

2026 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, six editions of the Rule of Law Report have been published since 2020.

As every year, the Commission would like to invite the stakeholders to provide contributions to the 2026 Rule of Law Report. On the basis of these contributions and on-going developments, further targeted questions may be shared at a later stage of preparation of the 2026 Rule of Law Report, in particular in the context of country visits, or bilateral contacts.

The Commission invites stakeholders to provide contributions which include:

(1) developments and measures taken in relation to the recommendations in the 2025 report,
(2) developments related to topics covered in the 2025 country chapters, as well as any other new developments related to the rule of law.

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.

This questionnaire also integrates the separate questionnaire on the single market from last year. In addition to these specific questions, respondents to the questionnaire are invited to consider the Single Market dimension, including any relevant cross-border issues, in all their answers.

Where questions of particular relevance under the single market dimension, this is indicated before the relevant question.

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

Type of information to be included:

Under each of the four pillars, the replies should include references to the following types of information:

A) Legislative developments

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

B) Policy developments

- Implementation and enforcement 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, Prosecutor General, heads of independent authorities included in the scope of the request for input[2])

D) 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.

Where relevant, please also indicate whether the developments reported are linked to the implementation of reforms and investments under the national Recovery Resilience Plan. To simplify your answers to the questionnaire, if there are no developments, it is sufficient to indicate this and the information covered in the contributions for the previous Rule of Law Reports does not need 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.

* 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

MEDEL(Magistrats Européens pour la Démocratie et les Libertés)

Main Areas of Work

- ☒ Justice System
- ☐ Anti-corruption
- ☐ Media Pluralism and Freedom
- ☐ Checks and Balances
- ☐ Other

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

500 character(s) maximum

<https://medelnet.eu;>
<https://www.facebook.com/medel.europe.3;>
<https://x.com/MedelEurope;>
[@medeleurope.bsky.social](#)

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

981119221130-18

* Country of origin

Please indicate the country of origin of your organisation

- ☐ 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
- ☐ Other - please specify

First name

Mariarosaria

Surname

Guglielmi

Email Address of the organisation

office@medelnet.eu

*** 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 as we will not be able to guarantee anonymisation of these elements.**
- ☒ 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 2026 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 for contribution.docx](#)

