



Brussels, 2.7.2025
SWD(2025) 182 final

COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT

EVALUATION

of the European Union Agency for Criminal Justice Cooperation

{SWD(2025) 183 final}

Table of contents

1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. WHAT WAS THE EXPECTED OUTCOME OF THE INTERVENTION?	2
2.1. History and Political context.....	2
2.2. Description of the intervention and its objectives.....	3
2.3. Point(s) of comparison	8
3. HOW HAS THE SITUATION EVOLVED OVER THE EVALUATION PERIOD?	9
3.1. Institutional Organisation.....	9
3.1.1 Governance.....	9
3.1.2 Activity planning.....	12
3.1.3 Use of human and financial resources	14
3.2. Data protection regime.....	17
3.3. Implementation of other activities to improve internal organisation	18
3.4. Casework	18
3.5 Cooperation with partners	20
3.8 Accountability for international crimes	23
4. EVALUATION FINDINGS (ANALYTICAL PART).....	24
4.1. To what extent was the intervention successful and why?	24
4.1.1 Effectiveness.....	24
4.1.2 Efficiency	33
4.1.3 Coherence	39
4.2. How did the EU intervention make a difference and to whom? (EU-ADDED VALUE). 43	
4.3. Is the intervention still relevant? (RELEVANCE)	44
5. WHAT ARE THE CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED?	47
5.1. Conclusions.....	47
5.2. Lessons learned.....	49
ANNEX I: PROCEDURAL INFORMATION.....	51
ANNEX II. METHODOLOGY AND ANALYTICAL MODELS USED	52
ANNEX III. EVALUATION MATRIX AND, WHERE RELEVANT, DETAILS ON ANSWERS TO THE EVALUATION QUESTIONS (BY CRITERION)	54
Evaluation Matrix.....	69
Effectiveness	69

Efficiency	77
Relevance	81
Coherence.....	86
EU added value	89
ANNEX IV. OVERVIEW OF BENEFITS AND COSTS [AND, WHERE RELEVANT, TABLE ON SIMPLIFICATION AND BURDEN REDUCTION]	91
ANNEX V. STAKEHOLDERS CONSULTATION - SYNOPSIS REPORT	95

Glossary

Acronym	Definition
AAP	Arab Association for Prosecutors
ABB	Activity-Based Budgeting
ABC	Activity-Based Costing
ABM	Activity-Based Management
AD	Administrative Director
AIAMP	Ibero-American Association of Public Prosecutors
AWP	Annual Work Programme
APA	Africa Prosecutors Association
BoRP	Board on Relations with Partners – a Working Group of the College, Eurojust
CAAR	Consolidated Annual Activity Report
CASC	Judicial Cooperation Network for Central Asia and Southern Caucasus
CATS	Informal Coordinating Committee in the area of police and judicial cooperation in criminal matters
CC	Coordination Centres
CEA	Cost-Effectiveness Analysis
CEPOL	European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Training
CIC	Core International Crimes
CICED	Core International Crimes Evidence Database
CIF	Case Information Form
CM	Coordination Meetings
CMS	Case Management System
CoE	Council of Europe

COPEN	Working Party on Cooperation in Criminal Matters
COSI	Operational Cooperation on Internal Security
CSDP	Common Security and Defence Policy
CTR	European Judicial Counter-Terrorism Register
DG HOME	Directorate-General for Migration and Home Affairs
DG JUST	Directorate General Justice and Consumers
DPR	Data Protection Rules
EAW	European Arrest Warrant
ECA	European Court of Auditors
ECRIS	European Criminal Records Information System
EDPS	European Data Protection Supervisor
EEA	European Economic Area
EFSA	European Food Safety Authority
EFTA	European Free Trade Association
EJCN	European Judicial Cybercrime Network
EJN	European Judicial Network
EJTN	European Judicial Training Network
EIO	European Investigation Order
EMPACT	European Multidisciplinary Platform Against Criminal Threats
EMSC	European Migrant Smuggling Centre
ENCS	Eurojust National Coordination System
EP	European Parliament
EPPO	European Public Prosecutor's Office
EU	European Union
EUCPN	European Crime Prevention Network

EU CTC	EU Counter-Terrorism Coordinator
EUDA	European Union Drugs Agency
EUIPO	European Union Intellectual Property Office
Eurojust	EU Agency for Criminal Justice Cooperation
Europol	European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Cooperation
EQ	Evaluation Question
eu-LISA	European Union Agency for the Operational Management of Large-Scale IT Systems in the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice
FRA	European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights
FRONTEX	European Border and Coast Guard Agency
GDPR	General Data Protection Regulation
GENVAL	Working Party on General Matters including Evaluation
GSC	General Secretariat of the Council
Iber-RED	Ibero-American Network of International Legal Cooperation
IBOA	EU institutions, bodies, offices and agencies
ICC	International Criminal Court
ICF	Internal Control Framework
ICPA	International Centre for the Prosecution of the Crime of Aggression against Ukraine
ICPO-Interpol	The International Criminal Police Organization
IIIM	International, Impartial and Independent Mechanism
IP	Intellectual Property
IPC	Intellectual Property Crime
JHA	Justice and Home Affairs
JIT	Joint Investigation Team
KPI	Key Performance Indicators

LIBE Committee	European Parliament Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs
LM	Liaison Magistrate
MAS	Multi-Annual Strategy
MASO	Multi-Annual Strategic Objective
MENA	Middle East and North Africa
MLA	Mutual Legal Assistance
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
NDA	National Desk Assistant
OCC	On-Call Coordination
OLAF	European Anti-Fraud Office
SAA	Strategic Action Areas
SEAJust	South East Asia Justice Network
SLA	Service Level Agreement
SNE	Seconded National Experts
SOCTA	Serious and Organised Crime Threat Assessment
SPD	Single Programming Document
TCA	EU-UK Trade and Cooperation Agreement
THB	Trafficking in Human Beings
TEU	Treaty on European Union
TFEU	Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union
UNITAD	United Nations Investigative Team to Promote Accountability for Crimes Committed by Da'esh/ISIL
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
VCF	VMware Cloud Foundation
WACAP	West African Network of Central Authorities and Prosecutors

WBCJ	Western Balkans Criminal Justice
------	----------------------------------

1. INTRODUCTION

The evaluation's purpose is determined by Regulation (EU) 2018/1727 of 14 November 2018 on the European Union Agency for Criminal Justice Cooperation (hereafter, the Eurojust Regulation). Article 69(1) of the Eurojust Regulation requires the European Commission to “commission an **evaluation of the implementation and impact of [the Eurojust Regulation], and the effectiveness and efficiency of Eurojust and its working practices**” by 13 December 2024.

This evaluation therefore fulfils the legal obligation of Article 69(1) of the Eurojust Regulation through the assessment of the achievement of four objectives:

- **Objective 1:** Examine whether the Eurojust Regulation has been completely and correctly implemented by both Eurojust and the Member States.
- **Objective 2:** Assess the performance of Eurojust and its working practices in relation to its objectives and tasks, as well as the overall impact of the Eurojust Regulation on the problems it was set out to solve. In line with the Commission's Better Regulation Guidelines¹, the evaluation will examine questions within the criteria of effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, coherence, and EU added value.
- **Objective 3:** Analyse the Agency's use of existing resources and identify any significant obstacles and their causes.
- **Objective 4:** Indicatively identify areas that might need revising within the Eurojust Regulation, in line with the competences attributed to Eurojust by Article 85 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), to serve as a foundation for a possible revision of the Eurojust Regulation.

In terms of **scope**, this evaluation covers the period from 12 December 2019 (the Eurojust Regulation's date of application) until 1 May 2024. Geographically, it covers all Eurojust's activities, including its cooperation with competent authorities in participating Member States, its cooperation with Denmark and with third countries (in particular, Switzerland, the UK, Ukraine, the USA, and countries from the Western Balkans) as well as with international organisations. For neighbourhood countries, particular attention is given to countries with which cooperation is supported through specific projects.

The implementation of the digital justice initiative at Eurojust, including the renewal of the Case Management System (CMS) and the set-up of secure digital information channels as provided by amending Regulation (EU) 2023/2131, is excluded from the scope of the evaluation as this is still in the process of technical implementation.

¹ SWD(2021) 305 final.

The evaluation draws upon an external support study² (“the study”) of the Eurojust Regulation and Eurojust, completed by an independent consultant, whose final report is published online,³ as well as by the Commission’s experience from participating in Eurojust’s governance bodies, for example Eurojust’s Executive Board, and steering the policy work of the Agency.

The evaluation and the study follow the Commission’s Better Regulation methodology⁴. The methodology of the study is set out in Annex I of the SWD. Limitations to the methodology are mainly due to the lack of an impact assessment in support of the adoption of the Eurojust Regulation, meaning that its baseline data was never set out in detail, and making its *ex-post* assessment more challenging. The sensitive nature of Eurojust’s work, and the individual nature of confidential casework, also limits the availability of certain factual data and associated analysis. Broad consultation activities provide a wide range of opinion data, and while not representative in the statistical sense, the response rates were generally good, and responses were received from all types of stakeholders targeted.

2. WHAT WAS THE EXPECTED OUTCOME OF THE INTERVENTION?

2.1. History and Political context

The foundations of Eurojust were laid in the 1990s, following the establishment of the Schengen area in 1985 and the lifting of internal EU borders. This development led to Member States realising that more frequent and systemic cooperation would be needed to fight serious cross-border crime, as reflected in the Tampere Council Conclusions⁵.

Eurojust was formally established as a “unit” in 2002⁶, a network of national prosecutors and judges permanently based in Brussels to coordinate mutual assistance in criminal

² The study was conducted from June 2024 to April 2025 under the guidance of an interservice group established by different services of the European Commission and the European External Action Service (EEAS) and under Framework Contract JUST/2020/PR/03/0001 for Evaluation, Impact Assessment and Related Policy Support Services in the Justice and Consumers Policy Areas.)

³ Evaluation of the implementation and impact of Regulation (EU) 2018/1727 of 14 November 2018 on the European Union Agency for Criminal Justice Cooperation (Eurojust), and of the effectiveness and efficiency of Eurojust and its working practices, Support Study, Final Report, ISBN978-92-68-28144-4, published here: [Eurojust - European Commission](#) (hereinafter: The study).

⁴ Better Regulation, guidelines and toolbox available here: https://commission.europa.eu/law/law-making-process/better-regulation/better-regulation-guidelines-and-toolbox_en#:~:text=The%20better%20regulation%20guidelines%20set%20out%20the%20principles,apply%20to%20each%20phase%20of%20the%20law-making%20cycle.

⁵ <https://www.europarl.europa.eu/bulletins/pdf/03s99en.pdf>.

⁶ 2002/187/JHA: Council Decision of 28 February 2002 setting up Eurojust with a view to reinforcing the fight against serious crime, *OJ L 63*, 6.3.2002, p. 1–13.

matters⁷. This “unit” was initially conceived as a “body of the Union”, overseen by the Council, following the inter-governmental approach of the third pillar “Police and Judicial Cooperation in Criminal Matters” under the 1992 Maastricht Treaty.

The Treaty of Lisbon introduced, after its entry into force in December 2009, the “community method”⁸ for Eurojust, abolishing the so-called “third-pillar” and placing Eurojust under the “Area of Freedom, Security and Justice” title of the TFEU. The transformation of Eurojust into a decentralised EU agency following the entry into application of the 2018 Eurojust Regulation was seen as a natural one, not least because Frontex, eu-LISA, and Europol had already undergone a similar transformation.

2.2. Description of the intervention and its objectives

Eurojust, as a “unit”, was established after it became increasingly clear that certain issues in EU criminal justice cooperation required more coordinated Union approach. The fight against serious cross-border crime was hindered by a lack of cooperation between national judicial authorities, as cooperation was sought *ad hoc* in each individual case and therefore often ineffective. Eurojust was thus created to contribute to the effective and efficient fight against serious cross-border crime, and to support and strengthen coordination and cooperation between national investigation and prosecution authorities in the fight against serious and organised cross-border crime. This objective did not change when Eurojust was transformed into an agency, but legislative changes were necessary to turn Eurojust into an agency and align Eurojust’s framework with the new institutional set-up deriving from the Lisbon Treaty, especially the change from intergovernmental to supranational cooperation. Even though Eurojust’s *raison d’être* – supporting judicial cooperation in criminal matters – remained unchanged, the shift from intergovernmentalism to the community method gave rise to a question that is echoed throughout this evaluation: “*What is Eurojust for different stakeholders?*”.

The Eurojust Regulation and hence Eurojust as an agency were therefore expected to address the following **needs**:

- **Improved cooperation between the investigating and prosecuting authorities of Member States and third countries.**
- **Improved coordination in criminal justice matters.**
- **Enhanced cooperation between law enforcement and judicial authorities.**
- **Improved operational efficiency of Eurojust.**

Behind these needs, the following **problem drivers** could be identified:

⁷ 20 years of Eurojust: EU judicial cooperation in the making, p.13-17 (hard copy).

⁸ [The Community and intergovernmental methods - EUR-Lex.](#)

- **Lack of mutual trust** between investigating and prosecuting authorities both at Member State and third country level, which related to the “presumption of compliance with rules on the protection of fundamental rights which are commonly accepted by Member States, offering a common denominator that renders different approaches equivalent”⁹.
- **Increased and dynamic growth, sophistication and diversification of serious cross-border crime.**
- **Diverse national criminal justice systems, with varying experiences and approaches** between Member States, but also between Member States and third countries, in the area of cross-border investigations and prosecutions, as well as different formal channels of cooperation, often leading to lengthy procedures.

To address these **needs** and **problem drivers**, the Eurojust Regulation set the following **objectives**:

General objective – *to contribute to the effective and efficient fight against serious cross-border crime*, which would be achieved through the following specific objective:

Specific objective – *to support and strengthen coordination and cooperation between national investigating and prosecuting authorities in relation to serious crime* (within the scope of Article 85 TFEU).

According to Article 2 Eurojust Regulation, this is to be achieved through:

- Requests from the competent authorities of the Member States,
- Eurojust’s own initiative or
- Requests from the EPPO.

Article 4 Eurojust Regulation lists four additional operational objectives (OO) to help achieve this specific objective:

OO 1. *To support Member States* in the investigation and prosecution of cases – supporting, informing and assisting Member States and Member States’ competent authorities in undertaking a number of tasks relating to cooperation and coordination.

OO 2. *To cooperate with EU Institutions, Bodies, Offices and Agencies (IBOAs), networks etc.* – i.a. cooperating with the European Judicial Network (EJN), European Judicial Training Network (EJTN), the EPPO, Europol, and OLAF.

OO 3. *To cooperate with third countries* to facilitate coordination and cooperation.

⁹ Ermioni Xanthopoulou, 'Mutual trust and rights in EU criminal and asylum law: Three phases of evolution and the uncharted territory beyond blind trust', (2018), 55, Common Market Law Review, Issue 2, pp. 489-509, available at: <https://kluwerlawonline.com/journalarticle/Common+Market+Law+Review/55.2/COLA2018034>.

OO 4. To *improve the operational organisation of the Agency*, in order to transform it into a post-Lisbon (i.e. post-Third Pillar) agency.

These operational objectives are therefore closely linked to the **activities and tasks** that Eurojust was expected to undertake – bearing in mind that the Agency operates within a broader justice and security architecture, involving mainly Member States’ national authorities, the European Commission, European Parliament and Council, as well as the European Data Protection Supervisor (EDPS):

Operational Objective	Activities (inputs)
OO1 - Support Member States	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inform the competent national authorities of the Member States of relevant investigation and prosecutions – Art. 4(1)(a); • Assist competent national authorities in ensuring the best coordination of investigations and prosecutions – Art. 4(1)(b); • Assist in improving cooperation between the CAs in particular on the basis of Europol’s analysis – Art. 4(1)(c); • Provide operational, technical and financial support to cross-border cooperations and investigations, including JITs – Art. 4(1)(f); • Support Member States’ action in combatting forms of serious crimes – Art. 4(1)(i) and(j).
OO 2 - Cooperation with EU IBOAs and networks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuation of supporting/hosting (the secretariats of) existing networks such as the European Judicial Network (EJN, Art. 48), European Judicial Training Network (EJTN, Art. 51), the Joint Investigation Team (JIT) network and other networks involved in judicial cooperation in criminal matters (Art. 48).
OO 3 - Cooperation with third countries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Posting liaison magistrates in third countries (Art. 53); • Coordinating the execution of requests for judicial cooperation issued by a third country (Art. 54); • Hosting liaison prosecutors from third countries (Art. 54a)¹⁵; • Concluding working arrangements with third countries (Art. 47(a) and Art. 52); • Establishing and maintaining cooperation with third country authorities and international organisations (Art. 52(1)); • Designating contact points in third countries (Art. 52(3)).
OO – 4 Improve the operational organisation of the Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific activities were to be undertaken regarding this operational objective, given this was seen as a natural transformation of an agency in the post-Lisbon period. • Adding an Executive Board into the governance structure of Eurojust was a step in this direction.

Table 1: Operational objectives and related activities


The **outcomes** of the intervention were not set out explicitly. However, expected results are logically connected to the above-mentioned objectives:

- **Improved cooperation and coordination between investigating and prosecuting authorities** through activities and outputs (such as coordination meetings, support for JITs, support to Member States, etc.).
- **Improved cooperation with IBOAs, networks and in particular the EPPO.**
- **Improved cooperation with third countries.**
- Greater **operational efficiency** of the Agency, primarily as a result of the creation of an Executive Board which was expected to unburden the College from non-operational work.

The following Intervention Logic¹⁰ presents a visual overview of how the intervention related to the Eurojust Regulation was expected to function:

¹⁰ The absence of a stand-alone impact assessment supporting the original proposal for the Eurojust Regulation, that would have provided measurable specific objectives and assessed the direct and indirect effects of this intervention (i.e. the Eurojust Regulation), meant that DG JUST and the external consultants preparing the study had to reconstruct the intervention logic behind the Eurojust Regulation, using documents such as the Eurojust Regulation itself, including its recitals, the Study on the strengthening of Eurojust (2012), the evaluation of Eurojust (2015), and the impact assessment for the creation of the European Public Prosecutor's Office (EPPO).

Figure 1: Intervention logic, the study p. 34



2.3. Point(s) of comparison

The baseline for this evaluation is the situation in 2019. As outlined above, before the entry into application of the Eurojust Regulation in 2019, Eurojust was not an agency, but a “unit”. In 2018, the last full year before Eurojust was transformed into an agency, this “unit” hosted 79 National Members, Deputies and Assistants, supported by 238 staff. The number of cases being dealt with by Eurojust had steadily increased from 200 new cases in 2002 to 3,317 in 2018. In the same year, Eurojust had organised 359 coordination meetings and 17 Coordination centres, and provided support to 235 JITs, 85 of which had been established that same year, and 121 of which were funded by Eurojust. In terms of third country cooperation, Eurojust hosted six liaison prosecutors, had cooperation agreements with 9 countries, and had contact points in 47 third countries.¹¹

The Agency had a budget of EUR 38.6 million. From the perspective of internal organisation, the College was responsible for all decisions linked to the functioning of the “unit”. It was its *de facto* Management Board and consisted of one National Member per Member State. The Commission was not represented. Instead, the cooperation between Eurojust and the Commission was based on a Memorandum of Understanding¹².

Data protection provisions reflected the situation before the adoption of the comprehensive data protection regime, in particular the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)¹³, the Law Enforcement Directive (LED)¹⁴ and the Data Protection Regulation for EU

¹¹ The study, p. 29.

¹² Memorandum of Understanding between the European Commission and Eurojust, 20 July 2012, https://www.eurojust.europa.eu/sites/default/files/InternationalAgreements/Eurojust-Commission-2012-07-20_EN.PDF.

¹³ Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive 95/46/EC, OJ L 119, 4.5.2016, p. 1–88.

¹⁴ Directive (EU) 2016/680 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data by competent authorities for the purposes of the prevention, investigation, detection or prosecution of criminal offences or the execution of criminal penalties, and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Council Framework Decision 2008/977/JHA, OJ L 119, 4.5.2016, p. 89–131.

institutions, bodies, offices and agencies (EUDPR)¹⁵. The provisions were therefore less detailed and the safeguards less ambitious.¹⁶

3. HOW HAS THE SITUATION EVOLVED OVER THE EVALUATION PERIOD?

This section focuses on a factual presentation of how Eurojust evolved over the evaluation period (2019-2024). It will look into the implementation of the Eurojust Regulation by both Eurojust and the Member States, but also into the change of external factors Eurojust had to face.

Over the evaluation period, Eurojust grew significantly: The number of cases referred to Eurojust rose from 3.317 cases in 2018 to 13.164 cases in 2023. Eurojust's targeted operational support via CM, CC and JITs grew as well (for CM from 359 to 577, for CC from 17 to 21 and for supported JITs from 235 to 288) – although not proportionate to the case numbers. The Agency's staff increased from 317 to 366 and its general budget from 36.6 to 55.23 million EUR (in addition to 14 million EUR via projects).

Overall, Eurojust implemented the changes deriving from the implementation of the Eurojust Regulation well. However, it has taken insufficient action to shift administrative tasks from the College to the Executive Board as intended by the Eurojust Regulation. Member States have also taken action to implement the necessary changes at national level, although the implementation varies between Member States. Challenges remain regarding how Member States have implemented the ENCS and the sharing of information on serious cross-border crimes in accordance with Article 21 EJR.

3.1. Institutional Organisation

The institutional organisation of Eurojust is set out in Chapter 2 of the Eurojust Regulation, which covers aspects of governance, activity planning, use of human and financial resources, and the Agency's data protection regime.

3.1.1 Governance

To implement Chapter 2 of the Eurojust Regulation, Eurojust functions as a two-track organisation that is made up of: i) the 26 national desks, headed by National Members appointed by their Member States; and (ii) the administration, headed by the Administrative Director (AD).

¹⁵ Regulation (EU) 2018/1725 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 October 2018 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data by the Union institutions, bodies, offices and agencies and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Regulation (EC) No 45/2001 and Decision No 1247/2002/EC, OJ L 295, 21.11.2018, p. 39–98.

¹⁶ The study, p. 29.




Figure 2: The organisational structure of Eurojust¹⁷

The main governance organs of the agency are the Eurojust’s College, the Executive Board (EB) and the Administrative Director (AD). College Working Groups, while not having any official role in the governance of the Agency based on the Eurojust Regulation, play an important role in the practical steering of the agencies work.

The College is the body in charge of operational and operational-related decisions, pursuant to Articles 5 and 16 of the Eurojust Regulation. The College is chaired by the President, who is a National Member elected by their peers for a four-year term (renewable once) and is assisted by two Vice-Presidents. When exercising its management functions, the College also includes a representative of the European Commission. The College adopts the Agency’s budget, Rules of Procedure¹⁸, as well as policy papers and guidelines related to the operational work of Eurojust. There is one National Member per Member State. National Members are responsible for overseeing the operational work of their respective National Desks. They are supported by a deputy and assistant(s). While the National Members are organs of Eurojust, they are appointed and continue to be employed by their respective Member States. Contractual terms, including remuneration, are defined and borne by the Member States. As Denmark does not participate in measures under the

¹⁷ https://www.eurojust.europa.eu/sites/default/files/assets/eurojust_organigram_latest.pdf.

¹⁸ In accordance with Art 5(5) of the Eurojust Regulation, the College adopts the Rules of Procedure, which shall then be approved by the Council by means of implementing acts.

third part of Title V of the TFEU¹⁹, Denmark has a Representative, rather than National Member, as provided for by the cooperation agreement concluded with Eurojust²⁰. Liaison Prosecutors, who represent third countries with whom Eurojust or the European Union have concluded cooperation agreements, and the Representative of Denmark, do not take part in the College by default, but can be invited as observers if the College considers their presence necessary.²¹

The introduction of the **EB** by the Eurojust Regulation aimed at reducing the administrative burden on the College. The Board consists of Eurojust's President, its two Vice-Presidents, a representative of the European Commission, and two other College Members designated on a two-year rotation system. As such, membership of the Board is not conditional on any managerial skill or experience. The Board shall not be involved in the operational functions of Eurojust (Art. 16). Instead, it shall focus on ensuring the Agency's proper functioning. Activities of the Board include reviewing key programming and planning documents (e.g. the draft annual budget), assisting and advising the AD on the implementation of College decisions, and adopting the anti-fraud strategy and financial rules.

The administration of Eurojust is headed by the **AD**, who is appointed by the College. The AD is responsible for the day-to-day administration of Eurojust, in line with the Eurojust Regulation, College decisions, and Eurojust programming documents, etc.²². The administration is further divided into two main departments, the Operations Department and the Resources Department.

According to the study, Eurojust has **implemented most of the Eurojust Regulation provisions** of Chapter 2. However, as will be explained in Section 4, **Articles 5 and 16 have not been properly implemented**, as the intended separation of responsibilities between the College and the EB has not been consistently executed in practice.

Working Groups are sub-structures of the Agency, which have no legal basis in the Eurojust Regulation. Instead, Working Groups are a continuation of a working practice established before the introduction of the Eurojust Regulation when Eurojust was still under the third pillar. While College members and representatives of the administration participate these working groups are usually chaired by a National Member. They cover three pillars: (i) corporate relations with partners; (ii) institutional relations and organisational development; and (iii) operational and policy priorities. In practice, these

¹⁹ Compare Protocol Nr. 22 to the Treaties on the Position of Denmark.

²⁰ Compare Article 6 of the Agreement on Criminal Justice Cooperation between Eurojust and the Kingdom of Denmark, available at: [Eurojust-Denmark-2019-10-07_EN.pdf](#).

²¹ Compare Article 10(3) of the Eurojust Regulation.

²² Compare Article 18 of the Eurojust Regulation.

Working Groups play an important role in objective-setting, planning and resourcing for the Agency.²³

When it comes to the **implementation of the Eurojust Regulation²⁴ by the Member States**, 21 have adopted relevant legislation implementing provisions related to the Eurojust Regulation.²⁵ However, as reported in the study, the status (Art. 7), approximation of powers (Art. 8), and access to national registers of operational data (Art. 9) by National Members differs from Member State to Member State.

Moreover, according to Article 20(3)(b), each Member State was expected to establish a **Eurojust National Coordination System (ENCS)** that would ensure coordination between competent national authorities and the Agency. Member States set-up the ENCS mechanism in different ways, including with regard to the number of national correspondents and contact points, the connection of the ENCS with Eurojust's case management system (CMS), and its overall utility. As the ENCS was meant to play a crucial role in filtering the cases to be referred by the Member States to Eurojust or to the EJM contact points, its effectiveness, as further elaborated in Section 4, is linked to Eurojust's, particularly in relation to the types, complexity or urgency of the cases referred.

Finally, Member States only partially implemented the obligation to share information on cases of serious cross-border crime as set out in Article 21 of the Eurojust Regulation.

3.1.2 Activity planning

The Eurojust Regulation sets out provisions relating to the Agency's annual and multiannual programming (Article 15), the preparation and implementation of its budget (Articles 61-62), and its reporting (Article 67) that are aligned with the EU's Common Approach on Decentralised Agencies²⁶. These rules are supplemented by the Rules of Procedure, the Eurojust Financial Regulation²⁷ (EJFR), and the framework financial regulation. Eurojust's budget is determined by the MFF ceilings, although, as shown in the section on efficiency, the Agency exceeds these ceilings when submitting its budgetary requests each year.

²³ The study, p. 41.

²⁴ The study, p. 46.

²⁵ This analysis covers all EU Member States except Bulgaria, Malta and Romania, the study, p. 43.

²⁶ EU Common Approach on Decentralised Agencies: https://european-union.europa.eu/document/download/d4199ff4-1e3d-45e6-af7e-90cf1a7b10bc_en?filename=joint_statement_on_decentralised_agencies_en.pdf.

²⁷ College Decision 2019-09 of 17 September 2019 On the Financial Regulation applicable to Eurojust, available at: <https://www.eurojust.europa.eu/sites/default/files/EJLegalFramework/College-Decision-2019-9-Financial-Regulation.pdf>.

Eurojust's key activities to implement the abovementioned provisions are:

- **Multiannual planning** established through Multi-Annual Strategies (MAS) that set out the Agency's objectives for a three-year period; this is even though Article 15(4) only provides for multiannual planning without specifying a timeframe. A key element of the MAS is the definition of Multi-Annual Strategic Objectives (MASOs) that should steer Eurojust's decision-making and prioritisation of activities. Two MAS, covering the periods 2019-21 and 2022-24, are relevant for this evaluation. The responsibility for the adoption of the MAS belongs to Eurojust's administration, although they are ultimately approved by the College.




Figure 3: Multi-Annual Strategic Objectives and Strategic Action Areas 2019-2024²⁸

- The **Single Programming Documents (SPD)** communicate Eurojust's annual programming and they are produced for each calendar year, covering a three-year period. They provide detailed plans for implementation, including Annual Work Programs (AWPs), where every planned activity is also budgeted. According to the Eurojust Regulation, the annual programming documents are prepared by the AD, reviewed by the EB, and adopted by the College. However, an issue of proper implementation by the Agency arises, as the College Working Groups have their own planning, prioritisation and reporting processes, something that is contrary to the intentions of the Eurojust Regulation that sought to rationalise decision-making processes.

²⁸ The study, p. 48.

- **Annual reporting.** Eurojust prepares an Annual Report and a Consolidated Annual Activity Report (CAAR).

Many of the activities planned and budgeted through the MAS and the SPDs are clearly specified in the mandate of Eurojust under the Eurojust Regulation (such as casework and cooperation with partners in the EU and beyond). Other activities, such as the sharing of expertise with the Commission and co-legislators for the purpose of policy making, are not explicitly part of the Agency's mandate as set out in the Eurojust Regulation. Eurojust's role in supporting the investigation and prosecution of international crimes by preserving, analysing and storing evidence was not foreseen in the Eurojust Regulation, but was added to the Agency's activities with amending Regulation (EU) 2022/838²⁹ at the direction of the co-legislators in the context of Russia's war of aggression against Ukraine.

Although Eurojust's activity planning is generally aligned with the Eurojust Regulation's provisions (and therefore the EU Common Approach), parallel tracks in the decision-making and prioritisation of activities have been observed between the AD and Working Groups when planning the Agency's activities.³⁰

Additionally, regarding the distribution of the SPD, the Eurojust Regulation (Art. 61), which stipulates that the final draft is to be sent to the Commission by 31 March of each year, is not aligned with the Financial Regulation³¹(Art.40), which requires Eurojust to share a draft SPD with the Commission, the Parliament and the Council by 31 January..

Lastly, regarding Eurojust's obligation to produce a single Annual Report each year, it is noted that the Agency publishes two annual reports, a practice that results in redundancies that are not foreseen in the Eurojust Regulation.

3.1.3 Use of human and financial resources

The SPD is Eurojust's instrument to determine the allocation and use of its financial and human resources, and the AD is responsible for its implementation.

Regarding **human resources**, the workforce within Eurojust is divided into two main categories of staff - statutory and non-statutory post holders:

- **Statutory staff:** Temporary Agents (TAs), who are employed under long-term or renewable short-term contracts to manage both operational and administrative duties, and Contract Agents (CAs), who typically work under fixed short-term

²⁹ Regulation (EU) 2022/838 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 May 2022 amending Regulation (EU) 2018/1727 as regards the preservation, analysis and storage at Eurojust of evidence relating to genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes and related criminal offences, available at: <http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2022/838/oj>.

