

2021 Rule of Law Report - targeted stakeholder consultation

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Introduction

The first annual Rule of Law Report was published on 30 September 2020. It is the core of the new European rule of law mechanism, which acts as a preventive tool, deepening multilateral dialogue and joint awareness of rule of law issues.

In the preparation of the first annual Rule of Law Report, the Commission relied on a diversity of relevant sources, including from Member States, country visits, and stakeholders' contributions collected through a targeted stakeholder consultation[1]. The information provided has informed the Member State-specific assessments of the Commission in preparing the Report. Building on the positive experience from the first Rule of Law Report, the Commission is inviting stakeholders to provide written contributions for the preparation of the 2021 Rule of Law Report through this targeted consultation.

The contributions should cover in particular (1) feedback and developments with regard to the points raised in the country chapters of the 2020 Rule of Law Report and (2) any other significant developments since January 2020[2] falling under the 'type of information' outlined in next section. This would also include significant rule of law developments in relation to the COVID-19 pandemic falling under the scope of the four pillars covered by the report.

The input should be short and concise, if possible in English, 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.

Please provide your contribution by 8 March. Should you have any requests for clarifications, you can contact the Commission at the following email address: rule-of-law-network@ec.europa.eu.

If you encounter persisting difficulties in submitting your contribution, please submit it directly by email to rule-of-law-network@ec.europa.eu

[1] https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/2020-rule-law-report-targeted-stakeholder-consultation_en

[2] Unless the information was already submitted in the consultation for the 2020 Rule of Law Report.

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 and nominations for high-level positions (e.g. Supreme Court, Constitutional Court, Council for the Judiciary, heads of independent authorities included in the scope of the request for input[1])

Any other relevant developments

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

Please include, where relevant, information related to measures taken in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic under the relevant topics.

If there are no changes, it is sufficient to indicate this and the information covered in the 2020 Rule of Law Report should not be repeated.

[1] Such as: media regulatory authorities and bodies, national human rights institutions, equality bodies, ombudsman institutions and supreme audit institutions.

About you

* I am giving my contribution as

Judicial association or network

* Organisation name

250 character(s) maximum

Italian Council of State

* 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://www.giustizia-amministrativa.it>

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

Italy

* First Name

Marcello

* Surname

Apicella

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

* 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](#).

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

[overview topics for contribution.pdf](#)

Please provide any relevant information on horizontal developments here

5000 character(s) maximum

Questions on developments in Member States

The following four pillars are sub-divided into topics and sub-topics. You are invited to provide concrete information on significant developments, focusing primarily on developments since January 2020, for each of the sub-topics which are relevant for your work. Please feel free to provide a link to and reference relevant legislation/documents. Significant developments can include challenges, positive developments and best practices, covering both legislative developments or implementation and practices (as outlined under "type of information").

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.

Please note that, due to the size of the questionnaire, certain elements may be slow to load, especially if selecting many Member States at once. In such cases, it is recommended to wait a few minutes to let the page load correctly.

Member States covered in contribution [several choices possible]

Please select all Member States for which you wish to contribute information. For each Member State, a separate template for providing information will open. This may take several minutes to fully load.

- ☐ 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

Justice System - Italy

Independence

Appointment and selection of judges, prosecutors and court presidents

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

3000 character(s) maximum

Administrative judges of first instance are recruited on the basis of a public selection, which includes a specific written and oral exam.

It is open only to: ordinary judges, lawyers of State, public officials with 5 years of experience and lawyers with 8 years of experience.

Administrative judges of the Council of State (second and last instance court) are recruited as follows: 25% by a public selection, open to administrative judges of first instance, ordinary judges, lawyers of State, public officials with 5 years of experiences and lawyers with 8 years of experience; 50% by promotion of administrative judges of first instance; 25% by appointment of the Government among university professors, high public functionaries, ordinary judges, etc.

