

Adoption: 12 June 2026
Publication: 27 August 2026

Public
GrecoRC4(2026)8

FOURTH EVALUATION ROUND

Corruption prevention in respect of members of
parliament, judges and prosecutors

FOURTH *INTERIM* COMPLIANCE REPORT AUSTRIA

Adopted by GRECO at its 103rd Plenary Meeting
(Strasbourg, 8-12 June 2026)

F
O
U
R
T
H

E
V
A
L
U
A
T
I
O
N

R
O
U
N
D

I. INTRODUCTION

1. [The Fourth Round Evaluation Report on Austria](#) was adopted at GRECO's 73rd Plenary Meeting (21 October 2016) and made public on 13 February 2017, following authorisation by Austria. GRECO's Fourth Evaluation Round deals with "Corruption prevention in respect of members of parliament, judges and prosecutors".
2. In [the Compliance Report](#) adopted by GRECO at its 81st Plenary Meeting (7 December 2018) and made public on 17 July 2019, following authorisation by Austria, it was concluded that only one of the 19 recommendations contained in the Evaluation Report had been dealt with in a satisfactory manner, five recommendations had been partly implemented and thirteen had not been implemented. GRECO concluded that the very low level of compliance with the recommendations was "globally unsatisfactory" and decided to apply its "non-compliance" procedure.
3. In the [Interim Compliance Report](#) adopted by GRECO at its 85th plenary meeting (25 September 2020) and made public on 1 March 2021. GRECO concluded that the low level of compliance with the recommendations remained "globally unsatisfactory".
4. In the [Second Interim Compliance Report](#) adopted by GRECO at its 89th plenary meeting (3 December 2021) and published on 20 April 2022, GRECO concluded that the low level of compliance with the recommendations was no longer "globally unsatisfactory".
5. In the [Second Compliance Report](#) adopted by GRECO at its 94th plenary meeting (9 June 2023) and made public on 16 November 2023, since the vast majority of recommendations remained partly implemented or not implemented, GRECO concluded that the level of compliance with the recommendations was again "globally unsatisfactory" within the meaning of Rule 31, paragraph 8.3 of the Rules of Procedure.
6. In the [Third Interim Compliance Report](#) adopted by GRECO at its 98th plenary meeting (22 November 2024) and made public on 26 March 2025, GRECO concluded that the current level of compliance with the recommendations remained "globally unsatisfactory" within the meaning of Rule 31, paragraph 8.3 of the Rules of Procedure. GRECO therefore decided to apply Rule 32 concerning members found not to be in compliance with the recommendations contained in the Evaluation Report. Pursuant to paragraph 8.2 of Article 31 of the Rules of Procedure, GRECO asked the Head of the Austrian delegation to provide a report on measures taken to implement the outstanding recommendations. That report, submitted on 26 November 2025, forms the basis of this report.
7. This [Fourth Interim Compliance Report](#) evaluates the progress made in implementing the outstanding recommendations (recommendations ii to xii, xiv, xvi, xvii, xviii and xix) since the previous Third *Interim* Compliance Report and provides an overall appraisal of the level of Austria's compliance with these recommendations.
8. GRECO selected Poland (in respect of members of parliament) and Liechtenstein (in respect of judges and prosecutors) to appoint Rapporteurs for the compliance procedure. The Rapporteurs appointed were Mr Piotr CHARKIEWICZ, on behalf of Poland, and Fabian RITTER, on behalf of Liechtenstein. They were assisted by GRECO's Secretariat in drawing up this Fourth *Interim* Compliance Report.

