

Pillar I

Question 7: First, data on the use of amicable settlements and the alleged increased use of GAS/SAC fines. Second, how the increased use of GAS/SAC fines could have an impact on access to justice (see the report of the Federal Institute for Human Rights referenced in footnote 1 of the document with questions). We understood that the Ministry for Home Affairs needs to be asked about this.

Question 8: measures taken to improve efficiency of justice. First, reference was made to a working group of academic experts. If available, we are interested in any official communication/publication on this group that could possibly be used for the report. Second, similarly we are interested in the 3-phase plan of the College of Courts and Tribunals. à Ministry of Justice.

Question 9: to be answered in writing (digitalization) à Ministry of Justice

Question 10: the date on execution of judgments, in particular the number of convictions of Fedasil and the statistic on the ECHR judgments to be implemented (we understood 7) compared to the total number of judgments 'against' Belgium (we understood 2286). What is the reference period for this total number of 2286 judgments?

Question 11: To be answered by the parliament (concerns "Parlementair Comité belast met de wetsevaluatie").

Since the 54th parliamentary term of the House of Representatives (2014–2019) and the Sixth State Reform, which significantly limited the Senate's legislative powers, debates have taken place in both the House and the Senate regarding the bicameral structure of the Parliamentary Committee responsible for legislative evaluation. It has been proposed to adapt the Committee to this new reality in terms of legislative powers and to transform it into a body that falls exclusively under the House. I refer you to the following texts:

- *54th parliamentary term (2014–2019):*
 - *Bill No. 54-1537, which aims, according to amendment No. 2, to repeal the Law of 25 April 2007 establishing the Committee;*
 - *Proposal No. 54-3130 to amend the Rules of the House, which aims to establish within the House a new parliamentary committee responsible for legislative evaluation;*
- *55th parliamentary term (2019–2024):*
 - *Bill No. 7-130, introduced in the Senate.*

These debates have resulted in the Parliamentary Committee responsible for legislative evaluation not having met since the 2014 federal elections. The services of the House are therefore unable to answer the European Commission's questions. This is all the more the case because the federal government agreement provides for the abolition of the Senate (see p. 10). The services of the House currently have no insight into the policy directions that will be followed regarding legislative evaluation in light of the proposed abolition of the Senate. However, we emphasize already that proper legislative evaluation in any case requires sufficient capacity.

Despite the above, it should be clear that legislative evaluation does not depend solely on the Committee:

- *The Legal Service reports weekly to the Conference of Presidents on new judgments of the Constitutional Court requiring action by the federal legislator;*

- *The annual analysis requested by the Law of 25/04/2007 from the Prosecutor-General at the Court of Cassation continues to exist; the House Committee on Justice hears the Prosecutor-General on this matter (example: DOC 56-0978 – 09/07/2025);*
- *Citizens can still submit their petitions directly to the House, without being bound by the restrictive condition imposed by the Law of 25/04/2007 that difficulties in the application of legislation may only concern laws that have been in force for at least three years;*
- *Legislative evaluation also – and especially – takes place at government level; the government is in fact the main source of legislative initiatives in the House;*
- *Finally, each Member of Parliament and each House committee is free to organise any form of evaluation, relying on the traditional instruments provided by the Rules of the House (Art. 28, Art. 32, resolutions, questions, etc.); in doing so, they will not be limited by the “consensus” decision-making mechanism required by the Law of 25/04/2007 for the Committee, which in fact restricted the Committee’s scope of action.*

Question 12: Any public documentation available on the next step of the Loi proposed by Minister Quentin in relation to a prohibition of extremist or radical organisations

“First and foremost, it is necessary to formally contest any notion of a “so-called loi Quentin”.

Notwithstanding this flawed connotation, it was indeed the Minister of Security and Interior Quintin (not Quentin) that has brought this draft legislation to the Belgian council of ministers, which approved the text in consensus.

The draft is currently, after an extensive consultation of advice bodies, being redrafted. The intention of the legislation is to provide a framework that would allow the Belgian government with a tool to mitigate serious and ongoing threats against national security, making it possible to impose a ban on certain organizations and their activities. The advice of the “Conseil d’Etat” will serve as guidelines to create a modified draft, in accordance with the Belgian constitution and the International treaties that bind us.

