



2021/2025(INI)

26.4.2021

AMENDMENTS

1 - 311

Draft report
Domènec Ruiz Devesa
(PE689.878v01-00)

The Commission's 2020 Rule of law report
(2021/2025(INI))

Amendment 1
Tineke Strik

Motion for a resolution
Citation 7

Motion for a resolution

— having regard to the Copenhagen criteria and the body of Union rules that a candidate country must fulfil if it wishes to join the Union (the *acquis*),

Amendment

— having regard to **Article 49 TEU**, the Copenhagen criteria and the body of Union rules that a candidate country must fulfil if it wishes to join the Union (the *acquis*),

Or. en

Amendment 2
Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba, Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution
Citation 9

Motion for a resolution

— **having regard to Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2020/2092 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 2020 on a general regime of conditionality for the protection of the Union budget¹,**

deleted

Amendment

¹ *OJ L 433 I, 22.12.2020, p. 1.*

Or. en

Amendment 3
Loránt Vincze, François Alfonsi, Andrea Bocskor, Herbert Dorfmann, Łukasz Kohut, Valdemar Tomaševski, Yana Toom, István Ujhelyi, Iuliu Winkler, Tatjana Ždanoka, Antoni Comín i Oliveres, Clara Ponsatí Obiols, Carles Puigdemont i Casamajó

Motion for a resolution
Citation 15

Motion for a resolution

— having regard to the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, the European Social Charter, the case law of the European Court of Human Rights and the European Committee of Social Rights, and the conventions, recommendations, resolutions, opinions and reports of the Parliamentary Assembly, the Committee of Ministers, the Human Rights Commissioner, the European Commission Against Racism and Intolerance, the Steering Committee on Anti-Discrimination, Diversity and Inclusion, the Venice Commission and other bodies of the Council of Europe,

Amendment

— having regard to the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, the European Social Charter, the case law of the European Court of Human Rights and the European Committee of Social Rights, ***the Council of Europe Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (FCNM) and the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (ECRML)*** and the conventions, recommendations, resolutions, opinions and reports of the Parliamentary Assembly, the Committee of Ministers, the Human Rights Commissioner, the European Commission Against Racism and Intolerance, the Steering Committee on Anti-Discrimination, Diversity and Inclusion, the Venice Commission, ***the Advisory Committee on the FCNM, the Committee of Experts of the ECRML*** and other bodies of the Council of Europe,

Or. en

Amendment 4
Tineke Strik

Motion for a resolution
Citation 16

Motion for a resolution

— having regard to the Memorandum of Understanding between the Council of Europe and the European Union of 23 May 2007,

Amendment

— having regard to the Memorandum of Understanding between the Council of Europe and the European Union of 23 May 2007 ***and Council Conclusions on EU priorities for cooperation with the Council of Europe 2020-2022,***

Or. en

Amendment 5
Evin Incir

Motion for a resolution
Citation 17 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

— *having regard to UN International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination*

Or. en

Amendment 6

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba, Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution
Citation 21

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

— *having regard to the Commission's reasoned proposal for a Council decision of 20 December 2017 on the determination of a clear risk of a serious breach by the Republic of Poland of the rule of law, issued in accordance with Article 7(1) of the Treaty on European Union (COM(2017)0835),* *deleted*

Or. en

Amendment 7

Lukas Mandl, Paulo Rangel, Roberta Metsola, Vladimír Bilčík

Motion for a resolution
Citation 26

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

— having regard to the report of the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights *of 17 January 2018* entitled 'Challenges facing civil society organisations working on human rights in the EU', and to *its* other reports *and data*,

— having regard to the report of the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights entitled 'Challenges facing civil society organisations working on human rights in the EU', *published on 17 January 2018, the bulletins on the fundamental*

rights implications of the Coronavirus pandemic in the EU, published in 2020, and to the Agency's other reports, data and tools, in particular the European Union Fundamental Rights Information System (EFRIS),

Or. en

Amendment 8

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba, Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution

Citation 29

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

— *having regard to its resolution of 25 October 2016 with recommendations to the Commission on the establishment of an EU mechanism on democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights²,*

deleted

² *OJ C 215, 19.6.2018, p. 162.*

Or. en

Amendment 9

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba, Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution

Citation 32

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

— *having regard to its resolution of 12 September 2018 on a proposal calling on the Council to determine, pursuant to Article 7(1) of the Treaty on European Union, the existence of a clear risk of a serious breach by Hungary of the values on which the Union is founded⁵,*

deleted

⁵ OJ C 433, 23.12.2019, p. 66.

Or. en

Amendment 10

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba, Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution

Citation 33

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

— *having regard to its resolution of 14 November 2018 on the need for a comprehensive EU mechanism for the protection of democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights⁶,*

deleted

⁶ OJ C 363, 28.10.2020, p. 45.

Or. en

Amendment 11

Evin Incir

Motion for a resolution

Citation 33 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

— *having regard to the EU gender equality strategy 2020 -2025, the EU LGBTIQ Equality Strategy 2020-2025, the EU Strategy on the Rights of the Child and the Strategy for the rights of persons with disabilities 2021-2030,*

Or. en

Amendment 12

Evin Incir

Motion for a resolution
Citation 33 b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

— *having regard to the Anti-racism Action Plan 2020-2025 and the EU Roma strategic framework for equality, inclusion and participation,*

Or. en

Amendment 13

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba, Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution
Citation 34

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

— *having regard to its resolution of 13 February 2019 on experiencing a backlash in women's rights and gender equality in the EU⁷,*

deleted

⁷ *OJ C 449, 23.12.2020, p. 102.*

Or. en

Amendment 14
Evin Incir

Motion for a resolution
Citation 34 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

— *having regard to its resolution of 19 June 2020 on the anti-racism protests following the death of George Floyd^{7a},*

^{7a} *Texts adopted, P9_TA(2020)0173.*

Amendment 15

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba, Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution

Citation 35

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

— *having regard to its resolution of 18 December 2019 on public discrimination and hate speech against LGBTI people, including LGBTI free zones⁸,*

deleted

⁸ *Texts adopted, P9_TA(2019)0101.*

Amendment 16

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba, Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution

Citation 37

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

— *having regard to its resolution of 16 January 2020 on ongoing hearings under Article 7(1) of the TEU regarding Poland and Hungary¹⁰,*

deleted

¹⁰ *Texts adopted, P9_TA(2020)0014.*

Amendment 17

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba, Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution
Citation 39

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

— *having regard to its resolution of 17 September 2020 on the proposal for a Council decision on the determination of a clear risk of a serious breach by the Republic of Poland of the rule of law¹²,* *deleted*

¹² *Texts adopted, P9_TA(2020)0225.*

Or. en

Amendment 18

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba, Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution
Citation 40

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

— *having regard to its resolution of 7 October 2020 on the establishment of an EU Mechanism on Democracy, the Rule of Law and Fundamental Rights¹³,* *deleted*

¹³ *Texts adopted, P9_TA(2020)0251.*

Or. en

Amendment 19

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba, Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution
Citation 43

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

— *having regard to its resolution of 17 December 2020 on the Multiannual Financial Framework 2021-2027, the* *deleted*

Interinstitutional Agreement, the EU Recovery Instrument and the Rule of Law Regulation¹⁶ ,

¹⁶ *Texts adopted, P9_TA(2020)0360.*

Or. en

Amendment 20

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba, Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution

Citation 44

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

— *having regard to its resolution of 11 March 2021 on the declaration of the EU as an LGBTIQ Freedom Zone¹⁷ ,* *deleted*

¹⁷ *Texts adopted, P9_TA(2021)0089.*

Or. en

Amendment 21

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba, Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution

Citation 45

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

— *having regard to its resolution of 25 March 2021 on the application of Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2020/2092, the rule-of-law conditionality mechanism¹⁸ ,* *deleted*

¹⁸ *Texts adopted, P9_TA(2021)0103.*

Or. en

Amendment 22

Lukas Mandl, Paulo Rangel, Roberta Metsola, Vladimír Bilčík

Motion for a resolution

Citation 50 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

— *having regard to the report of the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights of 10 September 2020 on Antisemitism: Overview of antisemitic incidents recorded in the European Union;*

Or. en

Amendment 23

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba, Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution

Recital A

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

A. whereas the Union is founded on the values set out in Article 2 of the Treaty on European Union (TEU); whereas democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights are mutually reinforcing values which, when undermined, may pose a systemic threat to the Union;

A. whereas the Union is founded on the values set out in Article 2 of the Treaty on European Union (TEU); whereas democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights are mutually reinforcing values which, when undermined, may pose a systemic threat to the Union; *whereas Article 2 TEU applies not only and not even primarily to the Member States, but to the European Union and the rule of law should cover the EU institutions, all the more so that they have long been accused of democratic deficit;*

Or. en

Amendment 24

Tineke Strik

Motion for a resolution

Recital A

Motion for a resolution

A. whereas the Union is founded on the values set out in Article 2 of the Treaty on European Union (TEU); whereas democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights are mutually reinforcing values which, when undermined, may pose a systemic threat to the Union;

Amendment

A. whereas the Union is founded on the values set out in Article 2 of the Treaty on European Union (TEU), ***values which are common to the EU Member States and which EU candidates countries must adhere to in order to join the EU***; whereas democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights are mutually reinforcing values which, when undermined, may pose a systemic threat to the Union; ***whereas respect of the rule of law binds the Union as a whole, and its Member States at all levels of governance***;

Or. en

Amendment 25

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Lukas Mandl, Konstantinos Arvanitis, Katarina Barley, Elena Yoncheva, Łukasz Kohut, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Petar Vitanov, Pietro Bartolo, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer, Dietmar Köster

Motion for a resolution

Recital A

Motion for a resolution

A. whereas the Union is founded on the values set out in Article 2 of the Treaty on European Union (TEU); whereas democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights are mutually reinforcing values which, when undermined, may pose a systemic threat to the Union;

Amendment

A. whereas the Union is founded on the values set out in Article 2 of the Treaty on European Union (TEU); whereas democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights are mutually reinforcing values which, when undermined, may pose a systemic threat to the Union; ***whereas respect of the rule of law binds the Union as a whole, its Member States and their subnational entities***;

Or. en

Amendment 26

Nicolas Bay, Jean-Paul Garraud, Tom Vandendriessche, Harald Vilimsky, Nicolaus Fest, Laura Huhtasaari, Mara Bizzotto

Motion for a resolution

Recital B

Motion for a resolution

B. whereas the annual rule of law review cycle *is a welcome addition to the tools available to preserve the Union's values, by addressing the situation in all EU Member States based on four pillars, with a direct bearing on respect for the rule of law; whereas it is intended as a yearly cycle to ensure the rule of law and to prevent problems from emerging or deepening;*

Amendment

B. whereas the annual rule of law review cycle *has been turned into a political tool and serves as a threat targeting Member States that may refuse to fall into line with the Commission's societal projects;*

Or. fr

Amendment 27

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba, Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution

Recital B

Motion for a resolution

B. whereas the annual rule of law review cycle is *a welcome* addition to the tools available to *preserve the Union's values, by addressing the situation in all EU Member States based on four pillars, with a direct bearing on respect for the rule of law;* whereas it is intended as a yearly cycle to ensure the rule of law and to prevent problems from emerging or deepening;

Amendment

B. whereas the annual rule of law review cycle is *an* addition to the tools available to *the Union;* whereas it is intended as a yearly cycle to ensure the rule of law and to prevent problems from emerging or deepening;

Or. en

Amendment 28

Konstantinos Arvanitis

Motion for a resolution
Recital B

Motion for a resolution

B. whereas the annual rule of law review cycle is a welcome addition to the tools available to preserve the *Union's* values, by addressing the situation in all EU Member States based on four pillars, with a direct bearing on respect for the rule of law; ***whereas it is intended as a yearly cycle to ensure the rule of law and to prevent problems from emerging or deepening;***

Amendment

B. whereas the annual rule of law review cycle is a welcome addition to the tools available to preserve the values ***enshrined in Article 2 TEU***, by addressing the situation in all EU Member States based on four pillars, with a direct bearing on respect for the rule of law;

Or. en

Amendment 29

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba, Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution
Recital C

Motion for a resolution

C. whereas the Commission's first Rule of Law Report (2020 report) is ***limited*** in scope, as it ***does not cover*** all Union values as provided for in Article 2 of the TEU;

Amendment

C. whereas the Commission's first Rule of Law Report (2020 report) is ***extended*** in scope, as it ***covers more than just rule of law as one of*** all Union values as provided for in Article 2 of the TEU; ***whereas the notion of the rule of law has different and distinct manifestations in the Member States and there is no definition of it at the EU level;***

Or. en

Amendment 30

Laura Ferrara, Sabrina Pignedoli

Motion for a resolution
Recital C

Motion for a resolution

C. whereas the Commission's first Rule of Law Report (2020 report) is limited in scope, as it does not cover all Union values as provided for in Article 2 of the TEU;

Amendment

C. whereas the Commission's first Rule of Law Report (2020 report) is limited in scope, as it does not cover all Union values as provided for in Article 2 of the TEU; ***whereas the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union became a fully-fledged component of the Treaties when the Treaty of Lisbon came into force, and is therefore now legally binding on the institutions, agencies and other bodies of the EU and on the Member States when EU legislation is applied; whereas a genuine fundamental rights culture must be developed, fostered and strengthened in the EU institutions, but also in the Member States, in particular when they apply EU law domestically and in their relations with non-EU countries;***

Or. it

Amendment 31

Loránt Vincze, François Alfonsi, Andrea Bocskor, Herbert Dorfmann, Łukasz Kohut, Valdemar Tomaševski, Yana Toom, István Ujhelyi, Iuliu Winkler, Tatjana Ždanoka, Antoni Comín i Oliveres, Clara Ponsatí Obiols, Carles Puigdemont i Casamajó

Motion for a resolution

Recital C a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

C a. whereas respect for the rights of minorities is a part of the political criteria an accession-candidate country must fulfil at the time of accession; whereas while the Union has an important role in ensuring respect for the rights of national and linguistic minorities in candidate-countries, it so far hasn't yet adopted any benchmarks for its Member States in this area, thus making possible that Member States backtrack on their commitments; whereas the 2020 report, too, misses to cover the rights of national and linguistic minorities;

Amendment 32

Loránt Vincze, François Alfonsi, Andrea Bocskor, Herbert Dorfmann, Łukasz Kohut, Valdemar Tomaševski, Yana Toom, István Ujhelyi, Iuliu Winkler, Tatjana Ždanoka, Antoni Comín i Oliveres, Clara Ponsatí Obiols, Carles Puigdemont i Casamajó

Motion for a resolution

Recital C b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

C b. whereas the European Parliament has already called on the European Commission to adopt a common framework of Union minimum standards for the protection of rights of persons belonging to minorities, which are strongly embedded in a legal framework guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights throughout the Union^{1a};

^{1a} European Parliament Resolution of 13 November 2018 on minimum standards for minorities in the EU (OJ C 363, 28.10.2020, p. 13)

Amendment 33

Nicolas Bay, Jean-Paul Garraud, Tom Vandendriessche, Harald Vilimsky, Nicolaus Fest, Laura Huhtasaari, Mara Bizzotto

Motion for a resolution

Recital D

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

D. whereas while the 2020 report raises concerns and awareness, it does not provide a sufficient assessment of the effectiveness of the reforms carried out by each country, nor any concrete country-specific recommendations, which could

deleted

jeopardise its intended preventive effects;

Or. fr

Amendment 34

Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution

Recital D

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

D. *whereas while the 2020 report raises concerns and awareness, it does not provide a sufficient assessment of the effectiveness of the reforms carried out by each country, nor any concrete country-specific recommendations, which could jeopardise its intended preventive effects;*

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 35

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba

Motion for a resolution

Recital D

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

D. *whereas while the 2020 report raises concerns and awareness, it does not provide a sufficient assessment of the effectiveness of the reforms carried out by each country, nor any concrete country-specific recommendations, **which could jeopardise its intended preventive effects;***

D. *whereas while the 2020 report raises concerns and awareness, it does not provide a sufficient assessment of the effectiveness of the reforms carried out by each country, nor any concrete country-specific recommendations, **because the Commission has no competences in this regard and the only recommendations regarding the rule of law may be addressed in accordance with procedure set up Article 7(1) TEU;***

Or. en

Amendment 36
Tineke Strik

Motion for a resolution
Recital D

Motion for a resolution

D. whereas while the 2020 report raises concerns and awareness, it does not provide a sufficient assessment of the effectiveness of the *reforms* carried out by each country, nor any concrete country-specific recommendations, which could jeopardise its intended preventive effects;

Amendment

D. whereas while the 2020 report raises concerns and awareness, it does not provide a sufficient assessment of the effectiveness of the *changes* carried out by each country, nor any concrete country-specific recommendations *or an examination of a country's adherence to the rule of law over time*, which could jeopardise its intended preventive effects;

Or. en

Amendment 37
Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution
Recital D a (new)

Motion for a resolution

D a. Whereas there have been complaints from NGOs and professional associations of magistrates about the objectivity of the 2020 Rule of Law Report and the sources of information chosen by the Commission for the report;

Or. en

Amendment 38
Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution
Recital D b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

D b. Whereas there is no definition

agreed yet of the rule of law and a single system to assess compliance with the rule of law at the level of the Union equally applied to all the Member States;

Or. en

Amendment 39

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba, Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution

Recital E

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

E. whereas without effective follow-up under an annual monitoring cycle, the 2020 report may fail to address systemic challenges and backsliding on the rule of law as witnessed in several EU Member States in recent years;

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 40

Maria Grapini

Motion for a resolution

Recital E

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

E. whereas without effective follow-up under an annual monitoring cycle, the 2020 report may fail to address systemic challenges and backsliding on the rule of law as witnessed in several EU Member States in recent years;

E. whereas without effective ***and informed*** follow-up ***with the same assessment criteria for all EU Member States*** under an annual monitoring cycle, the 2020 report may fail to address systemic challenges and backsliding on the rule of law as witnessed in several EU Member States in recent years;

Or. ro

Amendment 41
Tineke Strik

Motion for a resolution
Recital E

Motion for a resolution

E. whereas without effective follow-up under an annual monitoring cycle, the 2020 report may fail to address systemic challenges and backsliding on the rule of law as witnessed in several EU Member States in recent years;

Amendment

E. whereas without effective follow-up under an annual monitoring cycle, the 2020 report may fail to ***detect or*** address systemic challenges and backsliding on the rule of law as witnessed in several EU Member States in recent years;

Or. en

Amendment 42
Laura Ferrara, Sabrina Pignedoli

Motion for a resolution
Recital E

Motion for a resolution

E. whereas ***without effective follow-up under*** an annual monitoring cycle, ***the 2020 report may fail to*** address systemic challenges and backsliding on the rule of law as witnessed in several EU Member States in recent years;

Amendment

E. whereas ***the report is an integral part of*** an annual monitoring cycle ***which has to be followed up in order to prevent and effectively*** address systemic challenges and backsliding on the rule of law as witnessed in several EU Member States in recent years;

Or. it

Amendment 43
Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution
Recital E a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

E a. Whereas the Commission has negotiated with the pharmaceutical companies contracts regarding the

manufacturing of the anti-Covid-19 vaccines, which are not public in their entirety;

Or. en

Amendment 44

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba

Motion for a resolution

Recital F

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

F. *whereas backsliding on the rule of law and fundamental rights in some countries is seriously affecting mutual trust in the functioning of the area of freedom, security and justice and threatening the Union objectives as enshrined in Article 3 of the TEU;* ***deleted***

Or. en

Amendment 45

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Lukas Mandl, Tineke Strik, Michal Šimečka, Katarina Barley, Elena Yoncheva, Łukasz Kohut, Dietmar Köster, Petar Vitanov, Pietro Bartolo, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

Motion for a resolution

Recital F

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

F. *whereas backsliding on the rule of law and fundamental rights in some countries is seriously affecting mutual trust in the functioning of the area of freedom, security and justice and threatening the Union objectives as enshrined in Article 3 of the TEU;*

F. *whereas backsliding on the rule of law and fundamental rights in some countries is seriously affecting mutual trust in the functioning of the area of freedom, security and justice and threatening the Union objectives as enshrined in Article 3 of the TEU, as illustrated by several cases where the European Arrest Warrant was put under a strain due to profound doubts about the independence of the judiciary;*

Amendment 46

Ramona Strugariu, Michal Šimečka, Olivier Chastel, Sophia in 't Veld, Fabienne Keller, Hilde Vautmans, Dragoș Tudorache, Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Anna Júlia Donáth

Motion for a resolution

Recital F a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

F a. whereas ombudsperson institutions in the Member States play a critical role in safeguarding key principles of the Rule of Law, such as transparency, accountability and due process; whereas the COVID-19 crisis has brought about restrictions of fundamental rights that make it more important than ever to have effective checks and balances in place over the actions of the government and in defence of citizens' rights;

Or. en

Amendment 47

Cristian Terheș

Motion for a resolution

Recital F a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

F a. Whereas the Covid-19 pandemic was used as an excuse by Member States to implement many non-transparent, non-democratic and even abusive measures at the expense of citizens' fundamental and democratic rights like the right to free movement, access to justice, access to public information, privacy etc.;

Or. en

Amendment 48

Vladimír Bilčík, Paulo Rangel, Lukas Mandl, Isabel Wiseler-Lima

Motion for a resolution

Recital F a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

F a. whereas according to the 2021 World Press Freedom Index the worrisome developments aimed at stifling free speech and press freedom set a bad example within the EU and EU accession candidates;

Or. en

Amendment 49

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Lukas Mandl, Tineke Strik, Michal Šimečka, Katarina Barley, Elena Yoncheva, Łukasz Kohut, Dietmar Köster, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Petar Vitanov, Pietro Bartolo, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

Motion for a resolution

Recital F a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

F a. whereas emergency measures taken in response to the COVID-19 pandemic have put more pressure on fundamental rights and democratic checks and balances;

Or. en

Amendment 50

Vladimír Bilčík, Paulo Rangel, Lukas Mandl

Motion for a resolution

Recital F b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

F b. whereas several Member States' positions in international press freedom rankings have declined; whereas

according to the 2021 World Press Freedom Index Europe continues to be the most favourable continent for press freedom but violence against journalists has increased, and the mechanisms the European Union established to protect fundamental freedoms do not have sufficient effect in some cases;

Or. en

Amendment 51
Isabel Wiseler-Lima

Motion for a resolution
Recital F e (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

F e. whereas several Member States' positions in international press freedom rankings have declined; whereas according to the 2021 World Press Freedom Index Europe continues to be the most favourable continent for press freedom but violence against journalists has increased, and the mechanisms the European Union established to protect fundamental freedoms do not have sufficient effect in some cases;

Or. en

Amendment 52
Vladimír Bilčík, Paulo Rangel, Lukas Mandl, Isabel Wiseler-Lima

Motion for a resolution
Recital F c (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

F c. whereas the threats to media freedom include harassment and attacks aimed at journalists, disregard of journalists' legal protection as well as media capture or politically motivated

actions in the media sector;

Or. en

Amendment 53

Vladimír Bilčík, Paulo Rangel, Lukas Mandl, Isabel Wiseler-Lima

Motion for a resolution

Recital F d (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

F d. whereas it is necessary to strengthen and streamline existing mechanisms and develop an effective mechanism to ensure that the principles and values enshrined in the Treaties are upheld throughout the Union;

Or. en

Amendment 54

Nicolas Bay, Jean-Paul Garraud, Tom Vandendriessche, Harald Vilimsky, Nicolaus Fest, Laura Huhtasaari, Mara Bizzotto

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 1

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

1. *Welcomes* the Commission's first annual Rule of Law Report *as* part of the wider *European rule of law monitoring and enforcement architecture, as it adds an important, potentially preventive tool to the Union's rule of law toolbox;*

1. *Notes* the Commission's first annual Rule of Law Report *which forms* part of the wider *political instrumentalisation of the concept of the rule of law, the intention of which is to standardise lifestyles within the EU by means of the law;*