II. ANALYSIS

Corruption prevention in respect of members of parliament

Recommendation ii to viii

9. *GRECO recommended: (i) that a code of conduct (or ethics) be developed for members of parliament and communicated to the public; ii) ensuring there is a mechanism both to promote the code and to provide advice and counselling to MPs, but also to enforce such standards where necessary. (Recommendation ii)*
10. *GRECO recommended: (i) to clarify the implications for members of parliament of the current system of declarations of income and side activities when it comes to conflicts of interest not necessarily revealed by these declarations; and in that context (ii) to introduce a requirement of ad hoc disclosure when a conflict between specific private interests of individual MPs may emerge in relation to a matter under consideration in parliamentary proceedings – in the plenary or its committees – or in other work related to their mandate. (Recommendation iii)*
11. *GRECO recommended that internal rules and guidance be provided within parliament on the acceptance, valuation and disclosure of gifts, hospitality and other advantages, including external sources of support provided to parliamentarians, and that compliance by parliamentarians be properly monitored, consistent with the rules on political financing. (Recommendation iv)*
12. *GRECO recommended that the legal framework applicable to lobbying be reviewed so as to (i) improve the transparency of such activities (also for the public) and the consistency of requirements including the legal prohibition for parliamentarians themselves to act as lobbyists, and to ensure proper supervision of these declaratory requirements and restrictions (ii) to provide for rules on how members of parliament have contacts with lobbyists and other persons seeking to influence parliamentary work. (Recommendation v)*
13. *GRECO recommended: (i) that the existing regime of declarations be reviewed in order to include consistent and meaningful information on assets, debts and liabilities, more precise information on income (ii) that consideration be given to widening the scope of the declarations to also include information on spouses and dependent family members (it being understood that such information would not necessarily need to be made public). (Recommendation vi)*
14. *GRECO recommended that: (i) that the future declarations of income, assets and interests be monitored by a body provided with the mandate, the legal and other means, as well as the level of specialisation and independence needed to perform this function in an effective, transparent and proactive manner and (ii) that such a body be able to propose further legislative changes as may be necessary, and to provide guidance in this area. (Recommendation vii)*
15. *GRECO recommended that infringements of the main present and future rules in respect of integrity of parliamentarians, including those concerning the declaration system under the Act on incompatibilities and transparency, carry adequate sanctions and that the public be informed about their application. (Recommendation viii)*
16. GRECO recalls that, in the previous report, no progress had been reported, as the authorities stated that no new measures had been taken, that discussions had not resulted in implementation, and that further work on the recommendations was deferred until after the general election in September 2024. Therefore, GRECO

concluded that recommendations ii, iii, iv and vi remained partly implemented and recommendations v, vii and viii remained not implemented.

17. The Austrian authorities refer to a letter dated 27 June 2025 from the Secretary General of the Austrian parliamentary administration to the President of GRECO, informing that no dedicated working group would be established during the XXVIII legislative period to address these recommendations, although parliamentary groups indicated that they may consider them within the regular legislative process and would report any related measures taken.
18. The authorities further clarify that, with respect to recommendation ii, confidential integrity advice (not limited to gifts and other benefits) has been available since April 2019 through the Compliance Department, and that advisers to the Incompatibility Committee also provide guidance on matters related to the Incompatibility and Transparency Act.
19. Finally, the authorities report that parliamentary groups are working to develop binding rules on the handling of honorary gifts for members of parliament (MPs), drawing on the regulations applicable to federal officials, and that further information will be provided once these rules take concrete form.
20. GRECO welcomes the clarification provided by the authorities confirming that confidential integrity counselling is available to MPs, thereby partially meeting the second component of recommendation ii. It is recalled that, for recommendation ii to be fully complied with, GRECO expects additional measures regarding awareness-raising and enforcement of the code of conduct.
21. GRECO also welcomes the work underway to further regulate the acceptance of gifts. In this connection, it recalls that, although guidelines for MPs on the acceptance of gifts had been adopted, binding internal rules were previously lacking and not under preparation; the current update is therefore a positive development.
22. GRECO nevertheless regrets the lack of more determined and decisive action by parliament to address the remaining gaps in its integrity framework, such as conflict-of-interest prevention mechanisms and appropriate disclosure, lobbying regulation, enhanced financial disclosure requirements and effective sanctions for integrity-related breaches. GRECO urges the authorities to step up their efforts and take concrete and conclusive measures to address these outstanding issues.
23. GRECO concludes that recommendations ii, iii, iv and vi remain partly implemented and recommendations v, vii and viii remain not implemented.

Corruption prevention in respect of judges

Recommendation ix

24. *GRECO recommended that i) adequate legislative, institutional and organisational measures be taken so that the judges of federal and regional administrative courts be subject to appropriate and harmonised safeguards and rules as regards their independence, conditions of service and remuneration, impartiality, conduct (including on conflicts of interest, gifts and post-employment activities), supervision and sanctions; ii) the Länder be invited to support those improvements by making the necessary changes which fall within their competence.*
25. It is recalled that the second part of the recommendation had been assessed as implemented. However, GRECO's position since the evaluation, as confirmed in the

subsequent compliance reports, was that reform of the administrative courts remained outstanding, and no new developments had been made in this regard by the authorities other than reiterating the rules that had been in place at the time of the evaluation visit.