Please provide any relevant information on horizontal developments here

5000 character(s) maximum

Most of the alerts contained in the 2025 contribution are still completely valid and furthermore aggravated by the latest developments relating to the global wave of autocratization and global attacks on Rule of law values. Developments threatening judicial independence are part of a broader context, that is calling into question the very principle of the separation of powers and the system of checks and balances (see ENCJ statement of June 4, 2025 https://pgwrk-websitemedia.s3.eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/production/pwk-web-encj2017-p/Declaration%20of%20Riga%20_final.pdf), and include: -an increasing intolerance towards the judiciary for its role as impartial guarantor of fundamental rights and for its power to review the legality of the actions of the executive; this trend is particularly evident in certain national contexts where the main targets of such intolerance are judges dealing with migration cases, following their decisions which, although referring to supranational sources to protect individuals, are considered arbitrary as they are not in line with restrictive national policies and national interests; -political criticism of judicial decisions and populist rhetoric, questioning the democratic legitimacy of the judiciary and the impartiality of judges and prosecutors by accusing them to play a political role; -attacks and delegitimization affecting as well the role that national judges play as European judges, in reaffirming the primacy of EU law and supranational sources; part of the same trend is the non-compliance with CJEU judgments and the persistent non-compliance or incomplete implementation of ECtHR judgments; - the failure to implement decisions contrary to the government's position, the lack of adequate consultation with the judiciary on relevant draft legislation, and the implementation of reforms without the consent of the judiciary (see ENCJ stat.); - informal court-curbing policies and structural and constitutional reforms aimed at weakening judicial systems and their key institutions, such as High Councils and Prosecution services, supported by aggressive media campaigns, led also by high profile politicians, producing a distorting mirror image of the judiciary;- on the grounds that it compromises the impartiality and political neutrality of the judiciary, the attempt to limit the freedom of speech and association of judges, prosecutors and their associations; - smear campaigns, profiling and doxing attacks against individual magistrates. MEDEL reiterated its interventions in support of the judiciary and judicial associations in different contexts: denouncing the risk of a dangerous delegitimization of the judiciary and the prejudice to the trust of the citizens in its impartiality and fairness and in its effective role of impartial guarantor of fundamental rights (<https://medelnet.eu/medel-statement-on-romania/>; <https://medelnet.eu/statement-on-the-recent-attacks-on-the-french-judiciary/>); the necessity to adequately address systemic deficiencies that jeopardize the independence of the judiciary (<https://medelnet.eu/medel-statement-on-moldova/>); the serious risks to the Rule of law posed by a radical revision of the constitutional framework and the guarantees it provides for key institutions such as the public prosecutor and the Superior Council for the Judiciary; (<https://medelnet.eu/solidarity-with-all-italian-magistrates-and-the-associazione-nazionale-magistrati/>;<https://medelnet.eu/statement-on-constitutional-reform-of-the-judiciary-in-italy/>) ; the risks related to the globalisation of attacks on democracy, international law, international humanitarian law, supranational judicial institutions - such as the International Criminal Court - against the backdrop of mass human rights violation (<https://medelnet.eu/eu-should-defend-the-icc/> ; https://medelnet.eu/medel-stands-in-support-of-the-international-criminal-court-and-in-solidarity-with-its-officials/#_ftn1; <https://medelnet.eu/medel-stands-in-support-of-the-international-criminal-court-and-in-solidarity-with-its-officials/>) Medel focused on pressure against the judiciary organizing conferences on these topics, involving academics and judicial associations: <https://medelnet.eu/international-conference-berlin-28-february-2025/> ; <https://medelnet.eu/international-conference-next-ca-of-medel-athens-november-21st-22nd-2025/>; <https://medelnet.eu/the-backsliding-of-the-rule-of-law-and-the-pressure-exerted-on-the-judiciary-in-europe-the-role-of-the-european-union-international-conference-athens-21-november-2025/>; <https://medelnet.eu/judges-in-the-crisis-of-democracies-florence-29-11-2025/>

Questions for contribution

Under each pillar, you are invited to provide information on measures taken to implement the recommendations addressed to the Member State in the 2025 Rule of Law report, as well as developments with regard to the points raised in the respective country chapter of the 2025 Rule of Law Report and any other significant developments since January 2025 and up to the date of submission[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.

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/enlargement country covered in contribution [only one choice possible]

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

- ☐ Albania
- ☐ Austria
- ☐ Belgium
- ☐ Bulgaria
- ☐ Croatia
- ☐ Cyprus
- ☐ Czechia
- ☐ Denmark
- ☐ Estonia
- ☐ Finland
- ☐ France
- ☐ Germany
- ☐ Greece
- ☒ Hungary
- ☐ Ireland

- ☐ Italy
- ☐ Latvia
- ☐ Lithuania
- ☐ Luxembourg
- ☐ Malta
- ☐ Montenegro
- ☐ Netherlands
- ☐ North Macedonia
- ☐ Poland
- ☐ Portugal
- ☐ Romania
- ☐ Serbia
- ☐ Slovakia
- ☐ Slovenia
- ☐ Spain
- ☐ Sweden

I. Justice System

Please provide information on measures taken to follow-up on the recommendations received in the 2025 Report regarding the justice system (if applicable)

5000 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)

5000 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)

5000 character(s) maximum

The retirement regime slightly modified, and the retirement age is increased to 70 years. The final version of the law doesn't contain the originally proposed conditionality measures.

Promotion of judges and prosecutors (incl. judicial review)

5000 character(s) maximum

Allocation of cases in courts

5000 character(s) maximum

There has been no improvement regarding the automatic and absolute transparent case allocation at lower courts. The system allows the leader on the department to influence case allocation. Although it is an expectation that the regulation of the case allocation system should be published, the system is too complicated with many factors therefore citizens cannot follow how cases are actually allocated. Moreover, there are many possibilities to make exemptions, and this makes the whole system unaccountable.

According to the Organisation and Administration of Courts Act concerning the case allocation of the Supreme Court (Kúria) there is a difference between the panels of the Supreme Court (art.10): there are 'assigned' panels (6 members) and within that there are the 'adjudicating' panels (5 members from the 6 members), who will participate on the hearing. This system strengthens the possibility to violate the automatic case allocation system.

