

2024 Rule of Law Report - targeted stakeholder consultation

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Introduction

The annual Rule of Law Report lies at the centre of the Annual Rule of Law Cycle, which acts as a preventive tool, deepening multilateral dialogue and joint awareness of rule of law issues. So far, four editions of the Rule of Law Report have been published in 2020, 2021, 2022 and 2023.

The Commission would like to invite stakeholders to provide contributions to the 2024 Rule of Law Report. This survey provides information on the type of information and topics that will be covered in the 2024 Rule of Law Report, in order to allow stakeholders to provide input. More targeted input may be requested at a later stage of preparation of the 2024 Rule of Law Report, including in the context of country visits, or bilateral contacts.

The 2024 Rule of Law Report will continue to deepen the assessment under the existing four pillars, and will also follow-up on the implementation of the recommendations to Member States, that were issued as part of the 2023 Rule of Law Report. The contribution to be provided should include **(1) information on measures taken to implement the recommendations addressed to the Member State in the 2023 Rule of Law report, as well as developments with regard to the points raised in the respective country chapter and (2) any other significant developments since January 2023^[1] falling under the ‘type of information’ outlined in section II.**

The input should consist of a short summary, if possible in English, covering the areas referred to below. Legislation or other documents may be referenced with a link. Contributions should focus on significant developments since the last Rule of Law Report both as regards the legal framework and its implementation in practice.

[1] Unless the information was already submitted in the input for the previous Rule of Law Reports.

Type of information

The topics are structured according to four pillars: I. Justice system; II. Anti-corruption framework; III. Media pluralism; and IV. Other institutional issues related to checks and balances. The replies could include aspects set out below under each pillar. This can include challenges, current work streams, positive developments and best practices:

A) Legislative developments

- Newly adopted legislation
- Legislative drafts currently discussed in Parliament
- Legislative plans envisaged by the Government

B) Policy developments

- Implementation of legislation
- Evaluations, impact assessment, surveys
- White papers/strategies/actions plans/consultation processes
- Follow-up to reports/recommendations of Council of Europe bodies or other international organisations
- Important administrative measures
- Generalised practices

C) Developments related to the judiciary / independent authorities

- Important case law by national courts
- Important decision/opinions from independent bodies/authorities
- State of play on terms, nominations and expired mandates for high-level positions (e.g. Supreme Court, Constitutional Court, Council for the Judiciary, heads of independent authorities included in the scope of the questionnaire[2])

D) Any other relevant developments

- Respondents are free to add any further information, which they deem relevant; however, this should be short and to the point.

Please also indicate whether the developments reported are linked to the implementation of reforms and investments under the RRP, where applicable.

If there are no changes, it is sufficient to indicate this and the information covered in the contributions for the previous Rule of Law Reports should not be repeated.

[2] Such as: media regulatory authorities and bodies, national human rights institutions, equality bodies, ombudsman institutions, supreme audit institutions and, where they exist, transparency authorities.

About you

* I am giving my contribution as

- Academic/research institution
- Business association
- Civil society organisation/NGO

- International organisation
- Judicial association or network
- Media organisation or association
- Public authority or network of public authorities
- Other

* Organisation name

250 character(s) maximum

Funky Citizens

Main Areas of Work

- Justice System
- Anti-corruption
- Media Pluralism
- Other

Please insert an URL towards your organisation's main online presence or describe your organisation briefly:

500 character(s) maximum

www.funky.org

Transparency register number

Check if your organisation is in the transparency register. It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making

* Country of origin

Please add the country of origin of your organisation

- Afghanistan
- Albania
- Algeria
- Andorra
- Angola
- Antigua and Barbuda
- Argentina
- Armenia
- Australia
- Austria
- Azerbaijan
- Bahamas
- Bahrain
- Bangladesh
- Barbados

- Belarus
- Belgium
- Belize
- Benin
- Bhutan
- Bolivia
- Bosnia and Herzegovina
- Botswana
- Brazil
- Brunei Darussalam
- Bulgaria
- Burkina Faso
- Burundi
- Cabo Verde
- Cambodia
- Cameroon
- Canada
- Central African Republic
- Chad
- Chile
- China
- Colombia
- Comoros
- Congo
- Costa Rica
- Côte D'Ivoire
- Croatia
- Cuba
- Cyprus
- Czechia
- Democratic Republic of the Congo
- Denmark
- Djibouti
- Dominica
- Dominican Republic
- Ecuador
- Egypt
- El Salvador
- Equatorial Guinea
- Eritrea
- Estonia
- Eswatini
- Ethiopia
- Fiji
- Finland
- France
- Gabon