26. The Austrian authorities again refer to the legal frameworks governing the independence, conditions of service and remuneration, impartiality, performance appraisal and disciplinary systems applicable to judges of the Länder administrative courts. They indicate that the various Länder regimes show a high degree of similarity in their core features: judicial independence and irremovability are grounded in constitutional guarantees applicable nationwide; impartiality and recusal obligations are governed by uniform federal procedural legislation. Remuneration systems across the Länder follow comparable seniority-based structures with broadly aligned salary ranges. Periodic performance appraisal mechanisms are in place in all courts, based on largely similar qualitative criteria and involving judicial bodies in the evaluation process. Disciplinary regimes provide for comparable types of sanctions — including admonitions, fines and dismissal — subject to adjudication by judicial bodies and available avenues of appeal. The authorities acknowledge that some variation remains in institutional arrangements and procedural modalities across the Länder, which is consistent with the current constitutional distribution of competences in Austria.
27. GRECO notes the absence of any new developments in this area. It refers back to its reasoning in the Fourth Round Evaluation Report (paragraphs 80 and 81), as further supported in the Compliance Report (paragraphs 24 and 25) and reiterated in the subsequent compliance reports, which underline the need to pursue the reform process with a view to ensuring greater harmonisation and stronger safeguards within the system of administrative justice. In particular, concerns had been expressed regarding the fragmented legislative framework, the absence of consolidated service rules, discretion of the executive in matters relating to appointments career progression, and discipline, and the lack of a specific code of conduct for administrative judges. These concerns have not been resolved and continue to remain relevant (see also the considerations expressed by the CCJE in this respect, submitted for its attention by the Association of European Administrative Judges, and repeatedly raised by Austrian judicial unions)¹.
28. GRECO regrets that no further reflection and concrete follow-up measures have been undertaken by the authorities to address these sensitive underlying issues. This situation also impacts on the effective implementation of several related recommendations contained in this report, as set out below.
29. GRECO concludes that recommendation ix remains partly implemented.

Recommendation x

30. *GRECO recommended that the recruitment requirements be increased and formalised for judges when they are to become candidate-judges (Richteramtsanwärter) and administrative court judges, and that this includes proper integrity assessments as well as objective and measurable criteria on professional qualifications to be applied by the independent selection panels involved.*

¹ In addition to the concerns expressed by GRECO, as highlighted above, see also: Consultative Council of European Judges (CCJE): <https://rm.coe.int/2017-report-situation-of-judges-in-member-states/1680786ae1>, and more recently: <https://rm.coe.int/opinion-of-the-ccje-bureau-on-the-request-from-austria-published-/488028e4a3>

31. It is recalled that, in previous reports, this recommendation was assessed as partly implemented. The requirements of this recommendation had been met with regard to ordinary judges, but no new measures had been taken concerning administrative judges.
32. The Austrian authorities refer again to the provisions in place at the time of the visit. Notably, the criteria for the recruitment of administrative judges is defined in the Federal Constitutional Law (Article 134, subsections 2 and 3), further refined in the relevant organisational acts of relevant provincial administrative courts. Candidates must have a law degree and at least five years of relevant professional experience. Länder law adds further requirements, including passing a recognised professional legal exam (ordinary court judges' exam, bar exam or public service exam). The necessary qualifications also include a clean criminal record². A judicial body within the Court (either the plenary of the Court or a panel consisting of the president, the vice-president and 5 elected judges) prepares appointment proposals for the regional government; ranking of candidates follows performance appraisal criteria.
33. The authorities further explain that For the Federal Administrative Court (BVwG), which falls under the jurisdiction of the Federal Ministry of Justice, a significant proportion of administrative judges are recruited from the first-instance authorities, whereby these are generally civil servants who have already completed their basic training for higher civil service and for whom further basic training (which is what the training of trainee judges amounts to) would be contrary to the system. However, legal assistants at the BVwG who are completing basic training for the higher civil service and who have gained first-hand experience of judicial work at the BVwG and proven themselves in practice are increasingly being appointed as judges at the BVwG.
34. GRECO notes that the situation regarding the recruitment requirements for administrative court judges remains unchanged since the time of the evaluation, as reiterated by the authorities throughout the compliance procedure. It is recalled that, in the Evaluation Report, it was considered that, for administrative court judges, the recruitment requirements were too loose and left broad discretion to courts at federal or regional level in the selection of successful candidates. Unlike members of the ordinary courts, administrative judges often entered the profession directly without prior judicial experience (Fourth Evaluation Round Report on Austria, paragraph 90).
35. GRECO concludes that recommendation x remains partly implemented.