Or. fr

Amendment 55

Laura Ferrara, Sabrina Pignedoli

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 1

Motion for a resolution

1. Welcomes the Commission's first annual Rule of Law Report **as part of the wider** European rule of law monitoring and enforcement architecture, **as it adds an important, potentially preventive tool to the Union's rule of law toolbox**;

Amendment

1. Welcomes the Commission's first annual Rule of Law Report; **considers it vital to establish** European rule of law monitoring and enforcement architecture **in the EU**; **reiterates the importance of identifying in advance and preventing violations of fundamental rights and the rule of law instead of reacting ex post when such violations are repeated**;

Or. it

Amendment 56

Konstantinos Arvanitis

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 1

Motion for a resolution

1. Welcomes the Commission's first annual Rule of Law Report as part of the wider European rule of law monitoring and enforcement architecture, **as it adds an important, potentially preventive tool to the Union's rule of law toolbox**;

Amendment

1. Welcomes the Commission's first annual Rule of Law Report as part of the wider European rule of law monitoring and enforcement architecture; **considers however that the 2020 report is overly descriptive and does not provide sufficient analysis**;

Or. en

Amendment 57

Michal Šimečka, Sophia in 't Veld, Moritz Körner, Malik Azmani, Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Ramona Strugariu, Hilde Vautmans, Anna Júlia Donáth, Olivier Chastel, Dragoş Tudorache, Fabienne Keller

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 1

Motion for a resolution

1. Welcomes the Commission's first annual Rule of Law Report as part of the

Amendment

1. Welcomes the Commission's first annual Rule of Law Report as part of the

wider European rule of law monitoring and enforcement architecture, **as it adds an important, potentially preventive tool to the Union's rule of law toolbox;**

wider European rule of law monitoring and enforcement architecture; **encourages further development of this new tool for agenda-setting and preventive purposes;**

Or. en

Amendment 58

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba, Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 1

Motion for a resolution

1. **Welcomes** the Commission's first annual Rule of Law Report as part of the wider European rule of law monitoring and enforcement architecture, as it adds **an important, potentially preventive tool to the Union's rule of law toolbox;**

Amendment

1. **Notes** the Commission's first annual Rule of Law Report as part of the wider European rule of law monitoring and enforcement architecture, as it adds **a potentially preventive tool to the Union's rule of law toolbox;**

Or. en

Amendment 59

Laura Ferrara, Sabrina Pignedoli

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 1 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

1a. Notes that Article 6 TEU requires the EU to accede to the ECHR; calls on the Commission and the Council to ensure that the aforementioned obligation is met as quickly as possible, on the basis of full transparency and with the aim of enhancing the protection of individuals and making the European institutions more accountable for their actions or failings regarding fundamental rights;

Or. it

Amendment 60
Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

1 a. Calls to the Commission's attention that when drafting the Rule of Law Report the sovereignty and constitutional order of each and every Member States have to be respected;

Or. en

Amendment 61
Vladimír Bilčík, Lukas Mandl

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 1 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

1 a. Stresses that roles and prerogatives of respective institutions within the available procedures must be respected;

Or. en

Amendment 62
Milan Uhrík

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 2

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

2. **Welcomes the fact** that justice systems, the anti-corruption framework, media pluralism and certain institutional issues related to checks and balances, including civic space, are **all part of the Commission's annual overview** of the **rule**

2. **Stresses** that justice systems, the anti-corruption framework, media pluralism and certain institutional issues related to checks and balances, including civic space, are **exclusively a competence** of the Member States; encourages the

*of law situation in the Member States; encourages the Commission **to also highlight positive trends in Member States that could serve as good examples for others to follow;***

Commission ***not to interfere in any way in the justice or institutional systems of the Member States;***

Or. sk

Amendment 63

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 2

Motion for a resolution

2. ***Welcomes*** the fact that justice systems, the anti-corruption framework, media pluralism and certain institutional issues related to checks and balances, including civic space, are all part of the Commission's annual overview of the rule of law situation in the Member States; ***encourages*** the Commission ***to also highlight positive trends*** in Member States that could serve as ***good*** examples for others to follow;

Amendment

2. ***Notes*** the fact that justice systems, the anti-corruption framework, media pluralism and certain institutional issues related to checks and balances, including civic space, are all part of the Commission's annual overview of the rule of law situation in the Member States; ***notes that*** the Commission ***has no competences to determine whether the situation*** in Member States ***constitutes positive or negative trends*** that could serve as examples for others to follow;

Or. en

Amendment 64

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Lukas Mandl, Konstantinos Arvanitis, Tineke Strik, Katarina Barley, Elena Yoncheva, Łukasz Kohut, Dietmar Köster, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Petar Vitanov, Pietro Bartolo, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 2

Motion for a resolution

2. Welcomes the fact that justice systems, the anti-corruption framework, media pluralism and certain institutional issues related to checks and balances,

Amendment

2. Welcomes the fact that justice systems, the anti-corruption framework, media pluralism and certain institutional issues related to checks and balances,

including civic space, are all part of the Commission's annual overview of the rule of law situation in the Member States; encourages the Commission to also highlight positive trends in Member States that could serve as good examples for others to follow;

including civic space, are all part of the Commission's annual overview of the rule of law situation in the Member States; ***calls moreover for the inclusion in the annual reports of certain important elements of the Venice Commission's 2016 Rule of Law Checklist, such as legal safeguards to prevent arbitrariness and abuse of power by public authorities, independence and impartiality of the Bar and equality before the law and non-discrimination;*** encourages the Commission to also highlight positive trends in Member States that could serve as good examples for others to follow;

Or. en

Amendment 65

Anna Júlia Donáth, Moritz Körner, Fabienne Keller, Olivier Chastel, Hilde Vautmans, Jan-Christoph Oetjen, Sophia in 't Veld, Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Michal Šimečka

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 2

Motion for a resolution

2. Welcomes the fact that justice systems, the anti-corruption framework, media pluralism and certain institutional issues related to checks and balances, including civic space, are all part of the Commission's annual overview of the rule of law situation in the Member States; encourages the Commission to also highlight positive trends in Member States that could serve as good examples for others to follow;

Amendment

2. Welcomes the fact that justice systems, the anti-corruption framework, media pluralism and certain institutional issues related to checks and balances, including civic space ***to a certain extent***, are all part of the Commission's annual overview of the rule of law situation in the Member States; encourages the Commission to also highlight positive trends in Member States that could serve as good examples for others to follow;

Or. en

Amendment 66

Maria Grapini

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 2

Motion for a resolution

2. Welcomes the fact that justice systems, the anti-corruption framework, media pluralism and certain institutional issues related to checks and balances, including civic space, are all part of the Commission's annual overview of the rule of law situation in the Member States; encourages the Commission to also highlight positive trends in Member States that could serve as good examples for others to follow;

Amendment

2. Welcomes the fact that ***the functioning of the*** justice systems, the anti-corruption framework, media pluralism and certain institutional issues related to checks and balances, including civic space, are all part of the Commission's annual overview of the rule of law situation in the Member States; encourages the Commission to also highlight positive trends in Member States that could serve as good examples for others to follow;

Or. ro

Amendment 67

Monika Hohlmeier, Lena Düpont, Roberta Metsola

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 2 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

2 a. Welcomes that all Member States are being scrutinised along the same indicators and in accordance with the same methodology; appreciates that the Commission includes observations and findings about all Member States; regrets, however, that the current presentation of the report neither differentiates between the severity of the identified rule of law issues nor whether these are of systemic nature or individual, disconnected breaches; is of the opinion that there is a serious difference between systemic and individual, disconnected breaches of the rule of law; emphasises that this equal presentation of breaches of different nature carries the risk of trivialising the most serious rule of law breaches; urges the Commission to differentiate its reporting by distinguishing between systemic and individual, disconnected breaches of rule of law; calls on the

Commission to update its methodology accordingly and keep Parliament informed without undue delay;

Or. en

Amendment 68

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Lukas Mandl, Konstantinos Arvanitis, Tineke Strik, Katarina Barley, Elena Yoncheva, Łukasz Kohut, Dietmar Köster, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Petar Vitanov, Pietro Bartolo, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 2 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

2 a. Notes with satisfaction that the report contains country specific chapters; commends the Commission's efforts to engage with national Governments and national Parliaments as well as civil society and other national actors; encourages the Commission to devote more efforts to deepen the country analyses with a view to better assess the severity of rule of law challenges; believes that more time should be devoted to the Commission's country visits, including on site, in order to achieve broader engagement and dialogue with national authorities and civil society; considers that the Commission should raise greater awareness of such country visits to foster the emergence of a rule of law culture at national level;

Or. en

Amendment 69

Anna Júlia Donáth, Moritz Körner, Fabienne Keller, Olivier Chastel, Hilde Vautmans, Jan-Christoph Oetjen, Sophia in 't Veld, Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Michal Šimečka

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 2 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

2 a. *Considers that the 2020 report is overly descriptive and does not provide sufficient analysis; and the Commission do not draw any conclusions on the state of the Rule of Law in the Member States and in the Union in general; believes the 2020 report fails to provide clear assessments stating whether there are serious deficiencies or a risk of a serious breach of the Union values in each of the pillars under analysis in the country chapters; considers these assessments necessary to identify follow up actions and remedial tools; considers it necessary that the report contains country specific recommendations on how to address the identified concerns and benchmarks to be followed up;*

Or. en

Amendment 70

Anna Júlia Donáth, Moritz Körner, Fabienne Keller, Olivier Chastel, Hilde Vautmans, Jan-Christoph Oetjen, Sophia in 't Veld, Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Michal Šimečka

**Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 2 b (new)**

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

2 b. *Stresses that the analysis and the conclusions of the reports should be directly contributing to the Rule of Law Conditionality Mechanism; calls on the Commission to clarify in the methodology the link between the two mechanisms;*

Or. en

Amendment 71

Nicolas Bay, Jean-Paul Garraud, Tom Vandendriessche, Harald Vilimsky, Nicolaus Fest, Laura Huhtasaari, Mara Bizzotto

Motion for a resolution

PE691.450v01-00

34/161

AM1229990EN.docx

Paragraph 3

Motion for a resolution

3. ***Stresses the potential preventive benefits of the annual Rule of Law Report; considers that a more thorough evaluation is needed to assess whether the report has had a preventive effect; considers that in any event this is clearly not the case as regards the Member States under the Article 7(1) TEU procedure; believes that the 2020 report should have provided more in-depth assessments, stating whether there is a risk of or actual breach of the Union values; considers these assessments necessary to identify follow-up actions and remedial measures and tools;***

Amendment

3. Considers that the Article 7(1) TEU procedure ***is the only one that may lawfully be used to manage allegations of breach of the rule of law;***

Or. fr

Amendment 72

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba, Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 3

Motion for a resolution

3. Stresses the potential preventive benefits of the annual Rule of Law Report; considers that a more thorough evaluation is needed to assess whether the report has had a preventive effect; ***considers that in any event this is clearly not the case as regards the Member States under the Article 7(1) TEU procedure; believes that the 2020 report should have provided more in-depth assessments, stating whether there is a risk of or actual breach of the Union values; considers these assessments necessary to identify follow-up actions and remedial measures and tools;***

Amendment

3. Stresses the potential preventive benefits of the annual Rule of Law Report; considers that a more thorough evaluation is needed to assess whether the report has had a preventive effect;

Or. en

Amendment 73

Anna Júlia Donáth, Moritz Körner, Fabienne Keller, Olivier Chastel, Hilde Vautmans, Jan-Christoph Oetjen, Sophia in 't Veld, Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Ramona Strugariu, Michal Šimečka

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 3

Motion for a resolution

3. Stresses the potential preventive benefits of the annual Rule of Law Report; considers that a more thorough evaluation is needed to assess whether the report has had a preventive effect; considers that in any event this is clearly not the case as regards the Member States under the Article 7(1) TEU procedure; believes that the 2020 report should have provided more in-depth assessments, stating whether there is a risk of or actual breach of the Union values; considers these assessments necessary to identify follow-up actions and remedial measures and tools;

Amendment

3. Stresses the potential preventive benefits of the annual Rule of Law Report; considers that a more thorough evaluation is needed to assess whether the report has had a **sufficient** preventive effect; considers that in any event this is clearly not the case as regards the Member States under the Article 7(1) TEU procedure; believes that the 2020 report should have provided more in-depth assessments, stating whether there is a risk of or actual breach of the Union values; considers these assessments necessary to **formulate conclusions about the state of the rule of law and to** identify follow-up actions and remedial measures and tools; **calls on the Commission to include in the reports indication of such follow-up and remedial action, whose progress should be then illustrated in the following report;**

Or. en

Amendment 74

Maria Grapini

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 3

Motion for a resolution

3. Stresses the potential preventive benefits of the annual Rule of Law Report; considers that a more thorough evaluation is needed to assess whether the report has had a preventive effect; considers that in

Amendment

3. Stresses the potential preventive benefits of the annual Rule of Law Report; considers that a more thorough **and objective** evaluation, **taking account of input from each Member State**, is needed

any event this is clearly not the case as regards the Member States under the Article 7(1) TEU procedure; believes that the 2020 report should have provided more in-depth assessments, stating whether there is a risk of or actual breach of the Union values; considers these assessments necessary to identify follow-up actions and remedial measures and tools;

to assess whether the report has had a preventive effect; considers that in any event this is clearly not the case as regards the Member States under the Article 7(1) TEU procedure; believes that the 2020 report should have provided more in-depth **and transparent** assessments, stating whether there is a risk of or actual breach of the Union values; considers these assessments necessary to identify follow-up actions and remedial measures and tools **for each of the Member States; the CVM should accordingly be eliminated to avoid duplicating Member State evaluation systems;**

Or. ro

Amendment 75

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Lukas Mandl, Tineke Strik, Michal Šimečka, Katarina Barley, Elena Yoncheva, Łukasz Kohut, Dietmar Köster, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Petar Vitanov, Pietro Bartolo, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 3

Motion for a resolution

3. Stresses the potential preventive benefits of the annual Rule of Law Report; considers that a more thorough evaluation is needed to assess whether the report has had a preventive effect; considers that in any event this is clearly not the case as regards the Member States under the Article 7(1) TEU procedure; believes that the 2020 report should have provided more in-depth assessments, stating whether there is a risk of or actual breach of the Union values; considers these assessments necessary to identify follow-up actions and remedial measures and tools;

Amendment

3. Stresses the potential preventive benefits of the annual Rule of Law Report; considers that a more thorough evaluation is needed to assess whether the report has had a preventive effect; considers that in any event this is clearly not the case as regards the Member States under the Article 7(1) TEU procedure; believes that the 2020 report should have provided more in-depth assessments, stating whether there is a risk of or actual breach of the Union values **in each of the pillars under analysis in the country chapters**; considers these assessments necessary to identify follow-up actions and remedial measures and tools; **calls for a synthetic approach in the horizontal report in order to clearly identify where the most important risks and problems lie across Member States;**

Amendment 76
Konstantinos Arvanitis

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 3

Motion for a resolution

3. ***Stresses the potential preventive benefits of the annual Rule of Law Report***; considers that a more thorough evaluation is needed to assess whether the report has had a preventive effect; considers that in any event this is clearly not the case as regards the Member States under the Article 7(1) TEU procedure; believes that the 2020 report should have provided more in-depth assessments, stating whether there is a risk of or actual breach of the Union values; considers these assessments necessary to identify follow-up actions and remedial measures and tools;

Amendment

3. considers that a more thorough evaluation is needed to assess whether the report has had a preventive effect; considers that in any event this is clearly not the case as regards the Member States under the Article 7(1) TEU procedure; believes that the 2020 report should have provided more in-depth assessments, stating whether there is a risk of or actual breach of the Union values; considers these assessments necessary to identify follow-up actions and remedial measures and tools; ***believes that the report should include country specific recommendations; calls on the Commission to draw conclusions from its own findings, design follow up actions and use all tools available to address the identified breaches, including the rule-of-law conditionality mechanism***;

Or. en

Amendment 77
Michal Šimečka, Sophia in 't Veld, Moritz Körner, Malik Azmani, Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Ramona Strugariu, Hilde Vautmans, Anna Júlia Donáth, Olivier Chastel, Fabienne Keller

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 3

Motion for a resolution

3. Stresses the potential preventive benefits of the annual Rule of Law Report; considers that a more thorough evaluation

Amendment

3. Stresses the potential preventive benefits of the annual Rule of Law Report; considers that a more thorough evaluation

is needed to assess whether the report has had a preventive effect; considers that in any event this is clearly not the case as regards *the* Member States *under the Article 7(1) TEU procedure*; believes that the 2020 report should have provided more in-depth assessments, stating whether there is a risk of or actual breach of the Union values; considers these assessments necessary to identify follow-up actions and remedial measures and tools;

is needed to assess whether the report has had a preventive effect; considers that in any event this is clearly not the case as regards Member States *where the rule of law is in crisis*; believes that the 2020 report should have provided more in-depth assessments, stating whether there is a risk of or actual breach of the Union values; considers these assessments necessary to identify follow-up actions and remedial measures and tools;

Or. en

Amendment 78

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba, Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 4

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

4. Calls for a more integrated analysis on the interlinkages between the four pillars included in the report and of how combined deficiencies may amount to systemic breaches of the rule of law;

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 79

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Konstantinos Arvanitis, Michal Šimečka, Katarina Barley, Elena Yoncheva, Łukasz Kohut, Dietmar Köster, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Petar Vitanov, Pietro Bartolo, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 4

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

4. Calls for a more integrated analysis on the interlinkages between the four pillars included in the report and of how combined deficiencies may amount to systemic breaches of the rule of law;

4. Is concerned by the spill-over effects of the erosion of media freedom into the other areas of analysis; considers smear campaigns against judges, legal professionals and civil society

organisations and, in particular, strategic lawsuit against public participation (SLAPP) actions, as a limiting factor to their independence and capacity of action; calls, therefore, for a more integrated analysis on the interlinkages between the four pillars included in the report and of how combined deficiencies may amount to systemic breaches of the rule of law;

Or. en

Amendment 80
Tineke Strik

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 4

Motion for a resolution

4. Calls for a more integrated analysis on the interlinkages between the four pillars included in the report and of how combined deficiencies may amount to systemic breaches of the rule of law;

Amendment

4. *Is concerned by the spill-over effects of the erosion of media freedom into the other areas of analysis and the chilling effect of smear campaigns against academics, journalists, judges, legal professionals and civil society organisations and in particular strategic lawsuit against public participation (SLAPP) actions;* calls for a more integrated analysis on the interlinkages between the four pillars included in the report and of how combined deficiencies may amount to systemic breaches of the rule of law;

Or. en

Amendment 81
Lukas Mandl, Paulo Rangel, Roberta Metsola, Vladimír Bilčík

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 4

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

4. Calls for a more integrated analysis on the interlinkages between the four pillars included in the report and of how combined deficiencies may amount to systemic breaches of the rule of law;

4. Calls for a more integrated analysis on the interlinkages between the four pillars included in the report and of how combined deficiencies may amount to systemic breaches of the rule of law; ***calls on the Commission to propose EU Anti-SLAPP legislation to protect journalists from vexatious lawsuits;***

Or. en

Amendment 82
Maria Grapini

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 4

Motion for a resolution

4. Calls for ***a more*** integrated analysis on the interlinkages between the four pillars included in the report and of how combined deficiencies may amount to systemic breaches of the rule of law;

Amendment

4. Calls for ***an*** integrated analysis on the interlinkages between the four pillars included in the report and of how combined deficiencies may amount to systemic breaches of the rule of law; ***given that no democracy can function without independent courts, the independence of the judiciary in the Member States must be monitored;***

Or. ro

Amendment 83
Anna Júlia Donáth, Moritz Körner, Fabienne Keller, Olivier Chastel, Hilde Vautmans, Jan-Christoph Oetjen, Sophia in 't Veld, Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Ramona Strugariu, Michal Šimečka

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 4

Motion for a resolution

4. Calls for a more integrated analysis on the interlinkages between the four pillars included in the report and of how combined deficiencies may amount to systemic breaches of the rule of law;

Amendment

4. Calls for a more integrated analysis on the interlinkages between the four pillars included in the report and of how combined deficiencies may amount to systemic breaches of the rule of law ***and***

signal if those are affecting or risk affecting the financial interest of the Union;

Or. en

Amendment 84

Michal Šimečka, Sophia in 't Veld, Moritz Körner, Malik Azmani, Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Ramona Strugariu, Hilde Vautmans, Anna Júlia Donáth, Olivier Chastel, Dragoş Tudorache, Fabienne Keller

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 4

Motion for a resolution

4. Calls for a more integrated analysis on the interlinkages between the four pillars included in the report and of how combined deficiencies may amount to systemic breaches of the rule of law;

Amendment

4. Calls for a more integrated analysis on the interlinkages between the four pillars included in the report and of how combined deficiencies may amount to systemic breaches of the rule of law *or risks thereof*;

Or. en

Amendment 85

Monika Hohlmeier, Lena Düpont, Lukas Mandl, Roberta Metsola

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 4 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

4 a. Notes that the first rule of law report is mostly descriptive of the situation in the Member States; calls on the Commission to make the report more analytical in the future and also include specific assessments and recommendations to the Member States on how to improve or remedy the breaches; underlines that these recommendations should include deadlines for implementation, where appropriate, and asks the Commission to include a follow-up on the

implementation of its recommendations in its future reports;

Or. en

Amendment 86

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba, Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 5

Motion for a resolution

5. Considers that the annual reports ***should*** identify cross-cutting trends at Union level; believes that a Union-wide perspective is absent from the 2020 report; ***asks the Commission to identify instances where certain practices undermining the rule of law are becoming blueprints for others or when the gravity and scope of such practices have the potential to affect the Union as a whole;***

Amendment

5. Considers that the annual reports ***could*** identify cross-cutting trends at Union level; believes that a Union-wide perspective is absent from the 2020 report;

Or. en

Amendment 87

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Tineke Strik, Katarina Barley, Elena Yoncheva, Łukasz Kohut, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Dietmar Köster, Petar Vitanov, Pietro Bartolo, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 5

Motion for a resolution

5. Considers that the annual reports should identify cross-cutting trends at Union level; believes that a Union-wide perspective is absent from the 2020 report; asks the Commission to identify instances where certain practices undermining the rule of law are becoming blueprints for others or when the gravity and scope of such practices have the potential to affect

Amendment

5. Considers that the annual reports should identify cross-cutting trends at Union level; believes that a Union-wide perspective is absent from the 2020 report; asks the Commission to identify instances where certain practices undermining the rule of law, ***media freedom, check and balances or the fight against corruption in one Member State*** are becoming blueprints

the Union as a whole;

for others or when the gravity and scope of such practices have the potential to affect the Union as a whole; ***calls for the prioritisation of these Union-wide trends, including the increasing challenges by national Constitutional Courts to the EU legal architecture, in the analysis, to be able to direct remedial action at Union level;***

Or. en

Amendment 88

Lukas Mandl, Paulo Rangel, Vladimír Bilčík

Motion for a resolution Paragraph 5

Motion for a resolution

5. Considers that the annual reports should identify cross-cutting trends at Union level; believes that a Union-wide perspective is absent from the 2020 report; asks the Commission to identify instances where certain practices undermining the rule of law are becoming blueprints for others or when the gravity and scope of such practices have the potential to affect the Union as a whole;

Amendment

5. Considers that the annual reports should identify cross-cutting trends at Union level; believes that a Union-wide perspective is absent from the 2020 report; asks the Commission to identify instances where certain practices undermining the rule of law are becoming blueprints for others or when the gravity and scope of such practices have the potential to affect the Union as a whole; ***calls on the Commission to clearly illustrate systematic disinformation and foreign interference campaigns with the aim of undermining public trust in state institutions and independent media, while pushing Member States towards authoritarian-style governance structures;***

Or. en

Amendment 89

Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Olivier Chastel, Moritz Körner, Hilde Vautmans