³⁰ The study, p. 174.

³¹ Regulation 2024/2509 on the financial rules applicable to the general budget of the Union (recast), available at: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/en/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A32024R2509>.

contracts to handle support or project-based tasks.

- **Non-statutory staff:** Members of the National Desks, the Representative of Denmark, Seconded National Experts (SNEs), and
- **Post holders:** Liaison Prosecutors (LPs) from third countries.

In terms of numbers, the graph below shows a constant increase in the Agency’s staff over the evaluation period, which is mainly driven by an increase in administrative staff. Nevertheless, the proportion of roles identified as “operational” rose to 73.5% in 2023, whilst “administrative support” fell to 19.8% in the same year. These figures, however, should be interpreted with caution, given the unclear distinction between operational and administrative work in the Agency.




Figure 4: Development in actual (2018 – 2023) and planned (2024) staff numbers³²

Concerning the allocation of **financial resources**, these mainly stem from EU contributions, supplemented by contributions from Denmark and revenues from administrative recoveries. As shown in the table below, Eurojust’s **revenues** increased significantly between 2019 and 2023 (by over 53.8%).

Revenue Category	Executed Budget 2019	Executed Budget 2020	Executed Budget 2021	Executed Budget 2022	Executed Budget 2023
EU contribution (incl. assigned revenue deriving from surpluses)	38,773	41,547	43,798	49,087	59,163
Denmark’s contribution	0	852	1,011	1,181	1,417

³² Source: Annual Reports 2018 and 2021; CAARs 2022 and 2023; SPD 2022 – 2024. Figure prepared by the evaluation study team.

Administrative operations (incl. interest generated by funds)	1,001	189	347	11	593
TOTAL	39,774	42,587	45,156	50,279	61,173

Table 2: Eurojust's revenue streams in 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022 and 2023 (EUR thousands)³³

In addition to these figures, Eurojust is involved in **externally funded projects**, reflecting the Agency's evolving operational focus. In accordance with the financing provisions of respective external funding agreements, Eurojust received substantial amounts for the implementation of specific projects, including the **EuroMed Justice**, **SIRIUS**, **ICPA** and **Western Balkans Criminal Justice** projects. These externally funded projects received additional funding at the following proportions of the above revenue figures: 11.7% (EUR 5 million) in 2020, 1.1% (EUR 0.5 million) in 2021, 11.9% (EUR 6 million) in 2022, and 22.8% (EUR 14 million) in 2023.³⁴

Regarding budgetary requests, it is important to note that the budgetary ceilings are set by the MFF, and the final **budget allocations** are the outcome of the Agency's requests, the Commission services' assessment and the response of the budgetary authority (Council and European Parliament) to these requests. Over the evaluation period, the budget allocated to Eurojust increased by over 66%, mainly as result of amendments of Eurojust's legal basis, which included additional tasks or enabled digital development of the Agency and were therefore linked to a Legislative Financial Statement.

Year	Eurojust Request (EUR)	Initial MFF Allocation (EUR)	Updated MFF Allocation (EUR)*	Final EU Contribution (EUR)	Reasons for amended budgets
2020	43,345,638	40,000,000	41,700,000	41,700,000	<i>No significant amendments</i>
2021	45,050,856	43,297,699	43,297,699	53,297,699	<i>Reinforcement to initiate the development of the CMS</i>
2022	45,800,200	45,299,984	45,299,984	50,183,522	<i>Further development of the CMS; accelerating of COM(2022)187²⁶; inflation on salaries</i>
2023	55,619,300	47,394,863	48,170,063	55,230,112	<i>Exceptional inflation on salaries</i>
2024	75,755,700	49,586,620	56,111,972	60,524,241	<i>Exceptional inflation on salaries</i>

³³ Eurojust's budgetary and financial management reports 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022 and 2023.

³⁴ The study, p. 52.

2025	81,383,400	51,879,733	65,513,872	69,335,036	<i>Inflation on salaries; Network of Prosecutors</i>
Total	346,955,094	277,458,899	300,093,590	330,270,610	

Table 3: Eurojust's revenue streams in 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022 and 2023 (EUR thousands)³⁵

The expectation on Eurojust was for the Agency to organise and prioritise its operations within the limits of the available annual budget, as set by the MFF ceilings, of which the Agency is aware in advance. Consequently, the fact that Eurojust's requests constantly exceeded these ceilings could suggest either insufficient resources for the existing workload as provided under the MFF ceilings or that there is room for more efficient resource allocation on the part of the Agency. This issue is further analysed in Section 4 on efficiency.

3.2. Data protection regime

The Eurojust Regulation had to adapt to the revised EU legal framework on data protection and particularly Regulation 2018/1725 and Chapter IX thereof as "*lex generalis*" applicable processing of operational personal data. The Eurojust Regulation as "*lex specialis*" introduced additional new rules on data protection, including by incorporating data protection principles. The EDPS became the competent supervising authority to monitor the Agency's compliance with data protection rules.

These new rules were primarily implemented through the Rules of procedure on the processing and protection of personal data at Eurojust³⁶ (Data Protection Rules or DPR) and the Rules of procedure on restrictions of certain data subject rights in relation to the processing of personal data³⁷ coupled with establishing cooperation with the EDPS and appropriate amendments to Eurojust's IT infrastructure, and related workflows.

The study finds that **Eurojust's data protection system is overall well aligned with the EU data protection legal framework** as confirmed by positive EDPS assessments. From the perspective of operational work, challenges exist regarding the - in comparison with the previous rather light supervisory system –now more complex cooperation with the

³⁵ Consultation with DG BUDG and DG JUST. Working Documents III of the Draft Budget documents 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, and 2025. Note: *The budget under MFF is updated on a yearly basis to account for impacts of legal financial statements LFS, inflation on salaries, and other additions.

³⁶ Rules of procedure on the processing and protection of personal data at Eurojust, available at: https://www.eurojust.europa.eu/sites/default/files/Dataprotection/Eurojust-College-Decision-2019-18_on-data-protection-RoP.pdf.

³⁷ Rules of procedure on restrictions of certain data subject rights in relation to the processing of personal data, available at: <https://www.eurojust.europa.eu/document/rules-procedure-restrictions-certain-data-subject-rights-relation-processing-personal-data>.

EDPS. Additionally, differences between the application of data protection safeguards set out in the Eurojust Regulation and the national implementation of the LED sometimes lead to a disconnect between Eurojust and national practitioners.³⁸

3.3. Implementation of other activities to improve internal organisation

In order to ensure the implementation of the Eurojust Regulation, the 2019-21 and 2022-24 MAS foresaw activities to improve the Agency's organisational management, mainly relating to the **digitalisation** of Eurojust and to **corporate communication**.

Regarding the former, throughout the evaluation period Eurojust put in place the systems SYSPER and SUMMA that contribute to the digitalisation of human resources and financial management, respectively. The development of CICED and of the JITs Collaboration Platform also count among the Agency's efforts to digitalise its operations.

Eurojust's CMS is outdated, and it is unlikely that a new system will be in place by the legal deadline of December 2025. The project to set-up a system to identify links between information stored at the EPPO and Eurojust (hit/no-hit system), intended to improve cooperation and exchange of information between Eurojust and its JHA partners, as per the objectives of the Eurojust Regulation, has not produced the intended results. While Eurojust's outdated IT infrastructure is one of the reasons for the failure of the project, other unforeseen challenges, relating to ownership of operational data and different purposes of data-processing, persist. Regarding cooperation with third countries, Eurojust should also become the contact point for third countries and international organisations regarding criminal records of third country nationals under Article 17 of Regulation (EU) 2019/816 (ECRIS-TCN)³⁹ requests in the context of criminal proceedings by 2025.

In relation to corporate communication, Eurojust put forward outreach activities (press releases, publications, hosting press conferences, events and interviews) to increase its visibility and reputation among judicial practitioners in Member States. This, however, is not an obligation under the Eurojust Regulation.

3.4. Casework

Casework is Eurojust's core task, as stipulated in Article 4 of the Eurojust Regulation. Cases are initiated by national authorities, the EPPO or on the Agency's own initiative. Eurojust supports such cases practically and logistically. The Agency's operational and financial support to JITs, the facilitation of coordination meetings (CMs) between Member States as well as with third countries and coordination centres (CCs) are its main tools in

³⁸ The study, p. 56.

³⁹ Regulation (EU) 2019/816 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 April 2019 establishing a centralised system for the identification of Member States holding conviction information on third-country nationals and stateless persons (ECRIS-TCN) to supplement the European Criminal Records Information System and amending Regulation (EU) 2018/1726, OJ L 135, 22.5.2019, p. 1–26.

relation to case work. In addition, it offers an on-call coordination (OCC) mechanism – a mechanism where National Desks are made available 24/7 to support urgent cases.

The following table presents the evolution of the number of cases from the baseline of the evaluation until 2023.

Case types	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Average growth rate (2019-2023)
Ongoing from previous years	3,892	4,200	4,808	5,227	5,710	10.1%
New cases	3,912	4,599	5,297	6,317	7,454	17.5%
Total	7,804	8,799	10,105	11,544	13,164	14.0%
Closed cases	3,604	3,991	4,878	5,834	N/A	17.5% ⁴⁰
Share of closed out of total cases	46.2%	45.4%	48.3%	50.5%	N/A	

Table 4: Evolution of the number of Eurojust cases, 2019-2023⁴¹

As shown above, the number of cases handled by Eurojust has increased throughout the evaluation period. However, it is important to note that the nature of the cases supported by Eurojust can differ significantly, and a debate on what types of cases and support are most relevant to Eurojust's mandate has persisted over the evaluation period. Therefore, **using the number of cases as a KPI of Eurojust's casework, as demonstrated in the study, is not always a reliable metric**, particularly given the original expectation that Eurojust would focus more on complex, urgent or multilateral cases, whereas those cases not reaching this threshold could be supported by the EJM contact points ones being referred instead to the EJM. Eurojust's effectiveness, including its cooperation with the EJM, is further analysed in section 4.

Other activities relating to the implementation of Eurojust's operational work and their evolution during the evaluation period are presented in the table below. This shows a constant increase in all metrics, ranging from 0.3% in the number of ongoing JIJs from the previous year to 16% increase in the number of coordination meetings.

KPI	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Average growth rate (2019-2023)	
						2019-23	2020 excluded ³²
Share of cases falling under EJM priority crime areas	63%	72%	75%	76%	76%	4.9%	1.8%

⁴⁰ Excluding 2023.

⁴¹ Table 14 of the study.

Number of cases referred from the EJN	120	239	139	331	94	N/A	N/A
Number of cases referred to the EJN	28	109	44	115	341	N/A	N/A
Number of coordination meetings	428	371	457	528	577	8.7%	16.0%
Number of coordination centres	27	19	22	22	21	-4.6%	3.7%
Number of deliverables in support of casework (including conclusions, analyses, legal notes, case notes, advice to JITs, Case Information Forms,	800	777	781	941	1013	6.4%	9.6%
Number of ongoing JITs from the previous year	167	193	182	187	194	4.1%	0.3%
Number of new JITs supported	103	75	72	78	94	-0.6%	8.3%
Share of new JITs that are funded	51%	51%	58%	54%	5th4 %	1.7%	2.3%

Table 5: Evolution of key KPIs relating to activities undertaken by Eurojust relevant to casework⁴²

Regarding Eurojust's operational work on its **own initiative** (proactive function), although this is clearly stipulated in Article 2(3) of the Eurojust Regulation and constitutes one of the Agency's objectives, enhancing its own initiative action has proven difficult for Eurojust. To agree on a definition and workflows, Eurojust set up a dedicated Working Group under participation of the Commission. Nevertheless, according to the study, only 11 cases registered as own initiative cases could be identified in 2023⁴³.

3.5 Cooperation with partners

Eurojust has stepped up its cooperation with partners to achieve its objectives since 2019. This covers partners within and outside of the EU:

- **Relations with partners within the EU**, covering relevant networks involved in judicial cooperation in criminal matters, including the EJN, the JITs Network, and the Genocide Network, and relevant EU bodies, offices and agencies, including Europol, OLAF, the EPPO, Frontex, and the EJTN.
- **International cooperation**, covering relations with the authorities of third countries, including through the posting of Liaison Prosecutors by third countries to Eurojust and the contact point network, and international organisations, including the ICC.

In the context of the operationalisation of this cooperation, Eurojust concludes working arrangements (Art. 47(3) of the Eurojust Regulation) and Memoranda of Understanding

⁴² Table 16 of the study.

⁴³ The study, p. 66.

(MoUs) itself. Cooperation agreements are the central pillar of international cooperation. Previously concluded by Eurojust itself, they are now concluded by the European Union based on Article 218 TFEU.

Regarding **EU partners**, during the evaluation period Eurojust has concluded working arrangements with the EPPO and OLAF and has taken steps to update its working arrangement with Europol, but this has not been revised at the time that this report was drafted. Given that Eurojust and Europol pursue the same general objective but at a different stage of the criminal justice chain (representing the judiciary and law enforcement respectively), the two Agencies have joined efforts in a number of cases, cooperate in projects such as the SIRIUS project⁴⁴, participate jointly in the EMPACT platform⁴⁵, and experts from Eurojust are seconded to EU centres of expertise developed by Europol. Eurojust’s “Europol Project⁴⁶” (identifying best practices and problematic areas in the inter-agency cooperation) shows that the implementation of cooperation between these two partners (as per Art. 49 Eurojust Regulation) is not without challenges. The repercussions of this issue will be further explored in **section 4**. **The number of cases in cooperation with Europol, the EPPO, Frontex and OLAF is below the target that Eurojust set for both 2022 and 2023.**

When it comes to **networks** explicitly mentioned in the Eurojust Regulation, Eurojust hosts the Secretariats of the EJM, the JIJs Network, and the Genocide Network. Its relationship with the EJM is of particular importance due to their complementary roles.

Mechanism	Overview of Eurojust’s activities
EJM	<p>Hosting the Secretariat – preparing and hosting annual meetings (and <i>ad hoc</i> high-level meetings); reviewing and maintaining the EJM’s website content; preparing joint Eurojust-EJM products (e.g. 2023 contribution to the 5th edition of the SIRIUS EU Electronic Evidence Situation Report); and liaison with EJM Contact Points.</p> <p>In addition, case-by-case cooperation and consultation on operational work.</p> <p>Legal basis: <i>Eurojust Regulation; Council Decision 2008/976/JHA.</i></p>
JIJs Network	<p>Hosting the Secretariat – preparing and hosting the annual meeting of the network; preparing joint Eurojust-JIJ Network products, checklists and guidance (e.g. Fourth JIJs Evaluation Report 2023); participating in training activities for JIJ practitioners and engaging study visits; and participating in project meetings (e.g. Western Balkan Criminal Justice project).</p> <p>Legal basis: <i>Eurojust Regulation; Council Document 11037/05 establishing the Network.</i></p>
Genocide Network	<p>Hosting the Secretariat – preparing and hosting annual Network meetings and high-level meetings (e.g. of the Steering Board); preparing joint Eurojust-Genocide Network</p>

⁴⁴ More information available here: <https://www.eurojust.europa.eu/sirius>.

⁴⁵ European Multidisciplinary Platform Against Criminal Threats. More information available here: <https://www.eurojust.europa.eu/empact>.

⁴⁶ The study, Table 17, p. 72.

	products (e.g. 2023 Factsheet on Universal Jurisdiction); and participating in training activities and workshops. Legal basis: <i>Eurojust Regulation; Council Decisions 2002/494/JHA & 2003/335/JHA.</i>
--	---

Table 6: Overview of Eurojust’s activities in relation to networks and other practitioner support mechanisms⁴⁷

Apart from the networks mentioned above and explicitly referred to in the Eurojust Regulation, Eurojust supports other networks which were established *ad hoc*, e.g. as result of Council Conclusions (such as the European Judicial Organised Crime Network⁴⁸ or the European Judicial Cybercrime Network⁴⁹).

With regard to **international partners**, the study found that the number of cases with third countries has trended upward since the baseline year, with an overall increase of 52% since 2019. The number of coordination meetings (CMs) with third countries increased by 231%, from 138 CMs (2019) to 457 CMs (2021).⁵⁰

Before the entry into force of the Eurojust Regulation, Eurojust was able to negotiate and conclude cooperation agreements with international partners in its own capacity. With 12 such cooperation agreements in place in 2019, Eurojust continued to expand its operational cooperation based on these agreements over the evaluation period, in particular through the Liaison Prosecutors based at Eurojust. Following Brexit⁵¹ there are 12 Liaison Prosecutors (LPs) from third countries currently posted at Eurojust premises, up from 6 in 2018. The contact point network expanded to over 70 jurisdictions and three international organisations.

Since 2019, International Agreements on the cooperation with Eurojust are being negotiated by the Commission and concluded between the EU and the third country or international organisation in question. Accordingly, in 2021 the Commission was authorised by the Council to open negotiations with 13 third countries⁵². However, the

⁴⁷ Table 18 of the study.

⁴⁸ Established based on Council conclusions on ‘Fighting drugs trafficking and organised crime: Setting up a Judicial Organised Crime Network’, 18 June 2024.

⁴⁹ Established based on Council conclusions on the European Judicial Cybercrime Network, 6 June 2016.

⁵⁰ The study, p. 70.

⁵¹ Trade and Cooperation Agreement between the European Union and the European Atomic Energy Community, of the one part, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, of the other part, available here: [http://data.europa.eu/eli/agree_internation/2021/689\(1\)/oj](http://data.europa.eu/eli/agree_internation/2021/689(1)/oj).

⁵² Council Decision authorising the opening of negotiations for Agreements between the European Union and Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Colombia, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Tunisia and Turkey on cooperation between the European Union Agency for Criminal Justice Cooperation (Eurojust) and the competent authorities for judicial cooperation in criminal matters of those third States, 7072/21.

negotiation of international cooperation by the Commission with third countries proceeds at slow pace. The disconnect in the third countries between the ministries in charge of negotiating such agreements and the beneficiaries, the national competent authorities, as well as the lack of understanding of Eurojust's added value have proven as challenge at the beginning of the negotiations. In the negotiations, the requirement of adequate data protection safeguards to facilitate structured exchange of personal data as well as the costs linked to the posting of a LPs have proven as key points. Nevertheless, negotiations with Armenia, Lebanon, and Bosnia and Herzegovina have been successfully concluded. No agreement has entered into application yet. Article 54a of Regulation (EU) 2023/2131 has introduced specific provisions on the status and powers, secondment terms, and access of the third country LPs to the CMS.

The Eurojust Regulation treats cooperation with international organisations similarly to cooperation with third countries. However, as no cooperation agreements with international organisations exist, Eurojust cooperates with the former mainly on an *ad hoc*, case-by-case basis, rather than through formal and systematic channels. Nevertheless, close cooperation has been established during the evaluation period with the Office of the Prosecutor of the ICC with regard to investigations and prosecutions of international crimes committed in the context of the Russian war of aggression against Ukraine. Eurojust also cooperates with the UNODC in capacity building and information sharing areas.⁵³

3.8 Accountability for international crimes

With the onset of the Russian Federation's full-scale war of aggression against Ukraine on 24 February 2022, support to investigations and prosecutions of international crimes allegedly committed in Ukraine became a new operational priority for Eurojust. War crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide fell within Eurojust's mandate even before the entry into force of the Eurojust Regulation. Under the Regulation, they are now explicitly referred to in Annex II of the Regulation. Accordingly, the Agency has already supported investigations and prosecutions into such crimes, including via JITs, before February 2022, for example in relation to the genocide in Rwanda and the conflicts in Syria and Iraq.

In June 2022, the co-legislators endorsed the Eurojust's support in this area by attributing a new task to the Agency, accompanied by increases in its budget, to allow the storage, analysis and preservation of evidence relating to core international crimes. This additional task was not part of the original intervention logic. The most prominent additional activities in relation to Ukraine are the following:

JIT related to the war in Ukraine: Eurojust provided legal and technical support to the setting up of a JIT focused on alleged core international crimes committed in Ukraine. This

⁵³ More information available here: <https://www.eurojust.europa.eu/annual-report-2023/cooperation-international-organisations>.

JIT agreement was the result of a CM held on 2 March 2022; it was signed by the national authorities of Lithuania, Poland and Ukraine on 25 March 2022.⁶³ The ICC OTP has participated in the JIT since 25 April 2022, Estonia, Latvia and Slovakia since 30 May 2022, and Romania since 13 October 2022. The participating national authorities signed an MoU with the USA on 3 March 2023, and since Europol has also participated in the JIT since 10 October 2023.

Core International Crimes Evidence Database (CICED): Set up with the support of Eurojust in 2023, it provides for three core components: (i) a safe digital transmission method for evidence; (ii) the secure storage of evidence; and (iii) an advanced analysis tools. Alongside the evidence itself, CICED records information on who submitted the evidence, as well as the event and crime type to which it refers.

International Centre for Prosecution of the Crime of Aggression Against Ukraine (ICPA): Eurojust hosts the ICPA, which aims to enhance investigations into the crime of aggression, and is formed of Ukraine, five members of the abovementioned JIT, and representatives of the ICC OTP and formerly the USA, which participated until March 2025⁵⁴.

4. EVALUATION FINDINGS (ANALYTICAL PART)

Following an analysis of the extent to which the Eurojust Regulation has been implemented by Eurojust and the Member States, this section presents a qualitative assessment of the implementation of the Eurojust Regulation and performance of the Agency, drawing on the five Better Regulation criteria, namely the effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, coherence, and EU-added value of the intervention (described in section 2).

4.1. To what extent was the intervention successful and why?

Overall, Eurojust has contributed to the effective and efficient fight against serious cross-border crime. The Agency has successfully supported and strengthened coordination and cooperation between national investigating and prosecuting authorities in relation to serious crime. However, while it has been overall effective in achieving its operational objectives, challenges persist with regard to the efficiency. These efficiency deficits risks affecting the delivery of its overall and general objective. While there are some issues regarding consistency with the mandate and cooperation with other JHA agencies, the Agency is and likely to remain highly relevant and has a clear EU-added value.

4.1.1 Effectiveness

This criterion assesses how effectively Eurojust met its objectives as set out in the intervention logic, namely to support and strengthen coordination and cooperation between national investigation and prosecution authorities in the fight against serious cross-border

⁵⁴ <https://www.eurojust.europa.eu/international-centre-for-the-prosecution-of-the-crime-of-aggression-against-ukraine>.

crime, through improved organisation, cooperation with partners and support to Member States' competent national authorities in the investigation and prosecution of serious cross-border crime.

Eurojust has been very effective in supporting and strengthening coordination and cooperation between national investigating and prosecuting authorities. The effectiveness of Eurojust is however limited by Eurojust's organisational structure and decision-making. In particular the continuation of working practices predating the Eurojust Regulation limit the effectiveness of Eurojust. The lack of definition and overly broad interpretation of the term "operational" also hampers Eurojust's focus on its core business. While cooperation with partners is overall effective, too many simple cases end up being dealt with by Eurojust instead of the EJN. Eurojust's cooperation with Europol on a case-by-case basis is overall effective, but the structural cooperation between the two agencies could be significantly more effective. Eurojust's cooperation with third countries is very effective, and the main challenge remains that expanding the cooperation with international partners requires a lengthy and complex procedure to conclude new cooperation agreements.

Support to Member States

Providing support to Member States' national competent authorities in the investigation and prosecution of serious cross-border crime is the core of Eurojust's mandate and one of its key objectives. This support was anticipated as being provided mainly through support to cases, i.e. specific cross-border investigations and prosecutions. According to the study, this objective has overall been effectively achieved, with the surveys carried out reporting a high level of satisfaction of national desks and LPs. Also, national practitioners recognise Eurojust's significant value.⁵⁵ This positive response is largely attributed to Eurojust's role in providing a neutral platform for Member States to exchange, cooperate, coordinate, and develop joint actions.

Among the Agency's activities in supporting the Member States, the following three have been found to be the most effective:

- **Coordination Meetings** (CMs) are considered to be the most effective type of support. Nevertheless, their potential can be hindered by the limited number of rooms at Eurojust's premises as well as by the absence of up-to-date equipment.
- **Coordination Centres'** (CCs) effectiveness is mainly linked to their contribution to overcoming barriers (including linguistic ones) for the smoother planning and execution of casework.
- **Joint Investigation Teams** (JITs) are found to be effective because they combine a solid legal basis together with a dedicated network and established cooperation practices. As the study reports, there is a growing demand from Member States

⁵⁵ The study, p. 98.

regarding the establishment of JITs. However, despite increases in funding for JITs during the evaluation period, Eurojust considers the funding insufficient to respond to the growing demand of Member States⁵⁶. Nonetheless, given the importance of JITs, and Eurojust's core objective being to support operational work, the expectation is that the Agency would prioritise resource allocation to this type of activity.

Depending on the specific need of operational support, type of case and urgency of cases, cases can be referred to Eurojust or the EJM.⁵⁷ A limitation to the operational efficiency results from the fact that Eurojust supports many cases which do not require sophisticated or urgent operational support and would be better addressed to EJM contact points. An indicator for this is the significant increase of cases over the evaluation period, which is not proportionately reflected in the number of CCs, CMs and supported JITs.

As mentioned above (Sections 3.1.1 and 3.4), the “filtering” of cases was envisaged to be a key role of the ENCS. Eurojust and the EJM can also refer cases to each other. The lack of binding definitions, the willingness of some National Members to support cases, which could be solved through the EJM contact points, and the limited effectiveness of the ENCS in some Member States, make the allocation of cases between the EJM and Eurojust less effective than it could be. As a result, Eurojust cannot focus on its role supporting Member States which require more complex or structural operational support. Therefore, **the number of cases cannot be considered as a reliable KPI to measure the effectiveness of the Agency**, as such case can be simply solved by identifying the competent national authority of another Member States or require multiple coordination meetings or the set-up and support to a JIT. The lack of a reliable metric on increased caseload also weakens arguments in favour of staff and budget enhancements merely based on this KPI.

Regarding other case-related support to Member States, there is little evidence that **the OCC is used**, suggesting that it does not fulfil a real need. It therefore consumes financial resources that could be more impactfully applied to other tasks.⁵⁸

Another factor that can determine the effectiveness of Eurojust's support to Member States relates to the Agency's **access to operational data** and its ability to share it (e.g. with other Member States and JHA agencies). The effectivity of Eurojust's ability to **act on its own initiative** is limited due to the limited readiness of Member States to share information on serious cross-border cases under Article 21 of the Eurojust Regulation. This limits the

⁵⁶ The study, p. 100.

⁵⁷ For more elaborate explanations about the different type of support please see: Joint Paper, Assistance in International Cooperation in Criminal Matters for Practitioners, April 2024, European Judicial Network and Eurojust, What can we do for you? [EJM-EJ-Assistance-in-International-Cooperation-in-Criminal-Matters-for-Practitioners.pdf](#).

⁵⁸ The study, p. 102.

ability of the Agency to have a comprehensive view of issues and challenges in judicial cooperation, as well as to identify key, recurring issues.⁵⁹

While an important factor in relation to establishing and ensuring trust between Eurojust and the national competent authorities, the principle of data ownership also limits the effectiveness of Eurojust. These issues stem mainly from the fact that the competent national authorities of Member States, and not Eurojust, are the owners of the data. This means that the Agency cannot exchange this data directly, but must first consult the national authorities of the Member States, an often lengthy process, which ultimately limits Eurojust's effectiveness to act in a timely manner.

That the Agency does not own the data it hosts has also negatively affected Eurojust's ability to **act on its own initiative** when it comes to initiating a case. As mentioned in Section 3, only 11 own initiative cases have been registered during the entire evaluation period – compared to thousands of other new cases. Another contributing factor to this low performance seems to be the lack of a definition of “own initiative” in the Eurojust Regulation and therefore despite dynamic, proactive outreach from national desks to their competent national authorities, own initiative cases might remain undetected.⁶⁰

Accountability for international crimes

Since the entry into force of amending Regulation (EU) 2022/838, Eurojust has invested significant effort into the operational support to competent national authorities to enhance accountability for international crimes. Although it might be too early to assess the effectiveness of this work, the evidence collected in the study indicates that Eurojust's actions have been effective in producing outputs supporting accountability for international crimes and more specifically in relation to Ukraine⁶¹. A challenge in this regard is the lack of legal framework for the systematic exchange of data with the ICC. While Eurojust can exchange data on basis of a derogation, for more structured data exchange an international agreement with the ICC will be required (to be negotiated by the Commission and concluded by the European Union).

A few national desks view Eurojust's support to investigations and prosecutions linked to the Russian war against Ukraine as not being closely linked to the mandate of Eurojust and thus diverting resources from its core business. However, it should be noted that the work on Ukraine is not undertaken at the detriment of other objectives and that the Agency has received budget and staff reinforcements specifically for this work, to ensure that the

⁵⁹ The study, p. 103.

⁶⁰ The study, p. 328.

⁶¹ The study, p. 123

Agency can keep delivering on its support to Ukraine⁶², without this new priority being at the expense of existing operational work.

Cooperation with partners

Eurojust's **cooperation with the EJM** is overall deemed effective, however, lack of clear rules and practices for allocation of cases between Eurojust and EJM at national level limit the effectiveness of the cooperation, but also the effectiveness of Eurojust, as set out above.

With regard to **cooperation with Europol** (Art. 49 Eurojust Regulation), the number of cases, CMs and CCs between the two Agencies has increased during the evaluation period⁶³. Surveys conducted⁶⁴ in the context of the study suggest that the cooperation between the Agencies to support operational cases is effective. At the same time, the studies also indicated challenges and room for improvement that vary based on the Member States and the function of the respondents, indicating different legal cultures and perceptions of the role of the police.

What seems less effective is the structural cooperation between the two Agencies. The working arrangement,⁶⁵ which underpins Eurojust-Europol relations dates back to 2010 and was not updated after the adoption of the Europol and Eurojust Regulations in 2016 and 2018 and following the corresponding amendments to the agencies' mandates, seems to reflect that. While Eurojust's College sees the need for a new agreement as key to more effective cooperation between the two agencies, Europol's Management Body does not share this priority.

There are also no specific or routine workflows for data exchanges between the two agencies. While Article 2(1) of the Eurojust Regulation foresees that Eurojust should act, among others, based on information supplied by Europol, Europol appears to have no practice of proactively and promptly sharing information. The hit/no-hit system between the two agencies in accordance with Article 49 of the Eurojust Regulation produces also only very limited results due to restrictions based on data ownership and Eurojust's outdated IT-infrastructure. Significant manual intervention is necessary to verify each individual hit.⁶⁶ These limitations in the cooperation between the two Agencies risk

⁶² Details can be found in COM (2023) 531 final.

⁶³ The study, p. 111 and Eurojust consolidated Annual Activity Report 2022.

⁶⁴ The study, p. 112.

⁶⁵ Agreement between Eurojust and Europol, 1 January 2010, eurojust.europa.eu/sites/default/files/InternationalAgreements/Eurojust-Europol-2010-01-01-EN.pdf.

⁶⁶ The study, p. 108.

affecting the effectiveness of Eurojust and the coherent fight against serious cross border crime.