Recommendation xi

36. *GRECO recommended that staff panels be involved more broadly in the selection and career evolution of ordinary and administrative court judges, including the presidents and deputy-presidents, and that the proposals of the panels become binding for the executive body making appointments.*
37. It is recalled that, in the previous report, this recommendation was assessed as partly implemented. Only preliminary plans had been mentioned to review the appointment procedure for the Presidents and Vice-Presidents of the Federal Administrative Court; no substantial developments had occurred, and appointment proposals by judicial panels remained non-binding for the executive authorities.

² Applicants for a judgeship position are routinely asked for a recent criminal record check ("Strafregisterauszug") as part of their application. This is based on the legal requirement of "personal suitability" for the office, as regulated in the respective (federal and regional) acts (e.g. § 207 para. 1 no. 4 RStDG, § 2 para. 5 lit. e K-LVwGG, § 3 para. 3 no. 5 VGWG etc). In some cases, applicants for this reason also have to undergo background checks or need a security clearance ("Sicherheitsüberprüfung"). General public service law in some Länder explicitly excludes applicants with convictions (e.g. § 4 para. 1 Vienna DO).

38. The Austrian authorities have not reported any new information in this area.
39. In the absence of any update, GRECO concludes that recommendation xi remains partly implemented.

Recommendation xii

40. *GRECO recommended that a system of periodic appraisals be introduced for judges, including the presidents of the courts, and that the results of such appraisals be used in particular for decisions on career progression.*
41. It is recalled that, in the previous report, this recommendation was assessed as not implemented. Despite draft legislation under development since 2017, a periodic appraisal system for all judges, including court presidents, had not been introduced.
42. The Austrian authorities report that work on reforming the system for the evaluation of judges is ongoing. Discussions have taken place within a dialogue group of the European Network of Councils for the Judiciary (ENCJ) and through stakeholder meetings organised by the Ministry of Justice, drawing in particular on the Dutch feedback-based evaluation model. A consensus has emerged within the judiciary to further develop the current system with a stronger focus on regular feedback. The workshops with judges and judicial candidates have been successfully completed and evaluated. The results were presented to the relevant stakeholders at an information session in March 2026. The next step is to test the preferred reflection tools in a one-year pilot phase at 16 pilot courts in Austria, in collaboration with the judges, before further developing them. This pilot phase will run from May 2026 to April 2027. Based on the results, the evaluation tools will then be finalised and made permanent.
43. GRECO notes that the Austrian authorities have taken further steps towards reforming the system for the evaluation of judges, including stakeholder consultations and the development of feedback-based tools inspired by comparative models. It welcomes the completion of workshops and the planned pilot phase in selected courts. While these developments reflect a constructive and inclusive approach within the judiciary, GRECO underlines that the reforms are still at a preparatory stage. It therefore encourages the authorities to ensure that these initiatives lead to concrete and lasting measures in practice.
44. Therefore, GRECO concludes that recommendation xii remains not implemented.

Recommendation xiv

45. *GRECO recommended that (i) to ensure that all relevant categories of judges, including lay judges, are bound by a Code of conduct accompanied by, or complemented with appropriate guidance and (ii) that a mechanism is put in place to provide confidential counselling and to promote the implementation of the rules of conduct in daily work.*
46. It is recalled that, in the previous report, this recommendation was assessed as partly implemented. GRECO acknowledged the adoption of various documents on conduct and ethics applicable to judges but was awaiting further anticipated developments regarding dedicated codes of conduct for lay judges and administrative court judges. As regards counselling channels, GRECO expected further clarification of its confidential nature.

