

2023 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 European rule of law mechanism, which acts as a preventive tool, deepening multilateral dialogue and joint awareness of rule of law issues. So far, three editions of the Rule of Law Report have been published in 2020, 2021 and 2022.

In the preparation of the first three editions of the Rule of Law Report, the Commission has relied on a diversity of relevant sources, including from Member States, country visits, and stakeholders' contributions collected through the targeted stakeholder consultation [1]. The information provided has informed the Commission's country-specific assessments in preparing the Report. Building on the positive experience from the first three editions of the Rule of Law Report, the Commission is now inviting stakeholders to provide written contributions for the preparation of the 2023 Rule of Law Report through this targeted consultation.

The contribution to be provided should include (1) information on measures taken to implement the recommendations addressed to the Member State in the 2022 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 2022 [2] falling under the 'type of information' outlined in the next section.

The input should be short and concise and summarise information related to one or more of the areas referred to in the template. You are invited to focus on the areas that relate to the scope of work and expertise of your organisation. Existing reports, statements, legislation or other documents may be referenced with a link (no need to provide the full text). Stakeholders are encouraged to make references to any contributions already provided in a different context or to Reports and documents already published. Contributions should focus on significant developments both as regards the legal framework and its implementation in practice.

If you wish to submit information concerning several Member States, you will have to fill-in the questionnaire separately for each Member States (due to the size of the questionnaire). There is no limit to the number of contributions submitted by a single participant. In such cases, you are not required to repeat the information in the section "about you" that is non-mandatory nor the information on horizontal developments.

Please provide your contribution by **20 January 2023**. Should you have any requests for clarifications or encounter difficulties in filling in the questionnaire, you can contact the Commission at the following email

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

[1] For the consultation for the 2022 Report, see https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/2022-rule-law-report-targeted-stakeholder-consultation_en

[2] Unless the information was already submitted in the consultation 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:

Legislative developments

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

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

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[1])

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.

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.

[1] 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

Reporters Without Borders / Reporters sans frontières (RSF)

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

<https://rsf.org/en>

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

Julie

Surname

Majerczak

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

[REDACTED]

*** 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 2023 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 2023 Report.pdf](#)

Please provide any relevant information on horizontal developments here

5000 character(s) maximum

[REDACTED]

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 States in the 2022 Rule of Law report, as well as developments with regard to the points raised in the respective country chapter of the 2022 Rule of Law Report and (2) any other significant developments since January 2022[1]. Please include a link to and reference relevant legislation/documents (in the national language and/or where available, in English) if relevant. 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.

[1] 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 2022 Report regarding the justice system (if applicable)

3000 character(s) maximum

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)

3000 character(s) maximum

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)

3000 character(s) maximum

Promotion of judges and prosecutors (incl. judicial review)

3000 character(s) maximum

Allocation of cases in courts

3000 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)

3000 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)

3000 character(s) maximum

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

3000 character(s) maximum

Independence/autonomy of the prosecution service

3000 character(s) maximum

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

3000 character(s) maximum

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

3000 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)

3000 character(s) maximum

Resources of the judiciary (human/financial/material)

(Material resources refer e.g. to court buildings and other facilities)

3000 character(s) maximum

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

3000 character(s) maximum

Digitalisation (e.g. use of digital technology, particularly electronic communication tools, within the justice system and with court users, including resilience of justice systems in COVID-19 pandemic)

3000 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)

3000 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

3000 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

3000 character(s) maximum

Other - please specify

3000 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 2022 Report regarding the anti-corruption framework (if applicable)

3000 character(s) maximum

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 authorities. Indicate any relevant measure taken to effectively and timely cooperate with OLAF and EPPO (where applicable)

3000 character(s) maximum

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

3000 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

3000 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). Please provide figures on their application

3000 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

3000 character(s) maximum

Rules and measures to prevent conflict of interests in the public sector. Please specify the scope of their application (e.g. categories of officials concerned)

3000 character(s) maximum

Measures in place to ensure whistleblower protection and encourage reporting of corruption.

