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# Executive summary

|  |
| --- |
| *Question 1: Summary of progress achieved during the reporting period.* |
| During the second half of 2016, PA 11 continued to develop the impetus gained in project implementation and experts events carried out. The main topics at PA 11 agenda were combatting terrorism and property crime. The implementation of certain activities in the framework of countering trafficking in human beings, combatting cybercrime and in the area of visa and consular issue continued to be on focus.  Essential aspect within PA 11 portfolios is the long-term cooperation on establishing network of contact and coordination centres along the Danube that is continuously growing.  Another interesting emphasize within PA 11 portfolio comes from the activities in the area preventing the illicit use of chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear and explosive materials in the Danube region. By facilitating a widespread transnational cooperation, a newly launched project aims at enhancing the fight against serious forms of cross-border and international crime and terrorism, caused by chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear and explosive materials.  Several ongoing projects in the area of trafficking in human beings, combatting cybersecurity and property crimes among others were successfully finalized. Partly, follow-up projects were already initiated.  Backed up with the clear and determined political will on joining the efforts to prevent and counter the terrorism threats in the Danube region, the experts from EUSDR member-states and PA 11 stakeholders launched the cooperation at expert level.  The growing efforts of PA 11 to develop the “horizontal cooperation” with PA 1a, PA 6 and PA 10 already gave tangible results (ex. the elaboration of a Practical Manual with PA 1a or the participation in several overlapping workshops or forums).  The most important lessons learned were, that building networks of experts, exchanging knowledge and best practices are most fruitful for our working field and helps to make a vividly contribution to our targets and actions. The challenges ahead of PA 11 are related to the further development of the impetus already gained. Due to the specificity of the security issues, the better communication of our activities and their visibility to the public remain issues of key importance. |

# 

# Progress of the PA

## Progress on policy level

### Policy areas at focus

|  |
| --- |
| *Question 2: What are the policy areas (important policy topics/thematic issues) that the PA selected as main focus (i.e. priority) for work during the reporting period?* |
| The main topics during the second half of 2016 were intensifying the common approach in the fight against terrorism, police cooperation in the field of property crime and combatting the cybercrime. |
| *Question 3: What are the main arguments for selecting those policy areas as priority ones?* |
| * At present the global terrorist threat has reached unprecedented level. Counterterrorism has to be addressed adequately also within the framework of Priority Area Security of the Danube Region Strategy in order to reflect current developments. PA 11 is in the process of identifying main challenges in order to find comprehensive responses and to set realistic and feasible common initiatives into motion. * Crime against property is becoming an ever more important issue in police investigations. Especially in the field of domestic burglary, an increase in the number of incidents is recorded throughout Germany and Europe. EUSDR member countries are affected in different ways. Countries on the upper reaches tend to be somewhat more a target for burglaries whereas the lower reaches harbour some of the perpetrators. Cooperation within EUSDR in this field could help discouraging property crime and reducing incident numbers. * Nowadays cybercrime represents a significant risk for various actors (states, companies, individuals), having a serious impact on the economic development of a region. Internet has no boundaries. Therefore the transnational cooperation between the law-enforcement authorities is crucial for the success of the efforts in the field. |