47. The Austrian authorities indicate that, as regards lay judges, the Federal Ministry of Justice established a working group in 2025 composed of representatives from courts with a high number of lay judges and the Ministry itself. The group developed a training concept including an e-learning compliance module and optional in-person workshops. The e-learning tool on compliance has been made available to lay judges since 12 March 2026.
48. The Austrian Academy of Administrative Justice offers an introductory curriculum for newly appointed administrative court judges with a strong focus on compliance. The Academy also offers introductory seminars for lay judges at administrative courts, dealing with their rights and obligations, including compliance.
49. The authorities also report that the adoption of a specific code of conduct for the administrative court judges is currently stalled, as it has been viewed critically by judges' associations. Further development therefore needs to be initiated either by these associations or on a court-by-court basis.
50. Concerning confidential counselling, reference is made to the network of compliance officers, now comprising 101 members across courts, prosecution offices, penitentiaries and the Federal Ministry of Justice, who serve as contact persons and may provide confidential advice. Reference is also made to the Ethics Council within the Judges' Association.
51. With respect to the first part of the recommendation, GRECO was expecting further developments concerning the adoption of a specific code of conduct for lay judges, as anticipated by the authorities. A working group has been established and has engaged in training initiatives (for more details on this, see under recommendation xix); however, the adoption of a dedicated code of conduct for lay judges has not yet taken place.
52. GRECO notes that, with respect to conduct provisions applicable to administrative court judges, these relate primarily to general service-law duties of conduct and incompatibility rules, rather than to a specific, codified code of conduct. This was identified as an apparent gap in the Fourth Round Evaluation Report, particularly as administrative judges considered themselves a distinct professional group to which the general code of conduct for judges did not apply. In the previous compliance report, the authorities had indicated that the Conference of the Presidents of Administrative Courts was in the process of establishing a code of conduct; GRECO regrets that the process is currently stalled. While noting positively the training initiatives provided by the Austrian Academy of Administrative Justice, including compliance-focused curricula, GRECO underlines that these cannot substitute for a clear, dedicated code of conduct.
53. With respect to the second part of the recommendation concerning integrity-related advisory channels, GRECO welcomes the expansion of the network of compliance officers and the clarification provided by the authorities that the counselling they provide is confidential. This part of the recommendation is therefore considered implemented.
54. GRECO concludes that recommendation xiv remains partly implemented.

Recommendation xvi

55. *GRECO recommended that the persons responsible for the implementation and supervision of the various obligations laid upon judges - notably on professional secrecy, gifts, accessory activities and management of conflicts of interest – be*

properly identified and known to all, and that they be required to introduce the proper procedures needed for these obligations to become effective.

56. It is recalled that, in the previous report, this recommendation was not implemented. GRECO noted that plans were underway to establish a compliance management system but expected further information in this regard. No new information had been reported concerning supervision arrangements for administrative courts, as the information provided merely described the situation already in place at the time of the evaluation.
57. The Austrian authorities indicate that relevant provisions regarding supervisory arrangements for integrity-related matters are contained in the Judges and Public Prosecutors Service Act and the Civil Service Law. In addition to the Code of Conduct, directives issued by the Federal Ministry of Justice regulate the handling of gifts and representation duties and are accessible via the Ministry's intranet. Service authorities³ are responsible for service and disciplinary matters relating to breaches of these provisions and report annually to the Ministry on secondary employment activities. Compliance awareness, training, and secondary and ancillary activities are also reviewed as part of regular internal audits, and these topics are planned to be included in the Internal Audit Unit's 2026 annual audit plan.
58. The authorities also report that in 2021 a Compliance Committee has been set up, which includes a representative of the service authorities of the Austrian judiciary as well as representatives of professional associations and staff representatives. It carries out regular compliance risk analyses and prepares the annual compliance programme on this basis. In the same year a network of Compliance officers (currently about 100 members) was founded, in which all service authorities of the Austrian judiciary are represented. The members of this network are available to their colleagues as contacts and trusted advisors for and in compliance issues and are tasked with spreading and monitoring compliance awareness among their colleagues.
59. Moreover, an e-learning programme on compliance has been available to all employees of the Austrian judiciary since 2021 and must be completed by all members of the judiciary. It consists of eight learning modules (definitions and legal principles; overview; compliance guidelines; acceptance of gifts; invitations and hospitality; sponsoring; impartiality; secondary employment). A second e-learning programme, which has been online since 2022, deals with the topic of data security. The use of both tools is regularly monitored. Refresher courses on these topics are offered.
60. The Austrian authorities also indicate that since July 2023, there has also been a web-based internal reporting platform (addressees are only all members of the Austrian judiciary: judges, public prosecutors, judicial guards, etc.). The platform serves members of the Austrian judiciary on two levels: on the one hand as an information tool on compliance/integrity issues, and on the other hand as a reporting tool for corrupt practices that only affect members of the Austrian judiciary.
61. GRECO takes note of the information provided on implementation and supervisory arrangements for integrity-related matters and their monitoring through internal audits. GRECO welcomes the significant steps taken since the last evaluation, which demonstrate a comprehensive and structured approach to the implementation of integrity-related obligations for judges. GRECO notes that the persons responsible for