- Gambia
- Georgia
- Germany
- Ghana
- Greece
- Grenada
- Guatemala
- Guinea
- Guinea Bissau
- Guyana
- Haiti
- Honduras
- Hungary
- Iceland
- India
- Indonesia
- Iran
- Iraq
- Ireland
- Israel
- Italy
- Jamaica
- Japan
- Jordan
- Kazakhstan
- Kenya
- Kiribati
- Kuwait
- Kyrgyzstan
- Laos
- Latvia
- Lebanon
- Lesotho
- Liberia
- Libya
- Liechtenstein
- Lithuania
- Luxembourg
- Madagascar
- Malawi
- Malaysia
- Maldives
- Mali
- Malta
- Marshall Islands
- Mauritania
- Mauritius

- Mexico
- Micronesia
- Monaco
- Mongolia
- Montenegro
- Morocco
- Mozambique
- Myanmar
- Namibia
- Nauru
- Nepal
- Netherlands
- New Zealand
- Nicaragua
- Niger
- Nigeria
- North Korea
- North Macedonia
- Norway
- Oman
- Pakistan
- Palau
- Panama
- Papua New Guinea
- Paraguay
- Peru
- Philippines
- Poland
- Portugal
- Qatar
- Republic of Moldova
- Romania
- Russian Federation
- Rwanda
- Saint Kitts and Nevis
- Saint Lucia
- Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
- Samoa
- San Marino
- Sao Tome and Principe
- Saudi Arabia
- Senegal
- Serbia
- Seychelles
- Sierra Leone
- Singapore
- Slovakia

- Slovenia
- Solomon Islands
- Somalia
- South Africa
- South Korea
- South Sudan
- Spain
- Sri Lanka
- Sudan
- Suriname
- Sweden
- Switzerland
- Syrian Arab Republic
- Tajikistan
- Tanzania
- Thailand
- Timor-Leste
- Togo
- Tonga
- Trinidad and Tobago
- Tunisia
- Turkey
- Turkmenistan
- Tuvalu
- Uganda
- Ukraine
- United Arab Emirates
- United Kingdom
- United States of America
- Uruguay
- Uzbekistan
- Vanuatu
- Venezuela
- Viet Nam
- Yemen
- Zambia
- Zimbabwe

First name

Elena

Surname

Calistru

Email Address of the organisation (this information will not be published)

elena@funky.org

* Publication of your contribution and privacy settings

You can choose whether you wish for your contribution to be published and whether you wish your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

- Anonymous - Only your type of respondent, country of origin and contribution will be published. Organisation name, URL, transparency register number, first name and surname given above will not be published. **To maintain anonymity, please refrain from mentioning the name of your organisation and any details from which your organisation can be identified in the rest of your contribution.**
- Public - Your personal details (name, organisation name, transparency register number, country of origin will be published with your contribution).
- No publication - Your contribution will not be published. Elements of your contribution may be referred to anonymously in documents produced by the Commission based on this consultation.

I agree with the personal data protection provisions.

[Specific privacy statement targeted stakeholder consultation 2024 rule of law report.pdf](#)

Questions on horizontal developments

In this section, you are invited to provide information on general horizontal developments or trends, both positive and negative, covering all or several Member States. In particular, you could mention issues that are common to several Member States, as well as best practices identified in one Member State that could be replicated. Moreover, you could refer to your activities in the area of the four pillars and sub-topics (an overview of all sub-topics can be found below), and, if you represent a Network of national organisations, to the support you might have provided to one of your national members.

Overview topics for contribution

[List of topics 2024 RoL Report.pdf](#)

Please provide any relevant information on horizontal developments here

5000 character(s) maximum

Questions for contribution

The following four pillars (I.-IV.) are sub-divided into topics (A., B., etc.) and sub-topics (1., 2., 3., etc.). For each of the topics and sub-topics, you are invited to provide (1) information on measures taken to implement the recommendations addressed to the Member State in the 2023 Rule of Law report, as well as developments with regard to the points raised in the respective country chapter of the 2023 Rule of Law Report and (2) any other significant developments since January 2023[3]. Please always include a link to and reference relevant legislation/documents (in the national language and/or where available, in English). Significant developments can include challenges, positive developments and best practices, covering both

legislative developments or implementation and practices.