Cooperation between Eurojust and the **EPPO** began when **the EPPO took up operations** in 2021, and thereby assumed competences in relation to the coordination of cross-border PIF cases previously held by Eurojust. Eurojust retained this competence in cases where Member States, which do not participate in the EPPO, are involved, the EPPO does not have competence, or chooses not to exercise it.⁶⁷ In 2022, Eurojust supported 14 cases involving the EPPO, almost doubling to 26 cases in 2023.⁶⁸ These figures indicate that there is a role for Eurojust to support the EPPO in a similar manner to competent national authorities as foreseen in Article 2(3) of the Eurojust Regulation. While, given the EPPO's very recent establishment, conclusions on the effectiveness of the cooperation are yet early to draw, it is notable that almost half of the survey's respondents state that similar challenges regarding data ownership and the implementation of the hit/not-hit system as with Europol could limit the effectiveness of that cooperation.⁶⁹

Cooperation with **OLAF** is limited, with one case in 2022 and two in 2023⁷⁰. As a new working arrangement between Eurojust and OLAF was agreed in 2023, it is possible that its impact is not yet visible. Another aspect limiting the cooperation could be that, while Article 51 of the Eurojust Regulation refers to the cooperation with OLAF, it does not envisage a hit/no-hit system between Eurojust and OLAF.⁷¹ More effective information exchange between Eurojust and OLAF could also be a source of Eurojust own initiative cases.⁷² Additionally, increased awareness of the complementarity between criminal and administrative mandates and actions in the fight against organised (financial) crime, in line with existing views on the administrative approach of tackling organised crime (e.g. see: EU Strategy to tackle Organised Crime 2021-2025), and deployment of cooperation methods could also strengthen cooperation between OLAF and Eurojust.

Cooperation with **Frontex** is also limited and most national desks and LPs consider the cooperation ineffective.⁷³ Regarding cooperation with **other JHA partners**, the Eurojust Regulation does not include specific provisions. Nonetheless, cooperation with Eurojust

⁶⁷ Compare Article 2(1) and (2) of the Eurojust Regulation.

⁶⁸ The study, p. 113.

⁶⁹ The study, p. 110.

⁷⁰ Eurojust Consolidated Annual Reports for the years 2023 and 2022.

⁷¹ The study, p. 111.

⁷² The study, p. 111.

⁷³ The study, p. 111.

has progressed, with the number of shared initiatives remaining on track with the targets set by the Agency⁷⁴.

Eurojust's cooperation with **third countries** is generally deemed very effective, further enhancing and expanding the collaboration under the new provisions of the Regulation. The cooperation agreements predating the Eurojust Regulation provide a legal basis for systematic exchange of operational personal data. The most valuable asset in Eurojust's cooperation with third countries are the LPs, which are posted by third States at the Agency's premises in The Hague. Their physical presence allows for valuable and timely support to be provided to national desks *in situ*.⁷⁵

Since 2020, negotiations for international agreements on the cooperation with Eurojust have been authorised for 13 third countries. However, the process of negotiating these agreements requires significant human resources at Eurojust, although the competence to negotiate shifted to the Commission, and often lengthy⁷⁶. At various stages of the negotiations different challenges are met. The lack of adequate data protection safeguards and reluctance to align their national system with EU data protection standards is one more commonly encountered challenge⁷⁷.

In terms of cooperation with **international organisations**, such as the UNODC and the Council of Europe, Eurojust staff and national desks generally report cooperation to be rather limited due to limited resources of the Agency⁷⁸.

Organisation and Governance

According to the study, overall, the operational objective to improve the organisation of the agency has not been effectively achieved. Specifically, there has been **no shift of the administrative burden from the College to the EB**, with National Members spending 40-50% of their time on administrative work⁷⁹, at the expense of operational work. The study identified **duplication of work, repetitious decision-making processes, and overlaps** between the different bodies and functions of the Agency that generally undermine the effectiveness of the intervention.⁸⁰ A characteristic example of duplication is the planning of the SPD, whereby the process between initial planning and final adoption

⁷⁴ Eurojust Consolidated Annual Activity Reports for the years 2021, 2022 and 2023.

⁷⁵ The study, pp. 114f.

⁷⁶ The study, p. 114.

⁷⁷ The study, p. 115.

⁷⁸ The study, p. 119.

⁷⁹ The study, p. 84.

⁸⁰ The study, p. 87.

is allowed to run for over two years. During that period, the process has taken a minimum of nine discussions at College level, and a further ten in the EB⁸¹. This is one example of laborious decision-making, which – when accounting for the total number of participants in those meetings – consumes hundreds of working hours collectively. Through clarification of competences and implication of decision-making processes significant efficiency gains could be made.

This “dual structure”, with the College taking responsibility for operational, strategic, and administrative decisions alongside the EB, has been found to make the **decision-making process much longer than in other agencies**, such as Europol, where many decisions are taken by the Management Board only⁸². The study also reported that such decision-making processes contribute to **a feeling of “frustration”** among stakeholders. In addition, it is questionable why a body whose participants are selected based on their expertise in the investigation and prosecution of serious crime and judicial cooperation in criminal matters should focus on budgetary and management functions.⁸³

Another issue pertaining to the complexity of the decision-making processes is the **lack of clear prioritisation** in line with the objectives set out in the Eurojust Regulation. Instead, this multi-layered, consensual decision making often aims to consider the opinions of every stakeholder to ensure final support in the College, instead of following the priority setting in the Eurojust Regulation and the Agency’s strategic documents, such as the SPD. The parallel activities of Working Groups, not foreseen in the Eurojust Regulation but a *de facto* continuation of earlier working practices (Section 3.1.1), contribute further to such “blurred” priority setting.⁸⁴

Furthermore, the composition of the College can lead to conflict between national and European interests. When acting as a College, National Members have the dual role of representing their Member States, while also making operational, strategic, and administrative decisions for an EU agency. As a result, National Members may have different priorities based on their national agendas (e.g., the selection of priority third countries), which can complicate decision-making and undermine the Agency’s ability to follow consistent operational prioritisation and a coherent strategic vision at European level.⁸⁵

⁸¹ Planning and prioritisation methodology presented by the Budget, Finance & Planning Unit to the external evaluation study team.

⁸² The study, p. 86.

⁸³ The study, p. 87.

⁸⁴ The study, p. 86.

⁸⁵ The study, p. 84.

In relation to governance issues, the study identified potential **conflicts of interest and accountability challenges** in the roles of National Members. National Members are appointed by their Member States. This means they are not subject to the regime applying to EU civil servants, but at the same time they are not accountable for decision taken in relation to administrative matters in the College due to their independence. In addition, when the College acts as the Agency's Management Board, the College often takes decisions that can directly affect their own working conditions, such as the use of service cars or mission budgets, leading to conflicts of interests⁸⁶.

The abovementioned College-related issues that affect Eurojust's effectiveness can be attributed to a combination of factors. Perhaps most relevant, however, are two. On the one hand, the Eurojust Regulation often uses vague terms, which leave room for interpretation (e.g., "operational" and "administrative", without further definition). While an interpretation in line with the objectives of the Eurojust Regulation would be possible, the term "operational" is interpreted extremely broadly by Eurojust, leading to a situation where nearly all of Eurojust's activities are covered, not only support to national investigations and prosecution in individual cases, and therefore the College also remained in charge of related decisions. On the other hand, a clear desire seems to persist across the College to retain beyond the operational role most elements of its supervisory, executive and administrative roles, stemming from working practices predating the Eurojust Regulation.⁸⁷

The role of the EB in practice is also not seen as resulting in an effective governance model. Contrary to what was foreseen in the Eurojust Regulation, the EB has not taken over the administrative work of the Agency. This is largely down to the **perceived absence** of a **clear definition** of operational and administrative matters in the Eurojust Regulation, and is compounded by the *de facto* continuation of working practices predating the Eurojust Regulation on the part of the College, and the perceived need for College 'sign off' on the EB's tasks on the part of the Chair of the EB. This combination of legal vagueness permitting the continuation of earlier working practices permeates through every layer of the Agency's management structure.

Moreover, the composition of the EB is often deemed responsible for management challenges, particularly due to the current rotation system that does not require that National Members have the necessary managerial skills or experience. Their commitment varies considerably based on their interests, availability or understanding of strategic

⁸⁶ The study, pp. 119, 138.

⁸⁷ The study, p. 87.

planning and administrative matters, ultimately hindering the work of the EB. The potential envisaged for the EB under the Eurojust Regulation has therefore not been fully realised⁸⁸.

Finally, there is an issue **regarding the balance of powers between the AD and the College**. The AD is appointed by and also responsible to the College⁸⁹. The very fact that the College is also the AD's appointing authority might make it challenging for the post holder to be an agent of change and confront the College with issues or go against its will. In addition, while the AD is responsible for managing the administrative matters of Eurojust,⁹⁰ he or she is not a Member of the EB⁹¹. This problem can undermine the ability of the AD to take control over administrative tasks and to drive change, and the study suggests that this has been a contributing factor to a high turnover in this position (three in the last 3 years)⁹².

In this landscape of governance-related issues, the aggravating factor of **the slow pace of digitalisation** should be added. Outdated IT tools and infrastructure (such as Eurojust's CMS) affect the effectiveness of Eurojust's operations (Section 3.3). This issue could also be linked to the organisation of Eurojust, given that the Agency's IT functions are divided into two units (Data Management and Information Management), belonging to different departments, which has been found to create complexities and to slow down Eurojust's digitalisation efforts⁹³.

4.1.2 Efficiency

Efficiency is about comparing the actual costs and benefits of the intervention, as well as their interlinkages and proportionality, with initial expectations. However, given the lack of an impact assessment, there are no quantified statements against which to assess the efficiency of the Agency. This section will instead focus on the efficiency of Eurojust's existing working practices that inform the cost-benefit relationship, thus paving the way for a future analysis of simplification and potential efficiency gains endeavours.

While the Agency produces notable operational results, significant inefficiencies have been identified, which lead to the conclusion that the Agency could achieve more with the same resources. These stem mainly from unclear competences, overly complex governance structures, laborious decision-making, repetitive working practices, and

⁸⁸ Evaluation study, p. 87.

⁸⁹ Compare Article 16 of the Eurojust Regulation.

⁹⁰ Compare Article 18(1) of the Eurojust Regulation.

⁹¹ Compare Article 16(4) of the Eurojust Regulation.

⁹² The study, p. 87.

⁹³ The study, pp. 89ff.

inconsistent priority setting. By clarifying competences and simplifying procedures, clear efficiency gains could be achieved.

Costs

The following table presents an overview of the evolution of Eurojust's committed budget (showing the resources that were actually spent) throughout the evaluation period.

Budget Execution	2018 (baseline) 1	2019 (baseline) 1	2020	2021	2022	2023
Committed budget	38,583	38,868	41,696	53,280	50,151	55,264
Staff expenditure (%)	54%	56%	51%	43%	51%	55%
Infrastructure and operating expenditure (%)	19%	19%	22%	17%	25%	26%
Operational expenditure (%)	27%	25%	27%	40%	24%	20%
Expenditures related to operational projects based on agreements (%)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Year-on-year growth rate in commitments	n/a	1%	7%	28%	-6%	10%
Committed/final budget (%)	99.94%	99.88%	99.99 %	99.97 %	99.93 %	99.77 %
Paid/committed (%)	86.96%	90.72%	85.10 %	69.50 %	87.30 %	91.80 %
Paid/final budget (%)	86.91%	90.61%	85.10 %	69.50 %	87.30 %	91.60 %

Table 7: Overview of Eurojust's budget 2018-2023⁹⁴

As shown in the table, Eurojust's spending is marked by a steady increase between 2018 and 2023, with an average annual growth rate of 10%. On the one hand, the Agency's point of view⁹⁵ is that these resources remain insufficient and that Eurojust does not receive the additional financial resources requested in its annual SPDs⁹⁶ impact its implementation of activities planned. On the other hand, the Commission services have highlighted that Eurojust's requests are systematically 30-40% above the MFF ceilings without being supported by a Legislative Financial Statement. This instead suggests that the Agency does not plan its activities or resource management according to its assigned budgetary limitations. The high budget execution rates (constantly over 99%) indicate that Eurojust has a high absorption capacity. However, to assess if the budget is efficiently spent, it is

⁹⁴ Table 24 of the study.

⁹⁵ The study, p. 125.

⁹⁶ See section 3.

necessary to look into the allocation of the annual commitments, as shown in the graph below.




Figure 5: Development of annual commitments (total and budget categories, EUR million)⁹⁷

Staff commitments, that make up between 42% and 55% of the total allocations per year, as well as infrastructure and operating commitments, constantly increased throughout the evaluation period. Casework, as shown in previous sections, has been increasing in this period at a faster rate than staff increases, which might suggest that the efficiency of staff is increasing⁹⁸. However, operational commitments are at first stable, and then show a decreasing tendency over the last two years. Given that support to JITs, one of the Agency's most effective tools for support to Member States as indicated in Section 4.1.1, falls under this category, this raises questions about whether Eurojust has allocated its resources according to its operational priorities.

Investing in digitalisation, which was supposed to be an enabler of efficient governance, has not yet produced the desired results. Over the evaluation period, Eurojust has received significant budget reinforcements for its digitalisation⁹⁹. However, as Eurojust is still in the process of digitalising its infrastructure, it is too early to analyse the full effect of digitalisation. Some efficiency gains have been achieved regarding digitalisation with ICT projects, including upgraded video-conferencing tools, e-recruitment platforms, increased number of languages available for interpretation, and the use of SUMMA and SYSPER to further digitalise the management of financial and human resources respectively.

⁹⁷ Figure 12 of the study.

⁹⁸ The study, p. 131.

⁹⁹ The study, p. 143.

Most of the areas identified where there is the possibility to streamline and simplify processes are directly linked to the working practices of Eurojust and particularly to its governance model. Despite the provisions of the Eurojust Regulation, the study found that there is still perceived to be an unclear division of competences between the College and the EB by their members, with College members still being routinely and, for the most part, willingly involved in matters that are not operational in nature, contrary to the provisions of Articles 5 and 16 of the Eurojust Regulation.¹⁰⁰ For example, the study reports¹⁰¹ that College meetings often **consume** time discussing issues related to overseeing staff regulations, procurement rules, service cars, and mission allocations, instead of focusing on operational matters. College members report¹⁰² that College meetings are so frequent and long that they estimate them to occupy 20% of National Members' weekly **hours**, which would equate to hundreds of hours collectively each year, which could and should instead be invested in operational work. Beyond that, for each meeting of the EB and College, multiple briefing notes need to be prepared, coordinated, read, presented and revised, which adds to the administrative burden of College members as well as administrative staff. A clear delimitation of competences between EB and College and focus of the College on operational matters with an interpretation as focussing on the support to investigations and prosecutions of competent national authorities in individual cases could already significantly streamline the decision-making in the Agency.

The structure of the Agency also remains complex and difficult to navigate, with even the most simple decision-making requiring consultations across several layers. By way of illustration, the study found that, during the evaluation period, several agenda items underwent two or more cycles of discussion across the EB and College¹⁰³. This complex structure, including duplications and overlaps, also raises issues of efficient and strategic priority-setting – given that there can be multiple priorities pursued at the same time. This is the case, for example, in the selection of priority third countries or the production of policy documents. On top of this already complex governance model, the continuation of Working Groups, sub-structures of the Agency that predate the Eurojust Regulation and are not foreseen therein, further render consistent and coherent priority-setting difficult. This is in part because these Working Groups are chaired by National Members, which leads to them often being driven by the views and interests of the individual National Members involved and/or their Member States.

Benefits and outputs

¹⁰⁰ The study, p. 87.

¹⁰¹ The study, p. 142.

¹⁰² The study, p. 137.

¹⁰³ The study, p. 142.

Eurojust’s main outputs are its casework (number of cases, CCs, CMs, JITs etc.), which is the core business of the Agency. Relevant KPIs have already been presented in section 3. However, the following table is illustrative of the evolution in the number of Eurojust’s cases, caveated against the absence of a clear metric for measuring those cases – that is, whether they are “simple” or “complex”.

Case types	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Average growth rate (2019-2023)
Total (new and ongoing) cases	7,804	8,799	10,105	11,544	13,164	14.0%
Closed cases	3,604	3,991	4,878	5,834	N/A	17.0%
Share of closed out of total cases	46.2%	45.4%	48.3%	50.5%	N/A	

Table 8: Evolution of the number of Eurojust cases, 2019-2023¹⁰⁴

This data, taken in addition to that provided in Section 3, makes it clear that **nearly all case-related indicators are increasing**. Similar trends have also been identified in relation to cooperation with EU and international partners, with the exception of Europol where casework decreased by 23% between 2020 and 2021¹⁰⁵.

Eurojust’s **direct impact** is linked to the extent to which the Agency’s outputs contribute to the Agency achieving its specific objectives and, ultimately, to its general objective to “contribute to the effective and efficient fight against serious cross-border crime” (as summarised in the intervention logic). While Eurojust’s policy-related and strategic work does not directly contribute to its operational objectives, the positive impact in relation to its overall objective is clearly visible. In addition, recent discussions, including during the High-Level Forum on the Future of EU Criminal Justice¹⁰⁶, have shown, that also Member States appreciate Eurojust’s input based on the Agency’s operational experience to policy debates at Union level.

Eurojust’s **impact is difficult to monetise**, but a notable metric is the number of supported JITs and the amounts seized or confiscated as a result of cross-border investigations. Nevertheless, it is necessary to underline that these benefits are not only achieved by Eurojust, as other stakeholders are also involved¹⁰⁷, who deploy their own resources. In

¹⁰⁴ Table 26 of the study.

¹⁰⁵ The study, p. 133; the decrease might be linked to the COVID-19 pandemic.

¹⁰⁶ The second meeting of the High-Level Forum on the Future of EU Criminal Justice took place in Brussels on 21- 22 May 2025.

¹⁰⁷ For example, as the evaluation study (p.147) reports, Eurojust is also supported by the EJTN Exchange Programme through a traineeship scheme.

addition, the amounts vary according to the cases involved, and the numbers should therefore be considered as indicative only.

Year	Value of Criminal Assets Frozen/Seized (EUR)	Value of Drugs Seized (EUR)
2020	1.9 billion	3 billion
2021	2.8 billion	7 billion
2022	3 billion	12 billion
2023	1 billion	26 billion

Table 9: Monetary Impact of Eurojust's JIT support: Asset Freezes and Drug Seizures¹⁰⁸

Indirectly, through its coordinative role and its structured support, Eurojust was found to contribute to building a culture of cooperation in judicial matters across Europe and beyond.

Efficiency savings

The evidence collected for the study further indicates that around **70% of national practitioners and policymakers believe that Eurojust's operational tasks can be simplified and made more efficient to a moderate or great extent**¹⁰⁹.

According to the study, there is potential for Eurojust to achieve the same outputs/results at lower costs¹¹⁰. The multiple layers of consultations and laborious decision-making identified above limit the efficiency of operations. They highlight that the College is following its expected role to focus exclusively on operational matters, as envisaged in the Eurojust Regulation. As a consequence, the EB does not exercise its full spectrum of responsibilities provided for in the Eurojust Regulation.

Therefore, clarifying competences and thereby ensuring that the College focusses on its operational work, while all administrative decision-making would be dealt by the EB or the AD, and reviewing the necessity to bring together National Members for meeting of a frequency and length that consumes up to 20% of National Members' weekly hours would allow National Members to focus on the operational matters for which they are seconded to Eurojust, thereby achieving greater results with the same resources. At the same time, improving digitalisation would also enable more streamlined operations. Costs that occur from non-operational practices whose usefulness is unclear (e.g., those related to producing translations of various documents, including the annual report, working

¹⁰⁸ Table 32 of the evaluation study.

¹⁰⁹ Figure 18 of the evaluation study.

¹¹⁰ The study, p. 146.

arrangements, and the SPD¹¹¹) were also found to be an example of the unnecessary consumption of resources.

In light of these findings, **possibilities to increase efficiency by reducing unnecessary costs in both financial and human resources should be explored prior to renewed discussions on further budgetary increases for Eurojust above existing MFF ceilings.**

4.1.3 Coherence

This criterion assesses the degree of consistency between the Eurojust Regulation and the Agency's working practices with EU and international interventions in the JHA area.

While there are some smaller internal incoherences within the Eurojust Regulation, its internal coherence is overall satisfactory. Eurojust's role as an Agency is very coherent with the overarching policies in the area of internal security. While Eurojust's role is also overall coherent with those of other JHA agencies and bodies, the coherence of their interaction could be further strengthened.

Coherence with wider EU policies and priorities

A first element to be assessed is "internal coherence", namely how well different elements of the Eurojust Regulation and the Agency's working practices operate together to achieve the objectives set out in the intervention logic. As already shown in this report, internal coherence is generally satisfactory. However, there are issues relating to vague terms and lack of more clear definitions in the Eurojust Regulation that lead to very broad or conflicting interpretations, as highlighted with respect to "administrative and operational matters". In addition, some of the changes introduced by the Regulation are not fully coherent, e.g. the fact that the AD as responsible for administrative matters is not a member of the EB.

Overall, there is strong coherence between Eurojust's role and other, overarching policies in the field of internal security. Eurojust is an integral part of the EU Security Union Strategy¹¹², the EU strategy to Tackle Organised Crime¹¹³, the Counter-Terrorism Agenda

¹¹¹ The study, p. 146.

¹¹² Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the European Council, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on the [EU Security Union Strategy - COM\(2020\) 605 final](#).

¹¹³ Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on the [EU Strategy to tackle Organised Crime 2021-2025](#).

for the EU¹¹⁴, the EU Drugs strategy 2021-2025¹¹⁵, and the Communication on the digitalisation of justice in the EU. Eurojust is indeed a fundamental actor as the Agency represents the judiciary in the EU's security architecture. Nevertheless, the justice area is sometimes neglected at the institutional level, as shown by the example of security dialogues with third countries on migrant smuggling, where the criminal justice component is not always appropriately addressed. Eurojust contributes to its coherence with the wider EU policies through its core operations, and particularly its casework supporting Member States in the investigation and prosecution of serious cross-border crimes in areas indicated in the figure below.




Figure 6: Eurojust (new and ongoing) case support by crime type, 2022¹¹⁶

In terms of data protection, Eurojust's data protection regime is found to be consistent with the EU legal framework as this is stipulated in Regulation (EU) 2018/1725¹¹⁷.

Coherence with EU Partners

According to the study, **generally Eurojust has a complementary role alongside other JHA agencies and bodies** that are part of the broader EU security architecture. Activities that contribute to this coherence include annual meetings between Heads of the Agencies (last hosted by Eurojust in 2020) as well as at working level.

¹¹⁴ Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the European Council, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, [A Counter-Terrorism Agenda for the EU: Anticipate, Prevent, Protect, Respond - COM\(2020\) 795 final](#).

¹¹⁵ Council of the European Union, [EU Drugs Strategy 2021-2025 - Publications Office of the EU](#).

¹¹⁶ Figure 22 of the evaluation study.

¹¹⁷ The study, p. 152.

Nevertheless, some challenges exist, in particular **between Eurojust with Europol**. Both Agencies share the same objective, pursued through different means: Eurojust coordinates judicial cooperation whereas Europol's mandate is focussed on supporting law enforcement authorities. Article 49 of the Eurojust Regulation and Article 21 of the Europol Regulation¹¹⁸ constitute mirroring provisions, to facilitate cooperation between the two agencies.

However, incoherence and overlap between the two agencies seem rather linked to the *practical* implementation of their mandates¹¹⁹. As already addressed in Section 4.1, issues regarding Eurojust's outdated IT infrastructure, the implementation of the hit/no-hit system, as well as the limitations concerning data exchanges due to data ownership can limit or even undermine interoperability between the two agencies and ultimately their coherence. A risk for overlap has been identified with regard to the support to the long-standing instrument of the JITs and Europol's rather recent Operational Task Forces (OTFs)¹²⁰. However, also these tools are in principle complementary, but require close coordination and information exchange between the two agencies. While the mandates and activities of the two agencies is not incoherent, its coherence could be stronger. Therefore, the information exchange between the agencies would need to be enhanced and the complementarity their roles would need to translate in specific tasks in relation to each other and more accentuated cooperation modalities.

With regard to **coherence with the EPPO**, there is evidence that cooperation is currently strong and consistent, although this cooperation began only in 2021¹²¹. There is a clear distinction between their mandates, with the EPPO having competence for narrower crime types in comparison to Eurojust (e.g., no competence of the EPPO in money laundering or drug trafficking). However, in the case of combatting organised crime committed in Ukraine, some overlap does exist, as both Eurojust and the EPPO consider themselves most suitable to lead¹²².

When it comes to coherence with networks, there seems to be good coherence between Eurojust and the JITs network and between the Agency and the Genocide Network. However, as highlighted earlier in this section, overlaps between Eurojust and the EJNI have been identified regarding the Agency's involvement in "simple" cases. The perceived

¹¹⁸ Regulation (EU) 2016/794 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 May 2016 on the European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Cooperation (Europol) and replacing and repealing Council Decisions 2009/371/JHA, 2009/934/JHA, 2009/935/JHA, 2009/936/JHA and 2009/968/JHA.

¹¹⁹ The study, p. 154.

¹²⁰ The study, p. 151.

¹²¹ The study, p. 151.

¹²² The study, p. 151.

lack of a clear definition of “what constitutes a Eurojust case” among national desks compounds this unclear distinction.

Coherence with international actors

Overall, Eurojust’s activities are found to be complementary to those of international organisations that are working to achieve similar goals. However, these synergies are mainly on an *ad hoc* basis, as no formal or systematic cooperation has been established. Examples that highlight the coherence between Eurojust and some international organisations (per type of activity) are presented in the table below.

Type of activity	Examples of synergies and complementarity sought
Capacity building	<p>In 2024, Eurojust and UNODC co-organised a workshop for practitioners (including prosecutors, law enforcement authorities, and judges) from various countries in Central Asia on setting up and operationalising JITs. This initiative promoted the use of JITs in transnational criminal investigations, with both Eurojust and UNODC sharing their expertise and challenges encountered in using JITs in order to develop shared lesson learnt and best practices.</p> <p>In 2024, Eurojust and the CoE co-hosted a workshop on the spontaneous exchange of information obtained during criminal investigations. This event brought together over 70 participants from around 40 countries to discuss the practical use of Article 26 of the Cybercrime Convention. Eurojust’s observer status in the Cybercrime Convention Committee (T-CY) enabled it to contribute to the development of the guidelines and best practices for international cooperation in cybercrime investigations.</p>
Operational coordination	<p>Since 2023, the ICC OTP participates in the Eurojust-supported JIT for alleged core international crimes committed in Ukraine and in the ICPA. Their involvement ensures that investigations into the crime of aggression are comprehensive and coordinated with the work of the ICC, leveraging the expertise and resources of multiple international justice actors.</p> <p>In October 2023, Eurojust cooperated with Interpol in the coordinated arrest of a Swedish national in a cross-border drug trafficking case involving Sweden, Montenegro and Serbia. This operation, which included the execution of an International Arrest Warrant, was the result of several months of close cooperation between the authorities of the involved countries together with Interpol and Eurojust which provided complementary operational support (legal and police).</p>
Information sharing	<p>The recent amendment to the Eurojust Regulation mandates the Agency to exchange evidence with, or otherwise make evidence directly available to, international judicial authorities, in particular to the ICC (however, to facilitate such systematic data exchange, an international agreement with the ICC is required).</p> <p>UNODC grants National Members of Eurojust access to its legal tools, including its databases on treaty-related information. Eurojust, upon request by UNODC and on a case-by-case basis, can also transmit information to UNODC.</p>

Table 10: Examples of synergies and complementarity between Eurojust and international organisations¹²³

Regarding cooperation with third countries, there seems to be no duplication of efforts between the activities undertaken by Eurojust and those of third countries, as reported by

¹²³ Table 34 of the evaluation study.

the majority of the national desks and LPs interviewed in the context of the study¹²⁴. However, coherence can be limited where third countries' authorities are unwilling to cooperate with Eurojust (or the EU more broadly) as well as where Eurojust faces difficulties in identifying the single central authority of a third country.

4.2. How did the EU intervention make a difference and to whom? (EU-ADDED VALUE)

The assessment of Eurojust's EU-added value encompasses the key question of whether the same results could have been achieved without the Agency, that is, without the actual results Eurojust delivers.

Eurojust clearly provides significant EU-added value, particular by supporting national competent authorities in the coordination and cooperation of investigations and prosecutions they could not solve in a similar way without Eurojust's support. Similarly, Eurojust also provides clear EU-added value in relation to cooperation with third countries.

In general, the increase of globalised and cross-border crime renders the fight against it by individual Member States more challenging. In this context, Eurojust's general objective – to support the cooperation and coordination of national investigations and prosecutions – itself is predicated upon the existence of a supranational agency that effectively pursues this objective. As demonstrated in section 4, Eurojust is overall highly effective in providing operational support to Member States which in turn generates EU-added value that would be impossible without the Agency. Indeed, the study reports how some Member States were able to investigate and prosecute cross-border cases with Eurojust's support that they were unable to before the Agency existed¹²⁵.

This EU-added value is enhanced by Eurojust's structured environment for judicial cooperation, the opportunity for prosecutors to speak in their own language, the fact that coordination is undertaken by a neutral third party with supranational characteristics, the Agency's financial support, and the culture of cooperation that is being promoted that ultimately leads to building trust – essential for judicial cooperation among competent authorities. Additionally, cooperation with third countries provides added value particularly through the posting of LPs posted in The Hague, allowing for *in situ* cooperation with national desks and their smooth integration in ongoing operations.

Elements such as Eurojust's "own initiative" cases cannot, by definition, be undertaken by the Member States, and would be a considerable source of EU-added value. However, with only a very small number of cases having been initiated by Eurojust, this added value has not yet been realised.

¹²⁴ The study, p. 158.

¹²⁵ The study, p. 161.

Eurojust’s ability to deliver on Member States’ needs in terms of operational support is fundamental to the Agency’s EU-added value. The ability to allocate cases appropriately therefore also affects the EU-added value of Eurojust. Cooperation between Member States on bilateral cases is perceived to function well even without Eurojust. Such good bilateral cooperation already exists in areas with geographic and/or cultural proximity, typically involving two Member States with a shared border, where there is a longstanding “tradition” of cooperation in judicial matters¹²⁶.

Finally, it seems likely that the Agency’s EU-added value could be increased if Eurojust and its operational activities were more visible at the national level.

4.3. Is the intervention still relevant? (RELEVANCE)

Eurojust’s relevance depends ultimately on the extent to which it responds to the needs of its main stakeholders, namely the Member States, EU IBOAs, and third countries (as identified in the intervention logic of Section 2). While it is essential that the Agency responds to the present needs of stakeholders, it is also important to consider how Eurojust will continue to be relevant for its main stakeholders in the foreseeable future.

Eurojust’s core activities are highly relevant to the investigating and prosecuting authorities in Member States involved in cross-border cases. With the increase in the number and complexity of cases, as well as developments in the types of crime with a cross-border dimension, the relevance of the Agency’s operational work is ever increasing.

Member States

As reported in the study, 94.1% of national investigating and prosecuting authorities in Member States maintain that Eurojust has continued to address their needs to a great or moderate degree throughout the evaluation period¹²⁷. The Agency’s support is particularly relevant when it comes to Eurojust’s ability to support national competent authorities in identifying their counterparts in other Member States and providing them with logistical and practical assistance when cooperating. The **most relevant activity is casework**, which is also the core business of the Agency, with an emphasis given to “complex” cases that several Member States would not be able to prosecute without Eurojust. However, according to the support study, reports and guidance documents (with the exception of case-law analysis), are not always considered as relevant by national stakeholders.¹²⁸

¹²⁶ The study, p. 163.

¹²⁷ The study, p. 167.

¹²⁸ The study, pp. 166f.

