

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

Ossigeno per l'Informazione

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://www.ossigeno.info/chi-siamo/?lang=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 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

Alberto

Surname

Spampinato

Email Address of the organisation

board@ossigeno.info

* 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

Tutti i problemi del settore dei media e del pluralismo elencati nel Rapporto 2025 hanno continuato a produrre effetti negativi sulla libertà di stampa e il pluralismo dell'informazione. Alcuni problemi si sono aggravati e sono emersi nuovi problemi. Essi hanno prodotto gravi violazioni del diritto di informazione, come è dimostrato dal monitoraggio di Ossigeno e da vari singoli episodi. Nel 2025 le azioni violente sono aumentate. In particolare sono diventate più numerose e frequenti le SLAPP, le minacce, le aggressioni contro i giornali e i giornalisti. Le SLAPP hanno dilagato, hanno costretto chi ne è stato colpito a considerevoli spese di difesa, spese che di solito non vengono rimborsate dopo la sentenza di proscioglimento. Di fronte a questa situazione, che mette in difficoltà soprattutto i freelance, i cronisti locali e i giornalisti che non hanno tutela legale da parte dell'editore, Ossigeno ha avviato la creazione di un Pronto soccorso legale gratuito per i soggetti che dimostrano di avere agito in buona fede e hanno rispettato le regole etiche del giornalismo.

GIORNALISTI MINACCIATI - Il monitoraggio attivo svolto dall'osservatorio Ossigeno per l'Informazione ha segnalato 677 giornalisti minacciati nel 2025 in Italia, il 31% più dell'anno precedente, quando i minacciati erano stati 516). Le intimidazioni attuate con l'uso della violenza hanno colpito l'83,7% dei 677 giornalisti minacciati (+13,4%). Le intimidazioni avvengono in tutta Italia. Le regioni con più giornalisti minacciati sono il Piemonte, la Lombardia, il Lazio e la Sicilia. Ossigeno, una ONG che opera dal 2008 con il sostegno dell'Ordine dei Giornalisti e il patrocinio della FNSI, dal 2006 a oggi ha documentato oltre ottomila minacce rivolte in Italia a giornali, blogger, difensori dei diritti umani, pubblicando sul sito web [ossigeno.info](https://www.ossigeno.info) i nomi dei minacciati e le circostanze in cui sono stati minacciati. vedi <https://www.ossigeno.info/ossigeno-677-giornalisti-minacciati-nel-2025-in-italia-31/>

Il monitoraggio segnala che soltanto un giornalista minacciato su sei denuncia formalmente le minacce alle autorità. La percentuale si ricava dal confronto con i dati del centro di osservazione del Ministero dell'interno, che tiene conto soltanto delle denunce formali alle forze dell'ordine, nel primo semestre del 2025 ha segnalato 81 giornalisti minacciati (vedi <https://www.odg.it/atti-intimidatori-ai-giornalisti-il-report-criminalpol-con-i-dati-del-primo-semester-2025/63146>). Nello stesso periodo Ossigeno ne ha documentato 361, fra l'altro segnalando un aumento del 78% rispetto al 2024 (vedi <https://odg.roma.it/giornalisti-minacciati-78-rispetto-al-2024-cresce-la-violenza-anche-politica/>).

VIOLENZE FISICHE - Si ricordano tre fra gli episodi più significativi:

- l'attentato dinamitardo a Roma al giornalista RAI Sigfrido Ranucci, che era già sotto protezione delle forze dell'ordine;
- l'irruzione nella redazione di Torino del quotidiano La Stampa, un episodio di intimidazione collettiva senza precedenti
- l'intimidazione a Giorgia Venturini, una cronista di Milano impegnata in inchieste sulla mafia, che ha trovato la testa mozzata di un capretto davanti all'ingresso della sua abitazione.

Gli episodi di Roma e di Torino hanno mostrato che, per questi giornalisti minacciati, la protezione delle forze dell'ordine è stata inadeguata, insufficiente.