Irremovability of judges; including transfers, dismissal and retirement regime of judges, court presidents and prosecutors

3000 character(s) maximum

Administrative judges, as the ordinary ones, enjoy the guarantee of irremovability. Any decision regarding their career (transfer, dismissal, retirement regime) must be taken by the Council for the judiciary of administrative judges (self-governmental body).

Promotion of judges and prosecutors

3000 character(s) maximum

The Council of the judiciary of administrative judges is in charge of promoting administrative judges, appointing President of Section of the Council of State or of Regional Administrative Tribunals (first instance courts, hereinafter TAR) and taking disciplinary measures.

Allocation of cases in courts

3000 character(s) maximum

Criteria for allocating cases within a court are defined by Guidelines set up by the Council of the judiciary for administrative judges. The allocation of cases is subject to supervision of the Council of the judiciary.

Independence (including composition and nomination 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

The Council of administrative judiciary is the self government authority of the Italian administrative justice and it has its headquarter in Rome. The mandate of its members lasts for four years and they cannot be immediately re-elected.

The Council of judiciary consists of:

- the President of the Council of State, who presides it;
- four judges, elected by their peers, serving in the Council of State;
- six judges, elected by their peers, serving in the regional administrative courts;
- four citizens, chosen among university professors of law or among lawyers or among lawyers with twenty years practice, elected two from the House of deputies and two from the Senate, respectively;
- four judges (two serving in the Council of State and two serving in the TAR) as substitute members.

The Council of judiciary is competent for all matters concerning career and legal status of administrative judges belonging to the Council of State and to the TAR .

In particular, the Council acts:

- on recruitment, placement and functions, transfers, promotions, assignment of presidential functions and on any other provision concerning the legal status of judges;
- on disciplinary actions and transfer action for incompatibility;
- on assignment of offices and permission to held offices unrelated to the judicial functions;
- on the permission to stay temporary untenured;
- on exemption of judges' duty to move their domicile in the region where they have their office, in exceptional cases and for justified reasons.

The Council of judiciary has also the competence on internal organization matters. In particular, the Council:

- approves the budget and the final account of administrative justice;
- makes proposals about modification and modernization of facilities and services;
- prepares the annual report of the Prime Minister to Parliament on the state of the administrative justice;
- issues directives to the presidents of the courts for the organization of the judicial function. In particular, it establishes the general criteria for the allocation of cases and for the composition of the sections within the courts divided into sections; establishes the general criteria for the allocation of advisory affairs and appeals respectively among advisory and judicial sections of the State Council; determines criteria and rules for distributing the workload of judges;
- can order inspections to verify compliance with its directives.

Accountability of judges and prosecutors, including disciplinary regime and bodies and ethical rules, judicial immunity and criminal liability of judges

3000 character(s) maximum

Administrative judges have no judicial immunity neither political accountability. They are subject to civil, criminal and disciplinary liability. A special regime for civil liability connected with the exercise of judicial activity is established.

Remuneration/bonuses for judges and prosecutors

3000 character(s) maximum

The law fixes remuneration of administrative judges.

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

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 "type of information".)

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

3000 character(s) maximum

The access to administrative justice is very wide.
Not only single or legal persons may access to courts, also associations and NGOs can lodge an appeal against the measures affecting their own interests and to defend the collective interest of those they represent, if the disputed measure may affect this collective interest.
There is a court fee in proportion with the dispute's value (e.g. public procurements disputes) or according to the specific procedure followed (e.g. compliance or access to administrative documents). Claimants whose revenues are below a certain threshold may be eligible for free legal assistance provided by the State. When legal aid is granted, the claimant can choose a lawyer to be paid by the State, according to special rates.
The form of appeal is free but it must be written in Italian.