With regard to networks hosted or supported by Eurojust, the study finds that there are mixed views regarding their relevance in relation to Eurojust¹²⁹. The **EJN** has a significant potential to be highly relevant when taking over cases which require only simple support. Regarding the **Genocide Network**, the knowledge gained through its work has been important to identify avenues in which Eurojust could support the response to the Russian war of aggression against Ukraine. The Network's relevance in this field stems from the identification of key areas where the prosecution of crimes committed in war zones could be supported (such as the collection and preservation of evidence). Lastly, the cooperation with the **JITs Network** is relevant given the Agency's support to the JITs, including through funding, which are among Eurojust's most effective tools for cooperation (as mentioned in Section 4). The relevance of other networks in responding to Member States' needs is unclear¹³⁰.

Finally, Eurojust's work on Ukraine, although criticised by some National Members as "too politically driven"¹³¹, is highly relevant. On the one hand, it responded to requests from competent national authorities for support for their investigations based on universal jurisdiction. On the other, it responds to the importance of ensuring accountability for international crimes, in light of the *ius cogens* nature of these crimes, and supports the EU's commitment to upholding international law and with it the international legal order.

EU IBOAs

This sub-section will focus on Eurojust's relevance for some key partners within the EU, including the EU institutions, Europol, and the EPPO.

Eurojust's relevance for EU institutions (mainly the Commission, the European Parliament, and the Council) derives from the Agency's insight gained from its operational expertise. This can in turn be utilised in the EU institutions' activities, the preparation of strategies, legislative proposals and relations with third countries.¹³²

Whereas cooperation between Eurojust and Europol has been extensively analysed in previous sections, it is also pertinent to assess Eurojust's relevance in relation to Europol, which largely relates to the broader need for a strong judicial component alongside law enforcement in the criminal justice chain. As already highlighted, cooperation between the two agencies is suboptimal, in so far as Eurojust operates at a slower pace in comparison to Europol, meaning that it cannot always cater for Europol's operational needs in a timely manner. This is particularly evident in the case of information and data exchange. Another

¹²⁹ The study, p. 170.

¹³⁰ The study, p. 171.

¹³¹ The study, p. 177.

¹³² The study, p. 172.

factor that undermines Eurojust's relevance for Europol is the lack of interoperability and especially the dysfunctional hit/no-hit system that often renders their cooperation complex and lengthy. Moreover, Eurojust's lack of data ownership means that it has to request national authorities' permission to exchange this data, adding further delay and complexity to its cooperation with Europol. However, the fact that there is limited appetite from Europol to update their cooperation agreement¹³³ suggests that the cooperation in the existing framework may be more satisfactory for Europol or that cooperation with Eurojust is less relevant for Europol. Regarding Eurojust's performance in addressing the needs of the EPPO, it is noted that in the early stages of the Office, Eurojust provided it with substantial support pertaining to many of its tasks, particularly through sharing the Agency's network of contacts. Nevertheless, gradually, the EPPO has become more independent, developing its own networks, something that led to a decrease in Eurojust's relevance for its needs.

Third countries

The findings of the study suggest that Eurojust is relevant both for third countries' needs and for EU national authorities that need to cooperate with third countries¹³⁴.

As criminal networks become increasingly international, with various cross-border dimensions, both National Members and national prosecutors working with Eurojust believe that the Agency's supranational work has become increasingly relevant¹³⁵. This largely relates to Eurojust's ability to coordinate in a way that allows for the exchange of best practices and legal expertise between Member States and third countries, also based on cooperation agreements that provide a solid legal basis for the exchange of data.

Regarding third countries' authorities, Eurojust's relevance derives from the fact that it serves as a single point of entry for third countries seeking judicial cooperation in the EU. Cooperation agreements with third countries that provide for legal certainty regarding data exchange are highly relevant. A further highly relevant aspect of judicial cooperation with third countries is the posting of LPs in The Hague, which allows both National Members and third countries to have real time, in-person, *in situ* exchanges regarding operations, therefore improving the quality of their cooperation significantly.

Eurojust's relevance in the foreseeable future

Serious cross-border crime with increasingly international dimensions is expected to be the continuing trend in the foreseeable future, especially when carried out by organised

¹³³ The study. P. 173.

¹³⁴ The study, p. 173.

¹³⁵ The study, p. 173.

crime networks. This means that Eurojust will remain an extremely relevant actor in the fight against cross-border, organised crime.

In this context, cooperation agreements with third countries that allow for systematic data exchange will be even more relevant, while Eurojust's IT systems will need to be fit for purpose in order to meet the Agency's efficiency needs when fulfilling the growing demand for data exchange from Member States, EU partners and third countries. Correspondingly, the areas of inefficiency, identified in Section 4.1.2, if not addressed, run the risk of limiting or even undermining the Agency's relevance in the future as Eurojust may be unable to respond adequately to these increasing needs.

Finally, apart from the increasingly international nature of crime, criminal networks use increasingly advanced digital means to carry out their activities. Eurojust has generally adapted to the technological evolution of crime, for example in cases with encryption elements (e.g., EncroChat, SkyECC), and has made important progress in digitalising its operations (e.g., JIT platform, CICED, SIRIUS project etc.). However, as explained in Sections 4.1.1-4.1.2, implementation delays could negatively impact this progress in the future.

5. WHAT ARE THE CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED?

5.1. Conclusions

In conclusion, Eurojust appears to be **very effective in supporting and strengthening coordination and cooperation between national investigating and prosecuting authorities and national authorities and prosecutors are overall satisfied with the work and support of Eurojust.** This largely relates to the type of support it provides, whereby JITs, coordination meetings and coordination cases are considered to be the most effective tools of the Agency. In particular, Eurojust's casework is of fundamental importance to the Member States, as indicated by a consistently growing demand from their side.

Cooperation with third countries is also deemed to be increasingly effective (e.g., through a 52% increase in cases between 2019 and 2023), particularly in cases where LPs are posted in The Hague, and when cooperation is based on cooperation agreements that provide a legal basis for data exchange once concluded.

While cooperation with other JHA agencies, bodies and networks is considered overall effective, it is not without challenges, as problems such as **overlaps in the practical implementation of the mandates of the different agencies and difficulties in information and data sharing limit the effectiveness and efficiency of the cooperation.**

The allocation of cases between the EJN and Eurojust could also be optimised to enhance effectiveness. Currently, Eurojust is dealing with many cases which require only simple support instead of complex, multilateral cases which require more sophisticated support, **resulting in resources not being used strategically, but diverted to cases, which could have been handled by the EJN or Member States bilaterally.** This impacts also the

efficiency and relevance of Eurojust's operational outputs. However, **this problem also derives from the ENCS not properly “filtering” the cases** at national level as expected.

Eurojust's work on accountability for alleged international crimes committed in the context of the Russian war of aggression against Ukraine, particularly through the establishment of the ICPA and of the Ukraine-related JIT and the implementation of the CICED, **is considered effective in** responding to the new objectives conferred upon Eurojust by the co-legislators.

The evaluation has also identified areas where **several shortcomings prevent the Agency from realising its full potential in supporting national authorities** in cross-border cooperation and coordination. The majority of these shortcomings relate to the efficiency of the Agency.

Effectiveness and efficiency challenges largely result from Eurojust's working practices and decision-making culture, and the related structures, systems, and processes, which were not fully aligned with the intentions of the Eurojust Regulation. This has led to a situation where leadership, strategic priority-setting, and a lack of accountability of College members limit the Agency's performance. In turn, the factors limiting the change include a lack of clarity in the provisions of the Regulation, as well as the continuation of working practices pre-dating the Eurojust Regulation and maintaining the supervisory, executive and administrative roles and responsibilities of the College.

While the independence of College members when undertaking operational tasks is essential for Eurojust's functioning, it is found to lead to accountability problems when National Members exercise their second function, which is to make decisions for an EU Agency. Furthermore, **as National Members are appointed based on their expertise in judicial cooperation, there are no guarantees that they have experience in management or administration. A lack of checks and balances is also found between the College and the AD**, who nominally heads the administration but is appointed by and accountable to the College and is not even a member in the EB.

Priority setting (e.g., insufficient funding for JITs, an inconsistent strategy on third countries for cooperation) **is also considered an area with possibility for streamlining**. Governance sub-structures (Working Groups) that perpetuate the pre-Eurojust Regulation architecture are negatively impacting this process. Additionally, while operations are the *raison d'être* of Eurojust and therefore its priority, National Members are reported to spend 40-50% of their time on administrative work, including College meetings, which are reported to take up to 20% of their weekly hours. On balance, these ongoing issues **sometimes raise questions of clear prioritisation and efficient allocation of human and financial resources**.

The evaluation findings also indicate that the administration of **Eurojust struggles to organise its operations in line with the budget available under the MFF**, with annual budget requests systematically exceeding the budget ceilings by 30-40% on average. This is while JITs, one of Eurojust's most effective operational tools, were found to be funded insufficiently to meet growing demand.

Another area in which there is room to optimise Eurojust's **efficiency is the outdated IT tools and delays in the implementation of digitalisation**, with the use of outdated systems (such as the CMS) that do not meet the needs of the daily operational work. In addition to this, the division of Eurojust's IT function into two separate units under different departments is not found to positively contribute to increasing efficiency. The first challenge should, however, be addressed in the short-term with the establishment of a new CMS.

Eurojust's work is coherent with wider EU policies and priorities in the field of criminal justice, stemming from the Agency's role in the broader EU security and justice architecture along with other actors and notably Europol and the EPPO that have generally complementary mandates in the criminal justice chain. A specific challenge relates more to the coherence of tools, the relationship between JITs and OTFs. Eurojust's work is found to be coherent with the JIT network and the Genocide Network. **The Agency's data protection regime is also well aligned with the EU data protection framework**, with the EDPS providing positive assessments on that matter.

However, **the problems related to unclear and non-binding definitions** (e.g., what a Eurojust case is, what constitutes administrative vs. operational work, the Agency not acting on its "own initiative) **point to a lack of internal coherence in the Eurojust Regulation** that, in combination with the absence of a competent body that issues *de facto* binding interpretations, leads to a legal uncertainty and multiple interpretation of the Eurojust Regulation.

The Eurojust Regulation and its implementation by Eurojust was found to provide significant EU added value, with national practitioners reporting that, without Eurojust, certain cases, mostly of multilateral and complex nature, would be impossible to investigate and prosecute, and that the Agency made judicial cooperation in criminal matters more efficient and effective.

Growing demand and an increasing number of cases further showcase how **Eurojust is relevant for Member States' needs**, counting on the trust that the Agency has built, its ability to serve as a platform for exchanges between Member States and third countries, and the expertise and logistical support that it provides. Moreover, as crime has become increasingly cross-border and more technologically sophisticated, **Eurojust is expected to increase its relevance in the foreseeable future** due to its ability to adapt to new elements of criminal activities (e.g., cases with encryption elements, such as the EncroChat case).

5.2. Lessons learned

The evaluation of the Eurojust Regulation and the Agency's working practices shows that Eurojust has been successful across the board in providing Member States with the support needed for cooperation in the investigation and prosecution of cross-border crime. However, Eurojust is not yet exploiting its full potential to provide operational support to national competent authorities.

In this context, the following lessons learned from this retrospective exercise also reveal areas for improvement:

- **Significant possibilities for simplification and cost reduction were identified.** In particular, addressing the governance, working practices, and decision-making outlined in the analysis would result in significant efficiency gains that would allow Eurojust to fulfil its role more effectively and efficiently, achieving even better operational results without increasing resources.
- **Challenges within Eurojust’s governance**, stemming either from the incomplete implementation of the Eurojust Regulation due to “old habits” persisting or from vague Eurojust Regulation provisions, **have a multiplier effect impacting not only internal proceedings but also how the Agency operates and delivers externally.** Eurojust needs to be enabled to **react quickly** to challenges arising from the agile nature of organised crime or geopolitical challenges.
- As casework is expected to further increase in the future due to the constant increase in cross-border crime, more **efficient management of the Agency’s budget and allocation of resources to priority areas** (such as funding of JITs) is **essential for ensuring Eurojust’s success in the future.**
- **The Agency’s effectiveness also depends on which measures the Member States take to implement the Eurojust Regulation.** Examples are the implementation of the ENCS to ensure that the Agency can focus on complex, cross-border cases which Eurojust is best placed to facilitate or the information sharing under Article 21 of the Eurojust Regulation as basis for Eurojust’s “own initiative” – providing for its core EU-added value.
- Shortcomings related to procedures and prioritisation often lead to **frustration among Eurojust’s main stakeholders**, including staff and institutions.
- While increases in the number of cases have been used as an indicator of Eurojust’s success, it is clear this indicator is not well suited **to quantify the Agency’s effectiveness.**
- Regarding cooperation with third countries and international organisations, it seems that **cooperation agreements, although complex and time consuming to negotiate, are the most successful form of cooperation.** They provide a legal basis allowing for the posting of a LP to Eurojust and the structured exchange of operational personal data. Projects with regional or topical focus are also a very useful, complementary measure, especially to enhance practical cooperation or react to new developments.
- However, the Agency will also need to be prepared to respond to the growing demands from other EU actors, as the agency it is also expected to deliver on the international responsibility towards the EU.
- While aspects of Eurojust and its working practices present significant room for improvement, **it must be stressed that the Agency fulfils one unique role in the EU’s security and justice architecture** and as Eurojust evolves it must also be aligned with developments in other JHA agencies and bodies, in particular Europol and the EPPO.
- As regards the **future of EU’s security and justice architecture**, a more cooperative, coherent approach should be explored, envisaging closer collaboration mechanisms and ensuring better information exchange between the JHA agencies and bodies.

ANNEX I: PROCEDURAL INFORMATION

Directorate-General for Justice and Consumers

PLAN/2023/2531 - Evaluation of the European Union Agency for Criminal Justice Cooperation (Eurojust) and its implementation based on Regulation (EU) 2018/1727.

Organisation and timing of the evaluation study on which the Staff Working Document was mainly based

Tasks	Time
Signature of the contract	20 December 2023
First ISG meeting	14 February 2024
Kick-off meeting	18 June 2024
Report of the Kick-off meeting	1 July 2024
Second ISG meeting	10 July 2024
Submission of the inception report	16 July 2024
Comments on the inception report	2 August 2024
Submission of the interim report	28 October 2024
Third ISG meeting	6 November 2024
Submission of the draft final report	17 January 2025
ISG meeting to discuss draft final report	23 January 2025
Submission of the final report	2 April 2025

Inter-service Group members: Secretariat-General, Legal Service, DG BUDG, DGT, OLAF, DG HR, DG HOME, DG ENEST, EEAS, DIGIT, DG JUST.

Evidence, sources and quality

The results of this SWD are mainly informed by an evaluation study conducted by an independent consultant. This evaluation study took place from June 2024 to April 2025 under the guidance of an interservice steering group established by different services of the European Commission and under the framework contract JUST/2020/PR/03/0001 for Evaluation, Impact Assessment and Related Policy Support Services in the Justice and Consumers Policy Areas. The evidence base of this evaluation study consisted of two main components: analysing available documentation and consulting stakeholders.

ANNEX II. METHODOLOGY AND ANALYTICAL MODELS USED

Elements presented in this SWD are mainly taken from the above-mentioned evaluation study conducted by an independent consultant.

The methodology is based on data collection, targeted consultations, data analysis and synthesis of this analysis and consultations outputs.

These activities were exclusively undertaken by the contractors. In this context, the contractors carried out the following tasks:

- **Preparatory tasks:** Establishment of the evaluation's intervention logic with the assistance of DG JUST and Eurojust and design of the relevant analytical framework and tools, such as the detailed evaluation matrix.
- **Research tasks:** Quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis including document and data review relevant to the implementation of the Eurojust Regulation and the functioning of Eurojust, targeted consultations with relevant stakeholders and analytical activities focusing on mapping and assessing the implementation of the Eurojust Regulation.
- **Interviews:** In total, 115 semi-structured interviews were conducted with stakeholders from the following groups: Eurojust, covering National Members, deputies, assistants, liaison prosecutors and members of the administration; EU institutions and OLAF, as well as other bodies, agencies, offices and networks operating in the justice and home affairs field (including the European Commission, the European Parliament and the Council, Europol, the EPPO, FRA and Frontex); policymakers and practitioners from the EU Member States and third countries; international organisations; and other independent experts in the field.
- **Online surveys:** Two surveys were conducted, with: (i) members of Eurojust national desks and liaison prosecutors (*survey #1*); and (ii) members of Eurojust national coordination systems in the EU Member States, as well as other national level practitioners and policymakers (*survey #2*).
- **Direct observations:** The evaluation team had proposed to attend and observe up to 5 in-person meetings or events, where Eurojust was the host or a key participant. A range of different options were discussed with Eurojust, including meetings of the College and the Executive Board, and meetings of relevant expert groups or networks (e.g. EJN, JIT Network, Genocide Network, etc.). However, the then President of Eurojust interpreted the confidentiality requirement of Eurojust's Rules of Procedure (Art. 5(4)) as prohibiting the participation of the evaluation team in meetings of the College and the Executive Board. This provision requires College meetings – and, by analogy, Executive Board meetings – to be private and for discussions to be confidential. To mitigate this challenge, key interviews were conducted and/or focused on the functioning of the College and the Executive Board, including its practices as regards meetings. As a result, it was only possible to attend and observe two meetings hosted by Eurojust – a Meeting of the JIT Network on 23-24 October 2024 and a Meeting of the Genocide Network on 13 November 2024. That is, no meetings regarding the internal administration, functioning or governance of the Agency were able to be attended or observed. However, the evaluation team was invited to present a summary of the preliminary evaluation findings to the College as part of a validation workshop on 11 February 2025. This provided the evaluation team with the opportunity to observe the dynamics of the College.
- **Cross-country focus groups:** A small number of cross-border focus groups were planned, with the aim of bringing together national practitioners involved in cross-border cooperation to understand the challenges they face and the extent to which the EJR addresses them, any practical issues

relating to these cases, as well as the value that Eurojust delivers in such cases. As for the surveys, finalising the method for the cross-country focus groups was dependent on the initial data collection activities, in particular the interviews and the engagement of national level stakeholders. However, given the delays experienced in the interview programme, and their impact on obtaining relevant national level contacts, the hosting of the focus groups was delayed to January 2025, with the agreement of DG JUST. One focus group took place on 14 January 2025 and focused on the impact of Eurojust for national practitioners. The second focus group, which took place on 21 January 2025, focused on collaboration with third countries.

The information gathered from these different sources was triangulated, to identify similarities and explore differences, in order to draw evidence-based conclusions. This methodology is deemed to be reasonably robust. Its limitations are mainly related to the fact that, given the lack of an impact assessment prior to the adoption of the Eurojust Regulation, inputs, activities and expected outputs – baselines – were never set out in detail, therefore making assessment against these measures a challenging exercise. The sensitive nature of Eurojust’s work, and the individual nature of confidential casework also limits the availability of certain factual data and associated analysis. In addition, only a limited number of stakeholders have knowledge of the work of Eurojust. Therefore, much of the feedback provided came directly from Eurojust. Nevertheless, the wide consultation activities provided a good range of opinion data, and whilst not representative statistically, the response rates were generally good and included all the stakeholders targeted. While the consultation period was planned to take over summer and therefore initially the response rates were not yet very high, an extension of the deadlines ensured high feedback rates. Finally, it was not possible to collect sufficient information to define the exact number of hours/ human resources that are spend on administrative tasks at Eurojust and therefore clearly identify the potential for reduction of administrative burden. This is mainly because there is no reliable data as there is no reliable and common definition or understand of the term “operational” and “administrative” in the context of Eurojust’s work. However, the data collected allowed already to indicate that there is significant potential for simplification. The impact assessment will place specific focus on specifying the potential for simplification and reduction of administrative burden in more concrete numbers.

ANNEX III. EVALUATION MATRIX AND, WHERE RELEVANT, DETAILS ON ANSWERS TO THE EVALUATION QUESTIONS (BY CRITERION)

The evaluation matrix as well as the answers to the evaluation questions are presented in the table below. This table has been drafted exclusively by the contractors and is found in Annex 2 of the evaluation study. It signposts to the detailed discussions of each topic in the main body of the external evaluation the findings using the following (Red-Amber-Green, RAG) scale:

Red indicates overall negative findings, with limited or no positive elements.

Amber indicates largely neutral findings, with a relative balance of both positive and negative elements.

Green indicates overall positive findings, with limited or no negative elements.

Certain questions have been split to reflect the different components of those questions and their associated ratings.

Effectiveness (Section 4.1 of the external evaluation report)

Evaluation questions	Key findings	RAG	Signposting
EQ1: To what extent has progress been made towards achieving the Eurojust Regulation's objectives, considering the expectations and procedures it included?	<p>Eurojust has progressed positively towards achieving its general, specific and externally-focused operational objectives. The Regulation addresses sufficiently the key operational needs of the Agency, proving to be very effective in supporting national authorities in cross-border cooperation and coordination.</p> <p>However, the positive effects of Eurojust's work are offset by significant challenges related to the internally-focused operational objective of improving the organisational aspects of Eurojust's functioning, as outlined further (EQ1.3 and 1.4).</p>	Amber	Section 4.1
EQ1.1: To what extent have Eurojust's activities contributed to achieving overall EU policy objectives and priorities (i.e. to fight serious cross-border crime in the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice)?	<p>Eurojust positively contributes to EU policy objectives and priorities. At the core, this is driven by Eurojust's positive work in the fight against serious organised crime, where it provides national authorities with an effective and valuable platform through which it supports cooperation and coordination of actions and efforts in specific cases.</p> <p>The Agency is a well-established member of an EU ecosystem that provides national practitioners with the judicial cooperation support they need, improving mutual trust among EU judicial authorities. In addition, Eurojust contributes directly to the betterment of EU policy and legislation in response to direct requests for input and information from the EU institutions on EU initiatives.</p> <p>The Agency also acts as an EU-wide thought leader and facilitates knowledge sharing in the field of criminal justice and judicial cooperation in criminal matters through the production of its strategic outputs.</p>	Green	Section 4.1 Section 7.1

Evaluation questions	Key findings	RAG	Signposting
	<p>However, Eurojust's positive contributions in this regard are hindered by some limitations in its cooperation with partners at the EU level. In particular, this relates to the access to and processing of data of Eurojust members, and IT tools such as the hit/no-hit system. In this context, there has been a notable challenge in the overarching governance of the relationship between Eurojust and Europol – Eurojust considers the 2010 cooperation agreement as 'largely outdated' and is keen to agree a new working arrangement, while Europol appears happy to continue cooperating under the existing framework.</p>		
<p>EQ1.2: To what extent has Eurojust successfully enhanced and supported the coordination and cooperation between national investigating and prosecuting authorities in relation to serious cross-border crime within its competence?</p>	<p>Eurojust has been very effective in providing support to Member States in the investigation and prosecution of cross-border crimes in the areas within its competence; in turn, enhancing the availability and access to such support.</p> <p>National authorities and prosecutors are overall very satisfied with the work and support of Eurojust; this is true of both general perceptions of Eurojust's support to casework, but also perceptions of specific cooperation and coordination tools and mechanisms (e.g. coordination meetings, coordination centres, support to JITs, etc.). For instance, 93% (199 of 215) of respondents to the survey of national practitioners and policymakers reported that the cooperation and coordination support provided by Eurojust to cases was very (68%, 147/215) or moderately (24%, 52/215) effective.</p> <p>Moreover, 90% (222 of 246) of respondents (across both the survey of national practitioners / policymakers and the survey of Eurojust national desks and liaison prosecutors) perceived that Eurojust had achieved its objective of supporting and strengthening coordination and cooperation between national investigating and prosecuting authorities to a great (70%, 173/246) or moderate (20%, 49/246) extent.</p>		<p>Section 4.1.2 Case study 1</p>
<p>EQ1.3: To what extent has Eurojust's functioning been simplified and improved by the implementation of the Eurojust Regulation aimed at strengthening Eurojust's operational work?</p>	<p>In a context where Eurojust's operational work functions effectively, as set out above (see EQ1.2), there are a few areas of challenge.</p> <p>The Regulation is not always clear in specifying roles, in particular in distinguishing between tasks of national desks and administering operational work. In addition, the governance challenges outlined further below (see EQ1.4 and EQ2.2) also have an impact in an operational context – for instance, National Members still reported spending significant time on administrative work (40-50%), especially National Members with additional responsibilities (such as the presidency team), which ultimately reduces the time they can spend on operational work. National Members also highlighted the significant time required to input data into the Eurojust Case Management System (CMS) and the perceived insufficient support for these activities.</p>		<p>Section 4.1.1 Section 4.2.2</p>

Evaluation questions	Key findings	RAG	Signposting
	In addition, there are legacy operationally-focused tools within the EJR that were found to either be used very rarely (e.g. the on-call coordination system), or have vastly different implementations across the Member States (e.g. the European national coordination system).		
EQ1.4: How do Eurojust's governance structure and working practices correspond to the tasks and functions set out in the Eurojust Regulation? To what extent do they contribute to the effective implementation of its tasks?	<p>Technically, the governance and working practices of Eurojust could be said to largely follow the word of the Regulation's provisions. However, there is a lack of legal clarity and binding interpretation on the distinction between operational, managerial, strategic and administrative tasks (as set out in the Regulation). This means that deciding on the division of roles and responsibilities between Eurojust's governance and decision-making bodies falls on the Agency, and specifically the College.</p> <p>In this context, Eurojust has taken insufficient action to amend its governance and decision-making culture, and the related structures, systems and processes, to the intentions of the EJR. In fact, it has generally continued its pre-EJR approach in this regard, with the same challenges persisting.</p> <p>The result is a complex and inefficient governance and decision-making processes, a lack of clear vision and leadership, and challenges related to accountability and conflicts of interest. Ultimately, Eurojust's ongoing practices are not fully aligned with Art. 5 EJR (on the involvement of the College in administrative matters to the extent necessary) and Art. 16 (regarding the Executive Board's responsibility for administrative decisions), while the Agency's organisational structure negatively affects its effectiveness and efficiency, with an overarching sense that more could be achieved with the same resources.</p>		Section 4.1.1
EQ1.5: To what extent does the division of functions and responsibilities among the College, the Executive Board, the Administrative Director, and the President provided for in the Eurojust Regulation enable Eurojust to effectively fulfil its mission?	<p>In line with EQ1.4, the governance challenges stem largely from difficulties in the division of roles and responsibilities between the Executive Board and the College, as well as other key actors. Due to unclear provisions in the Regulation and their interpretation by Eurojust, the responsibilities of the College and the Executive Board were deemed blurred, resulting largely in continued handling of administrative work by the College and duplication of work across both bodies.</p> <p>Key contextual factors influencing this outcome were that the Regulation's provisions were intended to reduce the administrative burden on the College, that the College was the body responsible for making the interpretation decisions, and that there remained a desire across the College as a body (not necessarily reflected in individual discussions with National Members) to retain most elements of its supervisory, executive and operational roles.</p> <p>Beyond these core governance issues, the role and functions of National Desks Assistants are also not clearly defined by the Regulation, leaving a grey zone in the Agency's internal structure.</p>		Section 4.1.1

Evaluation questions	Key findings	RAG	Signposting
EQ1.6: How effective are Eurojust's working practices (in particular, the ENCS, working groups, project-based approaches, JITs, coordination meetings, network meetings, and the relationship between National Members and the administration)?	<p>Most Eurojust working practices are effective and well regarded by the national stakeholders benefiting from them. National practitioners agreed that Eurojust's operational work provides significant value. The Agency is particularly effective in its actions through coordination centres and meetings, as well as by providing support for joint investigation teams (JITs) involving EU Member States and third countries.</p>		Section 4.1.2 Case study 1
	<p>National desks play a vital role as the interface between the different and complex national criminal justice systems, as well as between these systems and Eurojust. A range of challenges and inconsistencies persist at the Agency's interface with these national-level systems for judicial cooperation in criminal matters. For example, longstanding discussions continued regarding what types of cases and support are most relevant to Eurojust's mandate, national desks taking different approaches as to whether to handle simpler cases that could be dealt with through other mechanisms (e.g. the EJNI) versus more complex and/or multilateral cases. There is no clear, common Agency approach in this regard. In this context, room for improvement is also found in the divergent implementation of the Eurojust national coordination system across Member States, as well as the On-Call Coordination System, which is rarely used.</p>		
EQ1.7: To what extent has the approximation of the status and powers of National Members under the Eurojust Regulation contributed to achieving Eurojust's operational objectives?	<p>Several concerns were identified regarding the approximation of the status and powers of National Members. However, these were generally perceived to have little practical impact on the Agency's operations. In fact, 68% (32 of 47) of respondents to the survey of national desk members and liaison prosecutors reported that they have entirely sufficient powers to carry out their daily responsibilities, with a further 30% (14/47) stating that they had somewhat sufficient powers (combined 98%, 46/47).</p> <p>In terms of challenges, there is a lack of clarity amongst stakeholders on whether the National Members derive their powers from the Regulation and/or from national law. Combined with differences across National Members and Deputies regarding whether they have the status of active members of the judiciary in their Member State or not, this could, in theory, risk having divergent powers across National Members. However, in practice, National Members considered that they could derive sufficient powers from the Regulation, such that a lack of standing at the national level did not cause any issues.</p> <p>In addition, many Member States have not amended their national laws following the adoption of the Eurojust Regulation, while it was reported that no Member States had notified the College of additional powers being granted to National Members, as stipulated in Art. 8(2) EJR.</p> <p>As a result, respondents to the survey of national desks and liaison prosecutors generally regarded the situation positively – 50% felt the implementation of the provisions on the approximation of the status and powers of National Members were either fully aligned to the</p>		Section 4.1.1.1

Evaluation questions	Key findings	RAG	Signposting
	EJR (12%, 6 of 48) or aligned to a great extent (37%, 18/48). Nonetheless, a quarter of respondents (13/48) did not feel able to provide an opinion on this, suggesting a limited awareness of the relevant Articles of the Regulation, but also limited impact of these provisions (and any related challenges) on the functioning of the Agency.		
EQ1.8: To what extent does the current framework for cooperation with third countries and international organisations facilitate effective cooperation with international partners?	<p>Cooperation with third countries is overall progressing positively, and Eurojust proves to be generally effective in enhancing and expanding cooperation and coordination within its remit. The volume of operational cooperation has increased significantly over the evaluation period (e.g. 52% increase in the number of cases with third countries between 2019 and 2023), driven by increases in the number of liaison prosecutors from third countries posted at Eurojust (from six in 2019 to 12 in 2024), albeit on the basis of pre-EJR agreements, and increases in the Agency's global network of contact points (from 52 third countries in 2019 to 72 in 2023).</p> <p>One factor limiting the Agency's ability to further drive cooperation with third countries over the evaluation period, with specific implications for the posting of liaison prosecutors at Eurojust and sharing of personal data (see below part of EQ1.8), relates to the fact that the Agency is no longer able to conclude cooperation agreements directly with third countries. While Eurojust has concluded working arrangements with four third countries / regional organisations over the evaluation period, these do not provide for the posting of liaison prosecutors. Moreover, the Commission opened (but did not conclude) negotiations with further third countries over international agreements in the evaluation period; Eurojust provided extensive support to the Commission in this regard.</p> <p>Nonetheless, all categories of stakeholders consulted agreed on the importance of Eurojust's work to deepen cooperation with third countries, and provide valuable opportunities to cooperate and coordinate on criminal justice matters.</p>		Section 4.1.3 Case study 2
	<p>An additional element influencing the effectiveness of the cooperation with third countries concerns data protection. While pre-EJR cooperation agreements with third countries have been instrumental to ensure the effective exchange of operational data, ensuring compliance with EU rules and regulations, third countries might not be ready to take up the EU data protection regime, which can slow down the process.</p> <p>Requirements around data protection can also impact the negotiations and the signature of agreements, as third countries would need to adjust to such a legislative regime which can be deemed to be quite heavy. Also, it would be difficult for Eurojust to verify and bear responsibility for the information received from third countries, which makes the Agency more careful in dealing with this aspect.</p>		