³ It is recalled that pursuant to regulation on judicial service law procedure and staff positions, service authorities in respect of judges, are the presidents of the higher regional courts or the President of the Supreme Court. The competences and tasks of the service authorities are also described in the Compliance Guidelines (cf. Interim Compliance Report on Austria).

the supervision of integrity-related matters are now clearly identified at all levels of the judiciary.

62. GRECO also notes that concrete procedures have been put in place to render the relevant obligations effective. In particular, the establishment of a Compliance Committee carrying out regular risk analyses, the introduction of a mandatory e-learning programme covering key integrity topics, and the creation of an internal reporting platform since July 2023 constitute meaningful and operational measures.
63. GRECO concludes that recommendation xvi has been implemented satisfactorily.

Corruption prevention in respect of prosecutors

Recommendation xvii

64. *GRECO recommended that the statute of prosecutors be further approximated with the one for judges recommended in the present report, particularly with regard to decisions on appointments and career changes including for the highest functions (the role of the executive should be limited to the formal appointment and should not include the choice of the candidate), as well as with regard to periodic appraisals for all prosecutors and the incompatibility of their function with a political function in the executive or legislature.*
65. It is recalled that this recommendation remained partly implemented. GRECO had welcomed that the issue of the incompatibility of the function of a prosecutor with that of an executive or legislative position had been dealt with in a satisfactory manner. However, it regretted that the remaining necessary legal and practical measures to implement this recommendation fully had not yet been taken.
66. The Austrian authorities do not report any new information in this area.
67. In the absence of any update, GRECO concludes that recommendation xvii remains partly implemented.

Recommendation xviii

68. *GRECO recommended that (i) that all prosecutors are bound by a code of conduct accompanied by, or complemented with, appropriate guidance and (ii) that a system be put in place to provide confidential counselling and to support the implementation of the code in daily work.*
69. It is recalled that this recommendation was assessed as partly implemented. GRECO welcomed the adoption of various documents on conduct and ethics applicable to prosecutors, thereby fulfilling the first part of the recommendation. With regard to the second part, GRECO acknowledged that compliance officers were being designated within the relevant service authorities of regional prosecution offices. It expected further clarification regarding the confidential nature of the counselling they provide.
70. The Austrian authorities report on the development of the network of compliance officers, now comprising 101 members across courts, prosecution offices, penitentiaries and the Federal Ministry of Justice, who serve as contact persons for integrity-related matters and may provide confidential advice.
71. GRECO welcomes the expansion of the network of compliance officers and the clarification by the authorities that the counselling they provide is confidential, thereby fulfilling the outstanding requirements of the second part of the recommendation.

72. GRECO concludes that recommendation xviii has been implemented satisfactorily.

Corruption prevention regarding judges and prosecutors

Recommendation xix

73. *GRECO recommended that an annual programme be put in place for the in-service training of judges and prosecutors, including administrative judges and lay judges, which would include integrity-focused elements concerning the rights and obligations of these professionals.*

74. It is recalled that this recommendation was considered partly implemented pending the development of integrity-related training for lay judges.