3000 character(s) maximum

List the sectors with high-risks of corruption in your Member State and list the relevant measures taken /envisaged for monitoring and preventing corruption and conflict of interest in these sectors (e.g. public procurement, healthcare, citizen investor schemes, 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)

3000 character(s) maximum

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

3000 character(s) maximum

C. Repressive measures

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

3000 character(s) maximum

Data on investigation and application of sanctions for corruption offences, including for legal persons and high level and complex corruption cases and their transparency, including as regards to the implementation of EU funds

(Please include, if available the number of (data since 2019): indictments; first instance convictions; first instance acquittals; final convictions; final acquittals; other outcomes (final) (i.e. excluding convictions and acquittals); cases adjudicated (final); imprisonment / custodial sentences through final convictions; suspended custodial sentences through final convictions; pending cases at the end of the reference year)

3000 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)

3000 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

3000 character(s) maximum

Other - please specify

3000 character(s) maximum

III. Media Freedom and Pluralism

Please provide information on measures taken to follow-up on the recommendations received in the 2022 Report regarding media freedom and pluralism (if applicable)

3000 character(s) maximum

A. Media authorities and bodies

(Cf. Article 30 of Directive 2018/1808)

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

3000 character(s) maximum

The Council for Electronic Media (CEM) is the regulatory body for radio and television broadcasting in Bulgaria. The institution has limited regulatory competence, mainly related to the licensing of private radio and television channels. The CEM monitors whether television and radio content meets the requirements in specific areas (related to elections, commercials, child protection, and hate speech, etc.). The Council has the power to fine electronic media violating these standards. The most important role CEM has is control over the public media - the Bulgarian National Television (BNT) and the Bulgarian National Radio (BNR). The Council appoints the Directors-General of both BNR and BNT and, based on their proposals, approves the boards of directors. The CEM also has a coordinating role in approving the state subsidy of BNT and BNR. The CEM is officially an independent body accountable only to the parliament. Every year, the Council prepares an annual report voted by the parliament. The parliament's reporting procedure is formally followed, but discussing the CEM's annual report has rarely sparked a debate among MPs.

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

3000 character(s) maximum

The CEM comprises five members, three of whom are elected (with a simple majority) by the National Assembly, and the President appoints two for a six-year term. There is a limit of two non-consecutive terms per member. The formal requirements for being appointed are Bulgarian citizenship, a university degree, and professional experience (in electronic media, electronic communications, journalism, law or economics). There is also a requirement that candidates are recognized as authorities and broadly respected, both in society and in their professional field. The requirements for education and experience are followed, but those for proven capacity and respect in society and the professional field are very often neglected.

In 2022 the Parliament appointed (<https://bit.ly/3X8IT1a>) two new members of the CEM. Their profile differed from the previous practice insofar as a long-time journalist expressing his position on media freedom issues and a lawyer and university lecturer specialising in the same topic. The president also made an appointment from his quota, appointing a TV journalist (<https://bit.ly/3Cq4hpH>)

The first priority for the new CEM was to elect a Director General of the Bulgarian National Television. The current director, Emil Koshlukov, whose previous managerial experience was in the television of the far-right party Ataka, was criticised by various stakeholders (<https://bit.ly/3lu>). In July, CEM failed to hold an election as none of the candidates gathered the required majority (<https://bit.ly/3QeNV8V>). One of the candidates appealed, which led to a judicial limbo (<https://bit.ly/3lznk4q>). Till the end of which the incumbent director would run the broadcast.

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

3000 character(s) maximum

The only existing and active organisation that carries out any form of self-regulation is the National Council for Journalism Ethics. It is a non-governmental organisation established in 2005, bringing journalists, professors in journalism schools, lawyers, and media experts.

The organisation's founders are the Association of Bulgarian Radio and Television Broadcasters, the Union of Publishers in Bulgaria, the Union of Bulgarian Journalists, the Media Development Center, and the Bulgarian Media Coalition. The Council has no independent funding. Its members work pro bono, and ABRO finances the administrative work.

The Ethics Code of Bulgarian media was adopted in 2004 and has since been recognized by various media outlets. In its practice, the National Council on Journalistic Ethics has accepted that it shall issue pronouncements also on complaints against media outlets that have not recognized the Code. In 2022, the Commission on Journalistic Ethics continued to be active, handling a total of 36 cases, including those related to the coverage of the war in Ukraine.