Evaluation questions	Key findings	RAG	Signposting
	Cooperation with international organisations constitutes another integral part of the international work of Eurojust. Across the evaluation period, cooperation with international organisations was targeted in nature, with further cooperation limited by priority setting and the perceived lack of resources. Eurojust primarily serves the national authorities of EU Member States, acting on demand when they see the need for cooperation and coordination. This can limit the engagement with international organisations if not linked to a specific topic or project.		
EQ1.9: How effective has Eurojust's support for the fight against impunity for international crimes in general, and in relation to the situation in Ukraine in particular, been? To what extent has the amendment of the Eurojust Regulation by Regulation (EU) 2022/838 allowed Eurojust to support national authorities more effectively? How effective has the establishment of the International Centre for the Prosecution of the Crime of Aggression against Ukraine (ICPA) been?	<p>The actions of Eurojust have been effective in producing outputs supporting the fight against impunity for international crimes, and in relation to the situation in Ukraine, even though it might be too early to fully assess the results achieved.</p> <p>While some National Members were concerned that Eurojust's new tasks in this space risk diverting efforts from the Agency's core work, the implementation of the ICPA and CIED have progressed positively, Eurojust playing a key role in the core activities, as well as implementing additional activities such as training sessions and workshops in the areas of genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity.</p>		Section 4.1.4

Efficiency (Section 4.2 of the main evaluation report)

Evaluation questions	Key findings	RAG	Signposting
EQ2: To what extent have the objectives of the Eurojust Regulation been achieved at a reasonable cost?	<p>The Agency has delivered significant benefits over the evaluation period, in particular to national practitioners across the Member States (e.g. see EQ1, and EQs 1.1, 1.2 and 1.6). However, in a context where the Agency has seen its budget increase significantly over the evaluation period (53.8% increase in revenue between 2019 and 2023), the Agency has faced a range of challenges related to its organisational structure that negatively affect its efficiency and effectiveness (e.g. see EQ1.4 and 1.5), with an overarching sense that more could be achieved with the same resources.</p> <p>The key area in which difficulties have been identified related to exercising effective leadership, making clear and timely decisions, setting priorities, and ensuring accountability. Beyond the challenges of the division of responsibilities between governance bodies, the collaborative nature of the College is another factor that leads to difficulties in setting priorities, especially in areas that are not casework related. The role of the College working groups as sub-structures of the College, that are not provided for in the Regulation but are key to internal prioritisation and planning (and sometimes</p>		<p>Section 4.2</p> <p>Section 4.1.1</p> <p>Chapter 7</p>

Evaluation questions	Key findings	RAG	Signposting
	<p>misaligned to the processes of Eurojust's administration in this regard), can lead to conflicting priorities being developed.</p> <p>Another area in which the efficiency of Eurojust is hindered by a lack of clarity is in the distinction between simple and complex cases, as well as different working methods and cultures of national desks, that affect the cases on which Eurojust engages. Some desks more proactively inform their colleagues that other channels of cooperation are available, pointing them towards the EJR and encouraging them to use Eurojust only for more complex and/or urgent cases requiring multi-national coordination. This mirrors national systems, which also diverge in terms of the extent to which they consider the need to request support from Eurojust as opposed to other mechanisms.</p>		
EQ2.1: How efficient are Eurojust's working practices?	<p>The Agency's governance structure is perceived as complex and challenging to navigate, with negative effects on processes, communications and working practices.</p> <p>Eurojust's volume of casework, as well as the number of closed cases, have increased more rapidly than staff numbers, indicating improved casework efficiency. However, surveys results, as well as interviews with members of national desks and liaison prosecutors indicate mixed perceptions of Eurojust's resource efficiency, primarily linked to challenges regarding the efficiency of the Agency's governance and decision-making processes. Digital tools have been integrated to improve the efficiency of financial and operational management, but challenges with outdated systems and the need for further digital improvements persist.</p>		<p>Section 4.2.2.1</p> <p>Section 7.1</p>
EQ2.2: Has the distinction between the operational and management functions of the Executive Board and the College helped reduce administrative burden on National Members and increased the overall efficiency of the decision-making process in the agency?	<p>Considering its current roles, responsibilities and composition, the Executive Board has not fulfilled its envisioned role of supporting the College and reducing the administrative burden on National Members. As noted in EQ1.5, there is a significant blurring of responsibilities between the two bodies, often resulting in duplicative efforts, inefficient decision-making and ineffective leadership. The survey of National Members illustrated the divergent views regarding the effectiveness of the EJR in reducing the non-operational burden on College members.</p>		<p>Section 4.2.2.2</p> <p>Section 4.2.2.1</p>
EQ2.3: Are the tasks of the national desks and the administration in operational work defined in an efficient way?	<p>The distinction between the tasks of the national desks and the administration in operational work is not always clearly defined, which can lead to inefficiencies. Several National Members pointed out during interviews that administrative support is not always optimised, as they spend significant time on administrative tasks that could be handled more effectively by dedicated administrative staff. This hinders their ability to focus fully on operational matters. On the other hand, national desks are reluctant to delegate some tasks to the administration (e.g. inputs or changes to the CMS). An added level of complexity raised was the position of National Desks Assistants (NDAs); their role as</p>		<p>Section 4.2.2.2</p> <p>Section 4.2.2.1</p>

Evaluation questions	Key findings	RAG	Signposting
	members of the administration but working exclusively for national desks can lead to structural inefficiencies.		
EQ2.4: To what extent might the same output and results be achieved at lower costs?	<p>Extensive possibilities for future simplification and cost reduction were identified. In particular, addressing the governance, decision-making and leadership challenges outlined previously (see EQ1.4-1.5, EQ2.1-2.2), for instance by ensuring a clear definition of roles and responsibilities as regards administrative tasks, could free up significant time for National Members, as well as members of the administration.</p> <p>In addition, certain elements of operational tasks could be further simplified, for instance, addressing delays in JIT agreements. Further integration of automation and digital tools could also enhance efficiency. Stakeholders surveyed in this support study also noted concerns such as inefficiency of handling last-minute coordination meeting confirmations and associated travel costs. Additionally, some respondents felt that Eurojust handles an excessive number of EJM cases, diverting resources from its core tasks.</p> <p><i>Considering the phrasing of this question, the 'Green' rating refers to a positive assessment of the potential for simplification and cost reduction (i.e. there is strong potential for the same outputs and results to be achieved at lower costs).</i></p>		Section 4.2.2.3
EQ2.5: To what extent has Eurojust sufficiently employed digital tools to move towards more efficient processes?	<p>Since 2019, the Agency has implemented various digital tools across areas such as financial management, human resources, telework (e.g. video conferencing), and procurement. However, the IT infrastructure and digital tools were not deemed to be state of the art by internal Eurojust stakeholders. While the CMS is being replaced by a new system scheduled to go live by the end of 2027, this has negatively affected the Agency's efficiency over the evaluation period. Furthermore, internal Eurojust stakeholders have highlighted the need for further improvements in digital tools that ensure interoperability with other agencies.</p>		Section 4.2.2.1 Section 4.2.2.3

Coherence (Section 4.3 of the main evaluation report)

Evaluation questions	Key findings	RAG	Signposting
EQ4: Internal coherence – How well do the different provisions of the Eurojust Regulation operate together to achieve its objectives?	<p><i>Links with EQs 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6 and 2.3</i></p> <p>The Eurojust Regulation suffers from a lack of consistency and clarity on very specific but important aspects, such as the role of the Executive Board and the cases in which Eurojust shall act as a College, which negatively affect the Agency's internal coherence. In addition, legacy working practices remain, without any mention in the EJR, such as the College working groups.</p>		Internal coherence is closely linked to the organisational aspects covered in

Evaluation questions	Key findings	RAG	Signposting
	They can create redundancies in the system, thus negatively affecting the Agency's internal coherence.		sections 4.1.1 and 4.2.2
EQ5: External coherence – To what extent are the results of Eurojust's work coherent with (current) wider EU policies and priorities in the field of criminal justice (e.g. EU Security Union Strategy 2020-2025, or the EU Roadmap to boost the fight against drug trafficking and organised crime and the related EU Strategy to Tackle Organised Crime 2021-2025 and the EU Drugs Strategy and Action Plan 2021-2025)?	<p>There is strong consistency and coherence between the Agency's work and wider EU policies and priorities in the field of criminal justice, and more specifically, judicial cooperation in criminal matters. This was confirmed through the interviews and the survey with national-level stakeholders. In particular, this is strengthened by the Agency's hosting of practitioner networks, which helps ensure coherence between Eurojust's focus, and wider EU policies and priorities.</p> <p>While the working groups of the College raise challenges regarding the organisation of the Agency, they support Eurojust's contributions to these EU priority topics and help strengthen external coherence, as confirmed through interviews with Eurojust representatives and external stakeholders (e.g. EU IBOAs, national practitioners).</p>		Section 4.3.1
EQ5.1: To what extent is Eurojust's mandate coherent with those of other JHA agencies' and bodies' (revised) mandates and the evolving security architecture of the EU? To what extent are its tasks clearly defined, leaving neither overlaps nor gaps, but building a coherent system? How well does the existing legal framework, including existing instruments such as cooperation arrangements, clarify the cooperation? To what extent is there a coherent approach to the use of IT systems and information sharing?	<p>Generally good legal coherence between the mandates of Eurojust and other EU JHA agencies, bodies and offices, judicial cooperation networks, OLAF, and EPPO. The Eurojust Regulation includes specific articles to better define these relationships and avoid duplications while ensuring complementarities and synergies. Working arrangements were concluded over the evaluation period with the EPPO and OLAF, defining new frameworks for cooperation. Working arrangements are also in place with Frontex, FRA, EU-LISA, and the EMCDDA (now the EUDA) to further ensure their complementarity. The coherence ensured by this legal framework was confirmed by stakeholders consulted, who noted the distinct mandate, clear distribution of tasks, and largely positive cooperation between Eurojust, JHA agencies, bodies, networks, OLAF and the EPPO.</p> <p>However, this legal coherence has not precluded practical challenges in cooperation and certain concerns were identified – some stakeholders suggested that the cooperation with the EPPO could diminish in future as Eurojust may become less relevant to the EPPO's needs. The relationship with Europol also faced a range of challenges, as considered in a dedicated evaluation question below (EQ5.2).</p>		Section 4.3.2
EQ5.2: The mandate of the European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Cooperation (Europol) has changed twice since its entry into force in 2017, significantly strengthening its mandate. To what extent is the extended mandate of Europol reflected in the Eurojust	<p>Good legal coherence between the mandates of Eurojust and Europol. While some overlaps exist in the Regulations in terms of shared goal (i.e. combatting cross-border crime), the different agencies have complementary means of achieving that goal (e.g. Europol's mandate focuses on police investigations, while Eurojust's mandate focuses on judicial actions). The MoU with Eurojust further strengthened this coherence, particularly regarding the financing of joint investigation teams (JITs).</p> <p>However, several stakeholders reported overlaps/duplications between Eurojust and Europol, related to the practical implementation of their respective mandates, such as issues of (lack of)</p>		Section 4.3.2

Evaluation questions	Key findings	RAG	Signposting
Regulation, especially when it comes to judicial follow-up?	information sharing on the hit/no hit system, while Eurojust stakeholders consider the working agreement governing the Agency's relationship with Europol to be largely outdated (working agreement from 2010). Eurojust's significant efforts over the evaluation period to redefine its relationship with Europol and agree an updated framework for cooperation have been unsuccessful, albeit due to limited interest from Europol.		
EQ5.3: To what extent is Eurojust's mandate coherent with the role and tasks of the judicial cooperation networks and their secretariats, which Eurojust hosts as specified in the Eurojust Regulation (e.g. the European Judicial Network and the Joint Investigation Teams Network)?	<p>The Eurojust Regulation includes specific articles to better define its relationship with the EJN, the JIJs network and the Genocide network (Art. 48). In accordance with this provision, the secretariats of these networks function as separate units within Eurojust, and the coordination of those secretariats, covered by Article 48(2) of the Eurojust Regulation, is ensured by Eurojust Operations Department. The networks were considered by stakeholders consulted as one of the most closely related actors to Eurojust. For example, most survey respondents agreed or strongly agreed that Eurojust's work is coherent with the roles and tasks of the judicial cooperation networks and their secretariats (50% of national practitioner and policymakers, and 66% of national desks and third country liaison prosecutors).</p> <p>While the mandates largely appear to be consistent and complementary, practical challenges exist in defining the types of case requests that should be allocated to Eurojust versus the EJN. However, as noted in EQ1.6, these challenges primarily stem from the lack of a clear, common approach to the allocation of cases across Eurojust and, by extension, the Member State competent authorities, rather than incoherence within the mandates of the different entities and the work of the networks.</p>		Section 4.3.2
	Beyond the core networks named in Article 48, Eurojust supports a range of practitioner networks that are not provided for in the EJR, including the European Judicial Cybercrime Network, the Consultative Forum and the Focus Group on Migrant Smuggling, all of which are based on pre-EJR agreements. While many Eurojust and national stakeholders perceived these additional networks to be useful, some National Members highlighted that the growing number of practitioner networks risked diverting resources and focus from Eurojust's core activities. However, the mandates largely appear to be consistent and complementary.		
EQ5.4: To what extent are the mandate and activities of Eurojust coherent with those of other relevant international actors (including third countries)? How well does the Eurojust Regulation	In line with its legal framework ¹³⁶ and international cooperation strategy, Eurojust has engaged with International Organisations (IOs) to ensure that its activities are implemented in a way that is coherent and complementary to those of relevant IOs working toward similar goals. The nature of the cooperation between Eurojust and IOs varies depending on the IOs but has mainly focused on capacity building activities. As evidenced through the desk research and interviews, synergies related to operational coordination and information sharing are increasingly being sought and		Section 4.3.3 Case study 2

¹³⁶ Eurojust's Regulation empowers the Agency to establish and maintain cooperation with IOs in so far as necessary for the performance of its tasks (Article 47) in accordance with its cooperation strategy (Article 15 and 52)

Evaluation questions	Key findings	RAG	Signposting
facilitate appropriate cooperation with such actors?	<p>developed where relevant to Eurojust's operational needs (e.g. with the ICC); but this was also limited over the evaluation period by the extent of operational coordination possible under the EJR (e.g. no possibility of IO access to the Eurojust CMS), as well as the Agency's priority setting and resourcing, as discussed under effectiveness (EQ1.8).</p> <p>Eurojust also cooperates with third countries in various ways, including through its cooperation agreements, working arrangements, posting of liaison prosecutors and its global network of contact points and correspondents. Through this work, Eurojust ensures coherence by coordinating the efforts across Member States and third countries. For instance, Eurojust has a role in preventing duplication of efforts, when preventing and resolving conflicts of jurisdiction. None of the stakeholders interviewed, including several third country liaison prosecutors and other representatives, identified any overlaps or duplications in the work of Eurojust and third countries. However, some interviewees noted challenges to internal coherence in this context, in relation to reported discrepancies between the Eurojust strategy on cooperation with international partners and the actions taken in practice.</p>		
EQ5.5: To what extent is Eurojust's data protection regime aligned with Regulation (EU) 2018/1725 and other relevant instruments of the EU data protection acquis?	<p>The Agency's data protection regime is generally well aligned with the EU data protection acquis. Eurojust introduced Data Protection Rules (DPR) that were supplemented by targeted activities to ensure the development and implementation of a robust system in practice. The EDPS provided positive assessments and the Eurojust administration reported a clear professionalisation and increasing understanding of the work since the entry into force of the Eurojust DPR – confirmed through desk research and interviews.</p> <p>Despite this alignment, a number of challenges persist, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Perceived slow pace at which the EDPS operates and provides feedback on specific operation issues. ii. Tensions in the Agency's operational work. Some National Members consider that waiting for the College to adopt a decision from the DPO even in cases where the data has already been shared by their central national authority is cumbersome. However, it is this process (which in practice is relatively rapid) that aligns with the existing EU data protection framework. iii. Eurojust considers that the EJR does not provide clear legal ground for processing publicly available sources of data. As a result, Eurojust does not use open-source data for operational matters and such data is not stored in Eurojust databases. 		<p>Section 3.1.5</p> <p>Section 4.1.2.4</p> <p>Case study 2</p>

EU added value (Chapter 5 of the main evaluation report)

Evaluation questions	Key findings	RAG	Signposting
<p>EQ6: To what extent could the identified changes/results/impacts have been achieved without Eurojust and/or the EJR?</p>	<p>The Eurojust Regulation and its implementation by Eurojust was found to provide significant EU added value, with national practitioners reporting that, without Eurojust, certain cases would be impossible to investigate and prosecute, whilst the Agency generally made judicial cooperation in criminal matters easier and more effective.</p> <p>Eurojust's success in addressing the needs of investigating and prosecuting authorities in the Member States is linked to its position as part of a wider EU ecosystem of judicial cooperation in criminal matters. Interviews with practitioners demonstrated how Eurojust and the EJR together have been instrumental in increasing the use of judicial cooperation instruments, in particular EIOs and EAWs, by national prosecutors and investigative judges.</p> <p>While there are internal debates as to the relative value of processing different cases through Eurojust or via other means (e.g. EJR), national prosecuting and investigating authorities see strong synergies between Eurojust's ability to support the investigation and prosecution of complex cases and the EJR tools to address simpler or less urgent cases. As such, the current set up adds value to national practitioners, even though it may not be the most efficient from the Agency's perspective.</p>		Section 5
<p>EQ6.1: Which, if any, objectives of the policy might have been achieved sufficiently by the Member States acting alone (if so, how)?</p>	<p>The objective of Eurojust is to "support and strengthen coordination and cooperation between national investigating and prosecuting authorities". The question of whether Member States would be able to achieve this objective without the existence of the Agency is therefore easy to answer. By the mere fact it exists and functions, Eurojust provides value beyond what Member States could achieve alone (interviews, survey, focus groups). While some Member States do have relatively well-developed mechanisms for judicial cooperation in criminal matters besides Eurojust, they are often not able to be as effective as Eurojust, particularly for complex crimes spanning multiple Member States and/or third countries. In addition, many Member States do not have extensive networks for judicial cooperation in criminal matters, or the resources to effectively conduct such cooperation, making Eurojust's work even more valuable.</p>		Section 5
<p>EQ6.2: To what extent did the resulting benefits outweigh any loss of (e.g. competence or anything else) in participating Member States?</p>	<p>The introduction of the Eurojust Regulation did not lead to any loss in competence for Member States. The only costs (beyond the EU budget) associated with the Agency is the remuneration of personnel in the Agency who would otherwise have been employed at the national level, arguably in a less effective role with regard to cross-border judicial cooperation in criminal matters (interviews).</p>		Section 5
<p>EQ6.3: What could reasonably have been achieved (particularly in terms of effectiveness and efficiency) by Member States acting at national and/or regional levels?</p>	<p>Without the existence of Eurojust, the Member States would have to rely on bilateral agreements or collaborate through the EJR. The effectiveness of the EJR is however increased by it being hosted by Eurojust and by EJR contact points and national contact points being integrated in the ENCS of Member States. In countries where this is the case, cooperation and coordination appear to be very strong. Situations in which cooperation and coordination does exist in the absence of Eurojust include cases involving two Member States sharing a border. At the bilateral level, there are cases where cooperation</p>		Section 5

Evaluation questions	Key findings	RAG	Signposting
	between Member States stems from their geographical or cultural proximity. Examples include cross-border cooperation in border regions, where the law enforcement and judicial authorities have cooperated for many years and can deal with cases without the support of Eurojust (interviews, focus groups).		

Relevance (Chapter 6 of the main evaluation report)

Evaluation questions	Key findings	RAG	Signposting
EQ3: How well do the objectives of the Eurojust Regulation still correspond to the needs within the EU and among the stakeholders?	The Agency's core activities are very relevant to investigating and prosecuting authorities in Member States involved in cross-border cases. With the increase in the number of cases, as well as developments in the types of crime with a cross-border dimension that are faced by national prosecutors and investigative judges, the relevance of the Agency's operational work is also increasing. Eurojust has kept abreast of developments in criminal activities, and its ability to facilitate the cooperation of experts from affected Member States to support wider investigations (such as for the EncroChat case) is highly relevant to the needs of Member States that lack the capacity or expertise to prosecute specific types of crime.		Section 6
EQ3.1: How well has Eurojust been able to respond to the needs of its stakeholders?	National investigating and prosecuting authorities in Member States <u>Casework:</u> The Agency has been able to respond very well to the needs of its key stakeholders (investigating and prosecuting authorities in the Member States – 91.4% of survey respondents). This was confirmed through interviews and focus groups with national practitioners. This is due to the practical and logistical support the Agency provides to cases.		Section 6.1
	National investigating and prosecuting authorities in Member States <u>Other activities:</u> Interviews with national practitioners revealed that they value some of the Agency's outputs (in particular case law analysis) but are more reserved about the relevance of other products.		Section 6.1
	EU IBOAs Eurojust can provide insight from a practical and operational perspective to the Commission, Council and Parliament, for instance to the negotiation of international agreements (interviews). However, this stakeholder group reported mixed views on the value of formal published reports; while some found them to be of less value (interviews), staff from the Council and the European Parliament valued the Agency's contribution in providing practical feedback based on existing cases and difficulties experienced by practitioners. The lack of a liaison person over the evaluation period has had a negative impact on the Agency's visibility and impact in EU decision-making processes.		Section 6.2 Section 4.3.2

Evaluation questions	Key findings	RAG	Signposting
	<p>National investigating and prosecuting authorities in third countries</p> <p>Third country liaison prosecutors stated that their involvement with Eurojust allowed them and their colleagues to prosecute cases they would not have been able to pursue without the Agency. One caveat is their struggle to get their colleagues in their home authority to know the Agency and make use of it more regularly. However, the sample could be considered as biased as the evaluation only consulted LPs and magistrates that have already cooperated with the Agency.</p>		Section 6.3
EQ3.2: To what extent are these needs evolving or likely to evolve in future, taking also into account the evolution of cross-border criminality in the EU and its overall security architecture? What types of action might need to be considered to address such changes and new trends?	The needs of national investigating and prosecuting authorities are evolving; important trends are the increase in cross-border cases, and type of crime with an inherent cross-border dimension. Criminal networks increasingly benefit from technology (either to communicate, transfer proceeds of crime or create new type of crime). As such, the role the Agency plays in supporting the investigation and prosecution of cross-border crimes continues being relevant (interviews, desk research).		Section 6.1
EQ3.3: Are the governance system and decision-making processes established by the Eurojust Regulation and internal rules appropriate to allow Eurojust to support its stakeholders as needed?	<p><i>Links to EQs 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6 and Efficiency questions under EQ2.</i></p> <p>The current governance system and internal rules do allow the Agency to support its stakeholders, in particular national investigating and prosecuting authorities (survey). However, issues in the decision-making process (slow decision-making process, lack of clear leadership) does affect the effectiveness and efficiency of the decision-making process, affecting the overall relevance of the Agency.</p>		Section 4.1.1
EQ3.4: Eurojust's role on the international plane has significantly changed due to continued globalisation, a steep increase in cases involving third countries, and the application of the principle of universal jurisdiction. To what extent is Eurojust's role in the international context still adequate?	<p><i>Links to EQ 1.8, 1.9, EQ 3.5, 3.6 and EQ 5.4</i></p> <p>Eurojust has expanded its cooperation with third countries and international organisations over the evaluation period (see EQ1.8-1.9). The relevance of the Agency's work with third countries is debated (interviews, surveys); Member States that have no/limited capacity to develop working arrangements with third countries are more supportive (and rely more heavily on) the Agency's work in this field, while Member States that have more established systems for international cooperation in criminal matters reported that the Agency's activities could better complement their ongoing national activities (focus groups). Moreover, there are disagreements on the geographical areas and third countries with which the Agency should focus its collaboration efforts (interviews).</p>		Section 6.3 Section 4.1.4 Section 4.3.3
EQ3.5: How well does the system set-up in the Eurojust Regulation for cooperation on the international level correspond to actual needs, especially	<p><i>Links to EQ 1.8, 1.9, EG 3.4, 3.6 and EQ 5.4</i></p> <p>While there is an increasing demand for collaboration with third countries (based on the increasing number of cases involving third countries, as well as the increasing development of systems and structures for</p>		Section 6.3 Section 4.1.4

Evaluation questions	Key findings	RAG	Signposting
cooperation with third countries and international organisations?	<p>international cooperation), the needs of Member States vary, as noted above (see EQ3.4) (desk research, interviews).</p> <p>Overall, the system set-up in the Eurojust Regulation largely corresponds to the needs of the EU, particularly for cooperation with third countries, and the work of the Agency with third countries is relevant and beneficial. In particular, liaison prosecutors are seen as particularly relevant (especially those representing countries such as the UK, Switzerland, and those in the western Balkans). Additional needs do exist but appear to be fragmented on the basis of the cases individual investigating and prosecuting authorities work on (e.g. based on factors such as the types of crimes, countries involved, etc.). However, as noted above (see EQ1.8), challenges exist in the implementation of the system set out in the Eurojust Regulation; for instance, considering the consistency between the strategy for international cooperation and the actions taken by Eurojust in practice (i.e. the specific countries targeted for missions, cooperation activities and working arrangements), as well as the amended role of Eurojust in negotiating and concluding international agreements.</p>		Section 4.3.3
EQ3.6: To what extent does Eurojust's work supporting the investigation and prosecution of international crimes contribute in a complementary way to the commitment to fight impunity?	<p><i>Links to EQ 1.9</i></p> <p>The creation of CISED, while initially developed to preserve, analyse and store evidence of core international crimes (genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes) as a result of the Russian war of aggression against Ukraine, can be used in other geographical areas (interviews)</p>		Section 6.3 Section 4.1.4
EQ3.7: How well adapted is Eurojust's intervention to the technological progress that has appeared since its introduction, e.g. looking at the area of cybercrime and electronic evidence?	<p>National investigating and prosecuting authorities reported an increase in crimes facilitated by technologies, including online fraud, cybercrimes, use of encrypted messaging services etc. (desk research, interview, survey). The Agency's support to cooperation and collaboration has helped with the pooling of resources, sharing of expertise, and ultimately to coordinate responses (e.g. in the SkyECC and EncroChat cases). The Agency's role in facilitating the electronic storage and exchange of evidence has been an important activity. However, the CMS is out of date and while some functionalities of the new CMS are on course to go live in 2025, its full implementation is delayed, which has a negative effect on the effectiveness of these tools.</p>		Section 6.4

Evaluation Matrix

The below tables present the **evaluation matrix**. In line with Tool #46 (Designing the Evaluation) of the BR toolbox, the matrix details:

- i) the **core evaluation questions** (highlighted in grey) and related **sub-questions for all evaluation criteria, covering effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, coherence and EU added value**.
- ii) the **criteria against which evidence-based judgements will be made** on each question/sub-question (i.e. what information do we need to know to make a judgement on the evaluation question).
- iii) **examples of qualitative and quantitative indicators** that will inform the responses to the evaluation questions.
- iv) the **data sources and research methods** proposed to capture the data necessary to fill the indicators and provide information for the judgement criteria.