### Main policy achievements

| *Question 4: Based on what has been reported under section 2.1.1: what are the PAs’ main policy achievements and developments during the reporting period?* |
| --- |
| Guided by the principle to embed PA 11 activities within the general framework of the EUSDR, we continue with our efforts to address the most important issues that have macro-regional impact in the field of security, such as countering terrorism, organized crime and cybercrime. Crimes that “do not know boundaries”.  One of the main priorities is to create synergies and coordination between existing policies and initiatives across the Danube Region. Without certain level of safety and stable security situation in the region, the cooperation in all other fields will be significantly affected.  During the reported period PA 11 continued to invest significant efforts in the development of one of the most emerging topics in PA’s portfolio –“to intensify the common approach in the fight against terrorism”.  Following the successfully conducted **Ministerial Conference on Combating Terrorism in the Danube Region** (January 2016, Sofia)during the report period two follow up events on the topic took place – *Workshop on best practices and possible joint actions between the police authorities in the prevention of terrorism threats in the Danube region* and *Expert meeting on coping life-threatening police operations in case of terrorist attacks.* The highest political will followed by the professional events led to significant progress in the cooperation in the field of combatting terrorism during the second half of 2017.  Important progress was also achieved in other two main areas: “**Combating Cybercrime”** and strengthening the cooperation in the field of **“Property Crime”.**  Strengthening and improving information security, sharing (software) tools, information and trainings for security teams, including best-practice exchange are among the most important developments in the area of combatting cybercrime in the Danube region.  The effort in the area of strengthening the cooperation in the field of property crime led to tangible results such as enhanced exchange of information and setting up a network of experts of the states of origin of the perpetrators with the states affected by the perpetrators. |

### Policy lessons learned

|  |
| --- |
| *Question 5: Based on what has been reported in sections 2.1.1and 2.1.2: what are the policy related lessons learned (positive or negative) from the PAs implementation during the reporting period (with focus on those that are important for the future EUSDR policy development)?* |
| **Excellent cooperation with stakeholders** – The broadening scope of PA 11 work and the wide variety of activities carried out during the last year prioritized the necessity of substantial involvement of the relevant actors in the Danube region – the EU institutions and agencies, European and regional law enforcement agencies and NGOs among others. The actively involved countries gained benefits from that cooperation by increasing their capacities in the relevant areas.  **The necessity to communicate our work -** Communicating the work and giving the appropriate visibility of achievements (having in mind the specificity of the security related topics) are crucial for achieving commitment of the participating countries and attracting potential financial sources.  All these lessons learned are closely related to the future EUSDR policy development. |

### Future policy development

|  |
| --- |
| *Question 6: Based on what has been reported in section 2.1.3: what next steps and challenges for future policy development the PA finds important to share for further consideration discussion or development (incl. possible solutions to overcome the challenges)?* |
| **The necessity to maintain the established cooperation and networks between the experts of the member states and at the same time continuing the efforts to create new networks in other working field.**  **The challenges of the horizontal cooperation - tool for creating synergies within the EUSDR**  Horizontal cooperation adds new impetus in cooperation within EUSDR and possibilities for establishing such cooperation with other Priority Areas must be further explored; (the cooperation with PA 1a is currently on-going and broadening its frameworks).Further possibilities will be explored to cooperate with PA 6 and PA 10.  **The necessity of identifying funding sources** – PA 11 continues to invest significant efforts in guarantying various different financial sources in order to secure the implementation of its projects and activities.  **Involvement/support of DG Home in PA 11 work is further needed.** |

## Progress on PA’s targets

*Table 1: Progress on targets during the reporting period*

| *PA Targets*  *(number and wording of the target)* | *Progress during the reporting period* | | | | *Clarifications* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Completed* | *Satisfactory progress* | *Delayed progress* | *Other* |
| *(a)* | *(b)* | *(c)* | *(d)* | *(e)* | *(f)* |
| Target I - Security offensive - Enhancing police cooperation with the aim of improving security and tackling serious and organised crime in the EUSDR countries and strengthening the efforts against terrorism threats |  |  |  |  | Targets of PA11 were modified in 2016 as part of overall revision & update of EUSDR Targets with regards to all PAs.  PA actions are numbered from 1 to 17: 1-6 correspond to Target I, 7-11 to Target II, 12-15 to Target III and 16-17 to Target IV) |
| Target II - Developing strategic long-term cooperation between law enforcement actors along the Danube river by strengthening networks for cooperation by 2020 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Target III - Improving the systems of border control, document inspection management and cooperation on consular related issues in the Danube region |  |  |  |  |  |
| Target IV - Promoting the rule of law and the fight against corruption. |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| *Question 7: Based on the information provided in Table 1, what is the PAs overall self-evaluation with regards to reaching the applicable targets? Any other positive experience or other important information to that respect that the PA considers necessary (or good) to be shared should be included here as well.* |
| As reported above the overall progress in achieving PA 11 targets is satisfactory, the activities planned and carried out reflect the variety in PA 11 portfolio and the efforts for balanced approach in the implementation of all the targets. |
| *Question 8: What, if anything, was/is missing in order to achieve the progress in reaching the targets as previously planned?* |
| *Not applicable* |
| *Question 9: Are there any plans (or needs) for revising/updating the list of targets, applicable for the PA? If so, please provide details.* |
| PA 11 targets and actions are the basis for every activity to be taken within the framework of the PA. The 4 targets and 17 actions reflect the current needs and trends in providing security and are of utmost importance for the success of the entire Strategy. Since the last revision of the targets was done a year ago, PA 11 Coordinators and PA 11 Steering Group consider the targets and their respective actions to be adequate both to the latest EU agenda on security and - most importantly – to the actual trends and development in the field of security in the Danube region. The newly revised targets were adopted by the PA11 Steering Group via electronic approval procedure in July 2015 and approved by the EUSDR National Coordinators and Commission on 23 May 2016 in Bratislava at the joint NC/PAC Meeting. |