Motion for a resolution Paragraph 5

Motion for a resolution

5. Considers that the annual reports should identify cross-cutting trends at Union level; believes that a Union-wide perspective is absent from the 2020 report; asks the Commission to identify instances where certain practices undermining the rule of law are becoming blueprints for others or when the gravity and scope of such practices have the potential to affect the Union as a whole;

Amendment

5. Considers that the annual reports should identify cross-cutting trends at Union level; believes that a Union-wide perspective is absent from the 2020 report; asks the Commission to identify instances where certain practices undermining the rule of law are becoming blueprints for others or when the gravity and scope of such practices have the potential to affect the Union as a whole; ***calls on the Commission to assess how such attacks compromise the quality of democracy in the Union and whether it is appropriate to reflect on the inclusion of offences against the rule of law and constitutional integrity in the Union's list of serious crimes;***

Or. en

Amendment 90
Konstantinos Arvanitis

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 5

Motion for a resolution

5. ***Considers that the annual reports should identify cross-cutting trends at Union level; believes that a Union-wide perspective is absent from the 2020 report;*** asks the Commission to identify instances where certain practices undermining the rule of law are becoming blueprints for others or when the gravity and scope of such practices have the potential to affect the Union as a whole;

Amendment

5. asks the Commission to identify instances where certain practices undermining the rule of law are becoming blueprints for others or when the gravity and scope of such practices have the potential to affect the Union as a whole;

Or. en

Amendment 91
Tineke Strik

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 5

Motion for a resolution

5. Considers that the annual reports should identify cross-cutting trends at Union level; believes that a Union-wide perspective is absent from the 2020 report; asks the Commission to identify instances where certain practices undermining the rule of law are becoming blueprints for others or when the gravity and scope of such practices have the potential to affect the Union as a whole;

Amendment

5. Considers that the annual reports should identify cross-cutting trends at Union level; believes that a Union-wide perspective is absent from the 2020 report; asks the Commission to identify instances where certain **measures or** practices undermining the rule of law are becoming blueprints for others or when the gravity and scope of such practices have the potential to affect the Union as a whole;

Or. en

Amendment 92
Jorge Buxadé Villalba

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 5 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

5a. Expresses its concern over the Commission's lack of impartiality in its first annual report, which displays greater flexibility over problems or a failure to mention them when the government of a Member State comes from one of the majority parties making up the Commission, but, when this is not the case, attempts to boost the arguments of the opposition parties in order to influence future electoral processes; regrets in this regard the failure to include the collusion by some national governments with attacks on freedom of expression and democratic rights when these are contrary to conservative ideas;

Or. es

Amendment 93

Michal Šimečka, Sophia in 't Veld, Moritz Körner, Malik Azmani, Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Ramona Strugariu, Hilde Vautmans, Anna Júlia Donáth, Olivier Chastel, Dragoș Tudorache, Fabienne Keller

**Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 5 a (new)**

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

5 a. Regrets that not all rule of law issues were covered in sufficient detail by the annual report; invites the Commission to develop its country-specific expertise and capacity to react more promptly to negative developments in the Member States; calls on the Commission to devote sufficient resources to the monitoring and enforcement of the rule of law in the EU;

Or. en

**Amendment 94
Cristian Terheș**

**Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 5 a (new)**

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

5 a. Notes that the rule of law report does not have the name of the authors who wrote the report; calls on the Commission to be fully transparent about the report and disclaim in the report the name of the authors who wrote it;

Or. en

**Amendment 95
Tineke Strik**

**Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 5 a (new)**

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

5 a. Regrets that its findings on the rule of law situation in several Member States, such as Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Malta and Slovenia are not fully reflected in the Commission's country reports;

Or. en

Amendment 96

Anna Júlia Donáth, Moritz Körner, Fabienne Keller, Olivier Chastel, Hilde Vautmans, Jan-Christoph Oetjen, Sophia in 't Veld, Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Ramona Strugariu, Michal Šimečka

**Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 5 a (new)**

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

5 a. Stresses that the laws, the democratic institutions, their independence, the checks and balances, the rule of law in a Member State have to be functional not only de jure but also de facto;

Or. en

Amendment 97

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba, Cristian Terheş

**Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 6**

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

6. Welcomes the monitoring of the independence, quality and efficiency of the Member States' justice systems; considers that the *enabling environment to ensure access to justice for all should also be monitored, including access to justice at Union level; considers that the reports should go beyond a static annual snapshot and include information on*

6. Notes the monitoring of the independence, quality and efficiency of the Member States' justice systems; considers that the *organization and functioning of state bodies, in particular the judiciary is one of the areas in which the Member States have not transferred competences to the European Union and despite this, the Commission evaluates them;*

relevant antecedents in the country chapters;

Or. en

Amendment 98
Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 6

Motion for a resolution

6. Welcomes the monitoring of the independence, quality and efficiency of the Member States' justice systems; considers that the enabling environment to ensure access to justice for all should also be monitored, including access to justice at Union level; *considers that the reports should go beyond a static annual snapshot and include information on relevant antecedents in the country chapters;*

Amendment

6. Welcomes the monitoring of the independence, quality and efficiency of the Member States' justice systems; considers that the enabling environment to ensure access to justice for all should also be monitored, including access to justice at Union level;

Or. en

Amendment 99
Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Lukas Mandl, Konstantinos Arvanitis, Katarina Barley, Elena Yoncheva, Łukasz Kohut, Dietmar Köster, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Petar Vitanov, Pietro Bartolo, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 6

Motion for a resolution

6. Welcomes the monitoring of the independence, quality and efficiency of the Member States' justice systems; considers that the enabling environment to ensure access to justice for all should also be monitored, including access to justice at Union level; considers that the reports should go beyond a static annual snapshot and include information on relevant

Amendment

6. Welcomes the monitoring of the independence, quality and efficiency of the Member States' justice systems *and hence their capacity to provide for effective judicial protection to ensure compliance with Union law*; considers that the enabling environment to ensure access to justice for all should also be monitored, including access to justice at Union level;

antecedents in the country chapters;

considers that the reports should go beyond a static annual snapshot and include information on relevant antecedents in the country chapters *to enable a dynamic and integral assessment of the independence of judicial systems, including the independence of lawyers and Bars*;

Or. en

Amendment 100
Tineke Strik

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 6

Motion for a resolution

6. Welcomes the monitoring of the independence, quality and efficiency of the Member States' justice systems; considers that the enabling environment to ensure access to justice for all should also be monitored, including access to justice at Union level; considers that the reports should go beyond a static annual snapshot and include information on relevant antecedents in the country chapters;

Amendment

6. Welcomes the monitoring of the independence, quality and efficiency of the Member States' justice systems *and hence their capacity to provide for effective judicial protection to ensure compliance with Union law*; considers that the enabling environment to ensure access to justice for all should also be monitored, including access to justice at Union level; considers that the reports should go beyond a static annual snapshot and include information on relevant antecedents in the country chapters *to enable an accurate, dynamic and integral assessment of the de jure and de facto independence of judicial systems, including the independence of lawyers and Bars, as well as over a longer period of time than the previous twelve months*;

Or. en

Amendment 101
Anna Júlia Donáth, Moritz Körner, Fabienne Keller, Olivier Chastel, Hilde Vautmans, Jan-Christoph Oetjen, Sophia in 't Veld, Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Michal Šimečka

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 6

Motion for a resolution

6. Welcomes the monitoring of the independence, quality and efficiency of the Member States' justice systems; considers that the enabling environment to ensure access to justice for all should also be monitored, including access to justice at Union level; considers that the reports should go beyond a static annual snapshot and include information on relevant antecedents in the country chapters;

Amendment

6. Welcomes the monitoring of the independence, quality and efficiency of the Member States' justice systems ***including the national prosecution services as those are essential preconditions not only of the rule of law within the Member States but also of the protection of the Union's financial interests***; considers ***that the integrity of the judges and prosecutors and other persons working in the justice systems and the enabling environment to ensure access to justice for all should also be monitored, including access to justice at Union level; considers that the reports should go beyond a static annual snapshot and include information on relevant antecedents in the country chapters***;

Or. en

Amendment 102

Laura Ferrara, Sabrina Pignedoli

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 6

Motion for a resolution

6. Welcomes the monitoring of the independence, quality and efficiency of the Member States' justice systems; considers that the enabling environment to ensure access to justice for all should also be monitored, including access to justice at Union level; considers that the reports should go beyond a static annual snapshot and include information on relevant antecedents in the country chapters;

Amendment

6. Welcomes the monitoring of the independence, quality and efficiency of the Member States' justice systems; considers that the enabling environment to ensure access to justice for all should also be monitored, including access to justice at Union level; ***points out that the right to access to justice is vital for the protection of all fundamental rights, democracy and the rule of law; calls for direct, easily accessible instruments to be made available to individuals to counter violations of their fundamental rights by Member States, without giving the national courts or the EU institutions any margin of discretion***; considers that the

reports should go beyond a static annual snapshot and include information on relevant antecedents in the country chapters;

Or. it

Amendment 103

Michal Šimečka, Sophia in 't Veld, Moritz Körner, Malik Azmani, Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Ramona Strugariu, Hilde Vautmans, Anna Júlia Donáth, Olivier Chastel, Dragoş Tudorache, Fabienne Keller

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 6

Motion for a resolution

6. Welcomes the monitoring of the independence, quality and efficiency of the Member States' justice systems; considers that the enabling environment to ensure access to justice for all should also be monitored, including access to justice at Union level; considers that the reports should go beyond a static annual snapshot and include information *on relevant antecedents* in the country *chapters*;

Amendment

6. Welcomes the monitoring of the independence, quality and efficiency of the Member States' justice systems; considers that the enabling environment to ensure access to justice for all should also be monitored, including access to justice at Union level; considers that the reports should go beyond a static annual snapshot and include *any relevant information about the state of the rule of law* in the country, *as well as situate new developments in their political context*;

Or. en

Amendment 104

Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Michal Šimečka, Olivier Chastel, Moritz Körner, Ramona Strugariu, Hilde Vautmans

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 6

Motion for a resolution

6. Welcomes the monitoring of the independence, quality and efficiency of the Member States' justice systems; considers that the enabling environment to ensure access to justice for all should also be

Amendment

6. Welcomes the monitoring of the independence, quality and efficiency of the Member States' justice systems; considers that the enabling environment to ensure access to justice for all should also be

monitored, including access to justice at Union level; considers that the reports should go beyond a static annual snapshot and include information on relevant antecedents in the country chapters;

monitored, including access to justice at Union level ***and the efforts and resources devoted to fighting impunity***; considers that the reports should go beyond a static annual snapshot and include information on relevant antecedents in the country chapters;

Or. en

Amendment 105
Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

6 a. Calls to the Commission's attention for its following report on rule of law that in many Member States the judiciary has overturned a series of abusive measures implemented under the pretext of combating the spread of the Covid-19 virus; Deplores, at the same time, that in some Member States the judiciary has avoided, under various pretexts, to judge and rule on the legality and proportionality of the anti-Covid-19 measures, leaving citizens exposed to abusive measures;

Or. en

Amendment 106
Maite Pagazartundúa, Michal Šimečka, Olivier Chastel, Moritz Körner, Ramona Strugariu, Hilde Vautmans

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

6 a. Calls on the Commission to examine the levels of impunity in the Member States when assessing whether

respect for effective judicial protection and systems of safeguards are adequate; reiterates that impunity is a systemic failure and that Member States must fight with all the means at their disposal to combat it; recalls that in a balanced judicial system, the level of protection for victims and defendants must be the same;

Or. en

Amendment 107
Laura Ferrara, Sabrina Pignedoli

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

6a. *Welcomes the fact that appointment methods, in addition to mechanisms governing career advancement, disciplinary procedures and sanctions, have also been identified as indicators of judicial independence; stresses that the monitoring of these parameters must be constant in order to verify the real autonomy of the judiciary;*

Or. it

Amendment 108
Paulo Rangel

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 6 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

6 a. *Recalls that the Union's judicial architecture includes national justice systems; expresses its concern about the alleged political interference on the appointment of some members of the European Public Prosecutor's Office; recalls the lack of transparency in the*

nomination of the Portuguese European Prosecutor;

Or. en

Amendment 109
Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 6 b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

6 b. Calls to the Commission's attention the ongoing attacks to the Constitutional Courts and Ombudsmen in different Member States; emphasizes that these are critical institutions to safeguard the rule of law and the fundamental rights of the citizens and must be protected;

Or. en

Amendment 110
Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 6 c (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

6 c. Underlines that, in order to safeguard the fundamental rights and freedoms of citizens, the justice system and the judges must be independent, thus protected from any pressure, threat or interference, direct or indirect, from inside or outside the judiciary, including political authorities or intelligence agencies/secret services;^{1a 2a}

^{1a} Paragraph 22 of Recommendation CM/Rec(2010)12 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on judges: independence, efficiency and

responsibilities
(https://search.coe.int/cm/Pages/result_details.aspx?ObjectId=09000016805afb78)

^{2a} *Paragraph 27 of CCJE Opinion No. 21 (2018) Preventing corruption among judges* (<https://rm.coe.int/ccje-2018-3e-avis-21-ccje-2018-prevent-corruption-amongst-judges/native/16808fd8dd>)

Or. en

Amendment 111

Nicolas Bay, Jean-Paul Garraud, Tom Vandendriessche, Harald Vilimsky, Nicolaus Fest, Laura Huhtasaari, Mara Bizzotto

Motion for a resolution Paragraph 7

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

7. *Is alarmed by the stark deterioration of the independence of some Member States' justice systems, as reflected in some country chapters; calls on the Commission to clearly assess and designate such shortcomings and findings identified as a clear risk of a serious breach of the rule of law;*

deleted

Or. fr

Amendment 112 Milan Uhrík

Motion for a resolution Paragraph 7

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

7. *Is alarmed by the stark deterioration of the independence of some Member States' justice systems, as reflected in some country chapters; calls on the Commission to clearly assess and designate such shortcomings and findings identified as a clear risk of a serious*

7. *Is alarmed by the EU's aggressive interference in the independence of some Member States' justice systems; calls on the Commission to immediately desist from its arbitrary interpretation of the rule of law;*

breach of the rule of law;

Or. sk

Amendment 113

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba, Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 7

Motion for a resolution

7. *Is alarmed by the stark deterioration of the independence of some Member States' justice systems, as reflected in some country chapters; calls on the Commission to clearly assess and designate such shortcomings and findings identified as a clear risk of a serious breach of the rule of law;*

Amendment

7. *Notes with concern that, apart from the reporting (objective) elements, the report contains evaluative (subjective) elements, without clearly delineating them; rebukes that when assessing similar legal regulations in force in different Member States, the Commission often points to reforms planned in a given area in the Member States, differently assessing solutions designed in some and identical solutions already in use in other Member States;*

Or. en

Amendment 114

Tineke Strik

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 7

Motion for a resolution

7. Is alarmed by the stark deterioration of the independence of some Member States' justice systems, as reflected in some country chapters; calls on the Commission to clearly assess and designate such shortcomings and findings identified as a clear risk of a serious breach of the rule of law;

Amendment

7. Is alarmed by the stark deterioration of the independence of some Member States' justice systems **and the increasing open lack of compliance with EU law, including judgments of the Court of Justice**, as reflected in some country chapters; calls on the Commission to clearly assess and designate such shortcomings and findings identified as a clear risk of a serious breach of the rule of

law; *is deeply concerned by the Commission's failure to promptly and legally react with respect of the serious risks regarding the rule of law identified in country reports, particularly after these serious risks have become actual breaches of the rule of law;*

Or. en

Amendment 115
Konstantinos Arvanitis

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 7

Motion for a resolution

7. Is alarmed by the stark deterioration of the independence of some Member States' justice systems, as reflected in some country chapters; calls on the Commission to clearly assess and designate such shortcomings and findings identified as a clear risk of a serious breach of the rule of law;

Amendment

7. Is alarmed by the stark deterioration of the independence of some Member States' justice systems *and equality bodies*, as reflected in some country chapters; calls on the Commission to clearly assess and designate such shortcomings and findings identified as a clear risk of a serious breach of the rule of law;

Or. en

Amendment 116
Michal Šimečka, Sophia in 't Veld, Moritz Körner, Malik Azmani, Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Ramona Strugariu, Hilde Vautmans, Anna Júlia Donáth, Olivier Chastel, Fabienne Keller

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 7

Motion for a resolution

7. Is alarmed by the stark deterioration of the independence of some Member States' justice systems, as reflected in some country chapters; calls on the Commission to clearly assess and designate such shortcomings and findings *identified as a clear risk of a serious breach of the rule*

Amendment

7. Is alarmed by the stark deterioration of the independence of some Member States' justice systems, as reflected in some country chapters; calls on the Commission to clearly assess and designate such shortcomings and findings *in light of applicable standards in EU law;*

of law;

Or. en

Amendment 117

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Lukas Mandl, Konstantinos Arvanitis, Tineke Strik, Michal Šimečka, Katarina Barley, Elena Yoncheva, Łukasz Kohut, Dietmar Köster, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Petar Vitanov, Pietro Bartolo, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

**Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 7 a (new)**

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

7 a. 1. Highlights that, in accordance with Article 17(1) TEU, the Commission is to ensure the application of the Treaties and of secondary legislation, including in cases where risks of serious breaches of the values laid down in Article 2 TEU, identified in country reports, have effectively materialised following the publication of the 2020 report;

Or. en

Amendment 118

Maria Grapini

**Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 7 a (new)**

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

7a. Calls on the Commission to implement an appropriate set of policies to combat judicial corruption in the Member States and, at the same time, provide for the exclusion and prosecution of corrupt magistrates in order to prevent serious breaches of the rule of law;

Or. ro

Amendment 119

Nicolas Bay, Jean-Paul Garraud, Tom Vandendriessche, Harald Vilimsky, Nicolaus Fest, Laura Huhtasaari, Mara Bizzotto

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 8

Motion for a resolution

8. **Decries** the fact that the initiation of preliminary ruling proceedings before the Court of Justice of the EU has been declared unlawful in Member States subject to Article 7 of the TEU; **is appalled by** the growing resistance of some Member States to comply with CJEU rulings on the grounds of sovereignty or unconstitutionality; believes that these developments **pose a systemic threat to** the Union; **considers, therefore, that forthcoming annual reports should consider challenges to the Union's legal architecture and principles as serious violations in the assessment;**

Amendment

8. **Notes** the fact that the initiation of preliminary ruling proceedings before the Court of Justice of the EU has been declared unlawful in Member States subject to Article 7 of the TEU; **takes into account** the growing resistance of some Member States to comply with CJEU rulings on the **legitimate** grounds of sovereignty or unconstitutionality; believes that these developments **constitute a protest against a change in direction by** the Union **which seeks to impose one single view of the rule of law and the EU model of society regardless of the legal, constitutional and cultural traditions of the Member States;**

Or. fr

Amendment 120

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba, Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 8

Motion for a resolution

8. Decries the fact that **the initiation of preliminary ruling proceedings before** the Court of Justice of the EU **has been declared unlawful in Member States subject to Article 7 of the TEU; is appalled by** the growing resistance of some Member States to comply with CJEU rulings on the grounds of sovereignty or unconstitutionality; believes that these developments pose a systemic threat to the Union; considers, therefore, that

Amendment

8. Decries the fact that the Court of Justice of the EU **more and more often goes beyond its Treaty competences and rules ultra vires; supports** the growing resistance of some Member States to comply with CJEU rulings on the grounds of sovereignty or unconstitutionality; believes that these developments **in the CJEU** pose a systemic threat to **the existence of** the Union; considers, therefore, that forthcoming annual reports

forthcoming annual reports should consider challenges to the Union's legal architecture and principles as serious violations in the assessment;

should consider challenges *from the CJEU's side* to the Union's legal architecture and principles as serious violations in the assessment;

Or. en

Amendment 121
Milan Uhrík

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 8

Motion for a resolution

8. *Decries the fact* that the initiation of preliminary ruling proceedings before the Court of Justice of the EU has been declared unlawful in Member States subject to Article 7 of the TEU; *is appalled by* the growing resistance of some Member States to comply with CJEU rulings on the grounds of sovereignty or unconstitutionality; believes that these developments pose a systemic threat to the Union; *considers, therefore, that* forthcoming annual reports *should consider challenges to the Union's legal architecture and principles as serious violations in the assessment*;

Amendment

8. *Notes* that the initiation of preliminary ruling proceedings before the Court of Justice of the EU has been declared unlawful in Member States subject to Article 7 of the TEU; *acknowledges* the growing resistance of some Member States to comply with CJEU rulings on the grounds of sovereignty or unconstitutionality; believes that *if* these developments pose a systemic threat to the Union, *consideration should be given in* forthcoming annual reports *to assessing whether the legal structure and principles of the Union are not in conflict with the sovereignty and constitutionality of several Member States*;

Or. sk

Amendment 122
Loránt Vincze, Sven Simon

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 8

Motion for a resolution

8. *Decries* the fact that the initiation of preliminary ruling proceedings before the Court of Justice of the EU has been declared *unlawful in Member States*

Amendment

8. *Decries* the fact that the initiation of preliminary ruling proceedings before the Court of Justice of the EU has been declared *not applicable; takes note that*

subject to Article 7 of the TEU; is appalled by the growing resistance of some Member States to comply with CJEU rulings on the grounds of sovereignty or unconstitutionality; believes that these developments pose a systemic threat to the Union; considers, therefore, that forthcoming annual reports should consider challenges to the Union's legal architecture and principles as serious violations in the assessment;

some courts in some Member States have reservations to CJEU rulings; reminds that the competence conflict between EU law and constitutional reservations was never solved in the treaties; is of the view that forthcoming annual reports should consider those challenges to the Union's legal architecture;

Or. en

Amendment 123
Maria Grapini

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 8

Motion for a resolution

8. Decries the fact that the initiation of preliminary ruling proceedings before the Court of Justice of the EU has been declared unlawful in Member States subject to Article 7 of the TEU; *is appalled by the growing resistance of some Member States to comply with CJEU rulings on the grounds of sovereignty or unconstitutionality; believes that these developments pose a systemic threat to the Union; considers, therefore, that forthcoming annual reports should consider challenges to the Union's legal architecture and principles as serious violations in the assessment;*

Amendment

8. Decries the fact that the initiation of preliminary ruling proceedings before the Court of Justice of the EU has been declared unlawful in Member States subject to Article 7 of the TEU;

Or. ro

Amendment 124
Tineke Strik

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 8

Motion for a resolution

8. Decries ***the fact*** that the ***initiation of preliminary ruling proceedings before the Court of Justice of the EU has been declared unlawful in Member States subject to Article 7 of the TEU***; is appalled by the growing ***resistance of some Member States to comply with CJEU rulings on the grounds of sovereignty or unconstitutionality***; believes that these developments pose a systemic threat to the Union; considers, therefore, that forthcoming annual reports should consider ***challenges to the Union's legal architecture and principles*** as serious violations in the assessment;

Amendment

8. Decries that the ***functioning of the preliminary ruling mechanism has been deliberately undermined in Poland and Hungary to prevent national judges from asking questions to the Court of Justice in relation to EU requirements relating to judicial independence***; is appalled by the growing ***and deliberate lack of compliance with CJEU rulings***; believes that these ***unlawful*** developments pose a systemic threat to the Union ***and the functioning of its legal order***; considers therefore that forthcoming annual reports should consider ***non-respect with the rulings of the CJEU*** as serious violations in the assessment; ***urges the Commission to ensure an immediate and legal response to any instance where national authorities refuse to comply with a specific judgment of the CJEU or more generally, the case law of the CJEU, such as court actions under Article 260 TFEU***; ***calls on the Commission to closely monitor the Polish Constitutional Tribunal's case regarding the primacy of national constitutional norms over EU law launched at the request of the Prime Minister***;

Or. en

Amendment 125

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Konstantinos Arvanitis, Michal Šimečka, Katarina Barley, Elena Yoncheva, Łukasz Kohut, Dietmar Köster, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Petar Vitanov, Pietro Bartolo, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

**Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 8**

Motion for a resolution

8. Decries the fact that the initiation of preliminary ruling proceedings before the Court of Justice of the EU has been declared unlawful in Member States subject to Article 7 of the TEU; is appalled by the growing resistance of some Member