Effectiveness

Evaluation questions	Judgement criteria	Examples of indicators	Data sources / research methods
Effectiveness			
EQ1: To what extent has progress been made towards achieving the Eurojust Regulation's objectives, considering the expectations and procedures it included?	<p>The general objective of the Eurojust Regulation, the resulting activities/working practices and the expected effects / causal mechanisms.</p> <p>The specific and activity-based objectives outlined in the Eurojust Multi-Annual Strategies and the Single Programming Documents, the resulting activities/working practices and the expected effects / causal mechanisms.</p> <p>The achievements of the Eurojust Regulation – i.e. positive effects (outputs, results, impacts) – and related explanatory factors (i.e. why and how, causal mechanisms, attribution).</p> <p>The challenges / negative effects of the Eurojust Regulation and related explanatory factors.</p> <p>Effects and challenges in the years prior to 2019, where relevant.</p> <p>Comparison of the balance of achievements / challenges against the objectives and effects baseline (e.g. expected effects, pre-Regulation effects).</p>	<p>Number and type of programming documents produced</p> <p>All output and result KPIs listed in Eurojust MAS and SPD/AWP, by objective (e.g. casework, cooperation, digitalisation, strategic work, organisational capabilities and efficiency) and action area: e.g.</p> <p>Number of cases supported, disaggregated by key variables including type of support (CMs, CCs/action days, JITs), year, crime type, initiating Member States participating Member States, initiating third countries, participating third countries, involvement of EU JHA partners, involvement of international organisations.</p> <p>Number of complex cases.</p> <p>Ratio of multilateral vs bilateral cases.</p> <p>Number of ICF principles present and functioning.</p> <p>Satisfaction level of the Eurojust support to coordination meetings.</p> <p>Number of Eurojust – Networks joint products.</p>	<p>Document review: Eurojust programming documents, legal documents and research outputs (e.g. casework insight reports), academic commentary and other studies on the functioning of Eurojust, etc.</p> <p>Targeted consultations: Interviews with all internal and external stakeholders; online surveys.</p> <p>Direct observation.</p> <p>Cross-country focus groups with national level practitioners</p> <p>Case studies.</p> <p>Implementation check and impact analysis.</p>

Evaluation questions	Judgement criteria	Examples of indicators	Data sources / research methods
		<p>Number of rules and policies adopted, implemented and amended, by area.</p> <p>Number of cooperation agreements / working arrangements with EU JHA agencies, third countries and international organisations.</p> <p>Number of prosecutions resulting from Eurojust cases.</p> <p>Value of money/goods seized and confiscated in Eurojust cases.</p> <p>etc.</p> <p>Stakeholder perceptions on issues such as: quality of support provided by Eurojust to JITs; the nature and impact of internal and external factors influencing the achievement of effects; level of expertise within Eurojust; utility of cooperation agreements / working arrangements.</p> <p>Level of general awareness and use of tools for judicial cooperation in criminal matters, by type (e.g. EAW, EIO, EPO, etc.)</p>	
<p>EQ1.1: To what extent have Eurojust's activities contributed to achieving overall EU policy objectives and priorities (i.e. to fight serious cross-border crime in the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice)?</p>	<p>Overall EU policy objectives and priorities. Eurojust activities that can/aim to have an effect on overall EU policy objectives and priorities, and their expected effects / causal mechanisms.</p> <p>Assessment of the wider context of interventions that aim to affect overall EU policy objectives and priorities (e.g. work of other agencies).</p> <p>The achievements of Eurojust activities – i.e. positive effects (outputs, results, impacts) – with regard to overall EU policy objectives and priorities and related explanatory factors (i.e. why and how, causal mechanisms, attribution).</p> <p>The challenges / negative effects of Eurojust activities with regard to overall EU policy objectives and priorities, and related explanatory factors.</p>	<p>As above, indicators from the MAS, SPD/AWPs related to the achievement of overall EU policy objectives and priorities, e.g. number and type of actions taken to fight serious cross-border crime, by type of action and type of crime.</p> <p>Impact indicators related to the scale and magnitude of serious cross-border crime, by type: e.g. number of cybercrime cases in the EU.</p> <p>Stakeholder perceptions on the level of Eurojust's contribution to such high-level objectives; and on other contributing factors.</p>	<p>Document review: Eurojust programming documents and research outputs (e.g. casework insight reports), EU policy documents and reporting.</p> <p>Targeted consultations: Interviews with all internal and external stakeholders, in particular national-level practitioners; online surveys.</p> <p>Cross-country focus groups with national level practitioners</p> <p>Case studies.</p> <p>Implementation check and impact analysis.</p>

Evaluation questions	Judgement criteria	Examples of indicators	Data sources / research methods
	Effects and challenges in the years prior to the Regulation, where relevant. Comparison of the balance of achievements / challenges against the overall EU policy objectives / priorities and effects baseline.		
EQ1.2: To what extent has Eurojust successfully enhanced and supported the coordination and cooperation between national investigating and prosecuting authorities in relation to serious cross-border crime within its competence?	<p>Eurojust activities that can/aim to contribute to enhancing and supporting the coordination and cooperation between national investigating and prosecuting authorities, and their expected effects / causal mechanisms.</p> <p>Assessment of the wider context in which Eurojust activities were implemented.</p> <p>The achievements / positive effects related to this objective and explanatory factors.</p> <p>The challenges / negative effects related to this objective and explanatory factors.</p> <p>Effects and challenges in the years prior to the Regulation, where relevant.</p> <p>Comparison of the balance of achievements / challenges against this objective and the effects baseline.</p>	<p>Eurojust KPIs related to coordination and cooperation activities, including on:</p> <p>Casework (e.g. number of cases, as above, satisfaction level of Eurojust support, etc.)</p> <p>Cooperation (e.g. number of cases with JHA partners, third countries, international organisations, successful delivery of externally funded projects).</p> <p>Stakeholder perceptions on the extent to which and how Eurojust has enhanced and supported coordination and cooperation, any external factors / challenges, any differences by Member State or by type of crime or action.</p>	<p>Document review: Eurojust programming documents, legal documents and research outputs (e.g. casework insight reports), academic commentary and other studies on the functioning and impact of Eurojust, etc.</p> <p>Targeted consultations: Interviews with all internal and external stakeholders; online surveys.</p> <p>Cross-country focus groups with national level practitioners</p> <p>Case studies.</p> <p>Implementation check and impact analysis.</p>
EQ1.3: To what extent has Eurojust's functioning been simplified and improved by the implementation of the Eurojust Regulation aimed at strengthening Eurojust's operational work?	<p>Assessment of simplification and improvements to the functioning of Eurojust introduced by the Regulation, any changes over the implementation period, and their expected effects / causal mechanisms.</p> <p>Assessment of alignment of the Eurojust Regulation with the common approach on decentralised agencies, and resulting effects on functioning and operational work.</p> <p>The achievements of the Eurojust Regulation regarding the simplification and improvement of Eurojust's functioning, and the secondary effects on operational work.</p>	<p>Number and type of simplification and improvement actions implemented through the EJR, and since December 2019.</p> <p>Degree of alignment between the EJR and the implemented actions.</p> <p>Stakeholder perceptions on the impact of simplification and improvement actions on Eurojust's operational work, influencing factors/challenges and their impact.</p> <p>KPIs on Eurojust's operational effects, as detailed above.</p>	<p>Document review: Eurojust programming documents, legal documents and research outputs (e.g. casework insight reports), academic commentary and other studies on the functioning of Eurojust, etc.</p> <p>Targeted consultations: Interviews with all internal stakeholders; online surveys.</p> <p>Case studies (e.g. on digitalisation, efficiency)</p> <p>Implementation check and impact analysis.</p>

Evaluation questions	Judgement criteria	Examples of indicators	Data sources / research methods
	<p>The challenges related to the changes to Eurojust's functioning, and the secondary effects on operational work.</p> <p>Assessment of the explanatory factors and wider context affecting the simplification and improvement of Eurojust's functioning.</p> <p>Comparison of the balance of achievements / challenges resulting from the simplification and improvement of Eurojust's functioning against the effects baseline.</p>		
<p>EQ1.4: How do Eurojust's governance structure and working practices correspond to the tasks and functions set out in the Eurojust Regulation? To what extent do they contribute to the effective implementation of its tasks?</p>	<p>The structure, tasks and functions of the different components of Eurojust as set out in the Eurojust Regulation (Chapter II), changes compared to the pre-Regulation situation and their expected effects.</p> <p>Assessment of the practical implementation of the governance structure and working practices, and changes over the implementation period.</p> <p>Comparison of the regulatory and practical situations.</p> <p>Comparison of (legislative and practical) changes to the governance structure and working practices against: (i) the pre-Regulation situation (baseline); (ii) the common approach; and (iii) the operation of other EU JHA agencies.</p> <p>The contribution of Eurojust's governance structure and working practices to the implementation of its activities and, ultimately, their effects (including attribution and causal mechanisms).</p> <p>Assessment of explanatory factors and wider context affecting the implementation of Eurojust activities and the related effects.</p>	<p>Degree of alignment between the EJR and the implemented governance structure and working practices.</p> <p>Output and result KPIs listed in Eurojust MAS and SPD/AWP, by objective (e.g. casework, cooperation, digitalisation, strategic work, organisational capabilities and efficiency) and action area, as detailed above.</p> <p>Stakeholder perceptions on the role of the governance structure and working practices in ensuring the implementation of Eurojust's tasks.</p>	<p>Document review: Eurojust programming documents, legal documents and research outputs (e.g. casework insight reports), academic commentary and other studies on the functioning of Eurojust, etc.</p> <p>Targeted consultations: Interviews with all internal stakeholders; online survey with national members.</p> <p>Direct observation.</p> <p>Implementation check and impact analysis.</p>

Evaluation questions	Judgement criteria	Examples of indicators	Data sources / research methods
	Comparison of the effects achieved against the expected effects (baseline).		
EQ1.5: To what extent does the division of functions and responsibilities among the College, the Executive Board, the Administrative Director, and the President provided for in the Eurojust Regulation enable Eurojust to effectively fulfil its mission?	<p>Assessment of the division of functions and responsibilities in the Regulation and in practice (including any changes over the implementation period), changes compared to the pre-Regulation situation and their expected effects.</p> <p>Comparison of (legislative and practical) changes in the division of functions and responsibilities against: (i) the pre-Regulation situation (baseline); (ii) the common approach; and (iii) other EU JHA agencies.</p> <p>The effects of the division of functions and responsibilities on the ability of Eurojust to achieve its objectives (including attribution and causal mechanisms).</p> <p>Assessment of explanatory factors and wider context affecting the division of functions / responsibilities and their effects.</p> <p>Comparison of the effects achieved against the expected effects (baseline).</p>	<p>Degree of alignment between the EJR and the implemented division of functions and responsibilities.</p> <p>Output and result KPIs listed in Eurojust MAS and SPD/AWP, by objective (e.g. casework, cooperation, digitalisation, strategic work, organisational capabilities and efficiency) and action area, as detailed above.</p> <p>Stakeholder perceptions on the role of the different components of Eurojust's structure in its effectiveness.</p>	<p>Document review: Eurojust programming documents, legal documents and research outputs (e.g. casework insight reports), academic commentary and other studies on the functioning of Eurojust, etc.</p> <p>Targeted consultations: Interviews with all internal and external stakeholders; online surveys.</p> <p>Direct observation.</p> <p>Implementation check and impact analysis.</p>
EQ1.6: How effective are Eurojust's working practices (in particular, the ENCS, working groups, project-based approaches, JITs, coordination meetings, network meetings, and the relationship between national members and the administration)?	<p>The working practices across the different Eurojust activities, as per the Regulation and in practice (including any changes over the implementation period), and their expected effects.</p> <p>Comparison of the Regulatory and practical situations.</p> <p>Comparison of (legislative and practical) changes to the working practices against the pre-Regulation situation.</p> <p>The contribution of Eurojust's working practices to achieving the effects of the Eurojust Regulation, including attribution and causal mechanisms.</p>	<p>Output and result KPIs listed in Eurojust MAS and SPD/AWP, by objective (e.g. casework, cooperation, digitalisation, strategic work, organisational capabilities and efficiency) and action area, as detailed above.</p> <p>Stakeholder perceptions on the effectiveness of each 'working practice', as well as the success factors, challenges and other influencing factors.</p>	<p>Document review: Eurojust programming documents, legal documents and research outputs (e.g. casework insight reports), academic commentary and other studies on the functioning of Eurojust, etc.</p> <p>Targeted consultations: Interviews with all internal and external stakeholders; online surveys.</p> <p>Cross-country focus groups with national level practitioners</p> <p>Case studies.</p> <p>Implementation check and impact analysis.</p>

Evaluation questions	Judgement criteria	Examples of indicators	Data sources / research methods
	<p>The challenges associated with Eurojust's working practices and their influence on the achievements of the Regulation, including attribution and causal mechanisms.</p> <p>Assessment of the explanatory factors and wider context influencing the effectiveness of Eurojust's working practices.</p> <p>Comparison of the balance of contributions / challenges resulting from Eurojust's working practices against their expected effects.</p>		
<p>EQ1.7: To what extent has the approximation of the status and powers of National Members under the Eurojust Regulation contributed to achieving Eurojust's operational objectives?</p>	<p>The provisions on the status and powers of National Members within the Eurojust Regulation (i.e. Chapter II, Section II), changes compared to the pre-Regulation situation, and expected effects (including causal mechanisms).</p> <p>Assessment of the practical implementation of the status and powers of National Members (e.g. amendments to Member State national law to ensure proper implementation of the Eurojust Regulation), including the level of approximation, challenges.</p> <p>The operational objectives of Eurojust.</p> <p>The contribution and causal mechanisms of the approximation of the status and powers of National Members to the implementation of its operational tasks and, ultimately, to the achievement of the operational objectives.</p> <p>Assessment of explanatory factors and wider context influencing the approximation of the status and powers of National Members and the causal mechanisms.</p> <p>Comparison of the effects achieved against the expected effects (baseline).</p>	<p>Degree of alignment between the Member State provisions and the EJR: e.g. number of Member States who have implemented all provisions clearly and properly.</p> <p>Output and result KPIs listed in Eurojust MAS and SPD/AWP, by objective (e.g. casework, cooperation, digitalisation, strategic work, organisational capabilities and efficiency) and action area, as detailed above.</p> <p>Stakeholder perceptions on the role of the approximation of the status and powers of national members in achieving Eurojust's operational objectives, as well as the influence of other factors, and challenges faced.</p>	<p>Document review: Eurojust programming documents, legal documents and research outputs (e.g. casework insight reports), academic commentary and other studies on the functioning of Eurojust, etc.</p> <p>Targeted consultations: Interviews with all internal and external stakeholders; online surveys.</p> <p>Cross-country focus groups with national level practitioners</p> <p>Implementation check and impact analysis, primarily review of national laws.</p>

Evaluation questions	Judgement criteria	Examples of indicators	Data sources / research methods
<p>EQ1.8: To what extent does the current framework for cooperation with third countries and international organisations facilitate effective cooperation with international partners?</p>	<p>The provisions on international cooperation within the Regulation (Chapter V, Section III), changes compared to the pre-Regulation situation and expected effects (including causal mechanisms).</p> <p>Assessment of the practical implementation of the provisions, including, e.g.: the Eurojust strategy for cooperation with third countries and international organisations, expected results, and performance indicators; and differences in international commitments by Member State and their practical implications.</p> <p>The achievements of Eurojust activities with regard to the objectives on international cooperation stemming from the Eurojust Regulation and strategy.</p> <p>The challenges / negative effects of Eurojust activities with regard to the objectives on international cooperation.</p> <p>Assessment of explanatory factors and wider context affecting the implementation of Eurojust activities on international cooperation and the related effects.</p> <p>Comparison of the effects achieved against: (i) the expected effects; (ii) the pre-Regulation situation; and (iii) the activities of other JHA agencies.</p>	<p>Contact and information exchange with competent international authorities by National Members, as per Art. 8(c) – number, by type of contact / information exchanged, by crime type, by Member State, by international authority.</p> <p>Number of relevant Member State international commitments.</p> <p>Number of Eurojust cooperation agreements with third countries / international organisations, by type of entity, type of agreement, timeframe.</p> <p>Differences between the form and content of cooperation agreements agreed pre- and post-Eurojust Regulation.</p> <p>Number of Eurojust contact points designated in third countries, by country, region and reason.</p> <p>Number of liaison magistrates posted to third countries, by country, region and reason.</p> <p>Number of requests for judicial cooperation to and from third countries, by type of request, crime type, country, region and reason.</p>	<p>Document review: Eurojust programming documents, legal documents and research outputs (e.g. casework insight reports), academic commentary and other studies on the functioning of Eurojust, etc.</p> <p>Targeted consultations: Interviews with all internal and external stakeholders; online surveys.</p> <p>Case studies.</p> <p>Implementation check and impact analysis.</p>
<p>EQ1.9: How effective has Eurojust's support for the fight against impunity for international crimes in general, and in relation to the situation in Ukraine in particular, been? To what extent has the amendment of the Eurojust Regulation by Regulation (EU) 2022/838 allowed Eurojust to support national authorities more effectively?</p>	<p>The strategy, objectives, activities and expected effects (and causal mechanisms) stemming from Eurojust's support for the fight against impunity for international crimes, including through Regulation (EU) 2022/838 and the establishment of the International Centre for the</p>	<p>Output and result KPIs listed in Eurojust MAS and SPD/AWP, by objective and action area, as detailed above.</p> <p>Stakeholder perceptions on the role of Eurojust in tackling core international crimes and its impact on the Agency's effectiveness; and other relevant factors, challenges, success factors.</p>	<p>Document review: Eurojust programming documents, CIED data, legal documents and research outputs (e.g. casework insight reports), academic commentary and other studies on the functioning of Eurojust, etc.</p> <p>Targeted consultations: Interviews with all internal and external stakeholders; online surveys.</p> <p>Implementation check and impact analysis.</p>

Evaluation questions	Judgement criteria	Examples of indicators	Data sources / research methods
How effective has the establishment of the International Centre for the Prosecution of the Crime of Aggression against Ukraine (ICPA) been?	<p>Prosecution of the Crime of Aggression against Ukraine (ICPA).</p> <p>The achievements and challenges / negative effects of these developments.</p> <p>Assessment of the explanatory factors and wider context influencing these activities.</p> <p>The implications of this work for other Eurojust activities.</p>	Indicators collected within the Core International Crimes Evidence Database (CICED).	

Efficiency

Evaluation questions	Judgement criteria	Examples of indicators	Data sources / research methods
Efficiency			
EQ2: To what extent have the objectives of the Eurojust Regulation been achieved at a reasonable cost?	<p>Objectives of Eurojust, implemented through its activities, have been achieved using the available inputs.</p> <p>Cost-effectiveness compared to planned targets and KPIs.</p> <p>The findings of the effectiveness assessment (e.g. regarding EJRs goal of limiting the administrative burden of national members).</p> <p>Efficiency of resource allocation, including prioritisation logic, with a target of a 20% increase in casework with third countries by 2021.</p> <p>Resource-related challenges, including the application of negative priorities.</p>	<p>Output, result and impact indicators as listed above.</p> <p>Total Eurojust budget, by year, by Title and by activity – as per MFF programming (Working Documents III to the Draft Budgets), amended and actual expenditure. Rate of budget execution (as reported in the Annual Reports).</p> <p>Cost of cooperation meetings year.</p> <p>Number and proportion of statutory and non-statutory staff, by type (e.g. temporary, contract, SNE, national desks, representatives of DK and the UK, LPs for third countries).</p> <p>Number of cases handled annually (including new cases opened).</p> <p>Caseload to staff ratio, by year.</p> <p>Number of closed cases, to staff ratio, by year.</p> <p>Number of JITs supported and funded.</p> <p>Impact of external factors such as COVID-19 on KPIs (e.g. the deployment of secure teleworking capabilities; investments made in the core ICT infrastructure).</p> <p>Number and proportion of KPIs achieved, compared to SPD target.</p> <p>Proportion of budget implementation, compared to SPD target.</p> <p>Rate of outturn, compared to SPD target.</p> <p>Proportion of payments executed within legal deadlines, compared to SPD target.</p> <p>Audit findings related to reliability of annual accounts, compared to SPD target.</p>	<p>Document review: EU legislation and policy documentation (e.g. Eurojust financial regulation, Council Decisions); Eurojust administrative / operational documentation (e.g. annual reports, financial reports, College and Executive Board meetings agendas; ECA audit reports); European Parliament's Discharge Reports on Eurojust's budget implementation; Working Documents III to the Draft Budgets under the MFF; Quantitative data from internal Eurojust data management systems (e.g. CSM, CISED).</p> <p>Targeted consultations: Interviews with internal and external stakeholders; online surveys; validation workshop.</p> <p>Case studies.</p> <p>Implementation check and impact analysis – resource analysis.</p>
EQ2.1: How efficient are Eurojust's working practices?	Eurojust's operational and administrative activities are conducted in a timely	.	Document review: EU legislation and policy documentation (e.g. Eurojust Regulation,

Evaluation questions	Judgement criteria	Examples of indicators	Data sources / research methods
	<p>manner and to a high degree of quality, compared to what is expected.</p> <p>Identification of efficiency challenges and actions taken to address them (e.g. use of videoconferencing, ICT tools).</p> <p>Specific actions to improve efficiency, such as increasing the ratio of new and existing cases over the number of staff and SNE to ≥ 40.</p> <p>Specific actions taken to ensure smooth implementation of the organisational changes stemming from the Eurojust Regulation, Regulation 2018/1725 and the revised data protection rules, as well as the EPPO working arrangement(s).</p> <p>Comparison of efficiency of working practices compared to the pre-Regulation situation.</p>	<p>Qualitative perceptions of Eurojust staff and operational partners on the quality and timeliness of the delivery of Eurojust operational activities.</p> <p>Qualitative perceptions of Eurojust staff on the quality and timeliness of Eurojust administrative activities.</p> <p>Number and type of efficiency challenges identified.</p> <p>Actions taken to improve the efficiency of working practices, by type, by year – e.g. ICT projects initiated.</p> <p>Number of CMs and CCs organised annually.</p> <p>Number of staff recruited and redeployed according to needs.</p> <p>Number and proportion of staff that report being ‘engaged’ or ‘satisfied’ with Eurojust’s working practices and internal communication.</p> <p>Actions agreed in working arrangements with the EPPO implemented, by type.</p> <p>Frequency and outcomes of videoconferencing and remote working sessions.</p> <p>Number of media mentions of Eurojust (incl. social media), compared to SPD target.</p> <p>Number of visits to Eurojust website, compared to SPD target.</p>	<p>Council Decisions), Eurojust programming documents (e.g. Human and Financial Resources Outlook), internal staff surveys; Eurojust quarterly reports; business cases/cost-benefit analyses for ICT or other projects; Eurojust web statistics, quantitative data from internal Eurojust data management systems (e.g. CSM, CICED). etc.</p> <p>Targeted consultations: Interviews with internal and external stakeholders; online surveys; validation workshop.</p> <p>Cross-country focus groups with national level practitioners</p> <p>Case studies.</p> <p>Implementation check and impact analysis – resource analysis.</p>
EQ2.2: Has the distinction between the operational and management functions of the Executive Board and the College helped reduce administrative burden on national members and increased the overall efficiency of the decision-making process in the agency?	<p>The operational and management functions of the Executive Board and the College, as set out in the Eurojust Regulation, changes compared to the pre-Regulation situation and their expected efficiency effects (including causal mechanisms).</p> <p>Assessment of the practical implementation of the operational and management functions of the</p>	<p>Stakeholder perceptions on the degree of clarity regarding the distinction between the operational and management functions of the Executive Board and the College</p> <p>Output and result KPIs listed in Eurojust MAS and SPD/AWP, as detailed above.</p> <p>Indicators on efficient resource use, as detailed above.</p>	<p>Document review: EU legislation and policy documentation (e.g. Eurojust Regulation, Council Decisions), Eurojust programming documents (e.g. Human and Financial Resources Outlook), internal staff surveys; Eurojust annual reports; Eurojust web statistics, quantitative data from internal Eurojust data management systems (e.g. CSM, CICED), etc.</p>

Evaluation questions	Judgement criteria	Examples of indicators	Data sources / research methods
	<p>Executive Board and the College, and changes over the implementation period.</p> <p>Comparison of the regulatory and practical situation.</p> <p>Comparison of (legislative and practical) changes against the pre-Regulation situation.</p> <p>Observed effects of the distinction between the functions of the Executive Board and the College on the administrative burden faced by National Members and overall efficiency.</p> <p>Comparison of the administrative burden facing National Members against: (i) the expected efficiency gains; and (ii) the pre-Regulation situation.</p>	<p>Scale of administrative activities conducted by national members</p> <p>Stakeholder perceptions on the impact of the distinction on the administrative burden on national members and overall efficiency, including the factors contributing and any challenges.</p>	<p>Targeted consultations: Interviews with internal stakeholders; online surveys; validation workshop.</p> <p>Implementation check and impact analysis.</p>
<p>EQ2.3: Are the tasks of the national desks and the administration in operational work defined in an efficient way?</p>	<p>The definition of the tasks of the national desks and the administration with regard to operational work, as stipulated in the Regulation, changes compared to the pre-Regulation situation and their expected efficiency effects (including causal mechanisms).</p> <p>Assessment of the practical implementation of the definition of tasks, and changes over the implementation period (e.g. to improve efficiency).</p> <p>Identification of challenges or inefficiencies in the definition of tasks for operational work (e.g. duplication / overlap, unclear responsibilities etc.)</p> <p>Assessment of the limited resources and tools for supporting judicial networks, despite the importance of</p>	<p>Stakeholder perceptions on the degree of clarity regarding the tasks of national desks and the administration in operational work.</p> <p>Output and result KPIs listed in Eurojust MAS and SPD/AWP, as detailed above.</p> <p>Indicators on efficient resource use, as detailed above.</p> <p>Stakeholder perceptions on whether the definition of tasks in operational work is efficient, as well as any challenges identified.</p>	<p>Document review: EU legislation and policy documentation (e.g. Eurojust Regulation, Council Decisions), Eurojust programming documents (e.g. Human and Financial Resources Outlook), internal staff surveys; Eurojust annual reports; Eurojust web statistics, quantitative data from internal Eurojust data management systems (e.g. CSM, CICED)., etc.</p> <p>Targeted consultations: Interviews with internal stakeholders; online surveys; validation workshop.</p> <p>Implementation check and impact analysis.</p>

Evaluation questions	Judgement criteria	Examples of indicators	Data sources / research methods
	<p>strong interaction with national authorities.</p> <p>Comparison of pre- and post-Regulation situations.</p> <p>Contribution of the definition of tasks to observed effects on the efficiency of operational activities (e.g. timely and quality delivery, no duplicate actions, etc.)</p>		
EQ2.4: To what extent might the same output and results be achieved at lower costs?	<p>Identification of potential for burden reduction, cost reduction or simplification with the EJR/ Eurojust activities, processes and systems without compromising the quality of outputs (e.g. the necessity for additional assessments for data transfers already assessed by Member States can create redundant processes and inefficiencies).</p> <p>Assessment of related challenges.</p> <p>Effects of Eurojust activities.</p>	<p>Output and result KPIs listed in Eurojust MAS and SPD/AWP, as detailed above.</p> <p>Indicators on efficient resource use, as detailed above.</p> <p>Number of inefficiencies or opportunities for simplification, cost or burden reduction identified, by type of area or activity.</p> <p>Stakeholder perceptions on the nature and scale of inefficiencies identified, as well as the nature and scale of any potential simplification measures.</p>	<p>Document review: EU legislation and policy documentation (e.g. Eurojust Regulation, Council Decisions), Eurojust programming documents (e.g. Human and Financial Resources Outlook), data from ABB/ABC/ABM, internal staff surveys; reports on rules of procedure; ECA audit reports; Eurojust annual reports; , etc.</p> <p>Targeted consultations: Interviews with internal stakeholders, validation workshop.</p> <p>Implementation check and impact analysis.</p>
EQ2.5: To what extent has Eurojust sufficiently employed digital tools to move towards more efficient processes?	<p>Assessment of the implementation of digital tools by Eurojust.</p> <p>Effects generated by the deployment of digital tools</p> <p>Consideration for the future use of digital tools and their potential effects.</p>	<p>Number of digital tools implemented, by type of tool and area of implementation.</p> <p>Output and result KPIs linked to the implementation of ICT projects and related benefits.</p> <p>Stakeholder perceptions on the scale of efficiency benefits delivered by digital tools, as well as any challenges or other factors.</p>	<p>Document review: EU legislation and policy documentation (e.g., Eurojust Regulation, Council Decisions), Eurojust programming documents (e.g. Human and Financial Resources Outlook), internal staff surveys; reports on digital tools and IT project documentation; Eurojust Annual Reports – specifically the targets set under the External Communication Action Plan 2020; , etc.</p> <p>Targeted consultations: Interviews with internal stakeholders; online surveys, validation workshop.</p> <p>Implementation check and impact analysis.</p>

Relevance

Evaluation questions	Judgement criteria	Examples of indicators	Data sources / research methods
Relevance			
EQ3: How well do the objectives of the Eurojust Regulation still correspond to the needs within the EU and among the stakeholders?	<p>The objectives of the Eurojust Regulation corresponded to the needs / problems within the EU at the time of adoption.</p> <p>The objectives of the Eurojust Regulation still correspond to the needs / problems within the EU today, in light of the evolution of cross-border criminality in the EU and its overall security architecture.</p> <p>The objectives of the Eurojust Regulation corresponded to the needs among relevant stakeholders at the time of its adoption.</p> <p>The objectives of the Eurojust Regulation still correspond to the needs among relevant stakeholders today (in particular at national level).</p>	<p>Identification of problems / needs when the Regulation was adopted / today (e.g. <i>Problems</i>: increase in cross-border crimes and conflicts of jurisdiction; parallel criminal proceedings; limited detection and lack of investigation / prosecution of cross-border cases; lack of legal certainty / predictability for suspects and victims; lack of accountability / possible impunity for serious cross-border crime; <i>Needs</i>: support / strengthen coordination / cooperation between national investigating and prosecuting authorities in relation to serious crime etc.)</p> <p>Stakeholder perceptions of the extent to which the objectives of the Eurojust Regulation correspond to the needs / problems within the EU (at the time of adoption / today)</p> <p>Stakeholder perceptions of the extent to which the objectives of the Eurojust Regulation correspond to their needs / problems among the stakeholders (at the time of adoption / today)</p>	<p>Document review (i.e. policy documents relating to the policy needs before / after adoption of the Eurojust Regulation; stakeholder consultations; IA for the establishment of the EPPO; Eurojust's Founding Regulation; MAS; SPDs; AWP; meeting notes etc.)</p> <p>Targeted consultations with Eurojust's external stakeholders (national competent authorities; third countries; European Institutions; networks; JHA agencies/bodies; EU judicial networks; expert groups etc.)</p> <p>Interviews with Eurojust internal stakeholders (College; Executive Board; Presidency; Administrative Director; Heads of Operational Units)</p> <p>Case studies</p>
EQ3.1: How well has Eurojust been able to respond to the needs of its stakeholders?	<p>Needs assessments were undertaken with Eurojust stakeholders.</p> <p>Needs assessments are updated whenever there are relevant contextual changes.</p> <p>Eurojust's MAS and AWP strategic objectives are consistent with stakeholder needs.</p> <p>Eurojust's activities / tasks meet the needs of its stakeholders.</p> <p>The Agency's activities enable Eurojust to respond to the needs of its stakeholders.</p>	<p>Stakeholder perceptions to what extent the Agency's objectives have met and are still meeting their needs;</p> <p>Stakeholder perceptions to what extent the Agency's activities and tasks have met and are still meeting their needs.</p> <p>Stakeholder perceptions regarding necessary changes / room for improvements</p> <p>Number and type of needs assessment exercises undertaken during Eurojust's programming and implementation phase;</p> <p>Number of positive / negative responses to the Agency's activities and tasks</p>	<p>Document review (i.e. needs assessments / stakeholder feedback; MAS; SPDs; AWP; AARs; any other performance reports)</p> <p>Stakeholder mapping</p> <p>Targeted consultations with Eurojust's external stakeholders (national competent authorities; Member States administrations / JHA counsellors; third countries; European Institutions; networks; JHA agencies/bodies; EU judicial networks; expert groups etc.)</p> <p>Targeted consultations with Eurojust internal stakeholders (College; Executive Board; Presidency; Administrative Director; Heads of Operational Units)</p>

Evaluation questions	Judgement criteria	Examples of indicators	Data sources / research methods
EQ3.2: To what extent are these needs evolving or likely to evolve in future, taking also into account the evolution of cross-border criminality in the EU and its overall security architecture? What types of action might need to be considered to address such changes and new trends?	<p>Needs assessments with the Agency's stakeholders are updated whenever there are relevant contextual changes.</p> <p>The evolution of cross-border criminality in the EU / overall security architecture is closely monitored by Eurojust</p> <p>Types of actions are considered to increase the relevance of Eurojust to meet the needs of its stakeholders by addressing changes / new trends.</p>	<p>Number and type of forecasting needs assessment exercises undertaken with Eurojust's stakeholders</p> <p>Stakeholder perceptions on what types of actions are needed to address evolving needs and new trends;</p> <p>Evidence of evolution of cross-border criminality in the EU and its overall security architecture</p> <p>Evidence that Eurojust is monitoring the evolution of cross-border criminality in the EU and its overall security architecture</p>	<p>Document review (i.e. needs assessments; foresight studies)</p> <p>Targeted consultations with Eurojust's external stakeholders (national competent authorities; Member States administrations / JHA counsellors; third countries; European Institutions; networks; JHA agencies/bodies; EU judicial networks; expert groups etc.)</p> <p>Targeted consultations with Eurojust internal stakeholders (College; Executive Board; Presidency; Administrative Director; Heads of Operational Units)</p> <p>Focus groups</p> <p>Case studies</p>
EQ3.3: Are the governance system and decision-making processes established by the Eurojust Regulation and internal rules appropriate to allow Eurojust to support its stakeholders as needed?	<p>Eurojust's governance system and decision-making processes established by the Eurojust Regulation and internal rules are appropriate to allow Eurojust to support its stakeholders as needed.</p> <p>There is a clear distinction in the EJR between Eurojust's operational, managerial, strategic and administrative tasks that leads to a clear division of competences (i.e. between the Executive Board, the College and the Administrative Director).</p> <p>Eurojust's management and decision-making are independent from other agencies, such as the EPPO.</p> <p>Eurojust has a strong interaction with (specialised) national authorities and provides support to judicial networks in order to perform its mandate.</p>	<p>Evidence that Eurojust's governance system, decision-making processes and its internal rules are in line with the needs of its stakeholders</p> <p>Stakeholder perception whether Eurojust's governance system and decision-making processes established by the Eurojust Regulation and internal rules are appropriate to allow Eurojust to support its stakeholders as needed</p> <p>Stakeholder perception on whether there is a clear distinction in the EJR between Eurojust's operational, managerial, strategic and administrative tasks that leads to a clear division of competences</p> <p>Stakeholder perception on difficulties related to the division of competences</p> <p>Evolution on the share of time spent by members of the Executive Board and the College on administrative duties since the introduction of the EJR</p> <p>Key stakeholders' perception of the efficiency of the decision-making process (especially with regard to administrative duties)</p>	<p>Document review (i.e. needs assessment; documents outlining Eurojust's internal rules and procedures; relevant Eurojust College Decisions; internal monitoring and evaluation documents; internal staff survey etc.);</p> <p>Targeted consultations with Eurojust's external stakeholders (national competent authorities; Member States administrations / JHA counsellors; third countries; European Institutions; networks; JHA agencies/bodies; EU judicial networks; expert groups etc.)</p> <p>Targeted consultations with Eurojust internal stakeholders (College; Executive Board; Presidency; Administrative Director; Heads of Operational Units; Heads of Operational Units)</p>