## Progress on PA’s actions

*Table 2: Progress on actions during the reporting period*

| *PA Targets (number)* | *Progress on action for reaching the targets during the reporting period* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *A1* | *A2* | *A3* | *A4* | *A5* | *A6* | *A7* | *A8* | *A9* | *A10* | *A11* | *A12* | *A13* | *A14* | *A15* | *A16* | *A17* |
| *(a)* | *(b)* | *(c)* | *(d)* | *(e)* | *(f)* | *(g)* | *(h)* | *(i)* | *(j)* | *(k)* | *(l)* | *(m)* | *(n)* | *(o)* | *(p)* | *(q)* | *(r)* |
| *I* | *ASP* | *ASP* | *ASP* | *ASP* | *ASP* | *ASP* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *II* |  |  |  |  |  |  | *ASP* | *ASP* | *ASP* | *ASP* | *ANS* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *III* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | *ASP* | *ASP* | *ASP* | *ANS* |  |  |
| *IV* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | *ASP* | *ASP* |

*Legend:*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ASP | actions, whose implementation is satisfactory progressing (according to what was initially planned in the Roadmap); |
| APD | actions, whose implementation is progressing with delays (comparing to what was initially planned in the Roadmap); |
| ACcp | actions completed in current reporting period; |
| ACpp | actions completed in previous reporting period(s); |
| ANS | actions, whose implementation has not started yet; |

|  |
| --- |
| *Question 10: Based on the information provided in Table 2, what is the PA’s overall self - evaluation regarding the progress in implementing the actions? A positive experience or other important information to that respect that the PA considers necessary (or good) to be shared should be included here as well.* |
| As reported above the overall progress of PA 11 is satisfactory, the activities planned and carried out reflect the variety in PA 11 portfolio and the efforts for balanced approach between our targets.  As a PA 11 good practice we could point out the balanced approach in the activities and the implementation of the targets as well as the efforts to maintain our work corresponding to the current EU and regional security challenges (esp. the introduction of the two topics of utmost importance – combatting terrorism and migration management). |
| *Question 11: What, if anything, was/is missing in order to achieve the progress in implementing the actions as previously planned?* |
| Not applicable |
| *Question 12: Are there any plans (or needs) for revising/updating the actions, applicable for the PA? If so, please provide details.* |
| Since the last revision of the actions was done less than a year ago, as for the moment PA 11 Coordinators and PA 11 Steering Group consider the targets and their respective actions to be adequate for achieving the targets. |

