are continuously evolving, in order to enable the rapid, secure and safe transmission of information and to provide convenient solutions for all stakeholders in the online ecosystem. Whether a particular service is 'pure transmission', a 'caching' service or a 'hosting' service depends exclusively on its technical functions, which may change over time, and needs to be examined on a case-by-case basis (see recital 29).

Articles 4 et seq. of the DSA establish, with regard to the liability of providers of such intermediary services, when a provider of intermediary services cannot be held liable for illegal content provided by users (see recital 17). However, the exclusions of liability it sets out are without prejudice to the possibility of injunctions of various kinds against providers of intermediary services, even if they fulfil the conditions laid down in the context of those exclusions. Such injunctions may consist, in particular, of judicial or administrative orders issued in accordance with Union law which require the cessation or prevention of an infringement, including the removal of illegal content specified in such injunctions or blocking access to them (see recital 25).

The 2021 State Treaty on Gambling reintroduced the power to block Internet sites (network blocking) as an important tool for combating unauthorised offerings on the Internet, with the aim of preventing or at least making it more difficult, in the light of the objectives set out in the first sentence of Section 1, for such offers to be technically accessible from within Germany. Network blocks can be implemented in various ways. One form of technical implementation is IP blocking. However, since this often entails the risk of overblocking if there are further websites (i.e. URLs) with legal content behind the blocked IP, according to current state of technical knowledge, the DNS block has established itself in official practice as a generally more proportionate blocking method. In the case of a 'domain name system' block, the attribution between the domain and the corresponding IP address in the DNS server of the internet access provider is separated. As a result, the website remains in existence, but can no longer be reached by entering the domain in the address bar of the browser. As a general rule, such a DNS block must be set up by the Internet access provider.

According to the previously applicable provision, in accordance with the wording of Section 9(1), third sentence, subparagraph 5, the range of addressees of official blocking orders comprised only service providers responsible within the meaning of Sections 8 to 10 of the TMG. However, since Paragraphs 8 to 10 of the TMG largely excluded service providers

from liability, there was routinely no liability under those provisions – in particular for the fundamentally neutral internet access providers. In order to effectively prevent future threats, the amended regulation waives the responsibility criterion to include, in particular, Internet access providers in the circle of possible recipients of official blocking orders. The appropriateness of such empowerment under the Treaty is nevertheless safeguarded by the fact that recourse to the internet access provider is not possible until all other measures to remove or disable illegal content against the organiser or retailer of the unauthorised gambling, that is to say, as a rule, the operator of the website who is directly responsible for the illegal content itself, prove impossible or are unlikely to succeed and measures against other potential providers of intermediary services would not be equally effective. Since, according to the DSA, registrars, as well as registries, are also to be regarded as providers of intermediary services which are purely transmissive in nature (see recital 29), they no longer need to be mentioned separately from internet access providers.

In accordance with the response options provided for in the DSA in dealing with illegal content (cf Section 7(3) sentence 1 TMG before 13 May 2024), the amended regulation includes the removal of illegal content as well as the blocking of access to such content. This is intended to take account of rapid technological advancements, and to also ensure effective security in future in cases where, due to changes in the technical framework (e.g. a mobile application instead of conventional website), the use of the illegal content does not have to be technically prevented by blocking, but rather by the targeted removal of the illegal offering.

In the fifth sentence of Section 9(1), the reference to the third sentence of Section 88(3) of the Telecommunications Law in the version in force until 31 December 2021 has been replaced by a reference to the identical successor provision in the third sentence of Section 3(3) of the Law on Data protection and privacy in telecommunications and digital services [Gesetz über den Datenschutz und den Schutz der Privatsphäre in der Telekommunikation und bei digitalen Diensten].

Re subparagraph 3b

An extension of the regulation to cover foreign law enforcement authorities appears necessary in view of the predominantly international gambling providers. In addition, the power to make a search is extended to both domestic and foreign security authorities.

The obligation to cooperate and the authority to exchange data in the licensing procedure is additionally extended to the special provision of Section 4b(2), second sentence, by incorporation into Section 9, to cover the entire activity of the gambling supervisory authority with regard to all gambling offerings. Certificates of good conduct do not cover many of the circumstances needed to assess trustworthiness from the perspective of gambling laws (cf. Section 32 BZRG). In this area, given its attractiveness to criminal activity, further investigations are very important, in particular if the objective of preventing attendant and associated criminal activity (Section 1(1)(4)) is to be achieved. In this context, it seems appropriate, especially where gambling takes place on physical premises, to obtain information about ongoing, discontinued or completed investigative or criminal proceedings in order to be able to forecast the potential for trustworthiness.

Investigations of this kind would be carried out solely for the purposes of the tasks and powers assigned under Section 9(1).

The exchange of data, in particular with the security authorities, is sensitive due to the particular intensity of the intervention, in particular if the data to be exchanged was obtained through intelligence services. The competent gambling authorities therefore have to pay particular attention to the principle of proportionality. In order to limit the intensity of intervention, a provision on data deletion has been added.

