

**Question for written answer E-004250/2025/rev.1
to the Commission**

Rule 144

**Marieke Ehlers (Pfe), Rachel Blom (Pfe), Ton Diepeveen (Pfe), Sebastian Kruis (Pfe),
Auke Zijlstra (Pfe)**

Subject: Follow-up questions in response to the answers to the questions on the
appointment of heads of cabinet in return for political support

In her answer to the questions of 6 May the Commission President states that she has spoken to leaders of political parties that are ‘pro-Europe, pro-Ukraine and pro-rule of law’ and that the exchanges covered organisational and policy priorities. These follow-up questions concern the accusation that some democratically elected parties are apparently not pro-rule of law, despite the fact that the actions of the Commission President herself cannot necessarily be described as pro-rule of law. The purpose of these questions is to obtain clarification regarding the actions of the Commission President.

1. In the Commission’s view, does respecting the rule of law also mean that the Commission President aims to achieve maximum transparency and, for example, to follow the Ombudsman’s recommendations to disclose text messages, even if those messages are the Commission President’s own text messages?
2. If not, can the Commission explain the criteria for being labelled as ‘pro-rule of law’?
3. On a scale of 1 to 10, to what extent does the Commission consider itself to be in compliance with the rule of law? What evidence demonstrates this and what criteria does the Commission use in this regard?

Submitted: 29.10.2025