## Progress on milestones

*Table 3: Progress on milestones during the reporting period*

| *PA Actions (numbers)* | *Progress on milestones during the reporting period* | | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *M1* | *M2* | *M3* | *M4* | *M5* | *M6* | *M7* | *M8* | *M9* | *M10* |
| *(a)* | *(b)* | *(c)* | *(d)* | *(e)* | *(f)* | *(g)* | *(h)* | *(i)* | *(j)* | *(k)* |
| *A1* | *MSP* | *MSP* | *MNS* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *A2* | *MSP* | *MNS* | *MSP* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *A3* | *MSP* | *MNS* | *MNS* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *A4* | *MSP* | *MSP* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *A5* | *MSP* | *MSP* | *MSP* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *A6* | MCcpp | *MSP* | *MNS* | *MNS* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *A7* | *MSP* | *MSP* | *MNS* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *A8* | *MSP* | *MSP* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *A9* | *MSP* | *MNS* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *A10* | *MSP* | *MSP* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *A11* | *MNS* | *MSP* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *A12* | *MSP* | *MNS* | *MSP* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *A13* | *MCcp* | *MSP* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *A14* | *MSP* | *MSP* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *A15* | *MNS* | *MNS* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *A16* | *MSP* | *MNS* | *MNS* | *MSP* | *MSP* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *A17* | *MSP* | *MSP* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

*Legend:*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MSP | milestones that are satisfactory progressing (according to what was initially planned in the Roadmap); |
| MPD | milestones that are progressing with delays (comparing to what was initially planned in the Roadmap); |
| MCcp | milestones completed in current reporting period; |
| MCpp | milestones completed in previous reporting period(s); |
| MNS | milestones, whose implementation has not started yet; |

|  |
| --- |
| *Question 13: Based on the information provided in Table 3, what is the PAs overall self - evaluation regarding the progress in reaching the milestones? A positive experience or other important information to* *that the PA considers necessary (or as good) to be shared should be included here as well* |
| As reported above the overall progress of PA 11 is satisfactory, the activities planned and carried out reflect the variety in PA 11 portfolio and the efforts for balanced approach between our targets. |
| *Question 14: What, if anything, was/is missing in order to achieve the progress in reaching the milestones as previously planned?* |
| Not applicable. |

## Progress on activities

*Table 4 Activities undertaken to progress on PA implementation*

| *PA Actions (numbers)* | *Activities undertaken during the reporting period to progress on PA implementation* |
| --- | --- |
| *(a)* | *(b)* |
| *A1* | * Wrap up activities of PA 11 project “Countering trafficking in persons” |
| *A2* | * Efforts for setting up the follow-up project “Cooperation Southeast-Drugs and Firearms” |
| *A3* | * Wrap up activities of PA 11 project “Combating Cybercrime in the Danube Region - Law Enforcement 2.0” |
| *A4* | * Planning activities for follow-up project “Cooperation Southeast – Drugs and Firearms” |
| *A5* | * 1 International symposium “Organized Property Crime – New Approaches in Combating Domestic Burglaries” * 1 closing conference of PA 11 project “Danube Property Crime Project (DPCP)” * Designing the follow-up project of the DPCP the “Danube Domestic Burglary Project (DDBP)” |
| *A6* | * 1 Workshop on best practices and possible joint actions between the police authorities in the prevention of terrorism threats in the Danube region * 1 expert meeting dedicated on coping with life-threatening police operations in case of terrorist attacks * Designing of a project dealing with the thematic field of “Deradicalisation” |
| *A7* | * Establishment of a National Contact Point DARIF |
| *A8* | * Participation in PA 11 SG meeting and joint participation in stakeholders events; support to project implementation |
| *A9* | * Planning activities between the PA 11 coordinators and the SG |
| *A10* | * Implementation activities within the framework of PA 11 project “Central-European CBRN-E Training Centre” |
| *A11* | * No activities during the reported period |
| *A12* | * Planning activities between the PA 11 coordinators and the relevant stakeholders |
| *A13* | * 1 Symposium on Documents Management and Security of Travel Documents in the Danube region |
| *A14* | * Updating the Manual on border control checks (jointly with PA 1a). Planning the Implementation of joint measures to improve the border control |
| *A15* | * No activities during the reported period |
| *A16* | * No activities during the reported period |
| *A17* | * No activities during the reported period |