The admissibility of the transmission of data under data protection law is also governed by the respective legal provisions applicable to the respective security authority.

See also the explanatory notes to Section 4b(2), second sentence.

Re subparagraph 4

This is an editorial clarification. As in the past, only the licences referred to in the first sentence of Section 12(3) should be uniformly granted throughout the Länder. If a social lottery is organised only in individual Länder, those Länder remain competent in accordance with the second sentence.

Re subparagraph 5a:

Section 27h(3) grants the Governing Board decision-making powers with regard to the fundamental affairs of the Agency (Joint gambling Authority of the Länder - GGL). The list that follows gives the Governing Board the power to decide on the conclusion of contracts with a term of more than five years (Section 27h(3), second sentence, subparagraph 11, option 2 in conjunction with Section 6(1), second sentence, subparagraph 11(c) of the GGL Statute). The State Treaty does not authorise the Agency to set a threshold value for the involvement of the Governing Board. Consequently, by way of derogation from Section 6(1), second sentence, subparagraph 11(a) and (b) (which provides for a minimum of EUR 100,000 depending on the duration of the contract), Section 6(1), second sentence, subparagraph 11(c) of the GGL Statutes does not lay down any limit on the value of the submission of such contracts. It therefore follows from the wording of the State Treaty and the Statute that any contract with a duration of more than five years must be submitted to the Governing Board for decision. The explanatory notes to Section 27h(3), second sentence, subparagraph 11 do not provide any further information regarding a threshold.

The Governing Board, as an organ of the GGL, decides on the fundamental matters of the GGL. The Governing Board is also responsible for overseeing the Executive Board. In order to enable the Governing Board to fulfil its fundamental and important tasks, the legislator introduced value and term limits in Section 27h(3), second sentence, subparagraph 11 and the specific listing to this end in the GGL Statute.

The new version of Section 27h(3), second sentence, subparagraph 11 has now set value thresholds for contracts entered into by the Agency, above

which the Governing Board's involvement is required. The idea behind this is that not every low-value micro-procurement or contract (e.g. recurring day-to-day acquisitions) needs to be submitted to the Governing Board for final decision. This simplifies administration and ensures that the Governing Board is able to function normally. The Governing Board should focus on the matters of substance and not be burdened or overburdened with comparatively minor matters. At the same time, the aim is to reduce the administrative burden on the Agency when low-value contracts are concluded.

Where a contract falls below the value threshold stipulated in the Statute, but is nevertheless substantively of fundamental or significant relevance to the Agency, the Governing Board can be involved on the basis of importance, as the list in subparagraph 11 is not exhaustive. Any other requirements regarding the involvement of the Governing Board remain unaffected.

Re subparagraph 5b

The new Section 27h(6a) introduces a confidentiality provision which excludes the information from the right to access information under the Information Access Act of the Federal State of Saxony-Anhalt as well as the freedom of information laws of other Federal States.

Due to the partly sensitive nature and significant impact of the activity of the Agency on third parties, the confidentiality of certain matters of the Agency needs to be legally regulated. In view of the far-reaching supervisory and licensing powers of the GGL, the investigations of the Governing Board, as the organ of the Agency, are to be made subject to confidentiality. Without the necessary confidentiality, the Governing Board would be restricted in openly forming its opinions and making impartial decisions. The decision-making process must be protected.

The executive interest in confidentiality thus outweighs the public interest of freedom of information.

This legal regulation does not restrict the constitutional status rights of the delegates. The second sentence makes it clear that this is not a statutory provision that would block any response to parliamentary inquiries.

Similarly, the right to information of public bodies, such as the Public Prosecutor's Office and other public authorities, should continue to be guaranteed. Interaction among state authorities should also remain unaffected, so that the confidentiality rules do not apply in dealings among other authorities and ministries and should not restrict corresponding overarching coordination.

The new paragraph 6a regulates the confidentiality of the deliberations of the Governing Board of the Agency at legislative level. It follows that both the proceedings and the contents of the meetings must remain secret (Federal Administrative Court, judgment of 28 July 2016, 7 C 3/15, para. 21 with regard to the Statutes of the Financial Services Authority (BaFin)). The case-law (cited above) recognises that the confidentiality objective of the provision, which allows participants in particular to make unbiased statements in the context of meetings and other deliberations or decisions of the Governing Board, can only be guaranteed if the records and minutes of the meetings are covered by confidentiality.

The objective of complete secrecy of the deliberations of the Governing Board pursued by the provision can only be achieved if confidentiality also extends to the preliminary technical consultations of the host Länder and the Agency, in direct preparation for the meetings and other deliberations of the Governing Board and which lead to recommendations to the Board with corresponding preliminary votes, where their disclosure would otherwise provide indications about the meeting itself. In order to arrive at consistent and balanced solutions to the substantive issues, unbiased discussion is also necessary in the bodies directly involved preparing the meetings on the upcoming deliberations of the Governing Board.