SLAPP - Le azioni civili e penali pretestuose configurabili come SLAPP hanno continuato a colpire i giornalisti con grande frequenza. Il monitoraggio conferma il trend crescente (8% ogni anno) segnalato nel 2016 con i dati statistici forniti dal Ministero della GIUSTIZIA (gli ultimi pubblicati). Quei dati segnalavano seimila nuovi procedimenti ogni anno e il fatto che 9 volte su dieci essi si concludevano con il proscioglimento degli accusati, mostrando che le accuse erano infondate. Le 93 SLAPP del 2005 che Ossigeno ha documentato pubblicamente e in dettaglio confermano il preoccupante andamento del fenomeno già rilevato nel triennio precedente (vedi <https://www.ossigeno.info/dossier-ossigeno-le-slapp-in-italia-hanno-colpito-290-giornalisti-nel-2022-2024/>). Essi evidenziano la mancanza di misure idonee a prevenire e sanzionare questi abusi che, secondo le statistiche di Ossigeno, nel 2025 sono stati commessi nel 52% di casi da personaggi e istituzioni pubblici e per circa il 15% da imprenditori e aziende private. In Italia le SLAPP trans-frontaliere sono pochissime. La Direttiva 1069 avrà poca incidenza poiché si applicherà esclusivamente alle cause civili trans-frontaliere, come ha deciso il Parlamento e ha confermato il Governo (vedi <https://www.ossigeno.info/meloni-la-direttiva-anti-slapp-si-applica-solo-a-cause-trans-frontaliere/>).

SLAPP più significative: un'impresa ha chiesto 2 milioni € a due ambientalisti di Pesaro; un'impresa di Faenza ha chiesto 50mila € alla giornalista freelance Linda Maggiori; un imprenditore ha chiesto 200mila € a giornalista Carlo Ruocco di Sarzana

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

Promotion of judges and prosecutors (incl. judicial review)

5000 character(s) maximum

Allocation of cases in courts

5000 character(s) maximum

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

5000 character(s) maximum

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

5000 character(s) maximum

Independence/autonomy of the prosecution service

5000 character(s) maximum

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

5000 character(s) maximum

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

5000 character(s) maximum

B. Quality of justice

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

[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

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

Nessuna delle questioni sollecitate dalle Raccomandazioni ha avuto un avanzamento positivo. Il bilancio dell'anno precedente era stato pressoché uguale. In Italia il Rapporto 2025 sullo stato di diritto è stato conosciuto soltanto dagli esperti del settore mediatico, ma non dall'opinione pubblica. I media italiani lo hanno ignorato, così come il parlamento, il governo e le altre istituzioni pubbliche del settore che non ne hanno parlato, neppure per commentarlo. Non si conoscono loro iniziative per discutere pubblicamente le Raccomandazioni e rispondere alle sollecitazioni che esse rivolgono all'Italia.

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

I quattro commissari dell'Autorità per le garanzie nelle comunicazioni (AGCOM) sono eletti per metà dalla Camera dei deputati e per metà dal Senato della Repubblica mentre il presidente è proposto direttamente dal presidente del Consiglio d'intesa col ministro dello Sviluppo economico (come stabilito dalla legge Maccanico). Dopo tali scelte, le investiture definitive vengono conferite dal presidente della repubblica. Il collegio resta in carica per sette anni. A causa dei criteri di nomina dei membri dell'Autorità, una parte autorevole della dottrina qualificava l'Agcom come "semi-indipendente"[21]: infatti, una "autorità amministrativa indipendente" è tale se non è subordinata né gerarchicamente né politicamente ai Ministeri, in modo tale da non essere caratterizzata da conflitti di interesse di natura politica o economica. Fonte Wlippedia https://it.wikipedia.org/wiki/Autorità_per_le_garanzie_nelle_comunicazioni