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)

3000 character(s) maximum

In 2018, the Compulsory Deposit of Copies of Printed and Other Works Act was amended and media outlets were obliged to declare all funding from donors, state advertising, political parties, and EU-funded projects. Those amendments were criticised because they particularly targeted independent media that receive funding from grants or crowdfunding. The obligation to declare revenue should have covered the most common practice of indirectly distributing EU funds through media agencies. The fines for failing to provide information are quite large; however, as of 16th of April 2020, several influential print media and websites close to the government have yet to declare the origin of their incomes (<https://bit.ly/3uKEIzg>). Some media have reported that the responsible authority - the Ministry of Culture - is not enforcing the law (<https://bit.ly/3r551ZD>).

The need for clear rules on how public funds are allocated to the media continues to raise doubts that this is based on their perceived editorial loyalty.

Outlets known for spreading pro-Kremlin propaganda before (<https://bit.ly/3GI3RNV>, <https://bit.ly/3Z7Rh1H> or <https://bit.ly/3Cn0rxy>) also have access to funding coming from the state, political parties or the European parliament (<https://web.archive.org/web/20230105133938/https://medien-registar.mc.government.bg:888/Register-7a-Firm-2022.jsp?id=634>
https://web.archive.org/web/*/https://medien-registar.mc.government.bg:888/Register-7a-Firm-2022.jsp?id=641
<https://web.archive.org/web/20230105134245/https://medien-registar.mc.government.bg:888/Register-7a-Firm-2022.jsp?id=537>)

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

3000 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

Beneficial owners of both TV, radio, print and internet media sites must be declared. There are two registers - the one dedicated to print media and websites is under the control of the Ministry of Culture, and the one for radio and TV is under the control of the CEM. In the first edition for each year, the name of the beneficial owner of print media must be announced. Even though the obligation to declare the beneficial owner seems well regulated by law, it does not actually shed light on the media ownership. It is a common practice for newspapers (mainly tabloids and yellow press) to declare that they are published by one company, but the whole business is operated through other companies (<https://bit.ly/3uHhDIm>). The purpose of such a move is to avoid payment of taxes and damages awarded in defamation cases, copyright infringement, etc. In other cases, there are objective doubts that the declared owner is actually a straw man. The Ministry of Culture is not active in prosecuting media that are not complying with the regulation. Although the law provides a financial penalty for failure to declare an ultimate owner, numerous popular quasinews sites have not filed such returns (<https://bit.ly/3WP1q1E>)

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

Rules and practices guaranteeing journalist's independence and safety, including as regards protection of journalistic sources and communications

3000 character(s) maximum

Apart from the constitutional provisions guaranteeing freedom of expression and the media, there needs to be a detailed framework at the legislative level to ensure the protection of journalists. In the professional community, the case-law of the European Court of Human Rights is used as guidelines in this direction, mainly regarding protection of sources and overriding public interest. The standards of the control institutions (NRA, Commission for Personal Data Protection, State Agency for the Protection of the Child, Commission for Protection of Competition, etc.) regarding the media show a strong bias depending on the editorial policy of the publications themselves. Government loyal media are much less likely to be scrutinised and sanctioned. The same approach is observed towards owners of media.

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

3000 character(s) maximum

For the past 20 years, not a single organiser or perpetrator of an assault against journalists has been indicted and sentenced. The very poor track record of Bulgarian law enforcement on investigating attacks on journalists calls into question their willingness or their professional capacity to deal with such cases. On March 2020, Slavi Angelov, Editor-in-Chief of the weekly 168 Chassa, was assaulted by two men outside his home. The investigation did not find who ordered the assault and why. The trial against the three presumed perpetrators is still pending.

On May 2020, local journalist and activist Dimitar Petsov was arrested under dodgy circumstances. After an anonymous call, Petsov's car was searched by the police. Drugs were found. It was revealed that an unknown perpetrator planted the drugs found. The case is still pending.