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

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

a) The amendment to the Code of Civil Procedure, which entered into force on August 19, 2025, automatically makes it mandatory for courts to award damages to the parties in civil proceedings ex officio if the statutory deadline for action is exceeded, without any possibility of exemption. Compliance with statutory deadlines is clearly one of the most important factors in any proceeding and should never be a matter of debate. However, the newly introduced provision not only places a financial burden on the already struggling court system but may also affect the independence and impartiality of the judiciary.

The payment of financial compensation is automatic, its legality cannot be disputed in any way during the proceedings, the reason for the omission cannot be presented, and there is no room for legal remedy. In practice, this means that judges hearing civil cases may fear administrative consequences, as the financial compensation places pressure on the administrative head due to the impossibility of financing the courts, which in turn may affect the impartiality and independence of decision-making. The prospect of consequences may lead to a loss of impartiality and call into question the professionalism of judges who prioritize quick decision-making to meet deadlines. The contested section of the law therefore jeopardizes the status of judicial independence, and the legislation affects not only judicial independence but also the principles of legal certainty and the right to legal remedy and is also discriminatory.

The amendment will enter into for concerning Administrative Courts from June 1, 2026.

b) According to one of the latest amendments, from January 1 in the Code of Criminal Procedure and the Code of Civil Procedure 'online publicity' makes part of the general concept of the publicity of hearings. This means that it becomes a general rule. But not through the journalist or media representatives but through an audio-visual camera system gestured by the National Judicial Office. The first 100 citizens are going to be allowed to participate online, after a registration through their digital citizen profile, providing full name, date and place of birth, mother's name, address, and a photo of the physical person who wishes to attend. And the court will have the data – concerns data protection issues.

This amendment – even if there are some exceptions – deprives the judge of the power to determine the extent of the hearing publicity and to ensure a fair trial and to protect private life rights.

The text here differs media representatives from ordinary audience because media representatives and journalists in their official capacity practically can't use for their work the possibility of the online publicity. There are no specific instructions regarding journalists, they are still allowed to take pictures or broadcast the hearings with the permission of the parties, after the authorization of the presiding judge.

c) Doxing judges

Hungarian judges are facing a completely new phenomenon: judges are being listed based on their perceived political affiliations, after their names appeared in a leaked database of supposed users of an online platform linked to a political party. None of these judges have ever publicly expressed political views or engaged in political activity. On November 2, 2025, news broke that a database of nearly 200,000 people registered with

an app linked to Tisza, the strongest Hungarian opposition party, had been leaked and published on the internet. The app was developed for participation in the opposition party's primaries, as well as for obtaining information about the party's events and getting involved in them. The pro-government press quickly began to pick out political analysts, journalists, and artists from the list, publishing their names and the fact that their addresses and phone numbers were included in the leaked list. Since several of these individuals stated that they had not downloaded or used the app, the authenticity of the leaked list was called into question. An interactive Google Maps-based database appeared, allowing anyone to search for the home address of individual users whose data had leaked from the app.

Judges appear to be a key target of this doxing attack. An anonymous blog spreading government narratives named three judges who appear on the list and questioned their independence on this basis. Soon, government-aligned media outlets also reported that judges were included on the list, although not all listed their names. The political columnist mentioned earlier, who is also a Fidesz-founder, called for these judges to be dismissed. The anonymous blog also reported that an unnamed judge of the Kúria (the Supreme Court of Hungary) may also be on the list. Considering that the private addresses of the judges mentioned are possibly searchable on an interactive map, this also poses a rather alarming security risk.

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 in the introduction)

[single market relevance] Accessibility of courts (e.g. court/legal fees, legal aid, language)

5000 character(s) maximum

Resources of the judiciary (human/financial/material), remuneration/bonuses/rewards for judges and prosecutors, including observed changes (significant and targeted increase or decrease over the past year)

(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

There has been an increase of 15% of the judicial salaries but the monthly net amount is still very low. The courts are still lack of court staff because of the low salary, especially in the central region, where the workload of the judges and court staff is the highest.

The legislation on the salaries of judges and court staff is incompatible with the principle of judicial independence for the following reasons:

- It does not ensure that Hungarian judges and judicial employees receive a remuneration that corresponds to the significance of the judicial profession.
- There is no such a correction mechanism that guarantees the conservation of the real value of the remuneration of judges and judicial staff.