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

5000 character(s) maximum

Queste organismi non sono presenti in Italia e non si prevede che siano istituiti. Non ci sono progetti né proposte per farlo. Dal 2012 i reclami dei cittadini per violazione dei doveri deontologici dei giornalisti sono giudicati dai Consigli di disciplina nazionale e territoriali, formati da giornalisti. I consigli possono applicare sanzioni che vanno dall'avvertimento, alla censura, alla sospensione e alla radiazione. vedi <https://www.odg.it/il-consiglio-di-disciplina-nazionale>. La pubblicità delle decisioni dei Consigli di Disciplina dei giornalisti è regolata dal principio di trasparenza bilanciato dalla tutela dei dati personali. Le decisioni che comportano sanzioni vengono generalmente pubblicate (spesso in forma anonimizzata o con l'indicazione del solo cognome), mentre le decisioni che non comportano sanzioni o richiami informali possono avere una pubblicità più discreta

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

Nel 2023 l'Italia era al quart'ultimo posto tra i Paesi Ue per quanto riguarda la trasparenza delle proprietà dei principali mezzi di informazione, secondo la classifica dell'Euromedia Ownership Monitor (EurOMo-27). Secondo questo studio, i fattori che influenzano negativamente la trasparenza dei media in Italia derivano soprattutto dalla struttura a scatole cinesi, con più società innestate in un grande macrogruppo, che caratterizza le realtà mediatiche del Paese. Una struttura che non permette di risalire in maniera lineare e chiara alle figure apicali. Negli anni successivi la situazione non è migliorata. Le speranze sono affidate al recepimento del EMFA, prevista nel 2026

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

Non ci sono norme che impongono la piena trasparenza della proprietà dei media. Si spera che siano introdotte quando sarà recepito l'EMFA. Il Governo si è impegnato a farlo entro il termine di scadenza, modificando alcune norme esistenti

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

Non esistono regole codificate per garantire la protezione e la sicurezza dei giornalisti che subiscono minacce e sono esposti a rischi personali a causa della loro attività di informazione. Chi ritiene di essere in pericolo deve rivolgersi alle forze dell'ordine che ne tengono conto come per qualsiasi cittadino. Molti giornalisti dichiarano apertamente che hanno rinunciato a denunciare minacce, intimidazioni e aggressioni alle forze dell'ordine, perché sono convinti che queste denunce non producono risultati utili. Il numero di quelli che non denunciano è aumentato negli ultimi anni. Tuttavia, in alcuni casi sono state le stesse forze dell'ordine a segnalare al giornalista situazioni di pericolo che risultano da indagini e informazioni di polizia e a offrire protezione. I casi in cui il rischio appare più grave e imminente sono valutati dai Comitati provinciali per l'ordine e la sicurezza pubblica, presieduti dal Prefetto. Questi organismi decidono se fornire al giornalista in pericolo una scorta armata o altre misure di tutela che impegnano meno risorse delle forze dell'ordine. Nel 2025 i giornalisti sotto scorta armata sono stati 30. Non sono state fornite informazioni sul numero di quelli protetti con servizi di tutela. Negli anni scorsi i servizi di scorta armata si sono rivelati affidabili e efficaci.

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

5000 character(s) maximum

In genere le forze dell'ordine rispettano il lavoro dei giornalisti durante le manifestazioni di protesta. Lo fanno seguendo regole informali che non sono codificate e che in alcuni casi si sono rivelate incapaci di prevenire incidenti. Le sollecitazioni di Ossigeno per approvare un codice di condotta condiviso da giornalisti e forze di polizia non sono state accolte, neppure dopo il grave incidente di Genova in cui nel 2019 il giornalista Stefano Origone durante una manifestazione di protesta è stato picchiato dagli agenti impegnati a garantire l'ordine pubblico. I processi penali per punire gli agenti responsabili non hanno avuto un iter lineare. Una prima sentenza ha condannato i responsabili a pene molto lievi, non adeguate per le lesioni personali causate. Dopo che la Corte di Cassazione ha annullato la sentenza, nel 2025 si è tenuto un nuovo processo e quattro agenti di polizia sono stati condannati a un anno di reclusione vedi <https://www.ossigeno.info/cassazione-definitiva-la-condanna-per-gli-agenti-che-picchiarono-stefano-origone/>

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

Le procedure di accesso ai documenti pubblici funzionano ma a volte richiedono tempi lunghi e alti costi