If there are developments you consider relevant under each of the four pillars that are not mentioned in the sub-topics, please add them under the section "other - please specify". Only significant developments should be covered.

Information provided in reply to the first question under each pillar, related to the follow-up to the recommendations, does not need to be repeated in subsequent parts of the questionnaire, but can be cross-referenced in the subsequent questions, where relevant. All other questions are not limited to the recommendations, but as in previous years, cover the entire scope of the Report.

[3] Unless already covered in the input for the previous Rule of Law Reports.

Member State covered in contribution [only one choice possible]

If you wish to submit information concerning several Member States, please fill in the questionnaire separately for each Member State. There is no limit to the number of contributions submitted by a single participant.

- Austria
- Belgium
- Bulgaria
- Croatia
- Cyprus
- Czechia
- Denmark
- Estonia
- Finland
- France
- Germany
- Greece
- Hungary
- Ireland
- Italy
- Latvia
- Lithuania
- Luxembourg
- Malta
- Netherlands
- Poland
- Portugal
- Romania
- Slovak Republic
- Slovenia
- Spain
- Sweden

I. Justice System

Please provide information on measures taken to follow-up on the recommendations received in the 2023 Report regarding the justice system (if applicable)

5000 character(s) maximum

While there have been some steps taken to address the recommendations, significant challenges remain, especially in the areas of human resources and the effective prosecution of cases previously handled by the SIIJ. The situation calls for a more robust approach to ensure that the reforms and changes are not just nominal but also result in tangible improvements in the justice system in Romania.

Firstly, the human resources issue within the justice system, notably the shortage of magistrates, has become even more pronounced. This growing deficit is a critical concern as it directly impacts the quality and efficiency of the justice system. The European Commission's report acknowledged this issue, yet the problem seems to have escalated rather than improved. The shortage of magistrates could lead to increased workloads, delays in judicial proceedings, and a general decline in the system's effectiveness. This situation necessitates urgent and concrete measures to bolster the workforce in the judiciary to maintain the standards of justice and efficiency. Because the justice system appears less and less appealing for independent magistrates, including because of the attacks and harassment suffered by some prominent judges and prosecutors, we expect to see not only a new wave of retiring from the profession, but also less professionals joining it.

Secondly, the dissolution of the SIIJ and the transfer of its cases to the General Prosecutor's office, while a step towards addressing the Commission's recommendations, has not led to significant progress in handling these cases. Concerns persist regarding the effective prosecution of these cases, as previously highlighted. This lack of progress raises questions about the effectiveness of the measure and indicates potential issues in the prosecution and investigation processes in these sensitive cases. It is essential that these cases, now under the General Prosecutor's purview, receive the attention and resources necessary to ensure they are handled appropriately and expeditiously. This once again shows that dealing with corruption in the judiciary remains just a nice statement so far, as there seems to be a void of dealing with cases that were previously handled by DNA.

A. Independence

Appointment and selection of judges, prosecutors and court presidents (incl. judicial review)

(The reference to 'judges' concerns judges at all level and types of courts as well as judges at constitutional courts)

5000 character(s) maximum

Regarding the appointment and selection of judges, prosecutors, and court presidents in Romania, including judicial review:

- The process of appointing key judicial figures in Romania continues to demonstrate significant political influence. A notable instance is the recent appointment of the chief prosecutors at the DNA and the Prosecutor's Office. The Minister of Justice's decisions, endorsed by the President, have been criticized for being politicized, particularly the appointment of Mihaela Iorga-Moraru as chief prosecutor of the Anti-corruption Section of the DNA. This appointment is seen as controversial due to her past revocation by the former head of DNA and subsequent legal disputes, raising concerns about the impartiality of the process.
- The Romanian judiciary is currently grappling with the issue of mass retirements, which is leading to instability and potential ineffectiveness within the system. These retirements, creating numerous vacancies, can significantly impact the appointment and selection process, leading to challenges in maintaining a stable and effective judiciary.
- The ongoing issues highlight the necessity for a more transparent, impartial, and independent process for appointing judicial figures. Ensuring the integrity and independence of the judiciary is paramount and requires concerted efforts to reform the existing system. This aligns with European standards and the principles of the rule of law, emphasizing the need for appointments to be made based on merit and professional qualifications, free from political interference.