Amendment

8. Decries the fact that the initiation of preliminary ruling proceedings before the Court of Justice of the EU has been declared unlawful in Member States subject to Article 7 of the TEU; is appalled by the growing resistance of some Member

States to comply with CJEU rulings on the grounds of sovereignty or unconstitutionality; believes that these developments pose a systemic threat to the Union; considers, therefore, that forthcoming annual reports should consider challenges to the Union's legal architecture and principles as serious violations in the assessment;

States to comply with CJEU rulings on the grounds of sovereignty or unconstitutionality; believes that these developments pose a systemic threat to the Union; considers, therefore, that forthcoming annual reports should consider challenges to the Union's legal architecture and principles as serious violations in the assessment; ***calls on the Commission to closely monitor the Constitutional Tribunal's ruling regarding the primacy of national constitutional norms over EU law launched at the request of the Government of one country subject to Article 7; urges the Commission to ensure an immediate and adequate response to a refusal to implement and respect CJEU judgments, such as court actions under Article 260 TFEU;***

Or. en

Amendment 126

Lukas Mandl, Paulo Rangel, Roberta Metsola, Vladimír Bilčík

Motion for a resolution Paragraph 8

Motion for a resolution

8. Decries the ***fact that*** the initiation of preliminary ruling proceedings before the Court of Justice of the EU ***has been declared unlawful in Member States subject to Article 7 of the TEU***; is appalled by the growing resistance of some Member States to comply with CJEU rulings on the grounds of sovereignty or unconstitutionality; believes that these developments pose a systemic threat to the Union; considers, therefore, that forthcoming annual reports should consider challenges to the Union's legal architecture and principles as serious violations in the assessment;

Amendment

8. Decries the ***political pressure in Member States subject to Article 7 of the TEU to prevent*** the initiation of preliminary ruling proceedings ***by national courts*** before the Court of Justice of the EU; is appalled by the growing resistance of some Member States to comply with CJEU rulings on the grounds of sovereignty or unconstitutionality; believes that these developments pose a systemic threat to the ***unity of EU law and to the functioning of the Union as such***; considers, therefore, that forthcoming annual reports should consider challenges to the Union's legal architecture and principles as serious violations in the assessment; ***calls on the Commission to closely monitor the rulings of national***

courts regarding the primacy of EU law over national constitutional norms; urges the Commission to ensure immediate and adequate responses to refusals to implement and respect CJEU judgements, such as court actions following Article 260 TFEU;

Or. en

Amendment 127

Michal Šimečka, Sophia in 't Veld, Moritz Körner, Malik Azmani, Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Ramona Strugariu, Hilde Vautmans, Anna Júlia Donáth, Olivier Chastel, Dragoş Tudorache, Fabienne Keller

Motion for a resolution Paragraph 8

Motion for a resolution

8. Decries *the fact* that the *initiation of preliminary ruling proceedings before the Court of Justice of the EU has been declared unlawful in Member States subject to Article 7 of the TEU*; is appalled by the growing resistance of some Member States to comply with CJEU rulings on the grounds of sovereignty or unconstitutionality; believes that these developments pose a systemic threat to the Union; considers, therefore, that forthcoming annual reports should consider challenges to the Union's legal architecture and principles as serious violations in the assessment;

Amendment

8. Decries that the *governments of Poland and Hungary have repeatedly attempted to prevent national courts from referring cases to the Court of Justice of the European Union under Article 267 TFEU; considers this practice to be in contravention of the Treaties and the CJEU's established interpretation of the relevant provisions*; is appalled by the growing resistance of some Member States to comply with CJEU rulings on the grounds of sovereignty or unconstitutionality; believes that these developments pose a systemic threat to the Union; considers, therefore, that forthcoming annual reports should consider challenges to the Union's legal architecture and principles as serious violations in the assessment;

Or. en

Amendment 128

Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Michal Šimečka, Olivier Chastel, Moritz Körner, Ramona Strugariu, Hilde Vautmans

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 8

Motion for a resolution

8. Decries the fact that the initiation of preliminary ruling proceedings before the Court of Justice of the EU has been declared unlawful in Member States subject to Article 7 of the TEU; is appalled by the growing resistance of some Member States to comply with CJEU rulings on the grounds of sovereignty or unconstitutionality; believes that these developments pose a systemic threat to the Union; considers, therefore, that forthcoming annual reports should consider challenges to the Union's legal architecture and principles as serious violations in the assessment;

Amendment

8. Decries the fact that the initiation of preliminary ruling proceedings before the Court of Justice of the EU has been declared unlawful in Member States subject to Article 7 of the TEU; is appalled by the growing resistance of some Member States to comply with CJEU rulings on the grounds of sovereignty or unconstitutionality; believes that these developments pose a systemic threat to the Union; ***invites the Commission to include in future reports detailed data on Member States' compliance with ECJ rulings;*** considers, therefore, that forthcoming annual reports should consider challenges to the Union's legal architecture and principles as serious violations in the assessment;

Or. en

Amendment 129
Sandro Gozi, Fabienne Keller

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 8 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

8 a. Notes that the slowness of civil, criminal and administrative judicial procedures are now common practice, which, as the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe has emphasized over time, "constitute a major danger, in particular for the respect of the rule of law"; calls on the Commission to include in its report on the Rule of Law an evaluation of prison conditions, judicial backlogs and the average duration of trials for each Member State; recommends, when possible, alternative measures such as parole, suspended and

Amendment

reduced sentences, probation and court supervision, and when relevant amnesties;

Or. en

Amendment 130

Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Michal Šimečka, Olivier Chastel, Moritz Körner, Ramona Strugariu, Hilde Vautmans

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 8 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

8 a. Calls on the Commission to analyse in detail initiatives by Member States' governments that may jeopardise the independence of their national courts, in particular when a very high percentage of members of the judiciary or other involved party request it; recalls that the rule of law report must be objective and apply the same criteria when assessing all Member States;

Or. en

Amendment 131

Terry Reintke, Marc Angel, Liesje Schreinemacher, Malin Björk, Michal Šimečka, Moritz Körner, Tineke Strik, Olivier Chastel, Ramona Strugariu, Anne-Sophie Pelletier, Evin Incir, Dietmar Köster, Sylwia Spurek, Hilde Vautmans, Sylvie Guillaume, Cyrus Engerer, Alice Kuhnke, Łukasz Kohut, Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 8 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

8 a. Is alarmed by the legislative measures adopted in some Members States under the pretext of COVID-19 measures; reaffirms its position that such measures need to respect EU fundamental rights and the rule of law and considers that equal treatment of persons is crucial^{1a};

Or. en

Amendment 132

Evin Incir

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 8 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

8 a. Reminds that EU Member States are obliged to give effect to Union legislation and adhere to the European Court of Justice's decisions; to this end, points specifically to the right of same-sex couples to equal treatment as established in case C-673/16;

Or. en

Amendment 133

Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 8 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

8 a. Emphasises that any discussions about sanctions against a Member State must be based solely on objective and technical criteria and not on political evaluations or motivations;

Or. en

Amendment 134

Terry Reintke, Marc Angel, Maria Walsh, Liesje Schreinemacher, Malin Björk, Michal Šimečka, Moritz Körner, Tineke Strik, Olivier Chastel, Ramona Strugariu, Anne-Sophie Pelletier, Evin Incir, Dietmar Köster, Sylwia Spurek, Hilde Vautmans, Sylvie Guillaume, Magdalena Adamowicz, Cyrus Engerer, Alice Kuhnke, Łukasz Kohut,

Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield

**Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 8 b (new)**

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

8 b. Expresses concern at the use of legal measures by governments and powerful individuals to silence critics, such as the use of strategic lawsuits against public participation (SLAPPs), or the use of laws curtailing the right to freedom of expression in a manner incompatible with international human rights law, for example against LGBTI and women's activists; calls on the Commission to accelerate the setting up of the expert group on SLAPPs as foreseen in the European Democracy Action Plan, to begin its work as soon as feasible and to ensure any upcoming legislative proposal addresses these issues;

Or. en

**Amendment 135
Laura Ferrara, Sabrina Pignedoli**

**Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 8 a (new)**

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

8a. Reiterates that corruption is a serious threat to democracy, the rule of law and fair treatment for all citizens; stresses that, by diverting public funds away from their intended public use, corruption detracts from the level and quality of public services, thereby undermining fundamental rights; calls on the Member States and institutions to devise effective ways of combating corruption, regularly monitoring the use made of both European and national public funds;

Amendment 136

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba, Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 9

Motion for a resolution

9. **Welcomes** the dedication of a specific chapter to anti-corruption efforts in each country report; points out that while the existence of national anticorruption strategies can be considered progress, their effectiveness on the ground must also be assessed; notes that an assessment of the resilience of the anti-corruption framework to tackle corruption-related risks in the area of public procurement remains largely absent from the 2020 report; **invites the Commission to place greater emphasis on the misuse of EU funds, particularly in view of the new conditionality mechanism;**

Amendment

9. **Notes** the dedication of a specific chapter to anti-corruption efforts in each country report; points out that while the existence of national anticorruption strategies can be considered progress, their effectiveness on the ground must also be assessed; notes that an assessment of the resilience of the anti-corruption framework to tackle corruption-related risks in the area of public procurement remains largely absent from the 2020 report;

Amendment 137

Nicolas Bay, Jean-Paul Garraud, Tom Vandendriessche, Harald Vilimsky, Nicolaus Fest, Laura Huhtasaari, Mara Bizzotto

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 9

Motion for a resolution

9. Welcomes the dedication of a specific chapter to anti-corruption efforts in each country report; points out that while the existence of national anticorruption strategies can be considered progress, their effectiveness on the ground must also be assessed; notes that an assessment of the resilience of the anti-corruption framework

Amendment

9. Welcomes the dedication of a specific chapter to anti-corruption efforts in each country report; points out that while the existence of national anticorruption strategies can be considered progress, their effectiveness on the ground must also be assessed; notes that an assessment of the resilience of the anti-corruption framework

to tackle corruption-related risks in the area of public procurement remains largely absent from the 2020 report; invites the Commission to place greater emphasis on the misuse of EU funds, ***particularly in view of the new conditionality mechanism***;

to tackle corruption-related risks in the area of public procurement remains largely absent from the 2020 report; invites the Commission to place greater emphasis on the misuse of EU funds;

Or. fr

Amendment 138
Tineke Strik, Domènec Ruiz Devesa

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 9

Motion for a resolution

9. Welcomes the dedication of a specific chapter to anti-corruption efforts in each country report; points out that while the existence of national anticorruption strategies can be considered progress, their effectiveness on the ground must also be assessed; notes that an assessment of the resilience of the anti-corruption framework to tackle corruption-related risks in the area of public procurement remains largely absent from the 2020 report; invites the Commission to place greater emphasis on the misuse of EU funds, particularly in view of the new conditionality mechanism;

Amendment

9. Welcomes the dedication of a specific chapter to anti-corruption efforts in each country report; points out that while the existence of national anticorruption strategies can be considered progress, their effectiveness on the ground must also be assessed; notes that an assessment of the resilience of the anti-corruption framework to tackle corruption-related risks in the area of public procurement remains largely absent from the 2020 report; invites the Commission to place greater emphasis on the misuse of EU funds, particularly in view of the new conditionality mechanism, ***and to review the proper functioning of investigation and public prosecution services in each Member State in relation to the investigation and prosecution of fraud, including tax fraud, corruption or other breaches of Union law relating to the implementation of the Union budget or to the protection of the financial interests of the Union***;

Or. en

Amendment 139
Michal Šimečka, Sophia in 't Veld, Moritz Körner, Malik Azmani, Maite

Pagazaurtundúa, Ramona Strugariu, Hilde Vautmans, Anna Júlia Donáth, Olivier Chastel, Dragoş Tudorache, Fabienne Keller

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 9

Motion for a resolution

9. Welcomes the dedication of a specific chapter to anti-corruption efforts in each country report; points out that while the existence of national anticorruption strategies can be considered progress, their effectiveness on the ground must also be assessed; notes that an assessment of the resilience of the anti-corruption framework to tackle corruption-related risks in the area of public procurement remains largely absent from the 2020 report; invites the Commission to place greater emphasis on the misuse of EU funds, particularly in view of *the new* conditionality *mechanism*;

Amendment

9. Welcomes the dedication of a specific chapter to anti-corruption efforts in each country report; points out that while the existence of national anticorruption strategies can be considered progress, their effectiveness on the ground must also be assessed; notes that an assessment of the resilience of the anti-corruption framework to tackle corruption-related risks in the area of public procurement remains largely absent from the 2020 report; invites the Commission to place greater emphasis on the misuse of EU funds, particularly in view of *Regulation 2020/2092 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 2020 on a general regime of conditionality for the protection of the Union budget; stresses that Regulation 2020/2092 is in force since 1 January 2021 and calls for its immediate application in line with Parliament's resolution of 25 March 2021*;

Or. en

Amendment 140

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Lukas Mandl, Konstantinos Arvanitis, Tineke Strik, Michal Šimečka, Katarina Barley, Elena Yoncheva, Łukasz Kohut, Dietmar Köster, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Petar Vitanov, Pietro Bartolo, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 9

Motion for a resolution

9. Welcomes the dedication of a specific chapter to anti-corruption efforts in each country report; points out that while the existence of national anticorruption

Amendment

9. Welcomes the dedication of a specific chapter to anti-corruption efforts in each country report *since systemic corruption undermines both the*

strategies can be considered progress, their effectiveness on the ground must also be assessed; notes that an assessment of the resilience of the anti-corruption framework to tackle corruption-related risks in the area of public procurement remains largely absent from the 2020 report; invites the Commission to place greater emphasis on the misuse of EU funds, particularly in view of the new conditionality mechanism;

functioning of the rule of law and the trust of citizens in the decisions taken by authorities, civil servants and the judiciary; points out that while the existence of national anticorruption strategies can be considered progress, their effectiveness on the ground must also be assessed; notes that an assessment of the resilience of the anti-corruption framework to tackle corruption-related risks in the area of public procurement remains largely absent from the 2020 report; invites the Commission to place greater emphasis on the misuse of EU funds, particularly in view of the new conditionality mechanism;

Or. en

Amendment 141
Monika Hohlmeier, Lena Düpont

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 9

Motion for a resolution

9. Welcomes the dedication of a specific chapter to anti-corruption efforts in each country report; points out that while the existence of national anticorruption strategies can be considered progress, their effectiveness on the ground must also be assessed; notes that an assessment of the resilience of the anti-corruption framework to tackle corruption-related risks in the area of public procurement remains largely absent from the 2020 report; ***invites the Commission to place greater emphasis on the misuse of EU funds, particularly in view of the new conditionality mechanism;***

Amendment

9. Welcomes the dedication of a specific chapter to anti-corruption efforts in each country report; points out that while the existence of national anticorruption strategies can be considered progress, their effectiveness on the ground must also be assessed; notes that an assessment of the resilience of the anti-corruption framework to tackle corruption-related risks in the area of public procurement remains largely absent from the 2020 report;

Or. en

Amendment 142
Paulo Rangel

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 9

Motion for a resolution

9. Welcomes the dedication of a specific chapter to anti-corruption efforts in each country report; points out that while the existence of national anticorruption strategies can be considered progress, their effectiveness on the ground must also be assessed; notes that an assessment of the resilience of the anti-corruption framework to tackle corruption-related risks in the area of public procurement remains largely absent from the 2020 report; invites the Commission to place greater emphasis on the misuse of EU funds, particularly in view of the new conditionality mechanism;

Amendment

9. Welcomes the dedication of a specific chapter to anti-corruption efforts in each country report; points out that while the existence of national anticorruption strategies can be considered progress, their **implementation and subsequent effectiveness on the ground are crucial for the rule of law and** must also be assessed; notes that an assessment of the resilience of the anti-corruption framework to tackle corruption-related risks in the area of public procurement remains largely absent from the 2020 report; invites the Commission to place greater emphasis on the misuse of EU funds, particularly in view of the new conditionality mechanism;

Or. en

Amendment 143
Laura Ferrara, Sabrina Pignedoli

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 9 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

9a. Welcomes the fact that the Commission has recognised that corruption is a powerful ally of organised crime and therefore urges the Commission to create stronger legislation to counter organised crime, especially the more aggressive type such as mafia-style crime;

Or. it

Amendment 144
Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Lukas Mandl, Konstantinos Arvanitis, Tineke Strik, Michal

Šimečka, Łukasz Kohut, Dietmar Köster, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Petar Vitanov, Pietro Bartolo, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

**Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 9 a (new)**

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

9 a. Is deeply concerned by the growing threat caused by corruption-related crimes and calls on the Commission to update and enhance where necessary the Union's anti-corruption legislation, making use of the findings of the report to better respond to the identified deficiencies;

Or. en

Amendment 145

Vladimír Bilčík, Paulo Rangel, Lukas Mandl, Isabel Wiseler-Lima

**Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 9 a (new)**

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

9 a. Is concerned by the rise of illiberal tendencies as well as corruption; underlines the dangers of this trend for the cohesion of the Union's legal order, the functioning of its single market, the effectiveness of its common policies and its international credibility;

Or. en

Amendment 146

Laura Ferrara, Sabrina Pignedoli

**Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 9 b (new)**

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

9b. Calls on the Commission to

provide for and adapt appropriate instruments and procedures to encourage and protect whistleblowers who report organised crime, corruption and money laundering offences, while providing the necessary security and confidentiality safeguards for citizens and public and private sector operators;

Or. it

Amendment 147

Milan Uhrík

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 10

Motion for a resolution

10. *Welcomes* the inclusion in the report of a specific chapter on monitoring media freedom and pluralism; urges the Commission to *provide an assessment of the efficiency and effectiveness of the national frameworks for the protection of media freedom and media pluralism;*

Amendment

10. *Acknowledges* the inclusion in the report of a specific chapter on monitoring media freedom and pluralism; urges the Commission to *include in the report a chapter on monitoring the freedom and pluralism of expression of individuals, in particular those who do not express their consent to current events and denounce the current situation in a democratic manner;*

Or. sk

Amendment 148

Ramona Strugariu, Michal Šimečka, Olivier Chastel, Sophia in 't Veld, Fabienne Keller, Hilde Vautmans, Dragoş Tudorache, Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Anna Júlia Donáth

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 10

Motion for a resolution

10. Welcomes the inclusion in the report of a specific chapter on monitoring media freedom and pluralism; urges the Commission to provide an assessment of the efficiency and effectiveness of the

Amendment

10. Welcomes the inclusion in the report of a specific chapter on monitoring media freedom and pluralism; urges the Commission to provide an assessment of the efficiency and effectiveness of the

national frameworks for the protection of media freedom and media pluralism;

national frameworks for the protection of media freedom and media pluralism **and make concrete recommendations for improving the situation; deems it important that the annual rule of law reports provide the basis for strong action on behalf of the European Commission in order to address the deficiencies identified;**

Or. en

Amendment 149

Laura Ferrara, Sabrina Pignedoli

Motion for a resolution Paragraph 10

Motion for a resolution

10. Welcomes the inclusion in the report of a specific chapter on monitoring media freedom and pluralism; urges the Commission to provide an assessment of the efficiency and effectiveness of the national frameworks for the protection of media freedom and media pluralism;

Amendment

10. Welcomes the inclusion in the report of a specific chapter on monitoring media freedom and pluralism; urges the Commission to provide an assessment of the efficiency and effectiveness of the national frameworks for the protection of media freedom and media pluralism; **stresses the importance of monitoring the situation of the media in the Member States in order to prevent the risk of further fostering the concentration of information in the hands of a few and preventing the spread of free and independent information;**

Or. it

Amendment 150

Lucia Ďuriš Nicholsonová

Motion for a resolution Paragraph 10

Motion for a resolution

10. Welcomes the inclusion in the

Amendment

10. Welcomes the inclusion in the

report of a specific chapter on monitoring media freedom and pluralism; urges the Commission to provide an assessment of the efficiency and effectiveness of the national frameworks for the protection of media freedom and media pluralism;

report of a specific chapter on monitoring media freedom and **media pluralism as these are the cornerstone of democratic societies; welcomes in particular the focus on the situation of safety of journalists as this is becoming increasingly urgent matter in the EU**; urges the Commission to provide an assessment of the efficiency and effectiveness of the national frameworks for the protection of media freedom and media pluralism;

Or. en

Amendment 151

Lukas Mandl, Paulo Rangel, Roberta Metsola, Vladimír Bilčík

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 10

Motion for a resolution

10. Welcomes the inclusion in the report of a specific chapter on monitoring media freedom and pluralism; urges the Commission to provide an assessment of the efficiency and effectiveness of the national frameworks for the protection of media freedom and media pluralism;

Amendment

10. Welcomes the inclusion in the report of a specific chapter on monitoring media freedom and pluralism; urges the Commission to provide an assessment of the efficiency and effectiveness of the national frameworks for the protection of media freedom and media pluralism; **calls on the Commission to put a specific focus on murder cases of journalists with a particular focus on the effective subsequent criminal investigations and proceedings;**

Or. en

Amendment 152

Maria Grapini

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 10

Motion for a resolution

10. Welcomes the inclusion in the

Amendment

10. Welcomes the inclusion in the

report of a specific chapter on monitoring media freedom and pluralism; urges the Commission to provide an assessment of the efficiency and effectiveness of the national frameworks for the protection of media freedom and media pluralism;

report of a specific chapter on monitoring media freedom and pluralism; urges the Commission to provide an assessment of the efficiency and effectiveness of the national frameworks for the protection of media freedom and media pluralism ***and an assessment of the degree of respect for the right of freedom of expression and opinion in the Member States;***

Or. ro

Amendment 153

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba, Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 10

Motion for a resolution

10. ***Welcomes*** the inclusion in the report of a specific chapter on monitoring media freedom and pluralism; ***urges*** the Commission to provide an assessment of the efficiency and effectiveness of the national frameworks for the protection of media freedom and media pluralism;

Amendment

10. ***Notes*** the inclusion in the report of a specific chapter on monitoring media freedom and pluralism; ***invites*** the Commission to provide an assessment of the efficiency and effectiveness of the national frameworks for the protection of media freedom and media pluralism;

Or. en

Amendment 154

Magdalena Adamowicz

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 10 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

10 a. Is alarmed by the growing use of SLAPP to silence or intimidate investigative journalists and outlets and create a climate of fear around their reporting of certain topics; stresses that SLAPP actions attack democratic public participation, interfere with fundamental

Amendment

rights of individuals, such as freedom of expression and freedom to receive information, and therefore threaten democracy and the rule of law within the whole Union;

Or. en

Amendment 155

Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Michal Šimečka, Olivier Chastel, Moritz Körner, Ramona Strugariu, Hilde Vautmans

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 10 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

10 a. Calls on the Commission to continue to assess rigorously and objectively whether press freedom is respected in all Member States; insists on the need to examine measures taken by any government to silence critical media and/or to undermine freedom and pluralism;

Or. en

Amendment 156

Lukas Mandl, Paulo Rangel, Roberta Metsola, Vladimír Bilčík

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 11

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

11. Deplores the lack of assessment as regards the public media sector at national level and its degree of independence from government or any other interference and an assessment of transparency of media ownership; believes that proper implementation of Article 30 of the 2018 Audiovisual Media Services Directive¹⁹ should be closely monitored;

11. Deplores the lack of assessment as regards the public **and private** media sector at national level and its degree of independence from government or any other interference and an assessment of transparency of media ownership; believes that proper implementation of Article 30 of the 2018 Audiovisual Media Services Directive¹⁹ should be closely monitored; **calls in this regard on the Commission to**

examine attempts of intimidation and defamation of journalists, in particular by public service broadcasters; in this context, highlights the trend that increasingly also foreign journalists are directly attacked as public enemies for their investigative reports;

¹⁹ OJ L 303, 28.11.2018, p. 69.

¹⁹ OJ L 303, 28.11.2018, p. 69.

