

| | |
|--|----|
| Editorial | 5 |
| A. Legal questions | 11 |
| B. Legal opinion | 15 |
| I. Law, politics and economics in the crisis | 15 |
| 1. No Suspension of Law | 15 |
| 2. Interests of the EU institutions | 17 |
| II. Scope of protection of fundamental and human rights | 22 |
| 1. Human rights obligations of the Commission and ECB | 23 |
| 1.1. CFR obligation | 23 |
| 1.1.1 Scope | 23 |
| 1.1.2 Subjective rights under the CFR | 26 |
| 1.2. Obligations under international human rights codifications | 27 |
| 1.2.1 Liberal human rights codifications: ECHR and UN Civil Covenant | 27 |
| 1.2.1.1 ECHR | 27 |
| 1.2.1.2 UN Civil Covenant | 29 |
| 1.2.2 Social human rights codifications | 29 |
| 1.2.2.1 UN Social Covenant and (R)ESC | 30 |
| 1.2.2.2 Principles of EU law | 33 |
| 1.2.2.3 Social human rights as general principles | 34 |
| 1.2.2.4 Interim conclusion | 35 |
| 1.2.3 ILO Conventions | 36 |
| 1.2.4 UN Disability Convention | 37 |
| 1.3 Obligations under customary international law | 38 |
| 1.3.1 International Bill of Rights | 40 |
| 1.3.2 Odious debts doctrine | 41 |
| 2. Specific scope of protection of human rights | 42 |
| 2.1 Labour and trade union rights | 42 |
| 2.1.1 Article 31 CFR (fair and just working conditions) | 44 |
| 2.1.2 Art. 28 CFR (freedom of collective bargaining) | 45 |
| 2.1.3 Interim conclusion | 48 |

| | |
|--|----|
| 2.2 Housing and social security | 48 |
| 2.3 Health | 51 |
| 2.4 Education | 52 |
| 2.5 Property | 54 |
| 2.6 The right to good administration | 54 |
| 3. Interim conclusion | 55 |
| III. Encroachment on fundamental rights by the MoUs | 56 |
| 1. Legal status of the MoUs | 56 |
| 1.1 MoUs as sui generis legal acts | 56 |
| 1.2 MoUs as real acts | 60 |
| 2. Encroachment | 61 |
| 3. Interim conclusion | 62 |
| IV. Justification | 62 |
| 1. Compliance with the system of competences under EU law | 62 |
| 1.1 The ESM and EU law | 63 |
| 1.2 Ultra vires | 64 |
| 1.2.1 Competences on EU level | 64 |
| 1.2.2 Separation of powers | 66 |
| 2. Substantive justification of encroachments | 67 |
| 2.1 Criterion for assessment of justification | 67 |
| 2.2 Details of substantive justification | 69 |
| 2.2.1 No public interest | 69 |
| 2.2.2 Disproportionality | 72 |
| 2.2.2.1 Insufficient regard for the non-regression principle | 72 |
| 2.2.2.2 Disproportionate deficit limits | 73 |
| 2.2.2.3 No long-term income protection | 74 |
| 2.2.2.4 Insufficient consideration of alternative cuts | 75 |
| 2.2.2.5 Insufficient balancing | 75 |
| 2.2.2.6 Interim conclusion | 77 |
| 2.2.3 No regard for core obligations | 77 |
| 2.2.4 Discriminatory effect | 78 |
| 2.2.5 No regard for participation requirements | 79 |
| 3. Interim conclusion | 81 |
| V. Legal protection | 82 |
| 1. EU law institutions | 83 |
| 1.1 Action for annulment | 83 |
| 1.1.1 'Act' of an EU institution | 84 |

| | |
|--|----|
| 1.1.2 Locus standi | 85 |
| 1.2 References for a preliminary ruling | 86 |
| 1.3 Claim for damages on the basis of official liability | 87 |
| 1.4 Article 37(3) of the ESM Treaty | 87 |
| 2. Council of Europe institutions | 87 |
| 3. International bodies | 89 |
| 3.1 ILO | 89 |
| 3.2 Human Rights Committees | 89 |
| 3.3 IMF compliance | 90 |
| 3.4 ICJ | 91 |
| C. Summary of main conclusions | 93 |