Resources of the judiciary (human/financial/material)

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

3000 character(s) maximum

The annual budget for administrative justice is decided by the law, taking into consideration a percentage of the fees paid by the parties for administrative cases.
Up to December 2019, administrative judges of first instance were 284 and of second and last instance 106. There is a big number of vacancies, in particular for first instance judges (134 positions).
A new procedure for the recruitment of 40 judges of first instance has been recently published (February 2021).
As the report already mentions, the law n. 205/2017 (the budget law for 2018) increased the number of administrative magistrates by 20 and, in February 2020, a new section of the Council of State and two new sections at one of the first instance courts (Tar Lazio) were established. These new sections will be functioning once the new staff is recruited.
Court buildings are generally in public domain and only in few cases they are rented.

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

3000 character(s) maximum

The Studies Office of the Council of State is competent for the initial and continuing training and for the professional updating of administrative magistrates. Numerous initiatives are also organized in coordination with other judicial institutions.

The Council of State attaches a great importance to exchanges of judges in the context of the international organizations gathering the administrative supreme Courts of different countries such as ACA - Europe (Association of EU Countries Supreme Administrative Jurisdictions), IASAJ (International Association of Supreme Administrative Jurisdictions) and EJTN (The Exchange Programme for Judicial Authorities).

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)

(Factual information presented in Commission Staff Working Document of 2 December 2020, SWD(2020) 540 final, does not need to be repeated)

3000 character(s) maximum

Thanks to alternative means and on-line services the access to administrative justice has been insured even during the COVID-19 pandemic according to the following rules, established by law:

- 1) suspension of all procedural terms, apart from urgent procedures, from 8.3.2020 to 15.4.2020 and deferral of all hearings after 15.4.2020 (law decree 11 March 2020 n.11 converted into law 8.5.2020, n. 31);
- 2) from 16.4.2020 to 30.6.2020, all disputes were decided without oral discussion and with the right of the parties to present brief "hearing notes" (law decree 17.3.2020 n. 18, converted into law 24.4.2020, n. 27);
- 3) from 1.6.2020 to 31.7.2020 the parties (lawyers) at request, were able to participate remotely to hearings through electronic communication tools (mainly the Teams Microsoft platform); without this specific request, decisions were taken on the basis of written statements (of lawyers) (law decree 30.4.2020 n. 28, converted into law 25.6.2020, n. 70);
- 4) from 1.8.2020 to 8.11.2020 the ordinary procedure was resumed, putting in place organisational measures to avoid the spread of the virus in the court rooms;
- 5) from 9.11.2020 the remote process has been resumed and, at the time of writing, it will last until 30.4.2021 (law decree 28.10.2020 n. 137 converted into law 18.12.2020 n. 176 and law decree 31.12.2020 n. 183 converted into law 26.2.2021, n. 21).

It is worth noting that before the pandemic, judges, according to the administrative electronic process, in force in Italy since 1 January 2017, could consult the assigned files remotely and deliver their judgments using electronic signature. However, before Covid-19 pandemic, judges had to be present in the courts to carry out hearings.

Despite of the emergency due to the pandemic, efforts to break down the backlog of administrative justice have continued, leading to a decreasing of 6,4% in the number of pending cases in the Council of State (from 25.752 in 2019 to 24.091 in 2020), and 9.7% in the TAR (from 149.958 in 2019 to 135.451 in 2020). Therefore, in 2020, not only there was no further backlog but, thanks to the definition of 13,221 appeals, there was a decrease in pending cases.

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

3000 character(s) maximum

Administrative Courts of first instance are 21 TAR, which work in each Italian Region. In eight biggest regions there is also a separated section of the Regional Administrative Court.
The judge of second and last instance is the Council of State. It has a separated section in Sicily.

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 "type of information".)

Length of proceedings

3000 character(s) maximum

In 2020, the disposition time for administrative judicial procedure was the following:

- 667 days (with an improvement compared to 2019, in which disposition time was 692), for the second and last instance 862 days for the first instance in comparison with 821 days in 2019 .

113 days for the first instance and 182 days for the second and last instance was the disposition time in public procurement cases, in 2020.