Or. en

Amendment 157
Tineke Strik

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 11

Motion for a resolution

11. Deplores the lack of assessment as regards the public media sector at national level and its degree of independence from **government** or any other interference and an assessment of transparency of media ownership; believes that proper implementation of Article 30 of the 2018 Audiovisual Media **Services** Directive¹⁹ should be closely monitored;

¹⁹ OJ L 303, 28.11.2018, p. 69.

Amendment

11. Deplores the lack of assessment as regards the public media sector at national level and its degree of **de jure and de facto** independence from **national authorities, political parties** or any other interference and an assessment of **media concentration and** transparency of media ownership; **deplores the lack of assessment of the jure and de facto degree of independence of national media regulatory bodies**; believes that proper implementation of Article 30 of the 2018 Audiovisual **and Media Service** Directive¹⁹ should be closely monitored;

¹⁹ OJ L 303, 28.11.2018, p. 69.

Or. en

Amendment 158
Laura Ferrara, Sabrina Pignedoli

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 11

Motion for a resolution

11. Deplores the lack of assessment as regards the public media sector at national level and its degree of independence from government or any other interference and an assessment of transparency of media ownership; believes that proper implementation of Article 30 of the 2018 Audiovisual Media Services Directive¹⁹ should be closely monitored;

¹⁹ OJ L 303, 28.11.2018, p. 69.

Amendment

11. Deplores the lack of assessment as regards the public media sector at national level and its degree of independence from government or any other interference and an assessment of transparency of media ownership; ***stresses how important it is for the Commission to monitor the existence of conflict-of-interest laws in the Member States, urging those without such laws to introduce them***; believes that proper implementation of Article 30 of the 2018 Audiovisual Media Services Directive should be closely monitored;

Or. it

Amendment 159

Anna Júlia Donáth, Moritz Körner, Fabienne Keller, Olivier Chastel, Hilde Vautmans, Jan-Christoph Oetjen, Sophia in 't Veld, Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Michal Šimečka

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 11

Motion for a resolution

11. Deplores the lack of assessment as regards the public media sector at national level and its degree of independence from government or any other interference and an assessment of transparency of media ownership; believes that proper implementation of Article 30 of the 2018 Audiovisual Media Services Directive¹⁹ should be closely monitored;

¹⁹ OJ L 303, 28.11.2018, p. 69.

Amendment

11. Deplores the lack of assessment as regards the public ***service*** media sector at national level and its degree of independence from government or any other interference and an assessment of transparency of media ownership; believes that proper implementation of Article 30 of the 2018 Audiovisual Media Services Directive¹⁹ ***and particularly its Article 30*** should be closely monitored ***and infringement procedures should be initiated as a matter of priority***;

¹⁹ OJ L 303, 28.11.2018, p. 69.

Or. en

Amendment 160

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba, Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 11

Motion for a resolution

11. **Deplores** the lack of assessment as regards the public media sector at national level and its degree of independence from government or any other interference and an assessment of transparency of media ownership; believes that proper implementation of Article 30 of the 2018 Audiovisual Media Services Directive¹⁹ should be closely monitored;

¹⁹ OJ L 303, 28.11.2018, p. 69.

Amendment

11. **Notes** the lack of assessment as regards the public media sector at national level and its degree of independence from government or any other interference and an assessment of transparency of media ownership; believes that proper implementation of Article 30 of the 2018 Audiovisual Media Services Directive¹⁹ should be closely monitored;

¹⁹ OJ L 303, 28.11.2018, p. 69.

Or. en

Amendment 161

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Konstantinos Arvanitis, Tineke Strik, Katarina Barley, Elena Yoncheva, Łukasz Kohut, Dietmar Köster, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Petar Vitanov, Pietro Bartolo, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 11

Motion for a resolution

11. Deplores the lack of assessment as regards the **public** media sector at national level and its degree of independence from government or any other interference and an assessment of transparency of media ownership; believes that proper implementation of Article 30 of the 2018 Audiovisual Media Services Directive¹⁹ should be closely monitored;

¹⁹ OJ L 303, 28.11.2018, p. 69.

Amendment

11. Deplores the lack of assessment as regards the media sector at national level and its degree of independence from government or any other interference and an assessment of transparency of media ownership; believes that proper implementation of Article 30 of the 2018 Audiovisual Media Services Directive¹⁹ should be closely monitored;

¹⁹ OJ L 303, 28.11.2018, p. 69.

Amendment 162
Konstantinos Arvanitis

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 11 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

11 a. Invites the Commission to include an overview of the attacks against journalists across the Union and the responses provided by Member States in this regard in future rule of law reports;

Or. en

Amendment 163
Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Konstantinos Arvanitis, Tineke Strik, Katarina Barley, Elena Yoncheva, Łukasz Kohut, Dietmar Köster, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Petar Vitanov, Pietro Bartolo, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 12

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

12. Is alarmed by the growing deterioration of media freedom and media pluralism in some Member States since the publication of the 2020 report; ***observes with concern that challenges to media freedom are interlinked with the undermining of artistic freedom and academic freedom; calls, therefore, for this pillar to be expanded to all aspects of freedom of expression and for the title of the pillar to be adapted accordingly;***

12. Is alarmed by the growing deterioration of media freedom and media pluralism in some Member States since the publication of the 2020 report; ***is deeply concerned at the abuses, crimes and deadly attacks being committed against journalists and media workers in the Union in view of their activities;***

Or. en

Amendment 164
Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Michal Šimečka, Olivier Chastel, Moritz Körner, Ramona

Strugariu, Hilde Vautmans

**Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 12**

Motion for a resolution

12. Is alarmed by the growing deterioration of media freedom and media pluralism in some Member States since the publication of the 2020 report; observes with concern that challenges to media freedom are interlinked with the undermining of artistic freedom and academic freedom; calls, therefore, for this pillar to be expanded to all aspects of freedom of expression and for the title of the pillar to be adapted accordingly;

Amendment

12. Is alarmed by the growing deterioration of media freedom and media pluralism in some Member States since the publication of the 2020 report; ***recalls that threats and intimidation against journalists, including with regard to the disclosure of information on violations of fundamental rights, not only persist but are on the increase, and often lead to self-censorship and undermine the public's right to information***; observes with concern that challenges to media freedom are interlinked with the undermining of artistic freedom and academic freedom; calls, therefore, for this pillar to be expanded to all aspects of freedom of expression and ***coexistence with hate crime and hate speech, and*** for the title of the pillar to be adapted accordingly;

Or. en

**Amendment 165
Laura Ferrara, Sabrina Pignedoli**

**Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 12**

Motion for a resolution

12. Is alarmed by the growing deterioration of media freedom and media pluralism in some Member States since the publication of the 2020 report; observes with concern that challenges to media freedom are interlinked with the undermining of artistic freedom and academic freedom; calls, therefore, for this pillar to be expanded to all aspects of freedom of expression and for the title of the pillar to be adapted accordingly;

Amendment

12. Is alarmed by the growing deterioration of media freedom and media pluralism in some Member States since the publication of the 2020 report; observes with concern that challenges to media freedom are interlinked with the undermining of artistic freedom and academic freedom; calls, therefore, for this pillar to be expanded to all aspects of freedom of expression and for the title of the pillar to be adapted accordingly; ***is***

concerned about the disinformation campaigns and uncontrolled spread of fake news in Europe during the COVID-19 pandemic, which was primarily targeted at the governments of certain EU countries;

Or. it

Amendment 166

Lukas Mandl, Paulo Rangel, Roberta Metsola, Vladimír Bilčík

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 12

Motion for a resolution

12. Is alarmed by the growing deterioration of media freedom and media pluralism in some Member States since the publication of the 2020 report; observes with concern that challenges to media freedom are interlinked with the undermining of artistic freedom and academic freedom; calls, therefore, for this pillar to be expanded to all aspects of freedom of expression and for the title of the pillar to be adapted accordingly;

Amendment

12. Is alarmed by the growing deterioration of media freedom and media pluralism in some Member States since the publication of the 2020 report; observes with concern that challenges to media freedom are interlinked with the undermining of *the freedom of expression*, artistic freedom and academic freedom; *recalls in this regard physical, psychological and economic threats directed towards journalists that have so far resulted in the murder of investigative journalists*; calls, therefore, for this pillar to be expanded to all aspects of freedom of expression and for the title of the pillar to be adapted accordingly;

Or. en

Amendment 167

Nicolas Bay, Jean-Paul Garraud, Tom Vandendriessche, Harald Vilimsky, Nicolaus Fest, Laura Huhtasaari, Mara Bizzotto

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 12 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

12a. *Is concerned by the worsening*

state of affairs as regards freedom of expression and the acceptance of a wide variety of opinions on certain social networks; considers that their monopoly position makes them essential to modern political life and that the arbitrary censorship of legally-held opinions has a serious impact on citizens' freedom of expression; urges the Commission to propose a penalty system for platforms exercising censorship without a court order;

Or. fr

Amendment 168
Laura Ferrara, Sabrina Pignedoli

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 12 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

12a. Expresses concern about the threats and physical attacks against journalists in several Member States, as well as the growing practice of strategic lawsuits against public participation (SLAPP), against which the Commission should urge Member States to legislate in order to protect journalists from this practice, for the purpose of effectively defending the freedom of journalists to inform and the right of citizens to be informed;

Or. it

Amendment 169
Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Michal Šimečka, Olivier Chastel, Moritz Körner, Ramona Strugariu, Hilde Vautmans

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 12 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

12 a. *Calls on the Commission to assess in future reports the effect that hate crimes and hate speech have on the rise of violent outbreaks and dynamics of discrimination in Member States; recalls that hate crimes and hate speech are becoming normalised in many Member States, fuelled by the rise of extremist movements and their rhetoric, including those in power;*

Or. en

Amendment 170

Vladimír Bilčík, Paulo Rangel, Lukas Mandl, Isabel Wiseler-Lima

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 12 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

12 a. *Highlights the irreplaceable role of public service media and stresses that it is essential to ensure and maintain their independence and freedom from political interference; highlights the need to ensure financial independence and conditions for sustainable activity by private media operators to avoid political capture of the media;*

Or. en

Amendment 171

Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 12 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

12 a. *Deplores that in a number of Member States the governments have classified information on public*

procurement during the Covid-19 pandemic, thus increasing the risk of corruption and mistrust among citizens; calls on these Member States to reverse these abusive measures and provide full transparency for journalists and citizens;

Or. en

Amendment 172

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Lukas Mandl, Konstantinos Arvanitis, Tineke Strik, Elena Yoncheva, Łukasz Kohut, Dietmar Köster, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Petar Vitanov, Pietro Bartolo, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

**Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 12 a (new)**

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

12 a. Observes with concern that challenges to media freedom are interlinked with the undermining of artistic freedom and academic freedom; calls, therefore, for this pillar to be expanded to all aspects of freedom of expression and for the title of the pillar to be adapted accordingly;

Or. en

Amendment 173

Konstantinos Arvanitis

**Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 12 a (new)**

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

12 a. Observes that the deterioration of media freedom is leading to an increase in scapegoating and targeting of minorities, often government-led, for example against LGBTI people, migrants and refugees, leading to an increase in hate-speech against these groups and censorship of media;

Amendment 174

Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Michal Šimečka, Olivier Chastel, Moritz Körner, Ramona Strugariu, Hilde Vautmans

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 13

Motion for a resolution

13. Welcomes the report's pillar on checks and balances and its examination of exceptional measures taken to fight the COVID-19 pandemic;

Amendment

13. Welcomes the report's pillar on checks and balances and its examination of exceptional measures taken to fight the COVID-19 pandemic; ***notes with concern that the shrinking space for civil liberties in response to the pandemic has led to growing frustration among many citizens; warns that the channelling of this frustration has sometimes resulted in protests against the authorities or street violence; calls on the Commission to analyse these phenomena in its next report;***

Amendment 175

Konstantinos Arvanitis

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 13

Motion for a resolution

13. Welcomes the report's pillar on checks and balances and its examination of exceptional measures taken to fight the COVID-19 pandemic;

Amendment

13. Welcomes the report's pillar on checks and balances and its examination of exceptional measures taken to fight the COVID-19 pandemic; ***is alarmed by the pretext of Covid-19 emergency measures used to fast-track discriminatory legislation; calls on the Commission to continue its monitoring on exceptional measures to ensure that bills are prepared and enacted in a timely and transparent way, under parliamentary scrutiny and***

with open consultation of civil society;

Or. en

Amendment 176
Lucia Ďuriš Nicholsonová

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 13

Motion for a resolution

13. Welcomes the report's pillar on checks and balances and its examination of exceptional measures taken to fight the COVID-19 pandemic;

Amendment

13. Welcomes the report's pillar on checks and balances and its examination of exceptional measures taken to fight the COVID-19 pandemic; ***calls on the Commission to continue the monitoring of gradual lifting of the measures in a timely manner, with the focus on their impact on democracy, rule of law and fundamental rights, with specific regards to minorities, and to include it in the next report;***

Or. en

Amendment 177
Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Lukas Mandl, Konstantinos Arvanitis, Tineke Strik, Katarina Barley, Elena Yoncheva, Łukasz Kohut, Dietmar Köster, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Petar Vitanov, Pietro Bartolo, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 13

Motion for a resolution

13. Welcomes the report's pillar on checks and balances and its examination of exceptional measures taken to fight the COVID-19 pandemic;

Amendment

13. Welcomes the report's pillar on checks and balances, ***covering, inter alia, the process for preparing and enacting laws, the regime for the constitutional review of laws, the role of independent authorities and of civil society organisations in safeguarding the rule of law,*** and its examination of exceptional measures taken to fight the COVID-19 pandemic;

Amendment 178

Maria Grapini

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 13

Motion for a resolution

13. Welcomes the report's pillar on checks and balances and its examination of exceptional measures taken to fight the COVID-19 pandemic;

Amendment

13. Welcomes the report's pillar on checks and balances and its examination of exceptional measures taken to fight the COVID-19 pandemic; ***encourages the Commission to ensure that, during the COVID-19 pandemic and beyond, the rights of EU citizens are respected, protected and upheld by the Member States;***

Or. ro

Amendment 179

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba, Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 13

Motion for a resolution

13. ***Welcomes*** the report's pillar on checks and balances and its examination of exceptional measures taken to fight the COVID-19 pandemic;

Amendment

13. ***Notes*** the report's pillar on checks and balances and its examination of exceptional measures taken to fight the COVID-19 pandemic;

Or. en

Amendment 180

Ramona Strugariu, Michal Šimečka, Olivier Chastel, Sophia in 't Veld, Fabienne Keller, Hilde Vautmans, Dragoş Tudorache, Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Anna Júlia Donáth

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 13 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

13 a. Welcomes the reference to the role of ombudsperson institutions, as well as the fact that the Commission systematically included them in the fourth pillar of the country reports; calls on the Commission to pay more attention in the next annual cycle to the activities of national ombudspersons by going beyond acknowledging that ombudspersons institutions are established in Member States and looking more in depth into how they function, their degree of independence and their real contribution in terms of ensuring that adequate safeguards are in place;

Or. en

Amendment 181

Tineke Strik

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 13 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

13 a. Reiterates its concern about the increasingly shrinking space for independent civil society in some Member States, in particular for women's rights organisations, LGBTI organisations and human rights defenders, including criminalisation of activities, unreasonable administrative burdens, restrictions in access to funding, decreasing financial support for conducting advocacy, as well as restrictions on freedom of assembly and organisation;

Or. en

Amendment 182

Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 13 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

13 a. Notes with concern that the contracts signed by the European Commission with the pharma companies developing the anti-Covid-19 vaccines have sections and provisions which have not been made public yet; emphasizes that any official acts or contracts adopted or signed by the European entities or Member States that concern the health of European citizens must be public in their entirety;

Or. en

Amendment 183

Terry Reintke, Marc Angel, Maria Walsh, Liesje Schreinemacher, Malin Björk, Michal Šimečka, Moritz Körner, Tineke Strik, Olivier Chastel, Ramona Strugariu, Anne-Sophie Pelletier, Evin Incir, Dietmar Köster, Sylwia Spurek, Hilde Vautmans, Sylvie Guillaume, Magdalena Adamowicz, Cyrus Engerer, Alice Kuhnke, Łukasz Kohut, Gwendoline Delbos-Corfield

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 13 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

13 a. Stresses in particular the deterioration of the independence of some Member States' equality bodies since the publication of the reports, which constitutes an immediate threat to the fundamental rights of citizens;

Or. en

Amendment 184

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba, Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 14

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

14. Invites the Commission to define clear benchmarks on an enabling civic space;

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 185

Ramona Strugariu, Michal Šimečka, Sophia in 't Veld, Fabienne Keller, Hilde Vautmans, Dragoş Tudorache, Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Anna Júlia Donáth

Motion for a resolution Paragraph 14

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

14. Invites the Commission to define clear benchmarks on an enabling civic space;

14. Invites the Commission to define clear benchmarks on an enabling civic space; ***underlines the very important role civil society organisations play in defending the rule of law and European values on the ground, as well as in terms of providing valuable expertise; strongly believes that the Commission should institute a formal and continuous dialogue with civil society representatives on these issues and ensure their meaningful involvement in the elaboration of the annual rule of law report; highlights in this regard, based on the NGOs' experience from the 2020 cycle, that thematically structured consultations within the framework of the rule of law debates would increase the efficiency of the process and the amount of valuable feedback provided by the civil society; underlines that the deadlines imposed and the documents' formats used in the consultation process should be adequately adapted and flexible in order to allow for a complete and comprehensive input;***

Or. en

Amendment 186

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Konstantinos Arvanitis, Tineke Strik, Michal Šimečka, Katarina Barley, Elena Yoncheva, Łukasz Kohut, Dietmar Köster, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Petar Vitanov, Pietro Bartolo, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 14

Motion for a resolution

14. Invites the Commission to *define* clear benchmarks on an enabling civic space;

Amendment

14. *Stresses the importance of a healthy civic space to counterbalance the erosion of the rule of law and foster a rule of law culture; invites the Commission to deepen the assessment of civic space in the forthcoming 2021 report; considers beneficial to explore the definition of clear benchmarks on an enabling civic space to further strengthen this area of analysis in the long run, including, among others, the enabling legal environment for the exercise of civic freedoms, the framework for civic organisations' financial viability and sustainability, access to and participation in decision-making, the right to access to information, safe space, including as regards incidence and responses to verbal and physical attacks, smear campaigns and legal harassment including through Strategic Litigation Against Public Participation;*

Or. en

Amendment 187

Anna Júlia Donáth, Moritz Körner, Fabienne Keller, Olivier Chastel, Hilde Vautmans, Jan-Christoph Oetjen, Sophia in 't Veld, Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Ramona Strugariu, Michal Šimečka

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 14

Motion for a resolution

14. *Invites the Commission to define clear benchmarks on an enabling civic space;*

Amendment

14. *Considers that, given the role of civil society in promoting, explaining, monitoring and holding governments accountable with regard to the realisation*

of Union values, including key building blocks of the rule of law, an additional chapter dedicated to monitoring the evolution of civic space in Member States should be added to each country report and the horizontal report;

Or. en

Amendment 188

Michal Šimečka, Sophia in 't Veld, Moritz Körner, Malik Azmani, Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Ramona Strugariu, Hilde Vautmans, Anna Júlia Donáth, Olivier Chastel, Fabienne Keller

Motion for a resolution Paragraph 14

Motion for a resolution

14. Invites the Commission to define clear benchmarks *on an enabling* civic space;

Amendment

14. Invites the Commission to define clear benchmarks *concerning the breadth and openness of* civic space;

Or. en

Amendment 189

Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Michal Šimečka, Olivier Chastel, Moritz Körner, Ramona Strugariu, Hilde Vautmans

Motion for a resolution Paragraph 14 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

14 a. Calls on the Commission to assess in future reports whether the exercise of political rights by citizens is guaranteed in all Member States; recalls that hate speech, hate crimes and ideologically motivated harassment can lead to a spiral of silence and under-representation in the political sphere and thus undermine ideological pluralism and fundamental rights; calls on the Commission to assess in future reports the situation of ideological and political pluralism in the

Member States; regrets that political freedom and freedom of thought, which underpin ideological pluralism, are increasingly under siege from parliamentary bodies and even regional or national governments; condemns harassment and attacks against individuals or parties on political grounds; notes that such acts increase tension, polarisation and the normalisation of the curve of violence, accelerating the deterioration of the rule of law;

Or. en

Amendment 190

Anna Júlia Donáth, Moritz Körner, Fabienne Keller, Olivier Chastel, Hilde Vautmans, Jan-Christoph Oetjen, Sophia in 't Veld, Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Ramona Strugariu, Michal Šimečka

**Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 14 a (new)**

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

14 a. Suggests therefore that such a chapter should focus on 1) the legal environment for the exercise of civic freedoms; 2) the framework for civic organisations' sustainability and financial viability, including the issue of government-organized non-governmental organizations (GONGOs); 3) participation in decision-making, including the right to access to information; 4) safe space, including verbal and physical attacks, smear campaigns as well as legal, administrative and fiscal harassment, the chilling effect they trigger and the long term consequences in terms of active citizenship in the country;

Or. en

Amendment 191

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Konstantinos Arvanitis, Tineke Strik, Michal Šimečka, Katarina Barley, Elena Yoncheva, Łukasz Kohut, Dietmar Köster, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Pietro Bartolo, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

**Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 14 a (new)**

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

14 a. Recalls the importance of independent national human rights institutions and ombudsman bodies, in full compliance with the Paris Principles, as well as equality bodies, in preserving citizens' rights and being able to defend the rule of law at national level; is deeply concerned by recent attempts in a Member State subject to Article 7(1) TEU to undermine the independence of the national Ombudsman from the executive;

Or. en

Amendment 192

Lukas Mandl, Paulo Rangel, Roberta Metsola, Vladimír Bilčík

**Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 14 a (new)**

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

14 a. Recalls the importance of independent national human rights institutions and national ombudsman bodies, in full compliance with the Paris Principles, as well as equality bodies, in preserving citizens' rights and being able to defend the rule of law at national, regional and local level;

Or. en

Amendment 193

Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Michal Šimečka, Olivier Chastel, Moritz Körner, Ramona Strugariu, Hilde Vautmans

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 14 b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

14 b. Regrets that freedom of association and the shrinking space for civil society are not part of the current report; reiterates that civil society is essential for democracies to flourish and that a shrinking space for civil society contributes to violations of democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights; reiterates that the Union institutions should maintain an open, transparent and regular dialogue with representative associations and civil society;

Or. en

Amendment 194
Milan Uhrík

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 15

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

15. Regrets the non-implementation, which in itself constitutes a serious violation of the rule of law, by a Member State subject to Article 7 of the TEU of a CJEU ruling in relation to restrictions imposed on the financing of civil organisations by persons established outside that Member State; notes with concern that an increasing number of Member States are adopting legislation that severely impinges on the freedom of association and expression for civil society organisations;

deleted

Or. sk

Amendment 195
Nicolas Bay, Jean-Paul Garraud, Tom Vandendriessche, Harald Vilimsky, Nicolaus

Fest, Laura Huhtasaari, Mara Bizzotto

**Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 15**

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

15. Regrets the non-implementation, which in itself constitutes a serious violation of the rule of law, by a Member State subject to Article 7 of the TEU of a CJEU ruling in relation to restrictions imposed on the financing of civil organisations by persons established outside that Member State; notes with concern that an increasing number of Member States are adopting legislation that severely impinges on the freedom of association and expression for civil society organisations; *deleted*

Or. fr

Amendment 196

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba, Cristian Terheş

**Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 15**

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

15. Regrets the non-implementation, which in itself constitutes a serious violation of the rule of law, by a Member State subject to Article 7 of the TEU of a CJEU ruling in relation to restrictions imposed on the financing of civil organisations by persons established outside that Member State; notes with concern that an increasing number of Member States are adopting legislation that severely impinges on the freedom of association and expression for civil society organisations; *deleted*

Or. en

Amendment 197

Tineke Strik

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 15

Motion for a resolution

15. Regrets the non-implementation, which in itself constitutes a serious violation of the rule of law, by **a Member State subject to Article 7 of the TEU** of a CJEU ruling in relation to restrictions imposed on the financing of civil organisations by persons established outside that Member State; notes with concern that an increasing number of Member States **are adopting** legislation **that** severely **impinges on** the freedom of association and expression for civil society organisations;