Irremovability of judges, including transfers, (incl. as part of judicial map reform), dismissal and retirement regime of judges, court presidents and prosecutors (incl. judicial review)

5000 character(s) maximum

Promotion of judges and prosecutors (incl. judicial review)

5000 character(s) maximum

Allocation of cases in courts

5000 character(s) maximum

Independence (including composition and nomination and dismissal of its members), and powers of the body tasked with safeguarding the independence of the judiciary (e.g. Council for the Judiciary)

5000 character(s) maximum

Accountability of judges and prosecutors, including disciplinary regime and bodies and ethical rules, judicial immunity and criminal/civil (where applicable) liability of judges (incl. judicial review)

5000 character(s) maximum

The disciplinary regime and bodies responsible for overseeing the judiciary in Romania have been under scrutiny, with growing concerns about their independence and impartiality. The previous report we discussed highlighted significant issues in this regard, pointing to instances of political influence that undermine the credibility and effectiveness of these mechanisms. This problem is exemplified by recent scandals within the judiciary, where the lack of decisive and transparent disciplinary action has been apparent. Cases that should have warranted prompt and firm responses were met with hesitation or inaction, raising questions about the integrity of the disciplinary process.

Further complicating the situation is the role of the Superior Council of Magistracy (SCM). Ideally positioned to enforce accountability and uphold ethical standards within the judiciary, the SCM's response to recent controversies has been lackluster. There have been high-profile instances where the SCM's action, or lack thereof, has been a point of contention. This inaction, especially in cases that have garnered significant public attention, not only reflects poorly on the SCM's commitment to upholding judicial standards but also contributes to a growing public perception of ineffectiveness and potential complicity in maintaining the status quo.

Examples include:

- a case that has attracted significant attention involves a judge who allegedly could not justify assets worth 6 million euros. Despite this serious allegation, which raises questions about integrity and ethical conduct, the response from the disciplinary bodies has been notably subdued. The judge in question not only remains in their position but has also reportedly sought an increase in salary.
- another scandal involves a judge suspected of providing sensitive information to suspects in criminal investigations, believed to be linked to her relationship with a known criminal figure. This case not only questions the integrity of the individual judge but also casts a shadow over the judiciary's ability to self-regulate and maintain ethical standards.

The issues extend beyond individual cases to the broader framework of transparency and consistency in the disciplinary regime. There is a notable lack of clear, uniformly applied guidelines, leading to inconsistent handling of cases. This inconsistency undermines the fairness and effectiveness of the disciplinary system, further eroding public trust. The perceived influence of political factors in what should be impartial judicial processes only exacerbates these concerns.

Remuneration/bonuses/rewards for judges and prosecutors, including observed changes (significant and targeted increase or decrease over the past year), transparency on the system and access to the information

5000 character(s) maximum

Independence/autonomy of the prosecution service

5000 character(s) maximum

Independence of the Bar (chamber/association of lawyers) and of lawyers

5000 character(s) maximum

Significant developments capable of affecting the perception that the general public has of the independence of the judiciary

5000 character(s) maximum

B. Quality of justice

(Under this topic, you are not required to give statistical information but should provide input on the type of information outlined under section 2)

Accessibility of courts (e.g. court/legal fees, legal aid, language)

5000 character(s) maximum

Resources of the judiciary (human/financial/material)

(Material resources refer e.g. to court buildings and other facilities. Financial resources include salaries of staff in courts and prosecution offices.)

5000 character(s) maximum

Training of justice professionals (including judges, prosecutors, lawyers, court staff, clerks/trainees)

5000 character(s) maximum

Digitalisation (e.g. use of digital technology, particularly electronic communication tools, within the justice system and with court users, procedural rules, access to judgments online)

5000 character(s) maximum

Use of assessment tools and standards (e.g. ICT systems for case management, court statistics and their transparency, monitoring, evaluation, surveys among court users or legal professionals)

5000 character(s) maximum

Geographical distribution and number of courts/jurisdictions (“judicial map”) and their specialization, in particular specific courts or chambers within courts to deal with fraud and corruption cases

5000 character(s) maximum

C. Efficiency of the justice system

(Under this topic, you are not required to give statistical information but should provide input on the type of information outlined under section 2)

Length of proceedings

5000 character(s) maximum

Other - please specify

5000 character(s) maximum

II. Anti-Corruption Framework

Where previous specific reports, published in the framework of the review under the UN Convention against Corruption, of GRECO, and of the OECD address the issues below, please make a reference to the points you wish to bring to the Commission's attention in these documents, indicating any relevant updates, changes or measures introduced that have occurred since these documents were published.

