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Eurojust, the European Union Agency for Criminal Justice Cooperation, plays a pivotal role in the fight against serious cross-border crime. Eurojust provides operational support and strengthens the coordination and cooperation between national investigating and prosecuting authorities of the Member States in relation to serious cross-border crime (Art.85 TFEU). The Agency has a central role in the Union’s security architecture, and ideas for enhancing this role should be discussed further.

In this context, the European Commission is currently conducting an evaluation of Eurojust and its founding Regulation (EU) 2018/1727. The evaluation assesses the Agency and its working practices from the aspects of its effectiveness, efficiency, relevance and coherence and EU added value. The Commission’s evaluation report, expected in summer 2025, would be the basis for a political decision about a revision. It would be followed by an impact assessment and guide the revision of the Eurojust Regulation, which could be presented in 2026. These changes could emerge as part of a larger revision package including also the EPPO and Europol Regulation.

The preliminary outcome of the evaluation shows that Eurojust’s operational support to investigations and prosecutions of competent national authorities is very successful. However, the evaluation also identifies certain areas, in which improvements could be beneficial, particularly Eurojust’s governance system, the decision-making and priority-setting processes at Eurojust, as well as Eurojust’s cooperation with JHA agencies and bodies and third countries.

Within this framework and with the goal of enabling an open discussion at the High-Level Forum, experts are invited to share their views on key topics crucial to this evaluation and potential reform process, drawing on the main conclusions of the evaluation report.

1. **Refining of strategic priorities**

Eurojust’s strategic priorities are agreed upon in a consensual process, collaborating input from the Eurojust administration and various working groups, in which National Member participate. Due to this collective consensual process, strategic priorities sometimes do not reflect the actual needs of national competent authorities in the fight against serious cross-border crime.

What should be Eurojust’s priorities in the future? Should Eurojust focus exclusively on operational matters, such coordinating cross-border prosecutions, or also keep feeding policy and strategic discussion in Brussels? Do you see additional roles for Eurojust in relation to judicial cooperation with third countries, e.g. by placing Eurojust liaison magistrates in countries with which cooperation is perceived important, but where conclusion of such international agreements seems not possible for political or other reasons? How could the priorities be set in a manner which reflect better the operational needs and strategic priorities of the Prosecution General Office’s of the Member States? How could, at the same time, also Union priorities be better taken into account, considering its nature as EU agency?

1. **Eurojust’s governance and decision-making**

To reduce administrative burden on the National Members, the Eurojust Regulation established an Executive Board to deal with administrative matters. However, in practice the College continues to discuss many administrative matters with distant links to operational matters such as mission rules, which leads to duplications rather than to a reduction of administrative burdens, as originally intended by the Eurojust Regulation.

What is your view regarding the governance model of Eurojust? How can Eurojust become more effective and efficient while safeguarding the College’s independence in operational matters? How can Eurojust streamline its decision-making process and ensure that its governance model corresponds to a modern EU agency’s requirements?

1. **Cooperation with other JHA agencies and bodies, including data sharing**

JHA agencies and bodies work hand in hand with national competent authorities to fight against serious crime efficiently. JHA agencies and bodies should have coherent mandates, objectives and tasks to establish an effective EU security infrastructure.

What should be Eurojust’s role in the EU’s evolving security architecture and how can this role be further enhanced? Should Eurojust have additional tasks, e.g. with view to the fight against organised crime? Do you see added value in a more proactive role of Eurojust, e.g. in relation to analysis of data or the setting up of JITs? How can cooperation between Eurojust and other with key JHA actors such as Europol and the EPPO be further improved and their complementarity enhanced? To which extent Eurojust should cooperate with Europol and with training agencies and networks to enhance mutual understanding between law enforcement authorities and judicial authorities of the respective capacities and needs?

Given the fact that Eurojust only supports the investigations and prosecutions conducted by national competent authorities and therefore never “owns” information relating to these cases, do you see any possibility how data access and data sharing between the JHA agencies and bodies could be done more effectively?