Amendment

15. Regrets **that** the non-implementation, which in itself constitutes a serious violation of the rule of law, by **Hungary** of a CJEU ruling in relation to **the unlawful** restrictions imposed on the financing of civil organisations by persons established outside that Member State, **continues to prevent civil society organisations from operating in an environment compliant with the rule of law; urges the Commission to refer Hungary to the CJEU and request dissuasive financial sanctions under Article 260 TFEU as a matter of urgency;** notes with concern that an increasing number of Member States **adopt** legislation **which** severely **constraints** the freedom of association and expression for civil society organisations **thus contributing to a shrinking space for civil society in breach of the EU Treaties;**

Or. en

Amendment 198

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Lukas Mandl, Konstantinos Arvanitis, Tineke Strik, Katarina Barley, Elena Yoncheva, Łukasz Kohut, Dietmar Köster, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Petar Vitanov, Pietro Bartolo, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 15

Motion for a resolution

15. Regrets the non-implementation, which in itself constitutes a serious violation of the rule of law, by a Member State subject to Article 7 of the TEU of a

Amendment

15. Regrets **that** the non-implementation, which in itself constitutes a serious violation of the rule of law, by a Member State subject to Article 7 of the

CJEU ruling in relation to restrictions imposed on the financing of civil organisations by persons established outside that Member State; notes with concern that an increasing number of Member States are adopting legislation that severely impinges on the freedom of association and expression for civil society organisations;

TEU of a CJEU ruling in relation to restrictions imposed on the financing of civil organisations by persons established outside that Member State, *perpetuates the process of shrinking space for civil society in that Member State*; notes with concern that an increasing number of Member States are adopting legislation that severely impinges on the freedom of association and expression for civil society organisations;

Or. en

Amendment 199

Michal Šimečka, Sophia in 't Veld, Moritz Körner, Malik Azmani, Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Ramona Strugariu, Hilde Vautmans, Anna Júlia Donáth, Dragoş Tudorache, Fabienne Keller

Motion for a resolution Paragraph 15

Motion for a resolution

15. Regrets the non-implementation, which in itself constitutes a serious violation of the rule of law, by *a Member State subject to Article 7 of the TEU* of a CJEU ruling in relation to restrictions imposed on the financing of civil organisations by persons established outside that Member State; notes with concern that an increasing number of Member States are adopting legislation that severely impinges on the freedom of association and expression for civil society organisations;

Amendment

15. Regrets the non-implementation, which in itself constitutes a serious violation of the rule of law, by *Hungary* of a CJEU ruling in relation to restrictions imposed on the financing of civil organisations by persons established outside that Member State; notes with concern that an increasing number of Member States are adopting legislation that severely impinges on the freedom of association and expression for civil society organisations;

Or. en

Amendment 200

Tineke Strik

Motion for a resolution Paragraph 15 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

15 a. *Regrets that the report fails to recognise in clear terms the deliberate process of democratic and rule of law backsliding organised by national authorities in some EU Member States and the ensuing progressive establishment of (semi-)autocratic regimes, based on the gradual annihilation of all checks and balances; calls on the Commission to acknowledge and take account of the multiple and authoritative annual reports and indexes which measures EU Member States' adherence to democracy, rule of law and human rights over time;*

Or. en

Amendment 201

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Lukas Mandl, Konstantinos Arvanitis, Michal Šimečka, Katarina Barley, Elena Yoncheva, Łukasz Kohut, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Dietmar Köster, Petar Vitanov, Pietro Bartolo, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 15 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

15 a. *Regrets that the report fails to recognise in clear terms the democratic backsliding and the establishment of (semi-)autocratic regimes in some Member States, based on the gradual annihilation of all checks and balances;*

Or. en

Amendment 202

Konstantinos Arvanitis

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 16

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

16. Regrets the fact that the 2020 report fails to encompass fully the Article 2 TEU values of democracy and fundamental rights, which are immediately affected when countries start backsliding on the rule of law;

16. Regrets the fact that the 2020 report fails to encompass fully the Article 2 TEU values of democracy and fundamental rights, ***especially the rights of persons belonging to minorities, and of non-discrimination***, which are immediately affected when countries start backsliding on the rule of law; ***calls on the Commission to assess the persistent violations of democracy and fundamental rights everywhere in the Union, including attacks against migrants, asylum seekers and refugees, women's rights, LGBTIQ people's rights, freedom of association and freedom of assembly***;

Or. en

Amendment 203

Michal Šimečka, Sophia in 't Veld, Moritz Körner, Malik Azmani, Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Ramona Strugariu, Hilde Vautmans, Anna Júlia Donáth, Olivier Chastel, Dragoș Tudorache, Fabienne Keller

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 16

Motion for a resolution

16. Regrets the fact that the 2020 report fails to encompass fully the Article 2 TEU values of democracy and fundamental rights, which are immediately affected when countries start backsliding on the rule of law;

Amendment

16. Regrets the fact that the 2020 report fails to encompass fully the Article 2 TEU values of democracy and fundamental rights, ***including the rights of persons belonging to minorities and non-discrimination, including gender equality, sexual and reproductive rights and LGBTIQ rights***, which are immediately affected when countries start backsliding on the rule of law;

Or. en

Amendment 204

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 16

Motion for a resolution

16. **Regrets** the fact that the 2020 report **fails to** encompass fully the Article 2 TEU values of democracy and fundamental rights, **which are immediately affected when countries start backsliding on** the rule of law;

Amendment

16. **Notes** the fact that the 2020 report **does not** encompass fully the Article 2 TEU values of democracy and fundamental rights, **because they are not** the rule of law;

Or. en

Amendment 205

Lukas Mandl, Paulo Rangel, Roberta Metsola, Vladimír Bilčík

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 16 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

16 a. Calls on the Commission to include country chapters of all candidate and potential candidate countries to EU enlargement with an in-depth analysis on their justice systems, anti-corruption frameworks, on media freedom and pluralism, as well as on institutional checks and balances;

Amendment

Or. en

Amendment 206

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba, Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 17

Motion for a resolution

17. **Encourages the Commission to consider including within the scope of future reports the application of all rights guaranteed by the Charter of Fundamental Rights;** stresses that any

Amendment

17. Stresses that any action taken by a Member State when acting within the scope of EU law must respect the rights and principles of the Charter of Fundamental Rights;

action taken by a Member State when acting within the scope of EU law must respect the rights and principles of the Charter of Fundamental Rights;

Or. en

Amendment 207

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Konstantinos Arvanitis, Lukas Mandl, Katarina Barley, Elena Yoncheva, Łukasz Kohut, Dietmar Köster, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Petar Vitanov, Pietro Bartolo, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 17

Motion for a resolution

17. Encourages the Commission to consider including within the scope of future reports the application of all rights guaranteed by the Charter of Fundamental Rights; stresses that any action taken by a Member State when acting within the scope of EU law must respect the rights and principles of the Charter of Fundamental Rights;

Amendment

17. ***Reiterates the intrinsic link that exists between the rule of law and fundamental rights and the need to increase awareness of the values enshrined in Article 2 TEU and the Charter;*** encourages the Commission to consider including within the scope of future reports the application of all rights guaranteed by the Charter of Fundamental Rights; stresses that any action taken by a Member State when acting within the scope of EU law must respect the rights and principles of the Charter of Fundamental Rights; ***insists therefore, on the link between upholding the rule of law and the right to an effective remedy before a tribunal, the right to a fair trial and the right to be advised, defended and represented, as well as the obligation to provide independent legal aid;***

Or. en

Amendment 208

Tineke Strik

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 17

Motion for a resolution

17. Encourages the Commission to consider **including** within the scope of **future reports** the application of all rights guaranteed by the Charter of Fundamental Rights; stresses that any action **taken** by a Member State when acting within the scope of EU law must respect the rights and principles of the Charter of Fundamental Rights;

Amendment

17. Encourages the Commission to consider within the scope of **the report** the application of all rights guaranteed by the Charter of Fundamental Rights, stresses that any action **undertaken** by a Member State when acting within the scope of EU law must respect the rights and principles of the Charter of Fundamental Rights; **insists therefore, on the link between upholding the rule of law and the right to an effective remedy before an independent and impartial tribunal established by law, the right to a fair trial and the right to be advised, defended and represented, as well as the obligation to provide independent legal aid;**

Or. en

Amendment 209

Loránt Vincze, François Alfonsi, Andrea Bocskor, Herbert Dorfmann, Łukasz Kohut, Valdemar Tomaševski, Yana Toom, István Ujhelyi, Iuliu Winkler, Tatjana Ždanoka, Antoni Comín i Oliveres, Clara Ponsatí Obiols, Carles Puigdemont i Casamajó

**Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 17 a (new)**

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

17 a. Calls on the Commission to include in its next reports detailed analyses and recommendations on the situation of the rights of autochthonous national and linguistic minorities, including through the involvement of the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights; stresses that this is an area where it should establish strong links and synergies with the Council of Europe, and in particular with its Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities and the Committee of Experts of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages;

Amendment 210

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Konstantinos Arvanitis, Katarina Barley, Elena Yoncheva, Łukasz Kohut, Dietmar Köster, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Petar Vitanov, Pietro Bartolo, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 17 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

17 a. Strongly denounces that European and international legislation are not fully respected in some EU Member States, for example in the field of anti-discrimination or in the field of asylum, such as the non-implementation by a Member State subject to an Article 7 TEU of several CJEU and ECtHR rulings in relation to access to the asylum procedure, including the automatic and unlawful detention and the deprivation of food, thus violating the rights of migrants and asylum seekers to apply for international protection;

Or. en

Amendment 211

Tineke Strik

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 17 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

17 a. Strongly denounces that European and international legislation are not fully respected in some EU Member States, for example in the field of anti-discrimination or in the field of asylum, such as the non-implementation by Hungary of several CJEU and ECtHR rulings in relation to access to the asylum procedure, thus violating the rights of migrants and asylum seekers to apply for international

protection;

Or. en

Amendment 212

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Lukas Mandl, Konstantinos Arvanitis, Tineke Strik, Michal Šimečka, Katarina Barley, Elena Yoncheva, Łukasz Kohut, Dietmar Köster, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Petar Vitanov, Pietro Bartolo, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 17 b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

17 b. Underlines with concern that people in vulnerable situations, including persons with disabilities, children, religious minorities, especially in times of rising anti-semitism and islamophobia in Europe, Roma and other persons belonging to ethnic minorities, migrants, refugees, LGBTI+ persons and elderly persons, as well as women continue not seeing their rights fully respected across the Union; emphasizes the obvious link between deteriorating rule of law standards and human rights and minority rights violations in those Member States;

Or. en

Amendment 213

Nicolas Bay, Jean-Paul Garraud, Tom Vandendriessche, Harald Vilimsky, Nicolaus Fest, Laura Huhtasaari, Mara Bizzotto

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 18

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

18. Reiterates its insistence on the need for a single monitoring mechanism on democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights, as proposed by Parliament, to cover the full scope of

deleted

Article 2 TEU values;

Or. fr

Amendment 214

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 18

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

18. *Reiterates its insistence on the need for a single monitoring mechanism on democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights, as proposed by Parliament, to cover the full scope of Article 2 TEU values;* *deleted*

Or. en

Amendment 215

Milan Uhrík

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 18

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

18. *Reiterates its insistence on the need for a single monitoring mechanism on democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights, as proposed by Parliament, to cover the full scope of Article 2 TEU values;* *deleted*

Or. sk

Amendment 216

Ioan-Rareş Bogdan, Vasile Blaga, Andrey Kovatchev, Emil Radev

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 18

Motion for a resolution

18. Reiterates its **insistence** on the need for a single monitoring mechanism on democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights, as proposed by Parliament, to cover the full scope of Article 2 TEU values;

Amendment

18. Reiterates its **calls and insists** on the need for a single monitoring mechanism on democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights, **applying equally, objectively and fairly to all Member States, while respecting the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality**, as proposed by Parliament, to cover the full scope of Article 2 TEU values; **Underlines that the mechanism should consolidate and supersede existing instruments to avoid duplication, in particular the Commission's annual rule of law report, the Commission's Rule of Law Framework, the Commission's annual reporting on the application of the Charter, the Council's Rule of Law Dialogue and the Cooperation and Verification Mechanism (CVM)**;

Or. en

Amendment 217

Laura Ferrara, Sabrina Pignedoli

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 18

Motion for a resolution

18. Reiterates its insistence on the need for a single monitoring mechanism on democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights, as proposed by Parliament, to cover the full scope of Article 2 TEU values;

Amendment

18. Reiterates its insistence on the need for a single monitoring mechanism on democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights, as proposed by Parliament, to cover the full scope of Article 2 TEU values; **expresses regret and concern about the Commission's reluctance to initiate infringement proceedings with regard to the violations of the Charter**;

Or. it

Amendment 218

Maria Grapini

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 18

Motion for a resolution

18. Reiterates its insistence on the need for a single monitoring mechanism on democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights, as proposed by Parliament, to cover the full scope of Article 2 TEU values;

Amendment

18. Reiterates its insistence on the need for a single monitoring mechanism on democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights, ***in line with the same evaluation criterion for all EU Member States***, as proposed by Parliament, to cover the full scope of Article 2 TEU values;

Or. ro

Amendment 219

Michal Šimečka, Sophia in 't Veld, Moritz Körner, Malik Azmani, Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Ramona Strugariu, Hilde Vautmans, Anna Júlia Donáth, Olivier Chastel, Dragoș Tudorache, Fabienne Keller

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 18

Motion for a resolution

18. Reiterates its insistence on the need for a single monitoring mechanism on democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights, as proposed by Parliament, to cover the full scope of Article 2 TEU values;

Amendment

18. Reiterates its insistence on the need for a single monitoring mechanism on democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights, as proposed by Parliament ***in its resolution of 7 October 2020***, to cover the full scope of Article 2 TEU values;

Or. en

Amendment 220

Cristian Terheș

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 18 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

18 a. Restates that, in order to avoid duplication with the rule of law report, the Verification and Cooperation Mechanisms for Romania and Bulgaria must be lifted;

Or. en

Amendment 221

Michal Šimečka, Sophia in 't Veld, Moritz Körner, Malik Azmani, Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Ramona Strugariu, Hilde Vautmans, Anna Júlia Donáth, Olivier Chastel, Fabienne Keller

**Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 19**

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

19. Calls on the Member States to present annual reports on democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights as part of the Union's annual reporting mechanism; **deleted**

Or. en

Amendment 222

Milan Uhrík

**Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 19**

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

19. Calls on the Member States to present annual reports on democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights as part of the Union's annual reporting mechanism; **deleted**

Or. sk

Amendment 223

Lukas Mandl, Paulo Rangel, Roberta Metsola, Vladimír Bilčík

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 19

Motion for a resolution

19. Calls on the Member States to present annual reports on democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights as part of the Union's annual reporting mechanism;

Amendment

19. Calls on the Member States to present annual reports on democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights, ***including equality and rights of persons belonging to minorities***, as part of the Union's annual reporting mechanism;

Or. en

Amendment 224

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Konstantinos Arvanitis, Tineke Strik, Michal Šimečka, Katarina Barley, Elena Yoncheva, Łukasz Kohut, Dietmar Köster, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Petar Vitanov, Pietro Bartolo, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 19

Motion for a resolution

19. Calls on the Member States to present annual reports on democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights as part of the Union's annual reporting mechanism;

Amendment

19. Calls on the Member States to present annual reports on democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights, ***equality and rights of persons belonging to minorities*** as part of the Union's annual reporting mechanism;

Or. en

Amendment 225

Lukas Mandl, Paulo Rangel, Roberta Metsola, Vladimír Bilčík

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 20

Motion for a resolution

20. ***Welcomes*** the Commission's ***announcement of its strategy to strengthen*** the application of the Charter of ***Fundamental Rights; believes that such***

Amendment

20. ***Points out that the mechanism should consolidate and supersede existing instruments to avoid duplication, in particular*** the Commission's ***annual rule***

an annual review should provide input for a comprehensive monitoring mechanism and that its methodology, cycle and scope should therefore be aligned with the annual reports;

of law report, the Commission's Rule of Law Framework, the Commission's annual reporting on the application of the Charter, the Council's Rule of Law Dialogue and the Cooperation and Verification Mechanism (CVM), while increasing complementarity and coherence with other available tools, including procedures under Article 7 TEU, infringement proceedings and budgetary conditionality once in force; considers that the three institutions should use the findings from the Annual Monitoring Cycle in their assessment for the purposes of triggering Article 7 TEU and of budgetary conditionality once in force; stresses that the roles and prerogatives of each of the three institutions must be respected;

Or. en

Amendment 226
Tineke Strik

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 20

Motion for a resolution

20. Welcomes the Commission's announcement of its strategy to strengthen the application of the Charter of Fundamental Rights; believes that such an annual review should provide input for a comprehensive monitoring mechanism and that its methodology, cycle and scope should therefore be aligned with the annual reports;

Amendment

20. Welcomes the Commission's announcement of its strategy to strengthen the application of the Charter of Fundamental Rights; believes that such an annual review should provide input for a comprehensive monitoring mechanism and that its methodology, cycle and scope should therefore be aligned with the annual reports; ***commits in the future to combine its annual work on the rule of law and fundamental rights reports into one document, reflecting also on democracy, and to start working on it immediately after the rule of law report by the Commission is published;***

Or. en

Amendment 227

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Konstantinos Arvanitis, Tineke Strik, Katarina Barley, Elena Yoncheva, Łukasz Kohut, Dietmar Köster, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Petar Vitanov, Pietro Bartolo, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

Motion for a resolution Paragraph 20

Motion for a resolution

20. Welcomes the Commission's announcement of its strategy to strengthen the application of the Charter of Fundamental Rights; believes that such an annual review should provide input for a comprehensive monitoring mechanism and that its methodology, cycle and scope should therefore be aligned with the annual reports;

Amendment

20. Welcomes the Commission's announcement of its strategy to strengthen the application of the Charter of Fundamental Rights; ***considers that focusing annually on a single pre-defined topic would not allow to highlight other serious violations of the Charter taking place on a given year***; believes that such an annual review should provide input for a comprehensive monitoring mechanism and that its methodology, cycle and scope should therefore be aligned with the annual reports;

Or. en

Amendment 228

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba, Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution Paragraph 20

Motion for a resolution

20. ***Welcomes*** the Commission's announcement of its strategy to strengthen the application of the Charter of Fundamental Rights; ***believes that such an annual review should provide input for a comprehensive monitoring mechanism and that its methodology, cycle and scope should therefore be aligned with the annual reports***;

Amendment

20. ***Notes*** the Commission's announcement of its strategy to strengthen the application of the Charter of Fundamental Rights;

Or. en

Amendment 229

Michal Šimečka, Sophia in 't Veld, Moritz Körner, Malik Azmani, Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Ramona Strugariu, Hilde Vautmans, Anna Júlia Donáth, Olivier Chastel, Dragoş Tudorache, Fabienne Keller

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 20

Motion for a resolution

20. Welcomes the Commission's announcement of its strategy to strengthen the application of the Charter of Fundamental Rights; believes that ***such an annual review should provide input for a comprehensive monitoring mechanism and that its methodology, cycle and scope should therefore be aligned with the annual reports;***

Amendment

20. Welcomes the Commission's announcement of its strategy to strengthen the application of the Charter of Fundamental Rights, ***as well as the Democracy Action Plan;*** believes that ***the presentation of these reports should be aligned and interlinked as part of a broader annual monitoring cycle on Article 2 TEU;***

Or. en

Amendment 230

Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Olivier Chastel, Moritz Körner, Ramona Strugariu, Hilde Vautmans

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 20 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

20 a. Proposes to expand the scope of the non-discrimination clause in the European Charter of Fundamental Rights, and to render it universal, to enable the enforcement of the rule of law in the Member States and the Union consistent with Article 14 of the European Convention on Human Rights; calls, in the meantime, on all EU institutions to give the non-discrimination clause the broadest possible legal interpretation;

Or. en

Amendment 231

Anna Júlia Donáth, Moritz Körner, Fabienne Keller, Olivier Chastel, Hilde Vautmans, Jan-Christoph Oetjen, Sophia in 't Veld, Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Michal Šimečka

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 20 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

20 a. *Regrets that the Commission did not consult stakeholders, including Parliament, on the development of the report's methodology and preparation process, and that it didn't seek to obtain feedback on their workability; points out that this has made it more difficult for stakeholders, especially for civil society organisations, to prepare and plan their contributions as well as for the domestic awareness-raising activities they intend to pursue for the launch of the report;*

Or. en

Amendment 232

Nicolas Bay, Jean-Paul Garraud, Tom Vandendriessche, Harald Vilimsky, Nicolaus Fest, Laura Huhtasaari, Mara Bizzotto

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 21

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

21. Calls on the Commission to strengthen the regular, ***inclusive*** and structured dialogue with governments and national parliaments, ***NGOs, professional associations and other stakeholders***; ***notes that three Member States refused to make public their submissions for the 2020 report; calls for transparency in the process and for all submissions to be made public***;

21. Calls on the Commission to strengthen the regular and structured dialogue with governments and national parliaments;

Or. fr

Amendment 233

Milan Uhrík

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 21

Motion for a resolution

21. Calls on the Commission to strengthen the regular, inclusive and structured dialogue with governments and national parliaments, *NGOs*, professional associations and other stakeholders; ***notes that three Member States refused to make public their submissions for the 2020 report; calls for transparency in the process and for all submissions to be made public;***

Amendment

21. Calls on the Commission to strengthen the regular, inclusive and structured dialogue with governments and national parliaments, professional associations and other stakeholders;

Or. sk

Amendment 234

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 21

Motion for a resolution

21. Calls on the Commission to strengthen the regular, inclusive and structured dialogue with governments and national parliaments, *NGOs, professional associations and other stakeholders*; notes that three Member States refused to make public their submissions for the 2020 report; calls for transparency in the process and for all submissions to be made public;

Amendment

21. Calls on the Commission to strengthen the regular, inclusive and structured dialogue with governments and national parliaments; notes that three Member States refused to make public their submissions for the 2020 report; calls for transparency in the process and for all submissions to be made public;

Or. en

Amendment 235

Tineke Strik

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 21

Motion for a resolution

21. Calls on the Commission to strengthen the regular, inclusive and structured dialogue with governments and national parliaments, NGOs, professional associations and other stakeholders; notes that three Member States refused to make public their submissions for the 2020 report; calls for transparency in the process and for all submissions to be made public;

Amendment

21. Calls on the Commission to strengthen the regular, inclusive and structured dialogue with governments and national parliaments, NGOs, professional associations and other stakeholders, ***and to continue with the practice of allowing for both public and confidential reporting, in order to protect and support human rights defenders and rule of law specialists at risk of SLAPPs, prosecution or harassment by national authorities or their proxies***; notes that three Member States refused to make public their submissions for the 2020 report; calls for transparency in the process and for all submissions to be made public;

Or. en

Amendment 236

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Konstantinos Arvanitis, Tineke Strik, Katarina Barley, Elena Yoncheva, Łukasz Kohut, Dietmar Köster, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Petar Vitanov, Pietro Bartolo, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

Motion for a resolution Paragraph 21

Motion for a resolution

21. Calls on the Commission to strengthen the regular, inclusive and structured dialogue with governments and national parliaments, NGOs, professional associations and other stakeholders; ***notes*** that three Member States refused to make public their submissions for the 2020 report; calls for transparency in the process and for all submissions to be made public;

Amendment

21. Calls on the Commission to strengthen the regular, inclusive and structured dialogue with governments and national parliaments, NGOs, ***national human rights institutions, Ombudsman and equality bodies***, professional associations and other stakeholders; ***regrets*** that three Member States refused to make public their submissions for the 2020 report; calls for transparency in the process and for all submissions to be made public;