## EUSDR Strategic Projects

*Table 5: Projects identified and proposed by PA (PACs + SG) as EUSDR strategic project (SP)*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Title of project proposed by PA as ESDR SP during the reporting period* | *Date of PA meeting when the project was approved as potential ESDR SP* | *To which PA target the project is relevant?* | *Main project activities of the EUSDR SP* | *Targeted funding source(s) for the SP* |
| *(a)* | *(b)* | *(c)* | *(d)* | *(e)* |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| *Question 15: Were any of the projects included in Table 5 already approved for funding during the reporting period? If so, please complete Table 6 below with the information only for those projects.* |

*Table 6: Proposed EUSDR strategic projects, which were approved for funding*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Title of project proposed by PA as ESDR SP, approved for funding* | *Total amount of approved funding* | *Approved funding source(s) for the EUSDR SP* |
| *(a)* | *(b)* | *(c)* |
|  |  |  |

# Funding

## Main achievements in terms of funding

|  |
| --- |
| *Question 16: What is considered as PAs main achievement/s with regards to funding sources and opportunities for EUSDR projects? Short analysis relevant only to the duration of the reporting period needs to be provided.* |
| PA 11 succeeded in identifying diverse funding opportunities:   * Excellent cooperation with NGOs and Foundations (e.g. financing from Hanns Seidel Foundation to PA 11 project “Danube Property Crime Project” and financing from Konrad Adenauer Foundation for PA 11 project “Comprehensive and Integrated Approach in Prevention and Fight against Organized Crime in the Danube Region”) * Good experience with the START instrument * Good opportunity to support the participation of the non-EU countries by using the TA Grant |

## Lessons learned

|  |
| --- |
| *Question 17: What are the lessons learned (positive or negative) during the reporting period, with regards to funding sources and opportunities for EUSDR projects and what responses to those the PA considers as relevant?* |
| At the start of the EUSDR implementation funding for PA 11 was complicated. To keep the PA 11 vital securing different funding sources continues to be essential. |

## The future

|  |
| --- |
| *Question 18: Based on what has been reported so far in Sections 3.1and 3.2, what next steps and challenges in terms of funding sources and opportunities for EUSDR projects that are important to be shared for further consideration, discussion or development (incl. possible solutions to overcome the challenges)?*  *Please answer also the same question with respect to better alignment of funding to support the PA and the EUSDR in general.* |
| Driven by the ambition to continually improve our work and to place it in the framework of the European area of internal security, we are taking stock of our achievements and looking ahead to respond the challenges in the future. The achievements of opening up Europe have also “another side” - old and new crime phenomena having impact on all major cities and requiring a mutual adaptation of the existing security architectures. As an essential part of these transnational efforts, the exchange of information among police organisations needs to be intensified.  Within the field of security steps like exchanging knowledge and best practices (within the framework of different thematic events), and building networks of experts (as one of the most important practical results of the thematic events carried out), are proved to be most successful and lead to tangible results. For setting up these networks, it is crucial to explore funding sources, so that projects could be launched. PA 11 keeps an open eye for different funding sources in the field of security.  The challenges facing PA 11 are related to the further development of the impetus already gained.  Due to the specific character of the security issues, the better communication of our activities and their proper visibility remain of key importance. Besides, in order to respond to the interrelationship of security with all other areas, PA 11 has to strengthen the already developed “horizontal cooperation” with other PAs. |

## Organisation and functioning of PA

|  |
| --- |
| *Question 19: Describe shortly any significant changes that have occurred during the reporting period on PA’s governance in terms of organisation and functioning of PACs and SGs?* |
| The PA’s governance is well functioning and information exchange between PACs and SG is permanently guaranteed. We don’t see the need for changes. The cooperation between the three PACs of PA 11 is excellent. The PA 11 Coordination Bureau will continue to be the driving force to the daily work, ensuring the active participation of the SG members and the stakeholders as well as to support the PACs in the strategic planning of PA 11 activities. |

|  |
| --- |
| *Question 20: Please provide in Table 7 the requested information on attendance (+/-) of Danube countries at SG meetings held during the reporting period.* |