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

In Italia non ci sono misure di salvaguardia efficaci per proteggere i giornalisti dall'abuso che si fa delle SLAPP e di altre azioni civili e penali (querele) promosse con accuse di diffamazione a mezzo stampa, che sono quasi sempre infondate o false e tuttavia hanno un effetto punitivo. Il codice penale prevede che per ogni denuncia di reato si debba svolgere un processo (obbligo di esercitare l'azione penale). Non esistono procedure per scartare preliminarmente le denunce palesemente strumentali (early dismissal). Il giudice può archiviare una querela soltanto svolgendo il processo. Lo stesso avviene per le cause civili. Questo obbligo di avviare il procedimento rende le SLAPP uno strumento molto utile, efficace e di uso frequente per chi vuole ostacolare i giornali e i giornalisti che pubblicano notizie non gradite: uno strumento utile a intimidire anche con accuse false o pretestuose, efficace per punire anche chi alla fine del processo viene proscioltto. Infatti le spese che il giornalista sostiene per difendersi nel processo restano quasi sempre a suo carico, anche se viene proscioltto. Questo regime ingiusto mette in particolare difficoltà i freelance e i giornalisti dei piccoli giornali e alimenta l'auto censura. Nel codice alcune norme permettono di punire chi abusa del processo e chi formula accuse false. Queste norme sono applicate raramente. Il disegno di legge S.466 si propone di affrontare sul piano legislativo il problema dell'abuso delle denunce di diffamazione a mezzo stampa, della protezione del segreto professionale dei giornalisti e delle loro fonti. Questo progetto di legge propone misure sostenute dalla maggioranza di governo e ritenute insufficienti e sbagliate da Ossigeno e da un ampio schieramento politico. Nel 2025 questo progetto di legge non ha proseguito il suo iter parlamentare. La sua trattazione si era fermata già alla fine del 2024 su richiesta del Governo del governo (vedi <https://www.ossigeno.info/querele-il-ddl->

diffamazione-in-marcia-verso-il-binario-morto/). A dicembre 2025 un dibattito parlamentare ha confermato che su queste questioni, anche dopo i recenti gravi episodi di intimidazioni e minacce rivolte a giornali e giornalisti, il Governo manterrà la linea minimalista degli anni scorsi, una linea che non ha prodotto alcuna contromisura concreta (vedi <https://www.ossigeno.info/diffamazione-anti-slapp-emfa-nessuna-misura-a-effetto-immediato-in-vista/>)

Any other developments related to media pluralism and freedom - please specify

5000 character(s) maximum

INTERCETTAZIONI - Vari episodi hanno mostrato che nel 2025 si è esteso l'abuso delle intercettazioni sui telefoni e i computer dei giornalisti e difensori dei diritti, alcuni effettuati senza autorizzazione della magistratura giudicante. I casi più gravi hanno riguardato i giornalisti Francesco Cancellato e Ciro Pellegrino, entrambi del giornale online Fanpage, e alcuni attivisti delle Ong impegnati nel soccorso in mare degli immigrati. Le intercettazioni sono state effettuate impiegando lo spyware Paragon, rilasciato dalla società israeliana Graphite solo ad autorità di governo con il vincolo di impiegarlo solo per motivi di sicurezza nazionale e mai nei confronti dei giornalisti. Il Governo ha negato di aver disposto queste intercettazioni e ha respinto ogni ogni responsabilità in proposito. Tuttavia non ha spiegato che cosa è effettivamente accaduto. Il senatore dell'opposizione Matteo Renzi, ex premier, ha accusato il governo di spiare i giornalisti con le "intercettazioni preventive" che dovrebbero essere impiegate solo per questioni di sicurezza nazionale, in base alla legge, e ha spiegato che cosa, a suo avviso, avviene nella realtà: richiesta del presidente del consiglio o dell'autorità da lui delegata, con l'autorizzazione di un giudice, vengono disposte intercettazioni preventive per esigenze di sicurezza nazionale. Nel 2025 sono stati intercettati gli attivisti politici che si occupano di immigrazione, un sacerdote e, la cosa più grave da un punto di vista istituzionale, il direttore di un giornale che ha indagato sui giovani di Fratelli d'Italia (Matteo Renzi il 23 marzo 2025 a La7).

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