Or. en

Amendment 237
Konstantinos Arvanitis

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 21

Motion for a resolution

21. Calls on the Commission to strengthen the regular, inclusive and structured dialogue with governments and national parliaments, NGOs, professional associations and other stakeholders; notes that three Member States refused to make public their submissions for the 2020 report; calls for transparency in the process and for all submissions to be made public;

Amendment

21. Calls on the Commission to strengthen the regular, inclusive and structured dialogue with governments and national parliaments, NGOs, professional associations and other stakeholders; notes that three Member States refused to make public their submissions for the 2020 report; calls for transparency in the process and for all submissions to be made public; ***considers that civil society organisations should be closely involved in all phases of the review cycle;***

Or. en

Amendment 238
Lukas Mandl, Paulo Rangel, Vladimír Bilčík

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 21

Motion for a resolution

21. Calls on the Commission to strengthen the regular, inclusive and structured dialogue with governments and national parliaments, NGOs, professional associations and other stakeholders; notes that ***three*** Member States ***refused to make*** public their submissions for the 2020 report; calls for transparency in the process and for all submissions to be made public;

Amendment

21. Calls on the Commission to strengthen the regular, inclusive and structured dialogue with governments and national parliaments, NGOs, professional associations and other stakeholders; notes that ***24*** Member States ***transparently made*** public their submissions for the 2020 report; calls for ***full*** transparency in the process and for all submissions to be made public;

Or. en

Amendment 239
Lukas Mandl, Paulo Rangel, Roberta Metsola, Vladimír Bilčík

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 21 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

21 a. Calls on the Commission to invite the EU Agency for Fundamental Rights to provide methodological advice and conduct targeted comparative research to fill gaps and add detail in key areas of the rule of law report in addition to the contributions the Agency already makes in terms of, for instance, using EFRIS and data on civic space;

Or. en

Amendment 240

Nicolas Bay, Jean-Paul Garraud, Tom Vandendriessche, Harald Vilimsky, Nicolaus Fest, Laura Huhtasaari, Mara Bizzotto

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 22

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

22. Stresses that civil society are key partners to identify rule of law violations and promote democracy and fundamental rights in countries where Union values have been eroded; considers that shadow reporting would bolster the efficiency and transparency of the process;

deleted

Or. fr

Amendment 241
Milan Uhrík

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 22

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

22. Stresses that civil society are key

deleted

partners to identify rule of law violations and promote democracy and fundamental rights in countries where Union values have been eroded; considers that shadow reporting would bolster the efficiency and transparency of the process;

Or. sk

Amendment 242

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba, Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution Paragraph 22

Motion for a resolution

22. Stresses that *civil society* are key partners to identify rule of law violations and promote democracy and fundamental rights *in countries where Union values have been eroded; considers that shadow reporting would bolster the efficiency and transparency of the process;*

Amendment

22. Stresses that *the Member States* are key partners to identify rule of law violations and promote democracy and fundamental rights *and therefore should hold a means of wielding influence on the reports' final content; calls on the Commission to provide that each Member State, after the report has been prepared but before it has been published, have the opportunity to read it and raise objections or comments and the right of final acceptance of that part of the report that relates to themselves and any non-acceptance or dissent, as the case may be, should be indicated directly in the report;*

Or. en

Amendment 243

Anna Júlia Donáth, Moritz Körner, Fabienne Keller, Olivier Chastel, Hilde Vautmans, Jan-Christoph Oetjen, Sophia in 't Veld, Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Ramona Strugariu, Michal Šimečka

Motion for a resolution Paragraph 22

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

22. Stresses that civil society are key partners to identify rule of law violations and promote democracy and fundamental rights in countries where Union values have been eroded; considers that shadow reporting would bolster the efficiency and transparency of the process;

22. Stresses that civil society are key partners to identify rule of law violations and promote democracy and fundamental rights in countries where Union values have been eroded; considers that shadow reporting would bolster the efficiency and transparency of the process; ***urges therefore the Commission to build on the good practice of the UN's Universal Periodic Review process, and adapt the preparation process by requiring Member State contributions to be public and setting a deadline for public consultation well after the publication of all Member State contributions so as to enable effective shadow reporting;***

Or. en

Amendment 244

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Lukas Mandl, Konstantinos Arvanitis, Tineke Strik, Katarina Barley, Elena Yoncheva, Łukasz Kohut, Dietmar Köster, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Petar Vitanov, Pietro Bartolo, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

Motion for a resolution Paragraph 22

Motion for a resolution

22. Stresses that civil society are key partners to identify rule of law violations and promote democracy and fundamental rights in countries where Union values have been eroded; considers that ***shadow reporting would bolster the efficiency and transparency of the process;***

Amendment

22. Stresses that civil society are key partners to identify rule of law violations and promote democracy and fundamental rights in countries where Union values have been eroded; considers that ***timeframes for consultation for civil society are too short and should be more predictable; notes that organising consultations before the annual release of public statistics impoverishes contributions; calls on the Commission to allow multilingual submissions; suggests making the framework for stakeholders' contributions less rigid;***

Or. en

Amendment 245

Tineke Strik

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 22

Motion for a resolution

22. Stresses that civil society are key partners to identify rule of law violations and promote democracy and fundamental rights in countries where Union values have been eroded; considers that shadow reporting would bolster the efficiency and transparency of the process;

Amendment

22. Stresses that civil society are key partners to identify rule of law violations and promote democracy and fundamental rights in countries where Union values have been eroded; considers that shadow reporting, ***with national authorities' submissions made publicly available and then followed by contributions from civil society, including during country visits,*** would bolster the efficiency and transparency of the process;

Or. en

Amendment 246

Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 22 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

22 a. Stresses that, in order to prevent foreign interference in the Member States' democracies and sovereignty as well as meddling with the EU democratic institutions, the NGOs must make public their funding sources; underlines that, in order to respect the transparency principle and the right to know of the European citizens, all European bodies must disclose and publish a list with all the NGOs they finance;

Or. en

Amendment 247

Anna Júlia Donáth, Moritz Körner, Fabienne Keller, Olivier Chastel, Hilde Vautmans,

Jan-Christoph Oetjen, Sophia in 't Veld, Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Ramona Strugariu, Michal Šimečka

**Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 22 a (new)**

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

22 a. Stresses that the consultation questionnaire should allow stakeholders to report elements beyond the scope followed by the Commission as these can help further assess the way power is exercised in a country and whether the constitutional setup provides efficient mechanisms to limits such exercise of power;

Or. en

Amendment 248

Nicolas Bay, Jean-Paul Garraud, Tom Vandendriessche, Harald Vilimsky, Nicolaus Fest, Laura Huhtasaari, Mara Bizzotto

**Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 23**

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

23. Considers that cooperation in the annual monitoring cycle with the Council of Europe and its Parliamentary Assembly, including through a more structured partnership, is of particular relevance for advancing democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights in the EU;

deleted

Or. fr

Amendment 249

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba

**Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 23**

Motion for a resolution

23. ***Considers that cooperation in the annual monitoring cycle with the Council of Europe and its Parliamentary Assembly, including through a more structured partnership, is of particular relevance for advancing democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights in the EU;***

Amendment

23. ***Stresses that the annual monitoring cycle should be an EU-only exercise and all sources that are not EU sources should be rejected in the selection of inputs to the report, which applies in particular to the Council of Europe and its Parliamentary Assembly, of which the EU is not a member so far;***

Or. en

Amendment 250

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Lukas Mandl, Konstantinos Arvanitis, Tineke Strik, Michal Šimečka, Katarina Barley, Elena Yoncheva, Łukasz Kohut, Dietmar Köster, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Petar Vitanov, Pietro Bartolo, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

**Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 23**

Motion for a resolution

23. Considers that cooperation in the annual monitoring cycle with the Council of Europe and its Parliamentary Assembly, including through a more structured partnership, is of particular relevance for advancing democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights in the EU;

Amendment

23. Considers that cooperation in the annual monitoring cycle with the Council of Europe and its Parliamentary Assembly, including through a more structured partnership, is of particular relevance for advancing democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights in the EU; ***recalls that accession of the Union to the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms is a legal obligation provided for under Article 6(2) TEU; reiterates the need for a swift conclusion of the accession process in order to ensure a consistent framework for human rights protection throughout Europe and to further strengthen the protection of fundamental rights and freedoms within the Union;***

Or. en

Amendment 251

Tineke Strik

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 23

Motion for a resolution

23. Considers that cooperation in the annual monitoring cycle with the Council of Europe and its Parliamentary Assembly, including through a more structured partnership, is of particular relevance for advancing democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights in the EU;

Amendment

23. Considers that cooperation in the annual monitoring cycle with the Council of Europe and its Parliamentary Assembly, including through a more structured partnership, is of particular relevance for advancing democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights in the EU; ***calls on the Commission to include into the country reports data on non-compliance with judgments of the European Court of Human Rights as assessed by the Committee of Ministers;***

Or. en

Amendment 252

Michal Šimečka, Sophia in 't Veld, Moritz Körner, Malik Azmani, Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Ramona Strugariu, Hilde Vautmans, Anna Júlia Donáth, Olivier Chastel, Dragoș Tudorache, Fabienne Keller

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 23 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

23 a. Calls on the Commission to regularize the schedule pertaining to the annual report's production, including the deadline for stakeholders' submissions, to make the process predictable for all institutions and stakeholders; calls on the Commission to ensure sufficient time for the preparation of stakeholders' submissions;

Or. en

Amendment 253

Konstantinos Arvanitis

**Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 23 a (new)**

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

23 a. Stresses the need to involve a panel of independent experts in cooperation with the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights and the Venice Commission in investigating and identifying potential breaches by a Member State;

Or. en

Amendment 254

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba

**Motion for a resolution
Subheading 8**

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

Institutional aspects of the EU mechanism on democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 255

Nicolas Bay, Jean-Paul Garraud, Tom Vandendriessche, Harald Vilimsky, Nicolaus Fest, Laura Huhtasaari, Mara Bizzotto

**Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 24**

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

24. Calls on the Commission and the Council to respond positively to Parliament's call in its resolution of 7 October 2020 for an EU mechanism on democracy, the rule of law and

deleted

fundamental rights;

Or. fr

Amendment 256

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 24

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

24. Calls on the Commission and the Council to respond positively to Parliament's call in its resolution of 7 October 2020 for an EU mechanism on democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights; **deleted**

Or. en

Amendment 257

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Lukas Mandl, Konstantinos Arvanitis, Tineke Strik, Katarina Barley, Elena Yoncheva, Łukasz Kohut, Dietmar Köster, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Petar Vitanov, Pietro Bartolo, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 24

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

24. Calls on the Commission and the Council to respond positively to Parliament's call in its resolution of 7 October 2020 for an EU mechanism on democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights;

24. Calls on the Commission and the Council to respond positively to Parliament's call in its resolution of 7 October 2020 for an EU mechanism on democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights; *reiterates that such mechanism is necessary to reinforce the promotion and respect for Union values; recalls that this annual Cycle should be comprehensive, objective, impartial, evidence-based and applied equally and fairly to all Member States; recalls that findings of relevant international bodies, such as the ones under the auspices of the*

UN, OSCE and the Council of Europe, are of crucial importance for the assessment of the situation in Member States; believes that the European Union Fundamental Rights Information System EFRIS is a source of information in this regard;

Or. en

Amendment 258

Michal Šimečka, Sophia in 't Veld, Moritz Körner, Malik Azmani, Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Ramona Strugariu, Hilde Vautmans, Anna Júlia Donáth, Olivier Chastel, Fabienne Keller

**Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 24**

Motion for a resolution

24. ***Calls on*** the Commission and the Council ***to respond positively to*** Parliament's call in its resolution of 7 October 2020 ***for*** an EU mechanism on democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights;

Amendment

24. ***Regrets that*** the Commission and the Council ***have so far refused to engage with*** Parliament's call in its resolution of 7 October 2020 ***to establish, through an interinstitutional agreement,*** an EU mechanism on democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights;

Or. en

Amendment 259

Domènec Ruiz Devesa

**Motion for a resolution
Subheading 8 a (new)**

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

Country-specific recommendations

Or. en

Amendment 260

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Konstantinos Arvanitis, Tineke Strik, Michal Šimečka, Elena

Yoncheva, Katarina Barley, Lukasz Kohut, Dietmar Köster, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Petar Vitanov, Pietro Bartolo, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

**Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 24 a (new)**

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

24 a. Reiterates its call on the Commission to provide for a true assessment of the situation of each of the Article 2 TEU values in the Member States and to adopt clear country-specific recommendations, with timelines and targets and concrete actions to be taken, in order to assist Member States in addressing the weaknesses identified in the report, and to be followed up in subsequent annual or urgent reports;

Or. en

Amendment 261

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Lukas Mandl, Konstantinos Arvanitis, Michal Šimečka, Katarina Barley, Elena Yoncheva, Lukasz Kohut, Dietmar Köster, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Petar Vitanov, Pietro Bartolo, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

**Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 24 b (new)**

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

24 b. Recommends that the Commission aligns recommendations with potentially applicable tools to remedy the identified shortcomings; calls on the Commission to better follow-up on the implementation of the country-specific chapters by the Member States concerned by activating other rule of law tools to achieve results in case of non-implementation of the recommendations; underlines the importance of identifying clear positive and negative trends in each Member State and the need to give special attention to comparisons with the reports of the respective previous year;

Amendment 262

Tineke Strik

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 24 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

24 a. Recommends that the Commission aligns each recommendation with potentially applicable tools to remedy the identified shortcomings; calls on the Commission to better follow-up on the implementation of the country-specific chapters by the Member States concerned by activating other rule of law tools to achieve results in case of non-implementation of the recommendations; considers that the Commission should increase referrals of infringement actions to the Court of Justice; underlines the importance of identifying clear positive and negative trends in each Member State and the need to give special attention to comparisons with the reports of the respective previous year;

Or. en

Amendment 263

Domènec Ruiz Devesa

Motion for a resolution

Subheading 8 b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

Interinstitutional agreement

Or. en

Amendment 264

Michal Šimečka, Sophia in 't Veld, Moritz Körner, Malik Azmani, Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Ramona Strugariu, Hilde Vautmans, Anna Júlia Donáth, Olivier Chastel, Dragoș Tudorache, Fabienne Keller

**Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 24 a (new)**

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

24 a. Considers the existing institutional arrangement behind the annual report to fall short of the Parliament's expectations; expects the Commission to create a permanent interinstitutional Working Group as proposed by the Parliament in its resolution of 7 October 2020;

Or. en

Amendment 265

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Lukas Mandl, Konstantinos Arvanitis, Tineke Strik, Michal Šimečka, Katarina Barley, Elena Yoncheva, Łukasz Kohut, Dietmar Köster, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Petar Vitanov, Pietro Bartolo, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

**Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 24 c (new)**

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

24 c. Calls on the Commission and the Council to enter without delay into negotiations with Parliament on an interinstitutional agreement in accordance with Article 295 TFEU in order to establish an objective and evidence-based monitoring mechanism enshrined in a legal act binding the three institutions to a transparent and regularised process, with clearly defined responsibilities, involving a panel of independent experts that shall advise the three institutions, in strong cooperation with the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, so that the protection and promotion of all Union values becomes a permanent and visible

part of the Union agenda;

Or. en

Amendment 266

Michal Šimečka, Sophia in 't Veld, Moritz Körner, Malik Azmani, Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Ramona Strugariu, Hilde Vautmans, Anna Júlia Donáth, Olivier Chastel, Dragoş Tudorache, Fabienne Keller

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 24 b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

24 b. Invites the Commission and the Council to enter without delay into negotiations with Parliament on an interinstitutional agreement in accordance with Article 295 TFEU; considers the proposal set out in the Annex to Parliament's resolution of 7 October 2020 on the establishment of an EU Mechanism on Democracy, the Rule of Law and Fundamental Rights to constitute an appropriate basis for such negotiations;

Or. en

Amendment 267

Tineke Strik

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 24 b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

24 b. Calls on the Commission and the Council to enter without delay into negotiations with Parliament on an interinstitutional agreement in accordance with Article 295 TFEU in order to establish an objective and evidence-based monitoring mechanism enshrined in a legal act binding the three institutions to a transparent and

regularised process, with clearly defined responsibilities, involving a panel of independent experts that shall advise the three institutions, in strong cooperation with the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, so that the protection and promotion of all Union values becomes a permanent and visible part of the Union agenda; commits in the meantime to launch a pilot project assessing the compliance with Union values with the involvement of independent experts;

Or. en

Amendment 268

Nicolas Bay, Jean-Paul Garraud, Tom Vandendriessche, Harald Vilimsky, Nicolaus Fest, Laura Huhtasaari, Mara Bizzotto

Motion for a resolution Paragraph 25

Motion for a resolution

25. *Strongly regrets the inability of the Council to make meaningful progress in enforcing Union values in ongoing Article 7 TEU procedures; notes that the Council's hesitance to apply Article 7 of the TEU effectively is enabling continued divergence from the values provided for in Article 2 of the TEU; calls for a reflection at the Conference on the Future of Europe on a revision of the Article 7 TEU procedure in order to realign the majority requirements of paragraphs 1 and 2 with a view to having super-majorities of four or five for both procedures;*

Amendment

25. *Highlights the fact that henceforth the Council is alone in being able to act in ongoing Article 7 TEU procedures;*

Or. fr

Amendment 269

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba, Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 25

Motion for a resolution

25. ***Strongly regrets the inability of the Council to make meaningful progress in enforcing Union values in ongoing Article 7 TEU procedures; notes that the Council's hesitance to apply Article 7 of the TEU effectively is enabling continued divergence from the values provided for in Article 2 of the TEU; calls for a reflection at the Conference on the Future of Europe on a revision of the Article 7 TEU procedure in order to realign the majority requirements of paragraphs 1 and 2 with a view to having super-majorities of four or five for both procedures;***

Amendment

25. ***Recognises the leading role of the Council in ongoing Article 7 TEU procedures;***

Or. en

Amendment 270
Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 25

Motion for a resolution

25. Strongly regrets the inability of the Council to make meaningful progress in enforcing Union values in ongoing Article 7 TEU procedures; notes that the Council's hesitance to apply Article 7 of the TEU effectively is enabling continued divergence from the values provided for in Article 2 of the TEU; ***calls for a reflection at the Conference on the Future of Europe on a revision of the Article 7 TEU procedure in order to realign the majority requirements of paragraphs 1 and 2 with a view to having super-majorities of four or five for both procedures;***

Amendment

25. Strongly regrets the inability of the Council to make meaningful progress in enforcing Union values in ongoing Article 7 TEU procedures; notes that the Council's hesitance to apply Article 7 of the TEU effectively is enabling continued divergence from the values provided for in Article 2 of the TEU;

Or. en

Amendment 271

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Konstantinos Arvanitis, Katarina Barley, Elena Yoncheva, Lukasz Kohut, Dietmar Köster, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Pietro Bartolo, Petar Vitanov, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 25

Motion for a resolution

25. Strongly regrets the inability of the Council to make meaningful progress in enforcing Union values in ongoing Article 7 TEU procedures; notes that the Council's hesitance to apply Article 7 of the TEU effectively is enabling continued divergence from the values provided for in Article 2 of the TEU; calls for a reflection at the Conference on the Future of Europe on a revision of the Article 7 TEU procedure in order to realign the majority requirements of paragraphs 1 and 2 with a view to having super-majorities of four or five for both procedures;

Amendment

25. ***Reiterates that the DRF mechanism must complement and reinforce, and by no means substitute, the ongoing and future proceedings under Article 7 TEU;*** strongly regrets the inability of the Council to make meaningful progress in enforcing Union values in ongoing Article 7 TEU procedures; notes that the Council's hesitance to apply Article 7 of the TEU effectively is enabling continued divergence from the values provided for in Article 2 of the TEU; ***urges the Council to proceed without delay to vote under Article 7(1) TEU; calls on the Council to ensure that hearings under Article 7(1) TEU start again as a matter of urgency and also address new developments; reiterates its recommendation to the Council to address concrete recommendations to the Member States in question, as enshrined in Article 7(1) TEU, as a follow-up to the hearings, and that it indicate deadlines for the implementation of those recommendations;*** calls for a reflection at the Conference on the Future of Europe on a revision of the Article 7 TEU procedure in order to realign the majority requirements of paragraphs 1 and 2 with a view to having super-majorities of four or five for both procedures;

Or. en

Amendment 272

Tineke Strik

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 25

Motion for a resolution

25. Strongly regrets the inability of the Council to make meaningful progress in enforcing Union values in ongoing Article 7 TEU procedures; notes that the Council's hesitance to apply Article 7 **of the** TEU effectively is enabling continued **divergence from** the values provided for in Article 2 of the TEU; **calls for a reflection at the Conference on the Future of Europe on** a revision of the Article 7 TEU procedure in order to realign the majority requirements of paragraphs 1 and 2 **with a view to having super-majorities of four or five for both procedures;**

Amendment

25. **Reiterates that the DRF mechanism must complement and reinforce, and by no means substitute, the ongoing and future proceedings under Article 7 TEU;** strongly regrets the inability of the Council to make meaningful progress in enforcing Union values in ongoing Article 7 TEU procedures; notes that the Council's hesitance to apply Article 7 TEU effectively is **in fact** enabling continued **disregard of** the values provided for in Article 2 **TEU with increasing open non-compliance with judgments of the CJEU and the harassment of those seeking to uphold the rule of law in some EU Member States;** **calls on the Council to ensure that hearings under Article 7(1) TEU are regularly organised and also address new developments; reiterates its recommendation to the Council to address concrete recommendations to the Member States in question, as provided for in Article 7(1) of the TEU, as a follow-up to the hearings, and that it indicate deadlines for the implementation of those recommendations; invites to reflect upon** a revision of the Article 7 TEU procedure **by the Conference on the Future of Europe** in order to realign the majority requirements of paragraphs 1 and 2;

Or. en

Amendment 273
Tineke Strik, Domènec Ruiz Devesa

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 25

Motion for a resolution

25. Strongly regrets the inability of the

Amendment

25. Strongly regrets the inability of the

Council to make meaningful progress in enforcing Union values in ongoing Article 7 TEU procedures; notes that the Council's hesitance to apply Article 7 of the TEU effectively is enabling continued divergence from the values provided for in Article 2 of the TEU; calls for a reflection at the Conference on the Future of Europe on a revision of the Article 7 TEU procedure in order to realign the majority requirements of paragraphs 1 and 2 with a view to having super-majorities of four or five for both procedures;

Council to make meaningful progress in enforcing Union values in ongoing Article 7 TEU procedures; notes that the Council's hesitance to apply Article 7 of the TEU effectively is enabling continued divergence from the values provided for in Article 2 of the TEU; ***regrets the Council's failure to organise hearings under the pretext of the COVID-19 whereas there is no legal obligation whatsoever to require hearings in personas opposed to hearings via videoconferencing; requests the public release of any eventual legal opinion of the Council Legal Service arguing otherwise;*** calls for a reflection at the Conference on the Future of Europe on a revision of the Article 7 TEU procedure in order to realign the majority requirements of paragraphs 1 and 2 with a view to having super-majorities of four or five for both procedures;

Or. en

Amendment 274

Michal Šimečka, Sophia in 't Veld, Moritz Körner, Malik Azmani, Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Ramona Strugariu, Hilde Vautmans, Anna Júlia Donáth, Olivier Chastel, Fabienne Keller

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 25

Motion for a resolution

25. Strongly regrets the inability of the Council to make meaningful progress in enforcing Union values in ongoing Article 7 TEU procedures; notes that the Council's hesitance to apply Article 7 ***of the TEU effectively*** is enabling continued divergence from the values provided for in Article 2 of the TEU; calls for a reflection ***at*** the Conference on the Future of Europe on a revision of the Article 7 TEU ***procedure*** in order to ***realign the majority requirements of paragraphs 1 and 2 with a view to having super-majorities of four***