75. The Austrian authorities report that the e-learning programme on compliance has been available to lay judges since 12 March 2026. In March 2026, an in-person workshop on compliance with regulations for 200 lay judges took place. The training explains the role of lay judges within the Austrian judiciary, covering legal foundations, practical responsibilities, judicial independence, neutrality, professional duties, and ethical standards. It addresses key topics such as case allocation, confidentiality, data protection, and consequences of misconduct, including legal and disciplinary outcomes. To reinforce understanding, the session includes practical case studies, highlighting behavioural rules during court proceedings and in private life, such as handling invitations from parties, witnesses, or interest groups. These examples serve as a basis for interactive discussion, aimed at clarifying boundaries and strengthening awareness of ethical conduct. The training prioritises practical relevance and active participation. Through case-based learning and guided discussions, participants are expected to gain clarity on what is permissible and what is not, ensuring they are well-prepared for their responsibilities.

76. GRECO welcomes the development of integrity-related in-service training for lay judges. The information provided on the in-person training is particularly encouraging, especially in view of its comprehensive scope and practical, hands-on approach. GRECO trusts that appropriate measures will be taken to ensure that lay judges complete the online course and that in-person training opportunities will not remain a one-off initiative but will instead form part of an ongoing curriculum.

77. GRECO concludes that recommendation xix has been implemented satisfactorily.

III. CONCLUSIONS

78. In view of the foregoing, GRECO concludes that Austria has made some progress in connection with the fulfilment of recommendations found to be not implemented or partly implemented in the Fourth Round Second Compliance Report; six out of nineteen recommendations have been implemented satisfactorily or dealt with in a satisfactory manner. Of the outstanding recommendations, nine remain partly implemented and four remain not implemented.

79. More specifically, recommendations i, xiii, xv, xvi, xviii and xix have been implemented satisfactorily or dealt with in a satisfactory manner. Recommendations ii, iii, iv, vi, ix, x, xi, xiv and xvii have been partly implemented and recommendations v, vii, viii and xii have not been implemented.

80. With respect to members of parliament, no substantial progress has been made. The authorities have clarified that confidential integrity counselling is available to parliamentarians, but further measures on awareness-raising and enforcement of the code of conduct are still required. Ongoing efforts to introduce clearer rules on the acceptance of gifts are a positive development, but they still need to be effectively introduced. Overall, GRECO regrets the lack of more decisive parliamentary action to address remaining gaps in the integrity framework, including conflict-of-interest prevention, disclosure requirements, lobbying regulation, stronger financial transparency, and effective sanctions, and urges the authorities to take concrete and conclusive steps to resolve these outstanding issues.
81. As to judges and prosecutors, the network of compliance officers has been expanded across courts, prosecution offices, penitentiary institutions and the Federal Ministry of Justice; these officers act as contact persons for integrity-related matters and may provide confidential counselling. A Compliance Committee carrying out regular risk analyses has been established, supported by a network of approximately 100 compliance officers across all service authorities of the Austrian judiciary, a mandatory e-learning programme covering key integrity topics has been introduced, along with an internal web-based reporting platform that serves both as an information and reporting tool for members of the judiciary. Dedicated training for lay judges has been developed, including integrity-related components addressing their rights and duties; however, a specific code of conduct for lay judges is still pending. Steps must be taken to ensure greater harmonisation and stronger safeguards within the system of administrative justice. The introduction of a system of periodic appraisals for judges (including court presidents) and prosecutors has yet to take place. Further, the statute of prosecutors should be further aligned with that of judges, particularly concerning appointments, career advancement and limits on executive influence.
82. Austria must substantially step up its response to GRECO's outstanding recommendations. Since the vast majority of recommendations remain partly implemented or not implemented, GRECO concludes that the current level of compliance with the recommendations remains "globally unsatisfactory" within the meaning of Rule 31 paragraph 8.3 of the Rules of Procedure. GRECO therefore decides to apply Rule 32 concerning members found not to be in compliance with the recommendations contained in the Evaluation Report and asks the Head of the Austrian delegation to provide a report on the progress made in implementing recommendations ii to xii, xiv and xvii by 30 June 2027.
83. In addition, in accordance with Rule 32, paragraph 2, sub-paragraph (ii.b), GRECO invites the President of the Statutory Committee to send a letter to the Permanent Representative of Austria to the Council of Europe, drawing her attention to non-compliance with the relevant recommendations and the need to take determined action with a view to achieving tangible progress as soon as possible.
84. Finally, GRECO invites the Austrian authorities to authorise, as soon as possible, the publication of this report, to translate it into the national language and to make the translation public.