Please provide information on measures taken to follow-up on the recommendations received in the 2023 Report regarding the anti-corruption framework (if applicable)

5000 character(s) maximum

The situation regarding vulnerabilities to corruption in Romania, particularly in the context of public financial management that is still highly politicized and under a very subjective control of the coalition in power, has worsen in our view, due to the following main issues:

- Lack of Transparency with MFF and RRF Funds: The significant funds available under the Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF) and Recovery and Resilience Facility (RRF) are managed with a notable lack of transparency. This raises concerns about the proper allocation and use of these substantial European funds.

- Absence of Budget Rectification in 2023: The Romanian government's decision to avoid budget rectification in 2023 resulted in bypassing standard accountability and transparency mechanisms. This led to discretionary allocations through the Emergency Fund of the Government, without the usual legislative scrutiny.

- Special Budgetary Mechanisms and Use of Emergency Funds: The channeling of over 10 billion lei into the Emergency Fund via a unique budgetary mechanism further complicates the transparency and accountability of public funds. This practice poses significant risks in terms of fiscal management and oversight.

- Fast-Track Budget Approval for 2024: The expedited approval of the 2024 budget, with limited time for debate, indicates a worrying trend towards reduced deliberation and examination in crucial financial decisions.

Frequent Use of Emergency Ordinances for Fiscal Measures: The Romanian government's reliance on emergency ordinances to implement fiscal measures due to insufficient funds exacerbates the issue. This approach allows for rapid, often opaque, changes in fiscal policy, bypassing the standard legislative process and curtailing public debate and scrutiny.

These factors collectively create a governance environment where corruption risks are heightened. The lack of thorough scrutiny and reduced opportunities for civil society involvement in fiscal policy discussions weaken the necessary checks and balances against corruption. Enhancing transparency, improving public participation in fiscal matters, and strengthening the legislative process are critical steps to mitigate these vulnerabilities.

A. The institutional framework capacity to fight against corruption (prevention and investigation / prosecution)

List any changes as regards relevant authorities (e.g. national agencies, bodies) in charge of prevention detection, investigation and prosecution of corruption and the resources allocated to each of these authorities (the human, financial, legal, and technical resources as relevant), including the cooperation among domestic and with foreign authorities. Indicate any relevant measure taken to effectively and timely cooperate with OLAF and EPPO (where applicable)

5000 character(s) maximum

Safeguards for the functional independence of the authorities tasked with the prevention and detection of corruption

5000 character(s) maximum

Information on the implementation of measures foreseen in the strategic anti-corruption framework (if applicable). If available, please provide relevant objectives and indicators

5000 character(s) maximum

B. Prevention

Measures to enhance integrity in the public sector and their application (including as regards incompatibility rules, revolving doors, codes of conduct, ethics training)

5000 character(s) maximum

General transparency of public decision-making (including rules on lobbying and their enforcement, asset disclosure rules and enforcement, gifts policy, transparency of political party financing)

5000 character(s) maximum

No changes, but the deteriorating trend continues, especially with the strong coalition in power leaving little room for transparency in the decision-making process.

Rules and measures to prevent and address conflicts of interest in the public sector. Please specify the features and scope of their application (e.g. categories of officials concerned, types of checks and corrective measures depending on the category of officials concerned)

5000 character(s) maximum

If available to you, for the three preceding questions, you are also invited to provide figures on their application, such as number of detected breaches/irregularities of the various rules in place and the follow-up given (investigations, sanctions, etc.).

