


# Transparency of the Superior Council of Prosecutors

(1 January – 31 October 2024)


## Organization of SCP meetings



In ten months of 2024, the SCP conducted more meetings than in any full year before.

The percentage of postponed and extraordinary meetings was the lowest in the last three years.


## Publication of main agendas



The publication date for almost two thirds of the agendas is unidentifiable, a problem that did not exist before.

Timely publication is confirmable only for 32% of all agendas (17 out of 53).

## Subiectele examinate



The share of resolved important matters regarding the work of the SCP and the prosecution system increased from 50% to 70%.

## Duration of SCP meetings and the examination procedure (public or closed)

On average 2 hours 31 min (of which 1 hour 15 min without public access)

163 (79%) were discussed in open sessions


44 (21%) were discussed in closed sessions

50% Half of the time spent in meetings, the proceedings were in closed sessions or deliberations.

Disciplinary matters were examined openly, and secret voting was ruled out.

## SCP decisions and their publication

Number of decisions adopted per year



In ten months of 2024, the CSP adopted more decisions than in any full year before.


Top five subject matters from decisions:



Most of the adopted decisions concerned the organization of competitions.

Publication of decisions

304 decisions do not contain information regarding the publication date



53 decisions allow determining the moment of publication;

46 decisions were published on time (13% of all decisions)

7 decision were published late (2% of all decisions)

For 85% of the decisions, it is not known whether they were published on time, and only for 2% can be confirmed that they were published on time.

The full report is available for reading [here](#).



This infographic was financed from a grant offered by the United States Department of State. The presented views, findings, and conclusions are those of the LRCM and do not necessarily reflect the position of the United States Department of State.