In June 2020, investigative reporter Nikolay Staykov's home was attacked after the anti-corruption watchdog that he works for -the Anti-Corruption Fund (ACF)- released his documentary about a corruption affair allegedly involving state institutions. The perpetrators were never prosecuted. The case is still unsolved.

In August 2020, during a political rally of the ruling political party GERB, young men with GERB badges attacked the RFE reporter Polina Paunova. One person was later arrested for the assault. He reached a plea agreement with the prosecutor's office. The reason for the attack remains unknown.

On 2 Sept 2020, freelance reporter Dimitar Kenarov was beaten and detained by the police while covering an anti-government protest in Sofia. Although Kenarov's arrest was announced illegal by the court (<https://bit.ly/3jRZmXY>) in early 2022, the prosecutor's office continues to refuse to open an investigation against the actions of the police officers.

In March 2021 the car of DenNews' journalist Desislava Panayotova was vandalised in Dupnitsa, for the 2nd time in 4 months. The case remains unsolved by the police.

In early 2022, Atanas Chobanov from the website bird.bg reported that he was informed by a representative of the US Embassy in Sofia that there was a threat to his life. The prosecutor's office announced it had launched an investigation into the case but did not provide an update on its progress.

Institutional pressure on journalists continued in 2022. In Dec 2022 two journalists from media outlet Capital were summoned for questioning by the police on the orders of the prosecutor's office after Capital published an investigation into one of Bulgaria's largest public hospitals. (https://twitter.com/RSF_inter/status/1603799054814699520)

The practice of verbal aggression by government officials against journalists also continued in 2022. In Dec, the President of the CEM made unacceptable comments against the journalist Maria Cheresheva because she participated in an international journalistic investigation revealing possible serious human rights violations by Bulgarian border guards.

Access to information and public documents (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)

3000 character(s) maximum

The Freedom of Information Act was adopted in the year 2000. Case law over the years has set standards that consider public interest over possible restrictions (personal data, trade secrets). Amendments to the law in 2008 and 2016 introduced the notions of overriding public interest and broadened the number of institutions that are obliged to answer on FOIA requests. The government's attempts to restrict the use of FOIA are not isolated but encounter noisy opposition from NGOs (<https://bit.ly/303cj3X>). For a number of independent journalists who are purposefully neglected by the state administration and its press centres, the FOIA remains the only means of receiving a formal response. This often takes time and lengthy litigation. At the same time, a large part of journalistic investigations in recent years have been based precisely on the use of this law. A blatant example of lack of transparency is the Prosecutor's office, which refuses to apply the FOIA for its work. A number of journalists criticising the work of the institution do not receive any answers to their questions from the Prosecutor's spokespersons.

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

3000 character(s) maximum

As 2021, 2022 was also marked by a series of SLAPP cases against journalists, which emerged as a new trend in the pressure on media representatives in Bulgaria.

Although the second instance significantly reduced the damages awarded in the case against Mitov and Mediapool (<https://rsf.org/en/bulgaria-alarming-slapp-cases-endanger-fragile-media-freedom>), it remains a dangerous precedent.

Two apparently SLAPP cases were filed against journalists from investigative journalism platform Bird.bg in 2022 (<https://bit.ly/3Qj37lt>)

Other - please specify

3000 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 2022 Report regarding the system of checks and balances (if applicable)

3000 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 (particularly consultation of judiciary and other relevant stakeholders on judicial reforms), and transparency and quality of the legislative process

[1] This includes also the consultation of social partners

3000 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)

3000 character(s) maximum

Regime for constitutional review of laws

3000 character(s) maximum

COVID-19: provide update on significant developments with regard to emergency regimes/measures in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic

- judicial review (including constitutional review) of emergency regimes and measures in the context of COVID-19 pandemic
- oversight (incl. ex-post reporting/investigation) by Parliament of emergency regimes and measures in the context of COVID-19 pandemic
- processes related to lessons learned/crisis preparedness in terms of the functioning of checks and balances

3000 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#>)

3000 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

3000 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)

3000 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)

3000 character(s) maximum

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

3000 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)

3000 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.

3000 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)

3000 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.)

3000 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 etc.)

3000 character(s) maximum

Other - please specify

3000 character(s) maximum

Contact

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