Measures in place to ensure whistleblower protection and encourage reporting of corruption, including the number of reports received and the follow-up given

5000 character(s) maximum

Sectors with high-risks of corruption in your Member State:

- Measures taken/envisaged for monitoring and preventing corruption and conflict of interest in public procurement

- List other sectors with high risks of corruption and the relevant measures taken/envisaged for monitoring and preventing corruption and conflict of interest in these sectors (e.g. healthcare, citizen /residence investor schemes, urban planning, risk or cases of corruption linked to the disbursement of EU funds, other), and, where applicable, list measures to prevent and address corruption committed by organised crime groups (e.g. to infiltrate the public sector)

5000 character(s) maximum

Any other relevant measures to prevent corruption in public and private sector

5000 character(s) maximum

C. Repressive measures

Criminalisation, including the level of sanctions available by law, of corruption and related offences, including foreign bribery

5000 character(s) maximum

Data on the number of investigations, prosecutions, final judgments and application of sanctions for corruption offences (differentiated by corruption offence if possible) including for legal persons and high level and complex corruption cases) and their transparency, including as regards to the implementation of EU funds

5000 character(s) maximum

Potential obstacles to investigation and prosecution as well as to the effectiveness of criminal sanctions of high-level and complex corruption cases (e.g. political immunity regulation, procedural rules, statute of limitations, cross-border cooperation, pardoning)

5000 character(s) maximum

Information on effectiveness of non-criminal measures and of sanctions (e.g. recovery measures and administrative sanctions) on both public and private offenders

5000 character(s) maximum

Other - please specify

5000 character(s) maximum

III. Media pluralism and media freedom

Please provide information on measures taken to follow-up on the recommendations received in the 2023 Report regarding media pluralism and media freedom (if applicable)

5000 character(s) maximum

In response to the 2023 Report on media pluralism and freedom in Romania, the situation remains largely unchanged, with several critical issues persisting:

Financial Influence Over Media: A significant issue is the continued infusion of public funds and political party expenditures into the media sector. This financial sway, particularly from state and political sources, is a dominant force in shaping the media landscape, with television and mainstream press being notably affected. The dependence on these funds creates a media environment where editorial independence can be compromised, leading to a media landscape that may not fully reflect the diversity of viewpoints in the society.

Lack of Transparency: Another pressing concern is the opacity surrounding media funding. There's a noticeable absence of clear information about the financial transactions between the state, political parties, and media outlets. This lack of transparency hinders the ability to scrutinize and understand the extent of financial influence on media content and biases.

Vulnerability of Small Media Outlets: Smaller newsrooms face significant sustainability challenges. This precarious situation leaves them more susceptible to political influence, as they may rely more heavily on external funding to remain operational. Consequently, their journalistic independence can be undermined, which in turn affects the diversity and plurality of media voices.

Political Influence on Media Landscape: The political dynamics in Romania, characterized by a coalition government with parties from different political spectrums, adds another layer of complexity to the media environment. This can lead to a media landscape that is reflective of the political machinations rather than providing a balanced and pluralistic range of viewpoints

A. Media authorities and bodies

(Cf. Article 30 of Directive 2018/1808)

Measures adopted to ensure the independence, enforcement powers and adequacy of resources (financial, human and technical) of media regulatory authorities and bodies

5000 character(s) maximum

Conditions and procedures for the appointment and dismissal of the head / members of the collegiate body of media regulatory authorities and bodies

5000 character(s) maximum

Existence and functions of media councils or other self-regulatory bodies

5000 character(s) maximum

B. Safeguards against government or political interference and transparency and concentration of media ownership

Measures taken to ensure the fair and transparent allocation of state advertising (including any rules regulating the matter)

5000 character(s) maximum

Safeguards against state / political interference, in particular:

- safeguards to ensure editorial independence of media (private and public)
- specific safeguards for the independence of heads of management and members of the governing boards of public service media (e.g. related to appointment, dismissal), safeguards for their operational independence (e.g. related to reporting obligations and the allocation of resources) and safeguards for plurality of information and opinions
- information on specific legal provisions and procedures applying to media service providers, including as regards granting/renewal/termination of licenses, company operation, capital entry requirements, concentration and corporate governance

5000 character(s) maximum

Transparency of media ownership and public availability of media ownership information, including on direct, indirect and beneficial owners, as well as any rules regulating the matter

5000 character(s) maximum

C. Framework for journalists' protection, transparency and access to documents

Rules and practices guaranteeing journalists' independence and safety, including as regards protection of journalistic sources and communications, referring also, if applicable, to follow-up given to alerts lodged with the Council of Europe's Platform to promote the protection of journalism and safety of journalists