- It does not ensure the separation of the judicial branch from the other two branches of power, because it makes the determination of the remuneration entirely dependent on the political will of the executive and the legislature.
- It is contrary to the requirement of the balance of powers, given that it provides a significantly lower remuneration for judges than for the members of both the executive and the legislature.

[single market relevance] Training of justice professionals (including judges, prosecutors, lawyers, court staff, clerks/trainees)

5000 character(s) maximum

Digitalisation (e.g. use of digital technology, including electronic communication and AI 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, including AI-based 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 specialisation, in particular specific courts or chambers within courts to deal with fraud and corruption cases.

5000 character(s) maximum

[single market relevance] Specialisation (of judges/specific courts/chambers within courts) and training for the judiciary to deal with commercial cases, as well as alternative dispute resolution mechanisms and mediation as regards commercial 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 in the introduction)

[single market relevance] Developments related to efforts to improve the efficiency of the justice system (e.g. as regards length of proceedings, to address backlogs)

5000 character(s) maximum

Any other developments related to the justice system - please specify

5000 character(s) maximum

-Political criticism of judicial decisions, questioning the impartiality and authority of judges and denial of the execution of the sentences on a political basis.

A recent decisions concerning privacy rights were strongly criticised by the government when the court banned the dissemination of the governing party's campaign publication. Some members of the government and the pro-government media questions the impartiality and directly the authority of the judge on the base of the above-mentioned leaked database and denies the execution of the judicial decision.

-The supreme judicial body in Hungary (Kúria), entrusted with ensuring the uniformity of national jurisprudence seeks to intervene in the answer phase of the preliminary reference procedure. Its apparent aim is to shape the referring court's interpretation and application of the CJEU's ruling. These dynamics may foreshadow the emergence of an institutional conflict, one that centres on the manner in which the Hungarian judiciary internalizes and operationalizes the jurisprudence of the CJEU. At stake is not merely a technical matter of judicial interpretation, but rather the Simmenthal doctrine and the fulfillment of the principle of sincere cooperation enshrined in Article 4(3) TEU. The main task of the Kúria is to guarantee the uniform application of the law, a duty it fulfils through the uniformity complaint panel ("UCP"). From 1 January 2026, a new law will further strengthen the UCP's role in enforcing the uniformity of case law in civil cases.

According to recent decisions of the UCP, if any new requirements arising from a CJEU judgement may lead to setting aside a prior Precedent, the Kúria's own chambers are required to request the ruling of the UCP. And the UCP in its ruling interprets the CJEU's decision.

The problem is already known to the EU Commission (Rule of law report 2024, and Rule of law report 2025) and must also be evident to the CJEU, given its judgment in Global Ink Kft. and following preliminary references from Hungarian courts in Gyula (April 2025) and Szeged (May 2025), both of which question the UCP's right to interpret the CJEU judgements for the Hungarian courts.

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 2025 Report regarding the anti-corruption framework (if applicable):

5000 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/specialised resources as relevant), including the cooperation among domestic and with foreign authorities. Indicate any relevant measures taken to effectively and timely cooperate with OLAF and EPPO

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 in particular as regards high-level officials (including as regards incompatibility rules, revolving doors, codes of conduct, ethics)

5000 character(s) maximum

Measures to enhance general transparency of public decision-making (including rules on lobbying, asset and interest disclosure rules, gifts policy, transparency of political party, financing)

5000 character(s) maximum

Measures to prevent 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

--> For the three previous points, **please also provide information and figures on their application/enforcement if available to you**, such as number of detected breaches/irregularities of the various rules in place and the follow-up given (investigations, sanctions, etc.)

Measures to ensure whistleblower protection and encourage reporting of corruption, including their application (i.e. number of reports received, and the follow-up given)

5000 character(s) maximum

[single market relevance] Specific measures to enhance transparency, integrity and accountability in sectors with high risks of corruption, with a view to monitor and prevent corruption and conflict of interests, and where applicable measures to prevent and address corruption committed by organised crime groups.

