

Evaluation on Eurojust Published



Cornelia Riehle

News

At the end of 2019, efforts to reform Eurojust came to pass with the entry into force of the new Eurojust Regulation (→[eucrim 4/2018, 196-197](#)). The reform aimed to address the new relationship between Eurojust and the EPPO, establish an Executive Board for Eurojust, modify the composition of the College, prepare an anti-fraud strategy for Eurojust, and introduce a new data protection regime. To assess its impact, the Regulation required an evaluation to be carried out by the end of 2024. In compliance with this requirement, the European Commission published an [evaluation](#) on 2 July 2025, assessing the implementation and impact of the new Eurojust Regulation as well as the effectiveness and efficiency of Eurojust and its working practices (from 12 December 2019 to 1 May 2024).

AUTHOR

Cornelia Riehle

Deputy Head of Section
Academy of European Law

Published in
2025, Vol. 20(2) [eucrim pp 130 – 131](#)

ISSN: 1862-6947
<https://eucrim.eu>

Specifically, the evaluation addressed the following questions:

- Has the Eurojust Regulation been completely and correctly implemented?
- Are the performance of Eurojust and its working practices in line with the Commission's Better Regulation Guidelines and the evaluation concepts of effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, coherence, and EU added value?
- How does the agency use its existing resources, and what significant obstacles and underlying factors can be identified?
- Which areas of the Eurojust Regulation might need revision, and how can these findings serve as a foundation for a possible future revision?"



The evaluation concluded that Eurojust has made significant progress towards meeting most objectives of the Eurojust Regulation. The agency appears to be very effective in supporting and strengthening coordination and cooperation between national investigating and prosecuting authorities. Overall, national authorities and prosecutors are satisfied with the work and support of Eurojust. Cooperation with third countries is also deemed to be increasingly effective. The same holds true for Eurojust's work on ensuring accountability for alleged international crimes committed in the context of the Russian war of aggression against Ukraine. The agency is relevant for Member States' needs and even expected to increase its relevance in the foreseeable future.

The evaluation also identified areas where several shortcomings prevent Eurojust from realising its full potential:

- Effectiveness and efficiency challenges - largely resulting from Eurojust's working practices and decision-making culture as well as related structures, systems, and processes, which were either not fully aligned with the intentions of the Eurojust Regulation or impeded by a lack of clarity in the provisions of the Regulation;

- The continuation of working practices pre-dating the Eurojust Regulation;
- Problems related to unclear and non-binding definitions in the Eurojust Regulation - leading to a lack of internal coherence;
- Non-optimised allocation of cases between the EJM and Eurojust - resulting in a decline in efficiency;
- Accountability problems when National Members exercise their second function, which is to make decisions for an EU agency;
- A lack of checks and balances between the College and the Administrative Director, who nominally heads the administration but is appointed by and accountable to the College and is not a member of the Executive Board;
- Priority setting - an area requiring streamlining;
- Challenges in clear prioritisation and efficient allocation of the National Members' human and financial resources;
- Outdated IT tools and delays in the implementation of digitalisation - preventing Eurojust from operating at full efficiency;
- Organisation of Eurojust operations in line with the budget available under the Multiannual Financial Framework;
- Overlaps in the practical implementation of the mandates of the different JHA agencies and difficulties in information and data sharing - limiting the effectiveness and efficiency of cooperation.

The Commission's report draws a series of "lessons learned" to improve Eurojust in the future. In this context, the report stresses that Eurojust plays a unique role in the EU's security and justice architecture. Hence, a more cooperative, coherent approach should be explored, envisaging closer collaboration mechanisms and ensuring better information exchange between the JHA agencies and bodies.

The [Commission's evaluation](#) drew upon an [external support study](#), includes the following in its annexes:

- A list of resources;
- An overview of the analytical framework of the study;
- An overview of all stakeholder consultations;
- A detailed analysis of financial and human resources;
- Budget tables for the years 2020-2024;
- Cost-benefit tables;
- Comprehensive case studies examining the questions of the evaluation;
- Comparative legal analysis conducted to identify and examine the differences between the provisions of the Eurojust Regulation and Council Decision 2009/426/JHA;
- An overview of Eurojust's objectives set out in the multi-annual strategies and of its cooperation with partners.

About eucrim

eucrim is the leading journal which regularly informs about current developments in European criminal and "criministrative" law.

All news items are freely accessible at: <https://eucrim.eu/news/>

Stay informed by emailing to eucrim-subscribe@csl.mpg.de to receive alerts for new releases of issues.

The project is co-financed by the [Union Anti-Fraud Programme \(UAFP\)](#), managed by the [European Anti-Fraud Office \(OLAF\)](#).



Co-funded by
the European Union