5000 character(s) maximum

Law enforcement capacity, including during protests and demonstrations, to ensure journalists' safety and to investigate attacks on journalists

5000 character(s) maximum

Access to information and public documents by public at large and journalists (incl. transparency authorities where they exist, procedures, costs/fees, timeframes, administrative/judicial review of decisions, execution of decisions by public authorities, possible obstacles related to the classification of information)

5000 character(s) maximum

Lawsuits (incl. SLAPPs - strategic lawsuits against public participation) and convictions against journalists (incl. defamation cases) and measures taken to safeguard against manifestly unfounded and abusive lawsuits

5000 character(s) maximum

Other - please specify

5000 character(s) maximum

IV. Other institutional issues related to checks and balances

Please provide information on measures taken to follow-up on the recommendations received in the 2023 Report regarding the system of checks and balances (if applicable)

5000 character(s) maximum

A. The process for preparing and enacting laws

Framework, policy and use of impact assessments and evidence based policy-making, stakeholders'[1] /public consultations (including consultation of judiciary and other relevant stakeholders on judicial reforms), and transparency and quality of the legislative process both in the preparatory and the parliamentary phase

[1] This includes also the consultation of social partners

5000 character(s) maximum

Rules and use of fast-track procedures and emergency procedures (for example, the percentage of decisions adopted through emergency/urgent procedure compared to the total number of adopted decisions)

5000 character(s) maximum

Rules and application of states of emergency (or analogous regimes), including judicial review and parliamentary oversight

5000 character(s) maximum

Regime for constitutional review of laws

5000 character(s) maximum

B. Independent authorities

Independence, resources, capacity and powers of national human rights institutions ('NHRIs'), of ombudsman institutions if different from NHRIs, of equality bodies if different from NHRIs and of supreme audit institutions

(Cf. the website of the European Court of Auditors: <https://www.eca.europa.eu/en/Pages/SupremeAuditInstitutions.aspx#>)

5000 character(s) maximum

Statistics/reports concerning the follow-up of recommendations by National Human Rights Institutions, ombudsman institutions, equality bodies and supreme audit institutions in the past two years

5000 character(s) maximum

C. Accessibility and judicial review of administrative decisions

Transparency of administrative decisions and sanctions (incl. their publication and rules on collection of related data)

5000 character(s) maximum

Judicial review of administrative decisions:

- short description of the general regime (in particular competent court, scope, suspensive effect, interim measures, and any applicable specific rules or derogations from the general regime of judicial review)

5000 character(s) maximum

Rules and practices related to the application by all courts, including constitutional jurisdictions, of the preliminary ruling procedure (Art. 267 TFEU)

5000 character(s) maximum

Follow-up by the public administration and State institutions to final (national/supranational, including the European Court of Human Rights) court decisions, as well as available remedies in case of non-implementation

5000 character(s) maximum

D. The enabling framework for civil society

Measures regarding the framework for civil society organisations and human rights defenders (e.g. legal framework and its application in practice incl. registration and dissolution rules)

5000 character(s) maximum

Rules and practices having an impact on the effective operation and safety of civil society organisations and human rights defenders. This includes measures for protection from attacks – verbal, physical or on-line –, intimidation, legal threats incl. SLAPPs, negative narratives or smear campaigns, measures capable of affecting the public perception of civil society organisations, etc. It also includes measures to monitor threats or attacks and dedicated support services

5000 character(s) maximum

Organisation of financial support for civil society organisations and human rights defenders (e.g. framework to ensure access to funding, and for financial viability, taxation/incentive/donation systems, measures to ensure a fair distribution of funding)

5000 character(s) maximum

Rules and practices on the participation of civil society organisations and human rights defenders to the decision-making process (e.g. measures related to dialogue between authorities and civil society, participation of civil society in policy development and decision-making, consultation, dialogues, etc.)

5000 character(s) maximum

E. Initiatives to foster a rule of law culture

Measures to foster a rule of law culture (e.g. debates in national parliaments on the rule of law, public information campaigns on rule of law issues, contributions from civil society, education initiatives etc.)

5000 character(s) maximum

Other - please specify

5000 character(s) maximum

Contact

rule-of-law-network@ec.europa.eu