Other - please specify

3000 character(s) maximum

Anti-Corruption Framework - Italy

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

List of relevant authorities (e.g. national agencies, bodies) in charge of prevention detection, investigation and prosecution of corruption. Please indicate the resources allocated to these (the human, financial, legal, and practical resources as relevant)

3000 character(s) maximum

Prevention

Integrity framework including incompatibility rules (e.g.: revolving doors)

3000 character(s) maximum

General transparency of public decision-making (including public access to information such as lobbying, asset disclosure rules and transparency of political party financing)

3000 character(s) maximum

Rules on preventing conflict of interests in the public sector.

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 preventing corruption and conflict of interest in these sectors. (e.g. public procurement, healthcare, other)

3000 character(s) maximum

Measures taken to address corruption risks in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic

3000 character(s) maximum

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

3000 character(s) maximum

Repressive measures

Criminalisation of corruption and related offences.

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 the implementation of EU funds

3000 character(s) maximum

Potential obstacles to investigation and prosecution of high-level and complex corruption cases(e.g. political immunity regulation).

3000 character(s) maximum

Other – please specify

3000 character(s) maximum

Media Pluralism - Italy

Media authorities and bodies

(Cf. Article 30 of Directive 2018/1808)

Independence, enforcement powers and adequacy of resources of media regulatory authorities and bodies

3000 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

3000 character(s) maximum

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

3000 character(s) maximum

Transparency of media ownership and government interference

The transparent allocation of state advertising (including any rules regulating the matter); other safeguards against state / political interference

3000 character(s) maximum

Rules governing transparency of media ownership and public availability of media ownership information

3000 character(s) maximum

Framework for journalists' protection

Rules and practices guaranteeing journalist's independence and safety

3000 character(s) maximum

Law enforcement capacity to ensure journalists' safety and to investigate attacks on journalists

3000 character(s) maximum

Access to information and public documents

3000 character(s) maximum

Lawsuits and convictions against journalists (incl. defamation cases) and safeguards against abuse

3000 character(s) maximum

Other - please specify

3000 character(s) maximum

Other institutional issues related to checks and balances - Italy

The process for preparing and enacting laws

Framework, policy and use of impact assessments, stakeholders'/public consultations (particularly consultation of judiciary on judicial reforms), and transparency and quality of the legislative process

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

Administrative justice has never stopped during the pandemic thanks to the full implementation of electronic process and the use of emergency procedures.

According to articles 55-62 of Administrative Procedure Code (CAP), in all cases and at any stage of administrative legal proceedings, the parties may file a request for an emergency measure. This request is

handled through a very rapid procedure, in a chamber hearing where lawyers can orally discuss the case. The panel rules on the interlocutory application in the first hearing following the twentieth day from the notification and, likewise, the tenth day from the filing of the application. The decision on interim relief is taken by the panel in the form of ordinance, which may be appealed before the Council of State. For extremely urgent requests, the President of the Section can provide for interim precautionary monocratic measures (art. 56 CAP), a fast-track procedure used very often in 2020. In this case, the decision is rendered by decree that loses its efficacy if the judicial panel does not confirm it at the chamber hearing. According to art. 55 CAP, the party asking for interim relief has to demonstrate that it will suffer a serious and irreparable harm during the time needed to reach a decision on the claim (*periculum in mora*) and that the claim is expected to be founded (*fumus boni iuris*).

During the pandemic, presidential precautionary measures have been the most common judicial instrument to face the demand of justice regarding the control of legitimacy of the administrative decisions taken by central and local Governments in order to face the spread of the virus, by imposing limits to citizens' fundamental freedoms.

In 2020, the number of precautionary monocratic measures has increased considerably in both degrees of administrative justice. 7845 presidential decrees have been adopted by TAR, compared to 5386 in 2019 with an increase of 45.7%. Following the same trend, the Council of State adopted 2.187 monocratic decrees in 2020, in comparison to 1447 in 2019, with an increment of 51.1%.

The response of the administrative justice in these cases has been extremely rapid: the procedure lasts no more than two or three days maximum from the filing of the claim, in the first instance.