Amendment

25. Strongly regrets the inability of the Council to make meaningful progress in enforcing Union values in ongoing Article 7 TEU procedures; notes that the Council's hesitance to apply Article 7 ***TEU*** is enabling continued divergence from the values provided for in Article 2 of the TEU; ***condemns the Council's reluctance to organize Article 7 TEU hearings under the pretext of the COVID-19 pandemic;*** calls for a reflection ***as part of*** the Conference on the Future of Europe on a revision of the ***voting majorities required*** by Article 7 TEU in order to ***render its***

or five for both procedures;

procedure more effective;

Or. en

Amendment 275

Nicolas Bay, Jean-Paul Garraud, Tom Vandendriessche, Harald Vilimsky, Nicolaus Fest, Laura Huhtasaari, Mara Bizzotto

Motion for a resolution Paragraph 26

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

26. *Reiterates that the annual report should serve as a basis for deciding whether to activate the procedure provided for in Article 7 of the TEU, whether to activate the Rule of Law Framework or whether to launch infringement procedures, including expedited procedures, applications for interim measures before the Court of Justice and actions regarding non-implementation of CJEU judgments concerning the protection of Union values;* ***deleted***

Or. fr

Amendment 276

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba, Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution Paragraph 26

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

26. *Reiterates* that the annual report should serve as a basis for deciding whether to activate the procedure provided for in Article 7 of the TEU, whether to activate the Rule of Law Framework or whether to launch infringement procedures, including expedited procedures, applications for interim measures before

26. *Stresses* that the annual report should ***not*** serve as a basis for deciding whether to activate the procedure provided for in Article 7 of the TEU, whether to activate the Rule of Law Framework or whether to launch infringement procedures, including expedited procedures, applications for interim measures before

the Court of Justice and actions regarding non-implementation of CJEU judgments concerning the protection of Union values;

the Court of Justice and actions regarding non-implementation of CJEU judgments concerning the protection of Union values;

Or. en

Amendment 277

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Konstantinos Arvanitis, Tineke Strik, Katarina Barley, Elena Yoncheva, Lukasz Kohut, Dietmar Köster, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Petar Vitanov, Pietro Bartolo, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 26

Motion for a resolution

26. Reiterates that the annual report should serve as a basis for deciding whether to activate the procedure provided for in Article 7 of the TEU, whether to activate the Rule of Law Framework or whether to launch infringement procedures, including expedited procedures, applications for interim measures before the Court of Justice and actions regarding non-implementation of CJEU judgments concerning the protection of Union values;

Amendment

26. Reiterates that the annual report should serve as a basis for deciding whether to activate the procedure provided for in Article 7 of the TEU, whether to activate the Rule of Law Framework or whether to launch infringement procedures, including expedited procedures, applications for interim measures before the Court of Justice and actions regarding non-implementation of CJEU judgments concerning the protection of Union values; ***considers that the Conference on the Future of Europe should further assert the precedence of the EU legal order; invites the Conference on the Future of Europe to consider strengthening the role of the Court of Justice of the European Union in protecting the Union's founding values;***

Or. en

Amendment 278

Tineke Strik, Domènec Ruiz Devesa

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 26

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

26. Reiterates that the annual report should serve as a basis for deciding whether to activate the procedure provided for in Article 7 of the TEU, whether to activate the Rule of Law Framework or whether to launch infringement procedures, including expedited procedures, applications for interim measures before the Court of Justice and actions regarding non-implementation of CJEU judgments concerning the protection of Union values;

26. Reiterates that the annual report should serve as a basis for deciding whether to activate the procedure provided for in Article 7 of the TEU, whether to activate the Rule of Law Framework or whether to launch infringement procedures, including expedited procedures, applications for interim measures before the Court of Justice and actions regarding non-implementation of CJEU judgments concerning the protection of Union values; ***recalls that infringement actions can be simultaneously launched in respect of issues identified in Article 7(1) TEU reasoned proposals as already established by the CJEU;***

Or. en

Amendment 279

Lukas Mandl, Paulo Rangel, Roberta Metsola, Vladimír Bilčík

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 26

Motion for a resolution

26. Reiterates that the annual report should serve as a basis for deciding whether to activate the procedure provided for in Article 7 of the TEU, whether to activate the Rule of Law Framework or whether to launch infringement procedures, including expedited procedures, applications for interim measures before the Court of Justice and actions regarding non-implementation of CJEU judgments concerning the protection of Union values;

Amendment

26. Reiterates that the annual report should serve as a basis for deciding whether to activate the procedure provided for in Article 7 of the TEU, whether to activate the Rule of Law Framework or whether to launch infringement procedures, including expedited procedures, applications for interim measures before the Court of Justice and actions regarding non-implementation of CJEU judgments concerning the protection of Union values; ***considers that the Conference on the future of Europe could further clarify in Treaty provisions the well-established legal principle on the primacy of EU law;***

Or. en

Amendment 280

Michal Šimečka, Sophia in 't Veld, Moritz Körner, Malik Azmani, Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Ramona Strugariu, Hilde Vautmans, Anna Júlia Donáth, Olivier Chastel, Dragoș Tudorache, Fabienne Keller

**Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 26**

Motion for a resolution

26. Reiterates that the annual report should serve as a basis for deciding whether to activate the procedure provided for in Article 7 of the TEU, whether to activate the Rule of Law Framework or whether to launch infringement procedures, including expedited procedures, applications for interim measures before the Court of Justice and actions regarding non-implementation of CJEU judgments concerning the protection of Union values;

Amendment

26. Reiterates that the annual report should serve as a basis for deciding whether to activate the procedure provided for in Article 7 of the TEU, whether to activate the Rule of Law Framework or whether to launch infringement procedures, including expedited procedures, applications for interim measures before the Court of Justice and actions regarding non-implementation of CJEU judgments concerning the protection of Union values; ***stresses that the report should be in any case accompanied by actionable recommendations, including deadlines for implementation;***

Or. en

**Amendment 281
Domènec Ruiz Devesa**

**Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 26 a (new)**

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

26 a. Welcomes that the Joint Declaration on the Conference on the Future of Europe identifies ‘European rights and values including the Rule of Law’ as one of the topics of discussion in the Conference; invites the Conference to reflect on the effectiveness of the EU’s existing tools to monitor, prevent and tackle violations of Article 2 TEU principles and to present concrete proposals to strengthen the EU’s toolbox;

Or. en

Amendment 282

Lukas Mandl

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 26 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

26 a. Welcomes that the Joint Declaration on the Conference on the Future of Europe identifies ‘European rights and values including the Rule of Law’ as one of the topics of discussion in the Conference; invites the Conference to reflect on the effectiveness of the EU’s existing tools to monitor, prevent and tackle violations of Article 2 TEU principles and to present concrete actions to strengthen the EU’s toolbox;

Or. en

Amendment 283

Nicolas Bay, Jean-Paul Garraud, Tom Vandendriessche, Harald Vilimsky, Nicolaus Fest, Laura Huhtasaari, Mara Bizzotto

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 27

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

27. Calls for the Commission to use the findings of the annual report in its assessment that forms the basis of the mechanism to protect the budget against breaches of the principle of the rule of law; reiterates its call on the Commission to dedicate a specific section of the annual report to an analysis of cases where breaches of the principles of the rule of law in a particular Member State could affect or seriously risk affecting the sound financial management of the Union budget in a sufficiently direct way;

deleted

Or. fr

Amendment 284

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba, Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 27

Motion for a resolution

27. ***Calls for the Commission to use the findings of the annual report in its assessment that forms the basis of the mechanism to protect the budget against breaches of the principle of the rule of law; reiterates its call on the Commission to dedicate a specific section of the annual report to an analysis of cases where breaches of the principles of the rule of law in a particular Member State could affect or seriously risk affecting the sound financial management of the Union budget in a sufficiently direct way;***

Amendment

27. ***Stresses that the findings of the annual report should not constitute the basis for further assessments, findings or formulation of recommendations concerning individual Member States, made in areas other than the rule of law, e.g. in the field of economic and fiscal policy;***

Or. en

Amendment 285

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Konstantinos Arvanitis, Tineke Strik, Michal Šimečka, Katarina Barley, Elena Yoncheva, Łukasz Kohut, Dietmar Köster, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Petar Vitanov, Pietro Bartolo, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 27

Motion for a resolution

27. ***Calls for the Commission to use the findings of the annual report in its assessment that forms the basis of the mechanism to protect the budget against breaches of the principle of the rule of law; reiterates its call on the Commission to dedicate a specific section of the annual report to an analysis of cases where breaches of the principles of the rule of law in a particular Member State could affect or seriously risk affecting the sound***

Amendment

27. ***Stresses that the applicability, purpose and scope of the Rule of Law Conditionality Regulation is clearly defined in the legal text of the said Regulation; considers that the European Council conclusions on the Regulation on a general regime of conditionality contravene Article 17 and Article 15 TEU and Article 288 TFEU, and introduce unnecessary legal uncertainty considering some recent developments by Member***

financial management of the Union budget in a sufficiently direct way;

States subject to Article 7 TEU; calls for action in this regard; recalls that said Regulation applies from 1 January 2021; calls for the Commission to use the findings of the annual report in its assessment that forms the basis of the mechanism to protect the budget against breaches of the principle of the rule of law, as well as in any other relevant assessment for the purposes of existing and future budgetary tools; reiterates its call on the Commission to dedicate a specific section of the annual report to an analysis of cases where breaches of the principles of the rule of law in a particular Member State could affect or seriously risk affecting the sound financial management of the Union budget in a sufficiently direct way; calls on the Commission to more vigorously apply the Common Provisions Regulation and the Financial Regulation to tackle discriminatory use of European funds, as it did when withholding funds for municipal or local governments proclaiming themselves to be “free from LGBTI ideology”;

Or. en

Amendment 286
Monika Hohlmeier, Lena Düpont

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 27

Motion for a resolution

27. Calls for the Commission to use the findings of the annual report in its assessment that forms the basis of the mechanism to protect the budget against breaches of the principle of the rule of law; ***reiterates its call on the Commission to dedicate a specific section of the annual report to an analysis of cases where breaches of the principles of the rule of law in a particular Member State could affect or seriously risk affecting the sound***

Amendment

27. Calls for the Commission to use the findings of the annual report in its assessment that forms the basis of the mechanism to protect the budget against breaches of the principle of the rule of law; ***underlines that the annual rule of law report is an independent and separate tool from the Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2020/2092 on the general regime of conditionality for the protection of the Union budget, which both serve different***

financial management of the Union budget *in a sufficiently direct way*;

purposes: while the annual rule of law reporting has a preventive and informative character aimed at providing a broader overview of the situation and possible breaches regarding the rule of law in all Member States independent of any link to the budget of the Union, Regulation (EU, Euratom)2020/2092 is a conditionality mechanism aimed at sanctioning breaches or the risk of a breach with a direct link to the budget or financial interests of the Union;

Or. en

Amendment 287

Lukas Mandl, Paulo Rangel, Vladimír Bilčík

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 27

Motion for a resolution

27. *Calls for the Commission to use the findings of the annual report in its assessment that forms the basis of the mechanism to protect the budget against breaches of the principle of the rule of law; reiterates its call on the Commission to dedicate a specific section of the annual report to an analysis of cases where breaches of the principles of the rule of law in a particular Member State could affect or seriously risk affecting the sound financial management of the Union budget in a sufficiently direct way;*

Amendment

27. *Reiterates its positions as laid down in its resolution of 17 December 2020; stresses that the Rule of Law Conditionality Regulation has entered into force and is binding in its entirety for all commitment appropriations and payment appropriations in all Member States and for the EU institutions; underlines the importance of the direct applicability of the Regulation since 1 January 2021, particularly in the context of the disbursement of the NextGenerationEU funds which will occur early in the budget cycle; recalls that the Commission ‘shall be completely independent’, and its members ‘shall neither seek nor take instructions from any Government’ in accordance with Article 17(3) of the TEU and Article 245 of the TFEU; recalls further that in accordance with Article 17(8) of the TEU, the Commission ‘shall be responsible to the European Parliament’; asks the Commission to include in its annual Rule of Law Report a dedicated section with an*

analysis of cases where breaches of the principles of the rule of law in a particular Member State could affect or seriously risk affecting the sound financial management of the Union budget in a sufficiently direct way;

Or. en

Amendment 288
Monika Hohlmeier, Lena Düpont

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 27 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

27 a. Emphasises the importance of keeping these two distinct legal tools clearly separated to avoid any kind of unlawful interference; acknowledges that the Commission can use the annual rule of law report as an important source of information when building cases for the application of Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2020/2092; is however of the opinion that concrete information relevant specifically for the application of Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2020/2092 should not merely be included as a chapter of the annual rule of law report, but should be presented as a separate report under the auspices of DG BUDG, as this report would include information drawn from a variety of different sources besides the annual rule of law report, including but not limited to reports by the ECA, OLAF and EPPO, audit reports by the Commission and national audit authorities, judgments by the CJEU and national courts, analyses by the FRA and information from different systems such as EDES and ARACHNE; calls therefore on the Commission to provide a distinct report with information about breaches or potential breaches of the principles of rule of law by a Member State which could affect or seriously risk affecting the sound

financial management of the Union budget in a sufficiently direct way; asks the Commission to align with Parliament whether this report should be presented annually, or on a continuous semi-annual or quarterly basis;

Or. en

Amendment 289

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Tineke Strik, Katarina Barley, Elena Yoncheva, Łukasz Kohut, Dietmar Köster, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Petar Vitanov, Pietro Bartolo, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 27 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

27 a. Calls on the Commission to develop a culture of European values, including through strengthened efforts to promote European citizens' education, which should include rule of law education;

Or. en

Amendment 290

Michal Šimečka, Sophia in 't Veld, Moritz Körner, Malik Azmani, Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Ramona Strugariu, Hilde Vautmans, Anna Júlia Donáth, Olivier Chastel, Dragoş Tudorache, Fabienne Keller

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 27 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

27 a. Calls for a strategic use of funding opportunities under the Regulation establishing the Rights and Values Programme in order to counteract threats to the rule of law identified in the annual report and more broadly support civil society organizations promoting the values listed in Article 2 TEU;

Amendment 291

Lukas Mandl, Paulo Rangel, Roberta Metsola, Vladimír Bilčík

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 27 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

27 a. Calls on the Commission to launch a dedicated programme that supports innovative initiatives with the aim of promoting formal and informal education with regard to the rule of law and democratic institutions among EU citizens of all ages, in particular at local and regional level;

Or. en

Amendment 292

Tineke Strik

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 27 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

27 a. Urges the Commission to invest more into awareness-raising about the Union values and applicable tools, including the annual report, at the national level, especially in those countries where there are serious concerns;

Or. en

Amendment 293

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Konstantinos Arvanitis, Tineke Strik, Katarina Barley, Elena Yoncheva, Łukasz Kohut, Dietmar Köster, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Petar Vitanov, Pietro Bartolo, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 27 b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

27 b. Calls on the Council and the Commission to provide adequate funding for European-wide, national, regional and local civil society organisations and independent journalism to foster grassroots support for democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights in all Member States, in particular where violations and shortcomings have been identified; believes that adequate funding under the Citizens, Equality, Rights and Values programme is extremely important, including for strategic litigation;

Or. en

Amendment 294
Lukas Mandl, Roberta Metsola, Vladimír Bilčík

Motion for a resolution
Subheading 10 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

Calls on the Council and the Commission to provide adequate funding for an independent and European-wide, national, regional and local quality journalism that investigates in particular where violations and shortcomings have been identified;

Or. en

Amendment 295
Lucia Ďuriš Nicholsonová

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 27 b (new)

27 b. *Calls on the Member States to learn from best practices and to address identified gaps and adopt measures to improve the situation in all four main pillars identified in the rule of law report;*

Or. en

Amendment 296

Monika Hohlmeier, Lena Düpont, Lukas Mandl, Roberta Metsola

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 28

Motion for a resolution

28. Calls on the Commission to assess in successive reports how the issues identified in the areas analysed in previous reports have evolved;

Amendment

28. Calls on the Commission to assess in successive reports how the issues identified in the areas analysed in previous reports have evolved; ***calls on the Commission to follow-up on its previous observations and analyse any positive or negative developments while highlighting in particular any systemic or reoccurring patterns of rule of law breaches;***

Or. en

Amendment 297

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Lukas Mandl, Konstantinos Arvanitis, Tineke Strik, Michal Šimečka, Katarina Barley, Elena Yoncheva, Łukasz Kohut, Dietmar Köster, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Petar Vitanov, Pietro Bartolo, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 28

Motion for a resolution

28. Calls on the Commission to assess in successive reports how the issues identified in the areas analysed in previous reports have evolved;

Amendment

28. Calls on the Commission to assess in successive reports how the issues identified in the areas analysed in previous reports have evolved, ***been solved, risk deteriorating or have further deteriorated,***

*to identify trends and transversal issues
and to put forward clear
recommendations to remedy any risks or
backsliding identified;*

Or. en

Amendment 298

Lukas Mandl, Paulo Rangel, Roberta Metsola, Vladimír Bilčík

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 28

Motion for a resolution

28. Calls on the Commission to assess in successive reports how the issues identified in the areas analysed in previous reports have evolved;

Amendment

28. Calls on the Commission to assess in successive reports how the issues identified in the areas analysed in previous reports have evolved, ***clearly outlining positive and negative trends;***

Or. en

Amendment 299

Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba, Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 28

Motion for a resolution

28. Calls on the Commission to ***assess*** in successive reports how the issues identified in the areas analysed in previous reports have evolved;

Amendment

28. Calls on the Commission to ***inform*** in successive reports how the issues identified in the areas analysed in previous reports have evolved;

Or. en

Amendment 300

Nicolas Bay, Jean-Paul Garraud, Tom Vandendriessche, Harald Vilimsky, Nicolaus Fest, Laura Huhtasaari, Mara Bizzotto

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 28 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

28a. Reiterates that the people are sovereign in a democracy and that the issue of respect for the rule of law shall not be used to restrict the exercise of power nor to influence the policy stance of democratically elected governments of the Member States when the rule of law is not being seriously and systematically breached, which the Council alone is able to determine through the procedure laid down in Article 7 TEU;

Or. fr

Amendment 301

Michal Šimečka, Sophia in 't Veld, Moritz Körner, Malik Azmani, Maite Pagazaurtundúa, Ramona Strugariu, Hilde Vautmans, Anna Júlia Donáth, Olivier Chastel, Dragoş Tudorache, Fabienne Keller

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 28 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

28 a. Stresses the importance of promoting the findings of the annual report at the national level; encourages the Commission to foster debate around the report in national parliaments and engage with civil society organizations in the follow-up to the report;

Or. en

Amendment 302

Maria Grapini

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 28 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

28a. Calls on the Commission to assess objectively, on the basis of common criteria accepted by all Member States, the degree of respect for the rule of law and the consolidation thereof;

Or. ro

Amendment 303
Loránt Vincze

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 29

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

29. Calls on the Commission to make clear in its annual Rule of Law Reports that not all rule of law shortcomings and violations are of the same nature and/or intensity and that when the values listed in Article 2 of the TEU are violated gravely, permanently and systematically, Member States cease being democracies;

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 304
Patryk Jaki, Jadwiga Wiśniewska, Joachim Stanisław Brudziński, Beata Kempa, Jorge Buxadé Villalba, Cristian Terheş

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 29

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

29. Calls on the Commission to make clear in its annual Rule of Law Reports that not all rule of law shortcomings and violations are of the same nature and/or intensity and that when the values listed in Article 2 of the TEU are violated gravely, permanently and systematically, Member States cease being democracies;

deleted

Or. en

Amendment 305

Tineke Strik

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 29

Motion for a resolution

29. Calls on the Commission to make clear in its annual Rule of Law Reports that not all rule of law shortcomings and violations are of the same nature and/or intensity and that when the values listed in Article 2 *of the* TEU are violated gravely, permanently and systematically, Member States cease being democracies;

Amendment

29. Calls on the Commission to make clear in its annual rule of law reports that not all rule of law shortcomings and violations are of the same nature and/or intensity and that when the values listed in Article 2 TEU are ***being*** violated ***deliberately***, gravely, permanently and systematically ***over a period of time***, Member States cease being democracies ***and become instead elected autocracies***; ***calls, therefore, on the Commission to separately assess countries under ongoing Article 7 TEU proceedings in-depth, in order to illustrate how the rule of law has been structurally undermined to facilitate the consolidation authoritarian-style governance structures***;

Or. en

Amendment 306

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Konstantinos Arvanitis, Katarina Barley, Elena Yoncheva, Łukasz Kohut, Dietmar Köster, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Pietro Bartolo, Petar Vitanov, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 29

Motion for a resolution

29. Calls on the Commission to make clear in its annual Rule of Law Reports that not all rule of law shortcomings and violations are of the same nature and/or intensity and that when the values listed in Article 2 of the TEU are violated gravely, permanently and systematically, Member States cease being democracies;

Amendment

29. Calls on the Commission to make clear in its annual Rule of Law Reports that not all rule of law shortcomings and violations are of the same nature and/or intensity and that when the values listed in Article 2 of the TEU are violated gravely, permanently and systematically, Member States cease being democracies; ***and***

become authoritarian regimes; calls, therefore, on the Commission to assess countries under ongoing Article 7 TEU proceedings in-depth, in order to illustrate how the rule of law has been structurally undermined to facilitate the consolidation authoritarian-style governance structures;

Or. en

Amendment 307
Konstantinos Arvanitis

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 29

Motion for a resolution

29. Calls on the Commission to make clear in its annual Rule of Law Reports that not all rule of law shortcomings and violations are of the same nature and/or intensity and that when the values listed in Article 2 of the TEU are violated gravely, permanently and systematically, Member States cease being democracies;

Amendment

29. Calls on the Commission to make clear in its annual Rule of Law Reports that not all rule of law shortcomings and violations are of the same nature and/or intensity and that when the values listed in Article 2 of the TEU are violated gravely, permanently and systematically, Member States cease being democracies; ***stresses that the Commission's main priority should be to enforce EU law when breaches of Article 2 of the TEU occur and that its annual Rule of Law Reports should mainly contribute to that end;***

Or. en

Amendment 308
Milan Uhrík

Motion for a resolution
Paragraph 29

Motion for a resolution

29. Calls on the Commission to make clear in its annual Rule of Law Reports that not all rule of law shortcomings and violations are of the same nature and/or

Amendment

29. Calls on the Commission to make clear in its annual Rule of Law Reports that not all rule of law shortcomings and violations are of the same nature and/or

intensity *and that when the values listed in Article 2 of the TEU are violated gravely, permanently and systematically, Member States cease being democracies;*

intensity;

Or. sk

Amendment 309

Lukas Mandl, Paulo Rangel, Vladimír Bilčík

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 29

Motion for a resolution

29. Calls on the Commission to make clear in its annual Rule of Law Reports that not all rule of law shortcomings and violations are of the same nature and/or intensity and that when the values listed in Article 2 of the TEU are violated gravely, permanently and systematically, Member States cease being democracies;

Amendment

29. Calls on the Commission to make clear in its annual Rule of Law Reports that not all rule of law shortcomings and violations are of the same nature and/or intensity and that when the values listed in Article 2 of the TEU are violated gravely, permanently and systematically, *the authoritarian-style governance structures and elements of a given Member State should be clearly denoted as such;*

Or. en

Amendment 310

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Lukas Mandl, Konstantinos Arvanitis, Tineke Strik, Katarina Barley, Elena Yoncheva, Łukasz Kohut, Dietmar Köster, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Petar Vitanov, Pietro Bartolo, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 29 a (new)

Motion for a resolution

29 a. Underlines that this report should serve as a basis for the prioritisation of follow-up actions by the EU regarding those Member States where shortcoming or deficiencies are witnessed, firmly placing the contribution of the report within the overarching democracy, rule of law and fundamental rights mechanism;

Amendment 311

Domènec Ruiz Devesa, Konstantinos Arvanitis, Tineke Strik, Katarina Barley, Elena Yoncheva, Łukasz Kohut, Dietmar Köster, Juan Fernando López Aguilar, Petar Vitanov, Pietro Bartolo, Raphaël Glucksmann, Cyrus Engerer

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 29 b (new)

Motion for a resolution

Amendment

29 b. Commits to start working on the 2021 report as early as possible after its publication;