The Belgian government would like to note that similar legislation exists in multiple EU member”

Question 13: Senate:

The impact on the appointment of magistrates would be limited. The current role of the Senate – for example in the appointment of members of the High Council of Justice (Hoge Raad voor de Justitie) and in the appointment of judges to the Constitutional Court – would, following its abolition, be taken over by the Chamber of Representatives.

As regards the judiciary’s budget, no impact is envisaged.

Pillar II + FOD BOSA

Answers Prime Minister:

Question 2: As regards the state of play, reference can be made to GRECO’s most recent report of November 2025. In the current practice, contacts between persons exercising top executive functions and third parties, including representatives of interest groups, are governed by

ethical rules and parliamentary oversight mechanisms, which offer guarantees of integrity and accountability. Members of government may, where appropriate, report on their contacts with third parties in the course of their parliamentary duties. This transparency is also underpinned by existing codes of conduct, which contain guidelines on the professional conduct of ministers and members of private office. The government is continuing to assess whether the existing framework needs to be strengthened or supplemented, having regard to international developments and relevant recommendations. At this stage, there is no political consensus on additional legislative measures, including draft initiatives prepared under the previous government.

Question 3: A coordination meeting with the competent policy units is scheduled in order to assess whether further progress can be achieved in light of GRECO's most recent report.

Question 4: PM: The Federal Deontological Commission organises annual information sessions for Members of the Chamber of Representatives. As regards integrity training for (other) high-level officials, we refer to FOD BOSA.

Pillar III

Question 2 on access to documents (Act of 11 April 1994)

Ministry of Interior: In the course of 2025, there were no amendments to the Law of 11 April 1994 on the publicity of the administration. In addition, the royal decree that is required to bring into force the new Article 3/3 (introduced by Article 7 of the Law of 12 May 2024 amending the Law of 11 April 1994 on the publicity of the administration and repealing the Law of 12 November 1997 on the publicity of the administration in the provinces and municipalities, Belgian Official Gazette 06/06/2024) has not yet been adopted.

This new Article 3/3 concerns, in the context of a future right, the obligations of proactive transparency for administrative authorities. It specifies in what form federal administrative authorities will make information available to citizens. Depending on the type of information, or on what the administrative authority has at its disposal, the publication of the information will consist either of making the document or information directly available for reading, printing or reuse, or of providing a link to a website allowing the reading, printing or reuse of the document or information. The objective therefore remains, of course, that the information be accessible to citizens, even if through a reference to a website, and that the type of access be adapted to the type of information.

Media regulators

Question 2 - Reference to the pending case at the constitutional court on the Flemish content obligation:

Het Grondwettelijk Hof heeft een bericht over de drie samengevoegde zaken gepubliceerd in het Belgisch Staatsblad op 30 oktober 2024: zie

https://www.ejustice.just.fgov.be/cgi/article.pl?language=nl&sum_date=2024-10-30&lg_txt=n&numac_search=2024009836

“Bericht voorgeschreven bij artikel 74 van de bijzondere wet van 6 januari 1989

Bij drie verzoekschriften die aan het Hof zijn toegezonden bij op 27 en 30 september 2024 ter post aangetekende brieven en ter griffie zijn ingekomen op 30 september en 1 oktober 2024, zijn beroepen tot gehele of gedeeltelijke vernietiging van het decreet van de Vlaamse Gemeenschap van 1 maart 2024 « tot wijziging van het decreet van 27 maart 2009 betreffende radio-omroep en televisie, wat betreft het stimuleren van de audiovisuele sector door financiële bijdragen aan de productie van audiovisuele werken » (bekendgemaakt in het Belgisch Staatsblad van 29 maart 2024) ingesteld respectievelijk door de vennootschap naar lers recht « Google Ireland Limited », door de vennootschap naar lers recht « Meta Platforms Ireland Limited » en door de vennootschap naar lers recht « TikTok Technology Limited ».

Die zaken, ingeschreven onder de nummers 8331, 8332 en 8334 van de rol van het Hof, werden samengevoegd.”

Op de website van het Grondwettelijk Hof is er ook een informatiepagina over hangende zaken, met mogelijkheid om op de hoogte gehouden te worden: zie rolnummers 8331, 8332 en 8334: <https://nl.const-court.be/judgments/pending-cases>

Ter info: omwille van de exacte formulering geven we u hierbij een antwoord in het Nederlands, maar de website van het Belgisch Staatsblad en het Grondwettelijk Hof zijn ook in andere talen raadpleegbaar.