Regime for constitutional review of laws.

3000 character(s) maximum

COVID-19: provide update on significant developments with regard to emergency regimes 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 by Parliament of emergency regimes and measures in the context of COVID-19 pandemic
- measures taken to ensure the continued activity of Parliament (including possible best practices)

3000 character(s) maximum

The access to administrative justice has been insured even during the COVID-19 pandemic according to the following rules, established by law:

- 1) suspension of all procedural terms, apart from urgent procedures, from 8.3.2020 to 15.4.2020 and deferral of all hearings after 15.4.2020 (law decree 11 March 2020 n.11 converted into law 8.5.2020, n. 31);
- 2) from 16.4.2020 to 30.6.2020, all disputes were decided without oral discussion and with the right of the parties to present brief "hearing notes" (law decree 17.3.2020 n. 18, converted into law 24.4.2020, n. 27);
- 3) from 1.6.2020 to 31.7.2020 the parties (lawyers) at request, were able to participate remotely to hearings through electronic communication tools (mainly the Teams Microsoft platform); without this specific request, decisions were taken on the basis of written statements (of lawyers) (law decree 30.4.2020 n. 28, converted into law 25.6.2020, n. 70);
- 4) from 1.8.2020 to 8.11.2020 the ordinary procedure was resumed, putting in place organisational measures to avoid the spread of the virus in the court rooms;

5) from 9.11.2020 the remote process has been resumed and, at the time of writing, it will last until 30.4.2021 (law decree 28.10.2020 n. 137 converted into law 18.12.2020 n. 176 and law decree 31.12.2020 n. 183 converted into law 26.2.2021, n. 21).

Independent authorities

Independence, 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

Accessibility and judicial review of administrative decisions

Transparency of administrative decisions and sanctions (incl. their publication and rules on collection of related data) and judicial review (incl. scope, suspensive effect)

3000 character(s) maximum

The administrative jurisdiction aims at ensuring the compliance of the Public administration with the principle of rule of law and at protecting individual rights as well as legitimate interests in their relationship with public powers.

An appeal against an administrative decision is examined by the judge, within the limits of the complainant's interest and within the arguments presented to the Court by the claimant. The judge cannot bring new arguments ex officio because the purpose of administrative justice is not to verify the administration's proper functioning in general, but to determine whether or not the alleged abuse of power violated the complainant's rights or interests.

The administrative judge can only quash the challenged decision if affected by breach of law, misuse or abuses of power, or lack of competence (art. 29 CAP) and cannot substitute the administration in its discretionary powers, except in specific cases, such as the proceeding on enforcement of judgements (so called "giudizio di ottemperanza").

All the judgments of administrative judges are published on a public and free online data base (www.giustizia-amministrativa.it)

Implementation by the public administration and State institutions of final court decisions

3000 character(s) maximum

If judgements are not spontaneously executed by administration, a specific procedure may be used to ensure that judges' decisions are enforced (articles 112- 115 CAP). This procedure is applied to public administrations or similar entities (for example public-law institutions) for various decisions, including those rendered by ordinary judges.

This procedure is particularly effective because the judge does not merely ask the administration to comply within a specific time; the judge may also declare null and void any acts in violation or circumvention of the judgment and appoint a Commissioner (Commissario ad acta), who acts in place of the administration and takes any measures required to enforce the decision. This is one of the rare cases where the administrative

judge has also substantive powers.

Unless this is manifestly unfair, and if there are no other reasons for impediment, the judge may also determine, at the request of one party, the amount of money payable by the defendant for each violation or subsequent non-compliance, or for any delay in the carrying out of the res judicata; that ruling is enforceable

The enabling framework for civil society

Measures regarding the framework for civil society organisations (e.g. access to funding, registration rules, measures capable of affecting the public perception of civil society organisations, etc.)

3000 character(s) maximum

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, etc.)

3000 character(s) maximum

Other – please specify

3000 character(s) maximum

Contact

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

