

**Question for written answer E-007510/2017
to the Commission**

Rule 130

Fabio Massimo Castaldo (EFDD), Laura Agea (EFDD), Dario Tamburrano (EFDD), Ignazio Corrao (EFDD), Eleonora Evi (EFDD), Marco Valli (EFDD), Laura Ferrara (EFDD), Isabella Adinolfi (EFDD), Rosa D'Amato (EFDD), Marco Zullo (EFDD) and Tiziana Beghin (EFDD)

Subject: Italian electoral law ('Rosatellum bis')

On 6 November 2012 the European Court of Human Rights ruled in the *Ekoglasnost v. Bulgaria* case that the Member State in question had violated Article 3 of Additional Protocol No 1 to the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms by failing to comply with the guidelines set out in Chapter 2 'Regulatory levels and stability of electoral law', Title II ('Conditions for Implementing these Principles'), of the Code of Good Practice in Electoral Matters drawn up by the Venice Commission. In particular, the Court established that Bulgaria had not complied with the one-year period suggested by the Venice Commission for the introduction of substantial changes to the electoral law.

Four months before the end of the parliamentary term, the Italian Parliament has approved Law 165/2017 'Changes to the system for the election of the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate of the Republic. Delegation to the government for the determination of single-member and multi-member constituencies' ('Rosatellum bis'), which radically changes the electoral system.

As the European Union is among the bodies entitled to request opinions from the Venice Commission, will the Commission say:

- by virtue of the founding principles and values of the EU set out in Article 2 TEU, including the rule of law, does it intend to request the Venice Commission to give an opinion on the Italian electoral reform?