Evaluation questions	Judgement criteria	Examples of indicators	Data sources / research methods
		<p>College Members' perception of their understanding of the administrative procedures they are involved in</p> <p>Stakeholder perceptions whether Eurojust's management and decision-making are independent from other agencies, such as the EPPO</p> <p>Stakeholder perception on Eurojust's ability to have a strong interaction with (specialised) national authorities and its ability to provide support to judicial networks in order to perform its mandate</p>	
EQ3.4: Eurojust's role on the international plane has significantly changed due to continued globalisation, a steep increase in cases involving third countries, and the application of the principle of universal jurisdiction. To what extent is Eurojust's role in the international context still adequate?	<p>Eurojust's role in the international context is still relevant.</p> <p>The objectives, competences and functions outlined in the Eurojust Regulation regarding the international context (e.g. third countries and international organisations) are still relevant and correspond to stakeholders' needs.</p>	<p>Evidence that the Agency's objectives, competences and functions outlined in the Eurojust Regulation regarding third countries and international organisations are still relevant</p> <p>Number of initiatives for cooperation launched / existing per annum</p> <p>Number of operational cases involving third countries</p> <p>Stakeholder perceptions that the Agency's objectives, competences and functions outlined in the Eurojust Regulation regarding third countries and international organisations are still relevant</p> <p>Stakeholder perceptions that the Agency's objectives, competences and functions outlined in the Eurojust Regulation still correspond to their needs</p>	<p>Document review (i.e. Founding Regulation; Eurojust Strategies on cooperation with international partners; cooperation agreements and working arrangements with third countries and other international actors, relevant Council Decisions authorising the Commission to negotiate cooperation agreements with third countries for Eurojust);</p> <p>Targeted consultations with Eurojust's external stakeholders (national competent authorities in third countries; international organisations (e.g. ICC; ICPO-Interpol; Iber-RED; the Office of the Prosecutor of the IIIM; the UNITAD; Interpol etc.); liaison prosecutors from third countries; European Institutions; networks; JHA agencies/bodies; expert groups etc.)</p> <p>Targeted consultations with Eurojust internal stakeholders (College; Executive Board; Presidency; Heads of Operational Units)</p>
EQ3.5: How well does the system set-up in the Eurojust Regulation for cooperation on the international level correspond to actual needs, especially cooperation with third countries and international organisations?	<p>The system set-up in the Eurojust Regulation for cooperation on the international level correspond to the actual needs (especially cooperation with third countries and international organisations).</p>	<p>Evidence that the system set-up in the Eurojust Regulation for international cooperation aligns with the needs regarding the cooperation with third countries and international organisations</p> <p>Stakeholder perceptions whether the system set-up in the Eurojust Regulation for</p>	<p>Document review (i.e. Founding Regulation; cooperation agreements and working arrangements with third countries and other international actors, relevant Council Decisions authorising the Commission to negotiate with third countries the cooperation with Eurojust);</p>

Evaluation questions	Judgement criteria	Examples of indicators	Data sources / research methods
		cooperation on the international level corresponds to the actual needs (especially cooperation with third countries and international organisations)	Targeted consultations with Eurojust's external stakeholders (national competent authorities in third countries; international organisations (e.g. ICC; ICPO-Interpol; Iber-RED; the Office of the Prosecutor of the IIIM; the UNITAD; Interpol etc.); liaison prosecutors from third countries; European Institutions; networks; JHA agencies/bodies; expert groups etc.) Survey / interviews with Eurojust internal stakeholders (College; Executive Board; Presidency; Heads of Operational Units) Case studies
EQ3.6: To what extent does Eurojust's work supporting the investigation and prosecution of international crimes contribute in a complementary way to the commitment to fight impunity?	Eurojust's work supporting the investigation and prosecution of international crimes contributes in a complementary way to the commitment to fight impunity. The objectives and activities in the Eurojust Regulation (including the amendment of the Eurojust Regulation by Regulation (EU 2022/838)) are still in line with and complementary to the commitment to fight impunity.	Number of cases relating to the investigation / prosecution of international crimes Stakeholder perceptions to what extent Eurojust's work supporting the investigation and prosecution of international crimes contributes in a complementary way to the commitment to fight impunity.	Document review (e.g. documents related to Eurojust's work supporting the investigation and prosecution of international crimes (i.e. from the Genocide network, ICPA, CICED etc.; documents from MAS; SPDs; AWP; Annual Activity Reports; etc.) Targeted consultations with Eurojust's external stakeholders (national competent authorities in third countries; international organisations; European Institutions; networks; JHA agencies/bodies; expert groups etc.) Survey / interviews with Eurojust internal stakeholders (College; Executive Board; Presidency; Heads of Operational Units)
EQ3.7: How well adapted is Eurojust's intervention to the technological progress that has appeared since its introduction, e.g. looking at the area of cybercrime and electronic evidence?	Eurojust's intervention is well adapted to technological progress, e.g. the area of cybercrime and electronic evidence.	Share of cases using electronic evidence. Budget (and share of budget) dedicated to the introduction of digital technologies Number (and share) of cases with a link to technological developments Evidence that Eurojust's intervention is well adapted to technological progress Number / types of activities where Eurojust has made available new/updated cross-border investigative tools or guidance according to technological progress.	Document review Targeted consultations with Eurojust's external stakeholders (national competent authorities; EJC members; third countries; international organisations; European Institutions; networks; JHA agencies/bodies; expert groups etc.) Targeted consultations with Eurojust internal stakeholders (College; Executive Board; Presidency; Administrative Director; Heads of Operational Units)

Evaluation questions	Judgement criteria	Examples of indicators	Data sources / research methods
		Stakeholder perceptions on how well adapted Eurojust's intervention is to the technological progress	Focus groups Case studies

Coherence

Evaluation questions	Judgement criteria	Examples of indicators	Data sources / research methods
Coherence			
EQ4: Internal coherence – How well do the different provisions of the Eurojust Regulation operate together to achieve its objectives?	The different provisions of the EJR have been implemented in a way that is complementary – i.e. avoids duplication.	Evidence of duplicative or contradictory provisions. Stakeholder perceptions of the degree of coherence of the activities and results of Eurojust.	Document review: EJR and key legal texts. Targeted consultations: Interviews with all internal stakeholders. Implementation check
EQ5: External coherence – To what extent are the results of Eurojust's work coherent with (current) wider EU policies and priorities in the field of criminal justice (e.g. EU Security Union Strategy 2020-2025, or the EU Roadmap to boost the fight against drug trafficking and organised crime and the related EU Strategy to Tackle Organised Crime 2021-2025 and the EU Drugs Strategy and Action Plan 2021-2025)?	Eurojust's activities have achieved results that are coherent and complementary to wider EU policies and priorities in the field of criminal justice cooperation There are mechanisms to ensure synergies exist between Eurojust and other EU actors in the context of policy development and/or implementation Challenges, including overlap, divergence or gaps, between the work of Eurojust and wider EU policies and priorities in the area of criminal justice.	Identification of duplication/overlaps or synergies between the objectives and activities of Eurojust and related EU policies and priorities. Number of cooperation agreements / working arrangements between Eurojust and other relevant EU Institutions, agencies and bodies. Number of existing cooperation mechanisms and coordination activities implemented. Number of networking or cooperation events hosted or participated in. Stakeholder perceptions on the degree of coherence between Eurojust's work and overall EU policy goals, as well as any challenges in this context	Document review: EJR, Eurojust programming documents, research and communications outputs, key EU policy and legal texts in the field of judicial cooperation in criminal matters and key crime types (e.g. EU Security Union Strategy 202-2025, or the EU Roadmap to boost the fight against drug trafficking and organised crime and the related EU Strategy to Tackle Organised Crime 2021-2025 and the EU Drugs Strategy and Action Plan 2021-2025). Targeted consultations: Interviews with internal and external stakeholders; online surveys. Implementation check
EQ5.1: To what extent is Eurojust's mandate coherent with those of other JHA agencies' and bodies' (revised) mandates and the evolving security architecture of the EU? To what extent are its tasks clearly defined, leaving neither overlaps nor gaps, but building a coherent system? How well does the existing legal framework, including existing instruments such as cooperation arrangements, clarify the cooperation? To what extent is there a coherent approach to the use of IT systems and information sharing?	Eurojust's work has been implemented in a way that is coherent and complementary to other EU JHA agencies and bodies (e.g. Europol, EPPO, OLAF, Frontex), initially and over time. Clear cooperation and cooperation between Eurojust and other EU agencies and bodies.	Stakeholder perceptions of coherence challenges identified between Eurojust and other EU agencies / bodies. Number of cooperation agreements / working arrangements. Number of key cooperation and coordination activities implemented – e.g. case involvement of other EU agencies and bodies. Number of networking or cooperation events hosted or participated in. Stakeholder perceptions on the degree of coherence between Eurojust's work and the mandates of other EU agencies and bodies.	Document review: EJR, Eurojust programming documents, research and communications outputs, cooperation agreements, working arrangements, MoUs with other EU JHA agencies and networks; legal frameworks for other agencies and bodies. Targeted consultations: Interviews with internal and external stakeholders (primarily other EU JHA agencies and bodies); online surveys. Implementation check

Evaluation questions	Judgement criteria	Examples of indicators	Data sources / research methods
EQ5.2: The mandate of the European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Cooperation (Europol) has changed twice since its entry into force in 2017, significantly strengthening its mandate. To what extent is the extended mandate of Europol reflected in the Eurojust Regulation, especially when it comes to judicial follow-up?	<p>Eurojust's work has been implemented in a way that is coherent and complementary to Europol, initially and over time.</p> <p>Effective coordination mechanisms exist to ensure coordination and the creation of synergies between activities of Eurojust and Europol.</p> <p>Clear cooperation and cooperation between Eurojust and Europol throughout this timeframe, including on judicial follow-up.</p>	<p>Stakeholder perceptions on coherence challenges identified between Eurojust and Europol.</p> <p>Number of key cooperation and coordination activities implemented – e.g. case involvement of Europol.</p> <p>Extent of data sharing between Eurojust and Europol.</p> <p>Number of networking or cooperation events hosted or participated in.</p> <p>Stakeholder perceptions on the degree of coherence between the objectives and activities of Eurojust and Europol.</p>	<p>Document review: EJR, Eurojust programming documents, Europol legal framework, documents on Eurojust-Europol cooperation, including MoU etc.</p> <p>Targeted consultations: Interviews with internal and external stakeholders (primarily Europol); online surveys.</p> <p>Implementation check</p>
EQ5.3: To what extent is Eurojust's mandate coherent with the role and tasks of the judicial cooperation networks and their secretariats, which Eurojust hosts as specified in the Eurojust Regulation (e.g. the European Judicial Network and the Joint Investigation Teams Network)?	<p>Eurojust's mandate and activities has been implemented in a way that is coherent and complementary to the judicial cooperation networks and secretariats hosted by Eurojust, including the EJN and the JIT Network.</p> <p>Effective coordination mechanisms exist to ensure coordination and the creation of synergies between activities of Eurojust and judicial cooperation networks.</p> <p>Clear cooperation and cooperation between Eurojust and these networks.</p>	<p>Stakeholder perceptions on coherence challenges identified between Eurojust and judicial cooperation networks.</p> <p>Stakeholder perceptions on the degree of coherence (effectiveness of cooperation mechanisms), as well as any challenges and suggestions of improvement.</p>	<p>Document review: EJR, Eurojust programming documents and research outputs, legal frameworks and outputs of key judicial cooperation networks.</p> <p>Targeted consultations: Interviews with internal and external stakeholders (incl. EJN and JIT Network); online surveys.</p> <p>Implementation check</p>
EQ5.4: To what extent are the mandate and activities of Eurojust coherent with those of other relevant international actors (including third countries)? How well does the Eurojust Regulation facilitate appropriate cooperation with such actors?	<p>Eurojust's work has been implemented in a way that is coherent and complementary to international actors and third countries working towards similar goals.</p> <p>Eurojust's strategy on international cooperation contributed to positive effects in terms of cooperation between Eurojust and relevant international actors.</p> <p>Effective coordination mechanisms exist to ensure coordination and the</p>	<p>Stakeholder perceptions of coherence challenges identified between Eurojust and key international partners.</p> <p>Number of cooperation agreements / working arrangements between Eurojust and international organisations and third countries.</p> <p>Number of Eurojust liaison prosecutors, liaison magistrates and contact points in third countries.</p>	<p>Document review: EJR, Eurojust programming documents and research outputs, strategy on international cooperation, cooperation agreements, etc.</p> <p>Targeted consultations: Interviews with internal and external stakeholders (i.e. international partners); online surveys.</p> <p>Implementation check</p> <p>Case study 2 (cooperation with third countries)</p>

Evaluation questions	Judgement criteria	Examples of indicators	Data sources / research methods
	creation of synergies between activities of Eurojust and international actors.	Number of key cooperation and coordination activities implemented – e.g. case involvement by third countries. Number of networking or cooperation events hosted or participated in. Stakeholder perceptions on the degree of success for cooperation between Eurojust and international partners.	
EQ5.5: To what extent is Eurojust's data protection regime aligned with Regulation (EU) 2018/1725 and other relevant instruments of the EU data protection acquis?	<p>Eurojust has implemented the data protection provisions of the EJR in line with Regulation (EU) 2018/1725 and other relevant data protection legislation.</p> <p>There are mechanism to ensure engagement between Eurojust management, its DPO and the EDPS on the management of data protection provisions.</p> <p>There is a clear division of roles and responsibilities between Eurojust and the EDPS on operational data processing.</p> <p>Assessment of challenges.</p>	<p>Evidence of (mis) alignment between Eurojust's data protection regime and Regulation (EU) 2018/1725</p> <p>Documentary evidence laying down roles and responsibilities between Eurojust and EDPS</p> <p>Number of data protection notices produced.</p> <p>Stakeholder perceptions of related coherence challenges.</p> <p>Stakeholder perceptions on the degree of alignment between Eurojust and Regulation (EU) 2018/1725 and other relevant data protection legislation.</p>	<p>Document review: EJR, Eurojust programming documents and data protection documents, Regulation (EU) 2018/1725, related legislation, policy and other publications.</p> <p>Targeted consultations: Interviews with internal and external stakeholders (e.g. EDPS); online surveys.</p> <p>Implementation check</p>

EU added value

Evaluation questions	Judgement criteria	Examples of indicators	Data sources / research methods
EU added value			
EQ6: To what extent could the identified changes/results/impacts have been achieved without Eurojust and/or the EJR?	<p>Similar changes/results/impacts could have been achieved at MS/EU or international level</p> <p>Similar changes/results/impacts could have been achieved without the 2018 Eurojust Regulation</p>	<p>Stakeholders' perception of the (type) operational changes brought about by the EJR</p> <p>Types of changes/results/impacts that stakeholders consider would not have been achieved at MS/EU or international level</p> <p>Types of changes/results/impacts that stakeholders consider would not have been possible without the 2018 Eurojust Regulation</p> <p>Stakeholder perceptions whether stopping Eurojust's activities would have negative / positive consequences</p>	<p>Document review (e.g. changes/results/impacts of Eurojust as outlined in Annual Activity Reports; casework evaluations)</p> <p>Targeted consultations with Eurojust internal stakeholders (College; Executive Board; Presidency; Administrative Director; Heads of Operational Units)</p> <p>Targeted consultations with Eurojust's external stakeholders (national competent authorities; Member States administrations / JHA counsellors; third countries; European Institutions; networks; JHA agencies/bodies; EU judicial networks; expert groups etc.)</p> <p>Case studies</p> <p>Cross-border focus groups</p> <p>Implementation check and impact analysis</p>
EQ6.1: Which, if any, objectives of the policy might have been achieved sufficiently by the Member States acting alone (if so, how)?	<p>Achieving the objectives of the Eurojust Regulation goes beyond what can be achieved by the Member States acting alone.</p> <p>Evidence of scope effects, i.e. additional target groups have been addressed or additional types of intervention have been offered, which could not have been achieved by MS acting alone</p> <p>Evidence of scale effects, i.e. a higher volume of services has been offered/end-users have been addressed, which could not have been achieved by MS acting alone</p>	<p>Stakeholders' perception of the objectives of the EJR that could not have been achieved by MS acting alone</p> <p>Stakeholder perceptions which objectives of the policy might have been achieved sufficiently by the Member States acting alone</p> <p>Stakeholder perceptions on whether possible scope and scale effects have been achieved</p>	<p>Document review (e.g. performance data related to the responsibilities and tasks of Eurojust; casework evaluations)</p> <p>Targeted consultations with Eurojust's external stakeholders (national competent authorities; Member States administrations / JHA counsellors; third countries; European Institutions; networks; JHA agencies/bodies; EU judicial networks; expert groups etc.)</p> <p>Targeted consultations with Eurojust internal stakeholders (Heads of Operational Units; College; Executive Board; Presidency; Administrative Director)</p>
EQ6.2: To what extent did the resulting benefits outweigh any loss of (e.g. competence or anything else) in participating Member States?	<p>The resulting benefits outweigh any losses in participating Member States</p>	<p>Evidence of benefits and losses in participating Member States associated with participation in Eurojust vs. activities at MS level</p> <p>Stakeholder perception on the extent to which the resulting benefits outweigh any losses in participating Member States</p>	<p>Document reviews (e.g. evidence of benefits / losses in participating Member States)</p> <p>Targeted consultations with Eurojust's external stakeholders (national competent authorities; Member States administrations / JHA counsellors; third countries; expert groups etc.)</p>

Evaluation questions	Judgement criteria	Examples of indicators	Data sources / research methods
			Case studies
EQ6.3: What could reasonably have been achieved (particularly in terms of effectiveness and efficiency) by Member States acting at national and/or regional levels?	Member States acting at national / regional levels could not have achieved similar changes/results/impacts (in particular in terms of effectiveness and efficiency)	Types of changes/results/impacts that stakeholders consider could have been achieved by Member States acting at national and/or regional levels Stakeholder perceptions regarding the types of changes/results/impacts that stakeholders consider could have been achieved by Member States acting at national and/or regional levels	Document reviews (e.g. performance data related to the responsibilities and tasks of Eurojust; casework evaluations) Targeted consultations with Eurojust's external stakeholders (national competent authorities; Member States administrations / JHA counsellors; third countries; expert groups etc.) Cross-country focus groups

ANNEX IV. OVERVIEW OF BENEFITS AND COSTS [AND, WHERE RELEVANT, TABLE ON SIMPLIFICATION AND BURDEN REDUCTION]

This annex represents an overview of all costs and benefits that can be linked to the intervention, as identified by the evaluation. The table presented below was drafted by the external contractors and is found in Annex 5 of the external evaluation study.

Costs/ benefits	Citizens		Businesses		Administrations		EU	
	Quantitative	Comment	Quantitative	Comment	Quantitative	Comment	Quantitative	Comment
Direct costs	0	No direct costs for citizens	0	No direct costs for businesses	Danish contribution to Eurojust's budget: 2019: EUR 0 2020: EUR 0.85 m 2021: EUR 1 m 2022: EUR 1.2 m 2023: EUR 1.4 m	Denmark has contributed to the overall budget for Eurojust since 2020	Commitments: 2019: EUR 38.9 m 2020: EUR 41.7 m 2021: EUR 53.3 m 2022: EUR 50.2 m 2023: EUR 55.3 m	Funded from the EU budget, together with contribution from Denmark, revenues from administrative operations and funding received due to Eurojust's participation in specific projects such as EuroMed Justice Programme, the SIRIUS project, etc.
Enforcement costs		Not relevant		Not relevant		Not relevant to Eurojust, costs of law enforcement by Member States considered under indirect costs		Not relevant
Indirect costs		Taxes contributing to EU contributions (the portion of taxes paid by citizens that support EU operations and contributions)		Taxes contributing to EU contributions		Cost of interacting with Eurojust and other national judicial authorities through Eurojust, costs of law enforcement linked to casework, cost of participation in coordinated activities (where not refunded by Eurojust)		Digitalisation and administrative costs (however, these are treated as direct costs and included in the annual commitments above) Cost of budget negotiations (multi-stage procedure) for Eurojust and DG BUDG
Direct benefits	Number of cases supported: 51,000 between 2019 and 2023	More effective law enforcement in individual cases where the citizen is a victim in a cross-border case dealt with by Eurojust	Number of cases supported: 51,000 between 2019 and 2023	More effective law enforcement in individual cases where a business is a victim in a cross-border case dealt with by Eurojust	Number of cases supported: 51,000 between 2019 and 2023	Better judicial cooperation and better law enforcement and improved effectiveness of judicial systems due to casework, JITs, co-operation within the EU and with third countries, etc. Effective enforcement in cross-border criminal matters, such as online fraud, money laundering and human trafficking Increased consistency and coordination between parallel national actions, such as searches, victim interviews, victims identification and rescue, suspect arrests,	Number of cases supported: 51,000 between 2019 and 2023 Significant increases in casework and CMs with third countries Total contributions to COSI and other working parties and groups: 113 between 2019 and 2021	Better judicial and security cooperation, better enforcement throughout the EU due to cooperation with other agencies such as Europol and the EPPO and contributions provided to EU bodies' working parties and expert groups (COSI, CATS, COPEN + GENVAL) More consistent criminal law enforcement across the EU, reducing differences between Member States
Indirect benefits		More effective protection of fundamental rights More effective prosecution of cross-border crime, reduced crime across the EU resulting in reduced likelihood of citizens		More effective prosecution of cross-border crime, resulting in a more stable business environment, including reduced risk of money laundering, cybercrime, etc.	An unknown proportion of asset and drug seizures as a result of cross-border investigations can be attributed to cooperation via Eurojust: Total criminal assets frozen/seized in cross-	Knowledge sharing: experience gained by SNEs fosters knowledge sharing amongst prosecutors Establishment of a cross-border collaborative culture in criminal matters across the EU		Greater acceptance of European integration due to more effective enforcement of cross-border crime Eurojust's actions are aligned with some of the targets under UN Sustainable Development Goal n.16 - Promote peaceful and

	becoming victims of crime		border cases: EUR 8.7 billion between 2020 and 2023 and value of drugs seized in cross-border cases: EUR 48 billion between 2020 and 2023		inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels
	Greater confidence in safety and security of societies in the EU				

At the same time, as existing margins for simplification and burden reduction have been identified by the evaluation, the table below summarizes these elements.

PART I: Simplification and burden reduction (savings already <u>achieved</u>) Report any simplification, burden reduction and cost savings achieved already by the intervention evaluated, including the points of comparison/ where available (e.g. REFIT savings predicted in the IA or other sources).				
	Citizens/Consumers/Workers	Businesses	Administrations	EU
	Qualitative	Qualitative	Qualitative	Qualitative
Type: recurrent	N/A	N/A	N/A	EJ ART simplified resource planning, EJ MAP mission requests, SYSPER simplified HR management and automated administrative processes, while SUMMA boosted workflow efficiency, reduced manual tasks and overall improved financial management. Regarding cooperation with third countries, Commission is now in charge of negotiating the relevant agreements, therefore reducing the burden from Eurojust. EJTN exchange programme reduced the burden for National Members.
PART II: <u>II Potential</u> simplification and burden reduction (savings) Identify further potential simplification and savings that could be achieved with a view to make the initiative more effective and efficient without prejudice to its policy objectives ¹³⁷ .				
	Citizens/Consumers/Workers	Businesses	Administrations	EU
	Qualitative	Qualitative	Qualitative	Qualitative
Description:...				
Type: recurrent	VAT fraud investigations in digital services, currently handled at national level, could be handled in the context of a permanent information hub with a JIT to address shared challenges and minimise tax revenue losses across Member States.	N/A	71% of national practitioners and policymakers believe that Eurojust's operational tasks could be simplified to a moderate or great extent.	Upgrade of the CMS, implementation of AI-driven translation tools could reduce costs and improve efficiency.

¹³⁷ This assessment is without prejudice to a possible future Impact Assessment.

				<p>Potential cost saving of up to 25% if funding last-minute travels is limited.</p> <p>Reducing frequency and/or time required for College meetings could free up human resources, as National Members currently spend 20% of their weekly time in these meetings.</p> <p>Redistributing responsibilities: administrative staff could be involved in more desk-related tasks, such as increasing the number of NDAs.</p> <p>Eurojust could reduce its workload by taking fewer or no “EJN cases”.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

ANNEX V. STAKEHOLDERS CONSULTATION - SYNOPSIS REPORT

This annex summarises all stakeholder consultation activities undertaken for the evaluation, drawing upon the feedback received during May-June 2024 on the Call for Evidence regarding the Eurojust evaluation¹³⁸ and the evidence collected in the context of the evaluation study.

Feedback on the Call for Evidence

Number of responses: 17 (from 8 MS, including ES, DE, FR, EL, HU, NL, SE, PL; 1 from a third country, i.e. Saudi-Arabia; 3 responses excluded from summary as they were not substantive)

The call for evidence confirmed the priorities set out in the ToR for the study. Most responses are less retrospective but rather forward-looking.

Key input:

- **Added value:** Most responses express a very positive opinion about Eurojust's work, the majority of which indicated that they are from prosecution services and had benefited from Eurojust's support themselves. Especially in complex cases and through judicial cooperation instruments, coordination meetings and joint investigation teams, Eurojust helps to speed up investigation and enhances quality and relevance of evidence.
- The **pro-active role** of the Agency should be strengthened as a continuation to recent developments such as CICIP, CTR and ICPC. One response suggested a stronger **control of Eurojust over cooperating states**, in particular in the correct application of EIO or EAW.
- **Cooperation with other JHA actors:** The EJR should be assessed also in the broader context of JHA actors, **ensuring coherence in the mandates**, alignment of their structure, clear information exchange workflows, in particular **Europol**.
- **Networks:** Few prosecutors praised the support of the **EJN services** in easier cases. Yet another practitioner proposed to frequent more **EJN in simpler cases** in order to use Eurojust's resources where its enhanced support is necessary. Yet another response proposed to **integrate the networks better into Eurojust's structure**.
- **Third countries:** Eurojust's role in relation to third countries was also praised. The exchange with third country LPs was considered particularly valuable. It was suggested by several responses to enhance **Eurojust's role as a global partner**, in particular with regard to poorly cooperating

¹³⁸ <https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/better-regulation/have-your-say/initiatives/14089-Eurojust-evaluation- en>

countries. An interesting suggestion was that **international agreements concerning Eurojust should include a legal basis for judicial cooperation between all MS** bound by the EJR and the third countries in question.

- **Governance system:** Many responses raised criticism about **Eurojust's governance** system, in particular the College, and its slow **decision-making process**. One of the reasons named was lack EU vision and administrative/budgetary experience of the national members. The hierarchical relationship between the College of Eurojust and the administration should be looked into.
- **Budget:** Few responses **Eurojust's budget** should be more **aligned with law enforcement** agencies to ensure that appropriate services are provided to national authorities. An amendment to the Eurojust Regulation should be accompanied by a sound impact assessment and financial fiche, avoiding resource allocation that do not match reality. In addition, it was suggested a **structural solution for projects** carried out by Eurojust for the Commission should be found.
- **Data-protection:** Rigid requirements limit the day-to-day operations of the Agency, with internal as well as with third countries.

Evidence collected in the context of the evaluation study¹³⁹

A total of 117 stakeholders were interviewed for the purposes of this evaluation support study. The below table breaks this down by stakeholder group:

Stakeholder groups	Target	Completed
Eurojust administration	12-15	21
Eurojust national members, deputies and assistants , including the Office of the Representative of Denmark	22-27	31
EU institutions	8-10	15
EU bodies, agencies, offices and networks	5-8	12
Third countries , including liaison prosecutors and contact points	5-10	8
International organisations	2-3	4
National-level authorities and practitioners	20-24	23
Independent experts and NGOs	2-3	3
Total	76-100	117

¹³⁹ Annex 3 of the evaluation study

The interviews provided evidence on all relevant evaluation issues, including: (1) the analysis of the implementation of the EJR over the evaluation period; and (2) the five evaluation criteria – effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, EU added value and relevance. A high-level summary, by type of stakeholder to the extent possible is now provided for each evaluation criterion.

Regarding **effectiveness**, the interviews provided insights into the functioning of Eurojust and the key challenges that may limit its overall performance. In general, all stakeholder groups agree that the Agency is performing well and providing crucial support to judicial cooperation. Members of the Eurojust administration highlighted how the work of Eurojust has progressed over the years, despite tensions related to resource allocation and priority setting. National Members confirmed Eurojust's significant role and identified a shift from purely operational tasks to more administrative and strategic work. This shift has improved the Agency's proactivity and ability to act on its own initiative, though some limitations remain, especially considering the limited understanding across the organisation of what this might mean. Liaison prosecutors from third countries confirmed the effectiveness of Eurojust, emphasising the value of Eurojust and the opportunities it provides for cooperation and coordination with EU Member States, particularly in complex cases. They also confirmed the current organisation and decision-making process at Eurojust is quite complex, including the fact that it is not always clear what the approach is to the participation of LPs in College meetings. Interviews with National Members and third-country liaison prosecutors suggested that the new data protection regime has created some tensions. In particular, applying data protection rules in cooperation with third countries — especially those with different levels of protection — has made data-sharing processes longer and more cumbersome. Interviews with representatives from EU institutions, bodies, offices and agencies confirmed that Eurojust is a well-established and important player in the EU ecosystem and a key partner for other authorities in the field. While cooperation was generally seen as positive, some shortcomings were noted, particularly regarding available tools and infrastructure, such as the hit/no-hit system, and the prompt access to and exchange of information. Some of them, however, mentioned how the internal organisation of Eurojust might affect the information flow given the complex and lengthy process, creating possible inefficiencies and delays in cooperation and exchange, with and compared to other Agencies, such as Europol.

Regarding **efficiency**, the interviews provided further evidence on the adequacy and proportionality of resources available to Eurojust for carrying out its work. Representatives of the Eurojust administration reported that, despite additional financial resources provided by the Commission, resources are stretched due to the Agency's increasing caseload. Some members also indicated that the complex governance structure does not always facilitate efficient decision-making and can create difficulties in setting priorities, particularly for non-casework-related matters. Some representatives of Eurojust administration indicated potential areas to further streamline and gain efficiency, such as through the use of digital tools – in particular internal tools for HR and support functions – translation costs, which represent a significant amount of expenses every year, and other internal procedures, such as meeting and travel arrangements. National Members indicated that they are heavily involved in both administrative and operational tasks, which place considerable burden on national desks. Liaison prosecutors underlined how most of their time is allocated to operational work, and, while they do not have desk assistants or supporting staff, they still receive good support from the administration. Interviews with representatives from EU institutions, bodies, offices and agencies provided a more mixed understanding of the current needs and resources available to Eurojust. According to a few interviewees, there is room for increasing efficiency and simplification, especially through better use of more efficient and effective IT tools. While the financial resources might be sufficient, the current structure and decision-making process of Eurojust is also likely to be another factor negatively affecting the Agency's efficiency.