Confidentiality covers, in particular, preliminary documents, draft resolutions and minutes of the meetings and the correspondence relating to items of consultation. The same applies to deliberations and decision-making outside the meetings of the Board of Directors, for example procedures involving circular decision-making procedures, since the same protective purpose applies here.

Re subparagraph 6

Auditing the budgetary and economic management of the Agency is the responsibility of the courts of auditors of the host Länder. This provision addresses the fact that, under Section 27c, the Agency is funded by financial contributions from the Länder and, under Section 27d, the Länder are liable on a subsidiary basis for the Agency's liabilities and there is therefore an audit interest on the part of the courts of auditors of the host Länder. Section 45 of the Budgetary Principles Act (HGrG) remains unaffected.

Pursuant to Section 55(2) of the HGrG, Section 53 HGrG applies mutatis mutandis to the audit of the annual financial statements of the Agency. In the second sentence of Section 68(1) of the financial regulations of the Länder, which is identical in throughout the Länder, it is provided that, when the auditors are elected or appointed in accordance with Section 53(1)(1) HGrG, the competent ministry exercises the rights of the federal state in agreement with the Court of Auditors. The participation of all the host Länder in the election or appointment of the statutory auditor, has not in the event proved necessary and, moreover, has proved excessively time-consuming. Paragraph 2 therefore provides that the rights under Section 53(1)(1) of the HGrG will in future be exercised solely by the competent supervisory authority and the Court of Auditors of the host Länder. This shall not affect the audit rights of the courts of auditors of the host Länder pursuant to Section 27m(1).

Re subparagraph 7

In order to effectively enforce the new obligations and prohibitions laid down in Section 8(3), sixth and seventh sentences, a corresponding fine will be included in the tariff of administrative fines in the case of infringements. The previous possibility of terminating the contractual relationship by termination in cases where search data has been passed on to third parties without authorisation remains intact.

Re Article 2

Article 2 regulates the entry into force on DD.MM.YYY. If not all instruments of ratification have been deposited by that date, this State Treaty becomes void.

Signature of the Second State Treaty amending the State Treaty on
Gambling 2021 (2. GlüÄndStV 2021)

For the Federal State of Baden-Württemberg:

Stuttgart, this _____

Signature

Signature of the Second State Treaty amending the State Treaty on
Gambling 2021 (2. GlüÄndStV 2021)

For the Free State of Bavaria:

Munich, this _____

Signature

Signature of the Second State Treaty amending the State Treaty on
gambling 2021 (2. GlüÄndStV 2021)

For the Federal State of Berlin:

Berlin, this _____

Signature

Signature of the Second State Treaty amending the State Treaty on
Gambling 2021 (2. GlüÄndStV 2021)

For the Federal State of Brandenburg:

Potsdam, this _____

Signature

Signature of the Second State Treaty amending the State Treaty on
Gambling 2021 (2. GlüÄndStV 2021)

For the Free Hanseatic City of Bremen:

Bremen, this _____

Signature

Signature of the Second State Treaty amending the State Treaty on
Gambling 2021 (2. GlüÄndStV 2021)

For the Free Hanseatic City of Hamburg:

Hamburg, this _____

Signature

Signature of the Second State Treaty amending the State Treaty on
Gambling 2021 (2. GlüÄndStV 2021)

For the Federal State of Hessen:

Wiesbaden, this _____

Signature

Signature of the Second State Treaty amending the State Treaty on
Gambling 2021 (2. GlüÄndStV 2021)

For the Federal State of Mecklenburg-Western-Pomerania:

Schwerin, this _____

Signature

Signature of the Second State Treaty amending the State Treaty on
Gambling 2021 (2. GlüÄndStV 2021)

For the Federal State of Lower Saxony:

Hanover, this _____

Signature

Signature of the Second State Treaty amending the State Treaty on
Gambling 2021 (2. GlüÄndStV 2021)

For the Federal State of North Rhine-Westphalia:

Düsseldorf, this _____

Signature

Signature of the Second State Treaty amending the State Treaty on
Gambling 2021 (2. GlüÄndStV 2021)

For the Federal State of Rhineland-Palatinate:

Mainz, this _____

Signature

Signature of the Second State Treaty amending the State Treaty on
Gambling 2021 (2. GlüÄndStV 2021)

For the Saarland:

Saarbrücken, this _____

Signature

Signature of the Second State Treaty amending the State Treaty on
Gambling 2021 (2. GlüÄndStV 2021)

For the Free State of Saxony:

Dresden, this _____

Signature

Signature of the Second State Treaty amending the State Treaty on
Gambling 2021 (2. GlüÄndStV 2021)

For the Federal State of Saxony-Anhalt:

Magdeburg, this _____

Signature

Signature of the Second State Treaty amending the State Treaty on
Gambling 2021 (2. GlüÄndStV 2021)

For the Federal State of Schleswig-Holstein:

Kiel, this _____

Signature

Signature of the Second State Treaty amending the State Treaty on
Gambling 2021 (2. GlüÄndStV 2021)

For the Free State of Thuringia:

Erfurt, this _____

Signature