- *Such high-risk sectors could include: public procurement, including construction, transport/infrastructure, defence, cohesion, agriculture, environment, healthcare, investor residence schemes, large-scale investments of national interest and the spending of EU funds, urban planning.*
- *In particular, measures to mitigate high risks of corruption in the area of public procurement, such as enhancing transparency and oversight (for example through digital technologies) and promoting fair competition and accountability in public procurement (e.g. targeted actions to address the high share of single bids) and measures to guarantee the effective and independent functioning of the public procurement review bodies.*

5000 character(s) maximum

[single market relevance] Measures for the prevention of corruption in relation to the issuing of official permits (e.g. related to environment, energy, service provision and various types of construction)

5000 character(s) maximum

C. Repression

The legal framework on the criminalisation and sanctions for corruption and related offences, including foreign bribery

5000 character(s) maximum

Official data on the number of investigations, prosecutions, final judgments and the application of sanctions for corruption offences (differentiated by offence if possible). Please indicate whether the cases: involve legal persons; are related to the implementation of EU or national funds; involve high level corruption. Please indicate which data is publicly available and how policy-making is informed by the data

5000 character(s) maximum

Potential obstacles identified in law or in practice to the investigation and prosecution 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 criminal and non-criminal measures and of sanctions (e.g. recovery measures and administrative sanctions) on both public and private offenders

5000 character(s) maximum

Any other developments related to the anti-corruption framework - 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 2025 Report regarding media pluralism and media freedom (if applicable)

5000 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

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

[single market relevance] Measures taken to ensure the fair and transparent allocation of state advertising

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 financial and operational independence (e.g. related to reporting obligations and the allocation of resources) and safeguards for plurality of information and opinions
- **[single market relevance]** 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

[single market relevance] Transparency of media ownership and public availability of media ownership information, including on direct, indirect and beneficial owners

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

Any other developments related to media pluralism and freedom - 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 2025 Report regarding the system of checks and balances (if applicable)

5000 character(s) maximum

A. The process for preparing, enacting and implementing laws

[single market relevance] Framework, policy and use of impact assessments and evidence based policy-making, stakeholders'*/public consultations (including rules and practices on the transparent participation of civil society to policy development

and decision-making processes), and transparency and quality of the legislative process in the preparatory, the parliamentary and implementation phase (including guidance on how to implement legislation)

** This includes also the consultation of social partners*

5000 character(s) maximum

[single market relevance] 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

[single market relevance] Safeguards to ensure legal certainty, the stability of the legal framework and non-discrimination.

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 (including effective access to relevant data) 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 to recommendations by National Human Rights Institutions, ombudsman institutions, equality bodies and supreme audit institutions in the past year

5000 character(s) maximum

[single market relevance] Safeguards to ensure the effective independence of supervisory and regulatory authorities with a direct impact on economic operators such as national economic oversight, enforcement and competition authorities

C. Accessibility and judicial review of administrative decisions

[single market relevance] Transparency of administrative decisions and sanctions (incl. their publication and rules on collection of related data) and respect of the good administration principle (including the obligation of the administration to give reasons for decisions)

5000 character(s) maximum

[single market relevance] 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

[single market relevance] Safeguards (other than judicial review) regarding decisions or inaction of administrative authorities, including remedies (e.g. administrative review)

5000 character(s) maximum

[single market relevance] 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

[single market relevance] Implementation of final judgments by the public administration and State institutions and follow-up given to supranational judgments, including decisions from the European Court of Human Rights, as well as available remedies in case of non-implementation

5000 character(s) maximum

Oversight, including by courts, of the use of intrusive surveillance software by national authorities

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, transparency 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 to protect them 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, as well as available remedies

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

E. Initiatives to foster a rule of law culture

If there have been developments related to initiatives to foster a rule of law culture, please specify, which (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

Any other developments related to the system of checks and balances - please specify

5000 character(s) maximum

Cross-pillar elements: cross-border rule of law issues related to the Single Market

If there are any significant challenges concerning the Single Market you have been facing in a cross-border context relating to any of the four pillars of the report, including for example issues with market access and the conditions for economic activities, that you would like to highlight, please do so here.

Given the cross-cutting nature of this question, it is included as a separate section in the questionnaire. Information collected under this question will however be integrated under the relevant existing pillar(s) of the Report.

5000 character(s) maximum

Supporting document upload

If you would like to submit any supporting document(s) to your contribution, please upload your file(s) here

Contact

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