Regarding **coherence**, all categories of stakeholders agreed that Eurojust's objectives and activities align well with EU priorities and the work of other agencies and bodies. The existing mechanisms facilitating cooperation with other agencies, networks, and bodies help ensure Eurojust's coherence within the EU framework. Also, the Eurojust data protection regime is perceived to be well aligned with EU standards and legislation. Representatives of the Eurojust administration agreed that the current mechanisms in place regarding the coordination and cooperation with other EU agencies and bodies, beyond the Regulation, work well to ensure coherence of actions. Possible issues of internal coherence highlighted by a few members of Eurojust staff concern the implementation of working groups – not foreseen by the Regulation – which might tend to work in isolation, thus creating a possible risk of misalignment with the priorities and objectives of the administration and the Agency overall. While not necessarily creating an issue of coherence, but a potential risk, a few interviewees pointed out that the Regulation is not very detailed or clear in some instances, such as the provision on Eurojust's ability to act on its own initiative. Representatives from EU institutions, bodies, offices and agencies confirmed the coherence of Eurojust with other EU policies and priorities, as well as with other actors and activities.

In terms of **relevance**, all stakeholders agreed that Eurojust's core objectives and activities remain highly relevant at both the national and EU levels. Rather mixed opinions were collected from National Members regarding the relevance of other outputs produced by the Agency, such as reports and guidelines. On the contrary, the presence of up-to-date information on case law was deemed very important and relevant by national practitioners. Representatives from EU institutions, bodies, offices and agencies underlined the importance of Eurojust in cooperating with other agencies and bodies, and how the Agency's value is often linked to the insight gained from its involvement in operational matters, with case law and guidelines becoming useful outputs of its work. According to a few interviewees, the relevance of Eurojust is also reflected by its added value, in an area where cooperation is essential but cannot be guaranteed necessarily by national actions alone. National Members, liaison prosecutors, and representatives of EU institutions emphasised that Eurojust has taken on additional roles over the evaluation period, particularly in response to the Russian war of aggression against Ukraine. This was seen as a positive and necessary adaptation to evolving EU needs and priorities.

Regarding **EU added value**, the interviews provided strong evidence of Eurojust's positive impact on judicial cooperation in criminal matters, with a key role in the JHA ecosystem.

Consultation with EU decentralised agencies and other EU bodies

Cooperation with EU partners is a key objective of the Eurojust Regulation, and thus a key focus of the Agency's activities. All relevant EU agencies, offices and bodies were given the opportunity to contribute via the interview programme. Concretely, interviews were conducted with representatives of Europol, the EPPO, FRA, Frontex and CEPOL. In addition, OLAF provided feedback in writing. Interviews were conducted with multiple representatives from Europol (x4) and the EPPO (x3) covering a range of specific perspectives, including governance, operational, and project-based cooperation. In line with the interviews with the European Commission, the European Parliament and the Council of Europe, the EU agencies, bodies and offices consulted were asked about their general perceptions about Eurojust's performance and functioning. In addition, each representative was asked about the

specific interactions between their entity and Eurojust, considering the governance arrangements, the operational cooperation and other activities (e.g. project-based cooperation).

All points raised by the consulted EU agencies, offices and bodies were taken on board in the analysis of implementation and each evaluation criterion; albeit, set against opposing views where relevant. For instance, as explained further in the main report, while Eurojust stakeholders (both representatives of the administration and National Members) reported a need to conclude a new cooperation arrangement with Europol, key representatives of Europol perceived that the existing 2009 agreement, in combination with the provisions of the Europol and Eurojust Regulations, were sufficient to ensure effective cooperation.

Targeted stakeholder surveys

Following data cleaning, largely to remove or consolidate multiple entries from the same respondent, but also to remove respondents not within the scope of the survey (e.g. national desk assistants within survey #1), the two surveys received a **total of 424 responses, with 288 completing all questions, and 136 providing partial responses**. The characteristics of these respondents are broken down below for each survey.

For the **survey targeting Eurojust national desks and third country liaison prosecutors** posted to Eurojust (*survey #1*), responses were received from 59 representatives covering the national desks of 22 Member States, and seven third-country LPs.

For the **survey targeting national-level stakeholders external to Eurojust** (*survey #2*), responses were received from 365 representatives covering all 27 EU Member States.

Given the extent of research issues covered by the two surveys, this Annex focuses on presenting a high-level summary of the survey findings, rather than a comprehensive examination of every question. It first addresses the implementation of the EJR by Eurojust, before presenting the results for each evaluation criterion, distinguishing the views of different stakeholders where relevant. For each research issue, this analysis presents the results for overarching summary questions before providing more granular results for key questions.

Questions on the **implementation of the EJR by Eurojust** were largely targeted at Eurojust national desks and LPs through survey #1. This covered the following key issues:

- **Alignment between elements of Eurojust's governance and functioning and the EJR.** For certain elements – i.e. Eurojust's tasks, operational functions and objectives (as outlined in the MAS and SPD/AWP) – the majority of respondents considered Eurojust to be aligned fully or to a great extent to the EJR. Specifically, 90.7% (39 of 43) of respondents for the tasks and operational functions, and 88.9% (24 of 27) for the objectives (excluding those that responded 'I can't say'). For the remaining elements – i.e. the approximation of the status and powers of NMs, the division of functions and responsibilities among the College, the Executive Board, the Administrative Director and the President, and the KPIs outlined in the SPD/AWP – results were more mixed. For instance, concerning the division of functions and responsibilities among the different governing bodies and actors, 55.9% (19 of 34) of those that did not select 'I can't say' responded that Eurojust practices were fully (17.6%, 6 of 34) or to a great extent (38.2%, 13 of 34) aligned to the EJR; 38.2% saw alignment to a moderate extent on this element, while to a limited extent and not at all were selected by 2.9% each (1 of 34).

- **Whether Eurojust has taken the necessary measures to fulfil its core tasks**, as per Art. 2 EJR. Where respondents have provided an opinion, they are largely positive on this question. Excluding ‘I can’t say’ responses, Eurojust was considered to have taken the necessary measures to a great extent to fulfil its core tasks of: supporting and strengthening coordination (91.3%, 42 of 46) and cooperation (89.1%, 41 of 46), responding to coordination and cooperation requests from Member State competent authorities (84.8%, 39 of 46), and facilitating the execution of requests for, and decisions on, judicial cooperation (83%, 39 of 47). In other areas, however, the responses are more mixed. For instance, respondents were spread across all options regarding the measures taken to ensure Eurojust can act on its own initiative (63.6% (21/33) to a great/moderate extent; 36.4% (12/33) to a limited extent/not at all). Moreover, when included, ‘I can’t say’ was the most common response (31.3%, 15/48).
- **Whether national desks and LPs have sufficient powers to carry out their responsibilities**. Respondents from those stakeholder groups were very positive on this point; 97.9% (46/47); they felt their powers were entirely (68.1%, 32/47) or somewhat sufficient (29.8%, 14/47).

On points of national-level implementation, the survey addressed the following key issues:

- **Set-up and functioning of the ENCS**. A complex and varied picture emerges from the responses on the composition and the tasks of the ENCS across the MS. The number of national correspondents and contact points ranged from three (in France, Italy) to all nine named options (in Germany, Latvia). The median was seven indicating that MS are more likely to be closer to the higher end of the scale; in fact, representatives of seven MS stated that their ENCS included eight of the named types of correspondent/contact point (CZ, FI, HU, NL, RO, ES, SE). Moreover, four respondents reported that no formal ENCS was in operation in their MS (16%, 4/25²⁵⁵). However, the survey also revealed discrepancies between the understanding of different respondents representing the same country.
- **National register access and use**. Across all options, Eurojust NMs, the Representative for Denmark and third country LPs more often have indirect access to relevant national registers (i.e. through their national authorities) (58.2%, 47/98) versus direct access (30.6%, 30/98) or no access (11.2%, 11/98). However, nearly all cases of no access were from LPs (81.8%, 9 of 11); both no access cases for NMs were related to access to DNA registers. Generally, access for these stakeholders is most restricted for DNA registers (68.8% (11/16) have indirect; 25% (4/16) have no access). For the other types of registers (e.g. arrested persons, investigation records, criminal records register), there is a balance between direct and indirect access. Beyond the registers formally listed in Art. 9, respondents reported access to a range of useful registers, including national case management systems, driving licence registers, licence plate registers, and real estate registers.

Responses on the use of these national registers also varied. For instance, 70% of respondents reported never using DNA registers, while 65% (13/20) reported using investigation registers, 50% (10/20) reported using criminal records registers, and 44% (8/18) reported using other registers at least once a quarter.

Effectiveness

Achievement of the Agency’s objectives. While largely positive across the board, the extent of positive stakeholder sentiment differs across Eurojust’s objectives. When combining the responses across both surveys and excluding ‘I can’t say’ responses, most stakeholders considered that Eurojust achieved all its external objectives to a great extent – ranging from 42% (73/174) of respondents selecting to a great extent for the objective of cooperating effectively with international organisations to 70.3% (173/246) for the objective of supporting and strengthening coordination and cooperation between national

authorities. Comparing the two surveys, Eurojust stakeholders responding to survey #1 (i.e. national desks, LPs) are more positive than external national practitioners responding to survey #2 with regard to the objectives about supporting casework. The results across the other three objectives are largely similar between the surveys.

However, across both surveys, there were a large number of ‘I can’t say’ responses to certain objectives, indicating a lack of awareness around Eurojust’s activities and achievements in these areas. For instance, in both survey #1 and #2, respondents had less knowledge of the Agency’s achievements related to cooperation with international organisations (34.1% (15/44) in survey #1; 51.7% (155/300) in survey #2) and cooperation with EU partners (27.3% (12/44) in survey #1; 41.3% (128/300) in survey #2).

In addition to the objectives related to Eurojust’s external activities, NMs and LPs were also asked about **improvements to the internal organisation of Eurojust**. Here, including those responding ‘I can’t say’, 61.4% (27/44) stated that Eurojust had achieved this objective to a great (36.4%, 16/44) or moderate (25%, 11/44) extent; however, a further 29.5% (13/44) responded ‘I can’t say’.

When examined further in a later question, national desks and LPs reported mixed perceptions regarding specific elements of Eurojust’s governance and operations. Some elements were seen in a positive light – for instance, 62.8% (27/43) of respondents to survey #1 agreed (37.2%, 16/43) or strongly agreed (25.6%, 11/43) that the tasks of the national desks and administration are clearly defined with regard to operational work, while 60.5% (26/43) agreed (44.2%, 19/43) or strongly agreed (16.3%, 7/43) that the support provided by the Eurojust administration is fully aligned with the Agency’s operational objectives.

Other elements received more mixed responses from national desks and LPs. For instance: 32.6% (14/43) of respondents neither agreed nor disagreed that the distinction between operational, managerial, strategic and administrative tasks is clear, with 27.9% (12/43) responding positively and 14% (6/43) responding negatively. The division of opinion was similar, albeit slightly more positive, regarding the issue of whether the division of functions and responsibilities among the College, the Executive Board, the Administrative Director and the President enables Eurojust to effectively fulfil its mission (37.2% (16/43) positive; 23.3% (10/43) neutral; 14% (6/43) negative). In addition, across all statements, the number of stakeholders that did not feel able to respond (‘I can’t say’) was relatively high, ranging from 20.9% (9/43) to 32.6% (14/43).

Both surveys also examined the effectiveness of Eurojust’s **external activities** in more detail:

- **Casework support.** Building on the positive overarching finding reported above, national practitioners and authorities (survey #2) were also very positive regarding the **impact of the EJR on Eurojust’s ability to respond to and support cross-border cases involving Member States and third countries**. In fact, when excluding ‘I can’t say’ responses, 89.2% (148/166) of respondents perceived the EJR to have had a very positive (37.3%, 62/166) or positive (51.8%, 86/166) impact in this regard, while no negative responses to this question were received.

Concerning the **effectiveness of specific cooperation and coordination activities conducted by Eurojust in support of casework**. When excluding ‘I can’t say’ responses, all activities listed were considered very or moderately effective by more than 80% of respondents, with at least 50% responding ‘Very effective’ in all cases. Coordination meetings (CMs) were the most valuable activity in this context – 91.3% (168/184) of respondents reported CMs to be very (73.4%, 135/184) or moderately (17.9%, 33/184) effective. CMs were followed closely by providing support for JITs (89.3%, 142/159 combined), facilitating the issuing or execution of requests for mutual legal assistance or mutual recognition (89.2%, 190/213), and exchanging information with competent national authorities (88.4%, 190/215). While still viewed very positively, the lowest scoring activities in terms of effectiveness from the perspective of national-level stakeholders were support and advice on special investigative measures (51.8% very and 28.8%

moderately effective), recurrent refusals (52.2% very and 28.9% moderately effective), and conflicts of jurisdiction (50.4% very and 31% moderately effective).

National desk members and LPs at Eurojust (survey #1) also perceived that the Agency contributes positively to casework through these activities. While the perceptions per activity were largely similar between the two surveys, internal Eurojust stakeholders were clearly less able to make a judgement regarding the exchange of information with competent international authorities – specifically, 32.6% (14/43) of this group responded with ‘I can’t say’ to this activity compared with 14% (6/43) or below for all other options.

Beyond these activities, stakeholders across both surveys were asked whether the **allocation of requests between Eurojust and the EJM** was aligned to the mandates and remits of both entities. National-level stakeholders responding to survey #2 were largely positive in this regard, with 83.9% stating that the allocation of requests between the two entities was appropriate to a great (43%, 64/149) or moderate (40.9%, 61/149) extent. Eurojust national desk members and LPs, however, reported mixed views, with responses spread across all available response options. For instance, 17.4% (4/23) agreed to a great extent that the allocation of requests between Eurojust and the EJM is conducted appropriately and in line with guidance, with 21.7% (5/23) agreeing to a moderate extent, 30.4% (7/23) agreeing to a limited extent, 21.7% (5/23) not agreeing at all, and 8.7% (2/23) responding with ‘I can’t say’. Perceptions on whether the criteria for the allocation of requests are clear and fit for purpose were similar, while views on the consistency of allocation across the Member States were slightly more negative (56.5%, 13/23, of respondents agreed to a limited extent or not at all that the allocation was consistent).

- **Cooperation with EU partners.** When investigating cooperation with Eurojust’s four key EU partners (Europol, the EPPO, OLAF, Frontex) in more detail, a more challenging picture emerges compared to the overarching perceptions reported above. Firstly, many respondents to survey #1 (Eurojust national desk members, LPs) were unable to comment on the effectiveness of Eurojust in cooperating with these partners – specifically, the proportions of ‘I can’t say’ responses were 9.3% (4/43) for Europol, 48.8% (21/43) for the EPPO and OLAF, and 69.8% (30/43) for Frontex. Secondly, when removing those without an opinion, perceptions on effectiveness were mixed, with clear room for improvement across all four relationships. Despite interview feedback indicating challenges related to Eurojust’s engagement with Europol, NMs and LPs were more positive in survey #1 regarding the effectiveness of the Agency’s cooperation with Europol compared to the Agency’s engagement with other EU partners, with 35.9% (14/39) selecting very effective and 56.4% (22/39) selecting moderately effective. These figures dropped to: 22.7% (5/22) and 50% (11/22) for the EPPO; 18.2% (4/22) and 40.9% (9/22) for OLAF; and 15.4% (for both, 2/13) for Frontex. Furthermore, cooperation with Frontex and OLAF was considered to be not at all effective by 38.5% (5/13 re Frontex) and 22.7% (5/22 re OLAF) of respondents, respectively.

Considering whether cooperation with key EU partners has enhanced the Agency’s effectiveness in supporting national desks fighting cross-border crime since the EJR, the responses of Eurojust national desk members and LPs (survey #1) mirrored the above findings. Again, a large proportion of respondents were unable to comment, with ‘I can’t say’ responses ranging from 15.9% (7/44) for cooperation with Europol to 52.3% (23/44) for cooperation with Frontex. And, for those with an opinion, cooperation with Europol was seen as the most positive relationship for enhancing casework support – 81.1% perceived this cooperation to have enhanced Eurojust’s effectiveness in casework support to a great (48.6%, 18/37) or moderate (32.4%, 12/37) extent. The positivity of respondents reduces for cooperation with the EPPO (70.8%, 17/24, stated to a great or moderate extent), OLAF (44%, 11/25) and Frontex (28.6%, 6/21).

- Eurojust also **cooperates with EU practitioner networks**, most prominently hosting the secretariats of the EJN, the JITs Network and the Genocide Network. While still largely positive, Eurojust national desk members and LPs (survey #1) were more circumspect regarding the effectiveness of cooperation with the EJN compared with the JITs and Genocide Networks. Specifically, 44.4% (16/36) reported that cooperation with the EJN was very effective, compared to 65.5% (19/29) for the Genocide Network and 84.6% (33/39) for the JITs Network. Respondents to survey #2 (i.e. national practitioners and policymakers) were largely positive about Eurojust's support to practitioner networks, with 57.1% (92 of 161) stating that Eurojust has performed very well in this regard, considering the resources available, and a further 31.7% (51/161) reporting that Eurojust has performed moderately well.

- **Cooperation with international partners.** Eurojust engages with third countries and international organisations through a variety of mechanisms, including the posting of LPs to Eurojust and the conclusion of working arrangements. There is a clear perception among national practitioners and policymakers (survey #2) that Eurojust has increased its international presence since the entry into application of the EJR – 89.1% (147/165) strongly agree (35.2%, 58/165) or agree (89/165) with this statement. In this context, they also view Eurojust's relationship with third countries and international organisations to have improved coordination and cooperation with these stakeholders and to be largely effective – this is true for the posting of third country LPs, the system of contact points in third countries, the conclusion of formal cooperation agreements and working arrangements. For instance, 87.4% of respondents to survey #2 agree (53.6%, 81/151) or strongly agree (33.8%, 51/151) that the posting of third country LPs to Eurojust has improved coordination and cooperation with third countries.

This result is supported by the perceptions of Eurojust national desk members and LPs (through survey #1). Concerning the posting of LPs, respondents that answered almost unanimously agreed that the posting of LPs has greatly enhanced Eurojust's effectiveness in supporting national desks fighting cross-border crime (97.6%, 41/42). This stakeholder group also largely reported that cooperation with third country partners was very (40%, 16/40) or moderately (45%, 18/40) effective.

For cooperation with **international organisations**, more than half of respondents (51.2%, 22/43) to survey #1 (Eurojust national desk members and LPs) selected 'I can't say' regarding Eurojust's effectiveness in cooperating with this group. For those that did respond, the perceptions were mixed, spread across the four options – very effective (28.6%, 6/21), moderately effective (42.9%, 9/21), weakly effective (23.8%, 5/21) and not at all effective (4.8%, 1/21).

In addition, Eurojust's core activities are supported by a range of **other tasks, activities and functions**. These include the provision of analysis and expertise, the ENCS, the OCC system, the provision of information by Member States to Eurojust under Art. 21 EJR, project-based approaches, the CTR, and CISED. National-level stakeholders were largely positive regarding the effectiveness of all these supplementary activities – in fact, between 63.4% and 82.8% of respondents to survey #2 perceived these activities to be very or moderately effective. The analysis and expertise provided by Eurojust was the most positively perceived activity (46%, 80/174, very and 36.8%, 64/174, moderately effective), followed by the ENCS (44.5%, 65/146, very and 35.6%, 52/146, moderately effective).

Efficiency

In line with the general views on Eurojust's effectiveness, the national-level stakeholders responding to survey #2 were also largely positive regarding the efficiency of the support activities, tasks and functions provided by the Agency. They reported that Eurojust: (i) contributed to the efficient investigation

and prosecution of serious cross-border crime – 63.9% (106/166) considered that Eurojust had achieved this to a great extent; and (ii) cooperated efficiently with different partners, at both the EU and international levels – between 40.4% (42/104, for relations with international organisations) and 46.7% (64/137) considered that Eurojust had achieved this to a great extent. Very few negative responses were received across these questions – only 7.1% (38/537) of all responses across these options selected to a limited extent (6%, 32/537) or not at all (1.1%, 6/537).

Similarly, these national-level stakeholders responded positively regarding how well Eurojust was able to implement its other across other tasks, activities and functions considering the resources available. As above, this included activities such as the provision of analysis and expertise, the ENCS, the OCC, the CTR, CICED, project-based approaches, and support to practitioner networks. Across these activities, when excluding ‘I can’t say’ responses, between 74.6% (25/67, CTR) and 88.8% (92/161, support to practitioner networks) of respondents perceived that these activities were implemented very well or moderately well, considering the resources available. However, the number of stakeholders that felt able to respond varied significantly, ranging from 40.1% (108/269, support to practitioner networks) to 75.8% (204/269, CICED).

Internal Eurojust stakeholders (national desk members, LPs) were asked in more granular terms about the Agency’s efficiency, concerning issues such as the burden of non-operational activities on NMs, the efficiency of decision-making by the College and the Executive Board, the efficient allocation of human and financial resources, the efficiency with which the Eurojust administration conducts its tasks, and the use of digital tools. While the sentiment on efficiency across these issues was generally positive, there were variations in the balance of positive and negative responses.

In general, the number of respondents strongly agreeing with the Agency’s efficiency across these issues was limited (between 0% and 16.1%), while the most common response option was ‘Agree’ (between 29.4% and 54.8%) in all but three cases. The three exceptions related to: reductions in the burden of non-operational activities on NMs (33.3% selected both agree and neither agree nor disagree); the successful use of digital tools to improve operational efficiency (again 33.3% selected both agree and neither agree nor disagree); and the successful use of digital tools to improve non-operational efficiency (41.4% selected neither agree nor disagree).

The sentiment was most positive regarding: the efficient allocation of Eurojust’s financial (71%, 22/31, selected either agree or strongly agree) and human (62.5%, 20/32) resources; the efficiency of Eurojust’s administration (62.9%, 22/35); and support to enable the efficient use of digital tools (61.8%, 21/34). While still largely positive, the issues where more neutral or negative sentiment emerged included: reductions in the burden of non-operational activities on NMs (33.3%, 8/24, equal split across positive, neutral and negative, with no respondents selecting ‘Strongly agree’); whether Eurojust has been provided with sufficient resources to implement all its activities and tasks (41.2%, 14/34, positive vs 35.3%, 12/34, negative); and the efficiency of decision-making by the College and Executive Board (52.2%, 12/23, positive vs 21.7%, 5/23, negative).

Investigating the balance between the operational and non-operational responsibilities of national desk members further, it was found that most respondents perceive the balance to be largely appropriate. Specifically, 30.4% (7/23) agreed to a great extent, with a further 47.8% (11/23) agreeing to a moderate extent, that the balance was appropriate. The non-operational activities considered to be the most important by these stakeholders were participation in the College (64.1%, 25/39, perceived this to be very important), as well as College working groups (53.8%, 21/39, selected very important), training (leading or participating), and non-case related missions (41% selected very important for both). The non-operational activities considered to be of less importance were basic administrative tasks for the Member States (46.2% selected moderately important) and Eurojust (41% selected moderately important), and topics/questionnaires (59% selected moderately important).

As a result, there remains room for improvement regarding the reduction of non-operational activities. Specifically, 45.5% (10/22) of respondents to survey #1 agreed to a moderate extent that the burden of non-operational activities on national desks could be reduced, with 9.1% (2/22) agreeing to a great extent and 31.8% (7/22) agreeing to a limited extent. This is complemented by results from survey #2, where national-level stakeholders also identified further room for simplification and efficiency with regard to operational tasks – 47.6% (69/145) agreed to a moderate extent that there was potential for simplification in this regard, with 22.8% (33/145) agreeing to a great extent and 24.1% (35/145) agreeing to a limited extent.

Coherence

Stakeholders across both surveys were largely positive regarding the coherence of Eurojust's work with related activities in the fields of criminal justice and judicial cooperation in criminal matters. For example, 93.6% (147/157) of national practitioners and policymakers responding to survey #2 stated that, overall, Eurojust's activities are coherent with the work of other actors, policies or legislation in the criminal justice field to a great (58.6%, 92/157) or moderate (35%, 55/157) extent. The only counterpoints highlighted through the open comments provided by this survey cohort related to the issue of what types of cases Eurojust should handle. For instance, one national prosecutor noted that Eurojust should take more account of the work of national structures set up to govern international judicial cooperation, particularly in the context of less complex or bilateral cases, while others perceived that many requests could be facilitated through the EJC or other mechanisms.

Relevance

Most stakeholders across both surveys responded that the needs of the EU and its stakeholders in the field of judicial cooperation in criminal matters have evolved since the entry into application of the EJC. More specifically, when excluding 'I can't say' responses, 58.1% (18/31) of national desk members and LPs (survey #1) and 48.1% (88/183) of national-level stakeholders (survey #2) stated that the needs have changed over this period to a great extent. The open comment responses related to this question highlighted a range of issues as important in this context. These include the increasingly cross-border nature of crime, driven by cybercrime, cyber-enabled crime and higher flexibility of criminal networks, resulting in increases in the need for judicial cooperation and the use of judicial cooperation instruments, as well as the need to address the challenges of digital evidence, and respond to the Russian war of aggression in Ukraine.

In this context, national-level stakeholders felt that Eurojust has continued to address their needs in the field of judicial cooperation in criminal matters since the entry into application of the EJC – 59.8% (104/174) of those that were able to comment agreed to a great extent, with a further 31.6% (55/174) agreeing to a moderate extent.

When investigating the Agency's continued relevance to specific developments, most stakeholders across both surveys remained positive. When combining data from both surveys, positive sentiment to statements on Eurojust's relevance was greater than 73% in all cases. Eurojust's continued response to the needs of its stakeholders in light of EU legal and policy developments received the most positive responses, with 92.4% (194/210) of stakeholders either agreeing (42.4%, 89/210) or strongly agreeing (50%, 105/210) that Eurojust had performed well in this regard. This was closely followed by the continued value delivered by Eurojust in an international context, both generally (52.1%, 111/213, strongly agreed; 38.5%, 82/213, agreed) and in the context of emerging needs related to Russia's war of aggression in Ukraine (42%, 68/162, strongly agreed; 45.1%, 73/162, agreed) and the Agency's new tasks related to core international crimes (42.6%, 69/162, strongly agreed; 43.8%, 71/162, agreed).

While still viewed positively, slightly different dynamics were found regarding: (i) the relationship between Eurojust's ability to act on its own initiative and its relevance to operational work; and (ii) Eurojust's adaptation to technological progress (e.g. cybercrime, electronic evidence). The first point (on own initiative) received the highest neutral and negative sentiment of the statements (across both surveys) – 19.6% (35/179) selected neither agree nor disagree, and 7.3% (13/179) either disagreed or strongly disagreed. Moreover, across both points, a clear shift was identified in the survey #1 responses (national desk members, LPs) from strongly agreeing to agreeing or a neutral response with regard to Eurojust's relevance in these areas. More specifically, the proportion of survey #1 respondents selecting strongly agree for these two options was 17.1% (6/35, on own initiative) and 19.4% (7/36, on technological progress), respectively, compared to at least 40% for all other response options. The proportion of respondents selecting neither agree nor disagree was 28.6% (10/35) for the relevance of own initiative to casework and 25% (9/35) for adaptation to technological progress, compared to a maximum of 6.1% (2/33) across the other options.

A similar trend was observed regarding the relevance statement on the continuing fitness for purpose of Eurojust's governance structure, which was asked only to survey #1 respondents (national desks, LPs). While most responses were positive (64.5%, 20/31, selected strongly agree or agree), they were largely weighted towards agree (48.4%, 15/31) rather than strongly agree (16.1%, 5/31). In addition, 29% (9/31) neither agreed nor disagreed with this statement.

EU added value

Across both surveys, stakeholders responded positively regarding the EU added value of Eurojust. When combining data across both surveys, a significant majority of respondents perceived that progress towards the following objectives was greater with Eurojust than it could have been in the Agency's absence:

- Strengthened coordination and cooperation between national investigating and prosecuting authorities in relation to serious crime – 80.8% (177/219) of respondents reported that progress towards this objective was greater with Eurojust than it could have been without the Agency.
- Effective and efficient investigation and prosecution of serious cross-border crime (81.1%, 176/217).
- Effective and efficient cooperation with other EU institutions, bodies, offices, and agencies working in the field of justice and home affairs (77.4%, 147/190).
- Effective and efficient cooperation with third countries in the area of criminal justice (75.9%, 148/195). Related to this point, national-level respondents to survey #2 also responded very positively regarding the extent to which Eurojust has added value to the ability of EU Member State authorities to cooperate with international partners on cross-border cases within its competence, with 67.6% (119/176) agreeing to a great extent and 26.7% (47/176) agreeing to a moderate extent.

Focus groups

Two focus groups were conducted on 14 and 21 January 2025 with a total of 11 national-level practitioners involved in cross-border cooperation.

The first discussion focused on the experiences of countries cooperating often. It included prosecutors, investigative judges and members of central authorities from Austria, Germany, Italy, Slovakia and Spain. The discussion focused on the added-value of the Agency compared to other cooperation and collaboration mechanisms (e.g. bilateral, EJM). Participants highlighted the importance of the Agency in cross-border cases, as well as the differing approaches of Member States in the types of cases being brought to Eurojust and the domestic systems and structures for international judicial cooperation

in criminal matters. Participants discussed the merits of different approaches, including the success factors of well-functioning ENCS and cooperation mechanisms, including knowledge of different mechanisms, having the right people in place and some degree of flexibility built into the system.

The second focus group centred on cooperation with third countries. It was attended by participants including prosecutors and members of central authorities from Austria, Croatia, Finland, North Macedonia, and the Netherlands. An important part of the discussion was dedicated to practical difficulties and issues relating to data protection. Some prosecutors were concerned about the lack of clarity of the rules and in particular the risk of seeing a case dismissed due to stringent data protection rules not being followed. Discussions also focused on different views on the value added of the Agency's role in creating ties with third countries. Some prosecutors saw this as positive, while others believed that, in their experience, the actions of national ministries in negotiating agreements with third countries was the exercise that started creating trust. This was linked closely to the point raised in the first focus group regarding the different national systems in place to deal with international judicial cooperation in criminal matters, considering both the size and maturity of these systems and structures.

Validation workshops

The findings were presented and discussed at two validation meetings, held with the College of Eurojust on 11 February 2025 and the Management Team of the Eurojust administration on 20 February 2025.

In general, both groups of stakeholders validated the findings on both positive elements and challenges. In particular, both groups agreed with the findings on the significant value and strong effectiveness of Eurojust's support to national practitioners across the Member States. However, they also confirmed the findings on the challenges brought by Eurojust's current governance structure, including on the distinction between operational and administrative matters, the division of responsibilities between the College and the Executive Board, and the composition of the Executive Board. Both groups also agreed with the findings on different working methods and cultures across the Member States, albeit reflecting that this was inherent in the nature of Eurojust's role in supporting national authorities that operate under different legal regimes. The members of the College also highlighted again the challenges they face with regard to the sharing of personal data with third countries. This point was also subject to further clarification in the discussion with the members of the Eurojust administration management team.

In addition, the members of the College flagged a range of issues where greater elaboration or nuance would be valuable within the evaluation. This included information sharing under Article 21, and the anticipated changes to the ecosystem due to developments in the field of digitalisation / e-evidence.