*Table 7: Attendance of SG meetings*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *SG meeting* | *AT* | *BA* | *BG* | *CZ* | *DE* | *HR* | *HU* | *MD* | *ME* | *RO* | *RS* | *SI* | *SK* | *UA* |
| XI SG meeting  November 2016 | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | - | x | x |

## Coordination and cooperation activities

|  |
| --- |
| *Question 21: Based on what has been reported in Section 2.5, please provide short description on what has been achieved with the undertaken activities for coordination, cooperation and establishing links with other PAs? Please describe also any methods/tools that are put in place as a result (if applicable).* |
| With the undertaken activities we achieved a better communication of PA 11 work and results. The joint activities and participation in other PA’s activities (incl. SG meetings) create synergies and give added value to the work. The cooperation with PA 1a is currently on-going and broadening its framework, different possibilities are explored to cooperate with PA 6 and PA 10.  Methods – workshops, meetings and discussions |
| *Question 22: Based on what has been reported in Section 2.5, please provide short description on what has been achieved with the undertaken activities for coordination, cooperation and establishing links with EU institutions (EC, EP, CoR, EESC, etc.) and/or other institutions (national, regional, international, as appropriate). Same applies also for activities for using the funding opportunities of the EC centrally managed programmes. Please describe also any methods/tools that are put in place as a result (if applicable).* |
| With the undertaken activities we achieved a close involvement and good information of EC, DG Home. The implementation of the activities could only take place because of a very good cooperation with EC, DG Regio and the DSP. Besides, with the continuous publication of our work on our website we guarantee permanent information and involvement of all interested stakeholders in our activities.  Methods – day-to-day communication, meetings and discussions |
| *Question 23: Based on what has been reported in Section 2.5, please provide short description on what has been achieved with the undertaken activities for cooperation between the PA (PACs and SG) and the authorities dealing with ESIF funding and more specifically with the Managing Authorities and the Monitoring Committees of programs of interest to the PA. Please describe also any methods/tools that are put in place as a result (if applicable).* |
| With the undertaken activities we achieved a close involvement and good information exchange with the Joint Secretariat of the Danube Transnational programme.  Methods – meetings and discussions |

## Activities for involvement of stakeholders and civil society

|  |
| --- |
| *Question 24: Based on what has been reported in Section 2.5, please provide short description on what has been achieved with the undertaken activities for involvement of stakeholders, incl. civil society (e.g. stakeholder conferences, activities with national/regional parliaments, other events, networks, platforms, etc.). Please describe also any methods/tools that are put in place as a result (if applicable).* |
| With the undertaken activities we achieved a positive influence on stakeholders by their participation in the SG meetings as well as in activities and projects. Concerning SG work, not only attendance has to be ensured but also the quality of participation is important - representatives in the SG meetings with clear mandate and broad continuity of support.  Methods: meetings and day-to-day communication |

## Publicity and communication activities

|  |
| --- |
| *Question 25: Based on what has been reported in Section 2.5, please provide short description on what has been achieved with the undertaken activities for better publicity and communication (e.g. publications, website developments, etc.). Same applies also for activities for better communication of PA’s results and work as well as those related to public debate(s) on the macro - regional approach. Please describe also any methods/tools that are put in place as a result (if applicable).* |
| We launched a new website in May 2016. PA 11 SG is encouraged to send regularly information to be uploaded on PA 11 website. Furthermore we plan to draft and publish an informational brochure on PA 11 activities, projects and successful stories. Besides we also submit advertising material for the EUSDR. |

## Lessons learned

|  |
| --- |
| *Question 26: Based on what has been reported so far in Section 4: what are the lessons learned (positive or negative), in terms of PA governance during the reporting period and what responses to those the PA considers as relevant?* |
| * An active political engagement (e.g. ministerial conference) is important for encouraging participation of stakeholders and ensuring the visibility of the EUSDR within the participating countries. * Encouraging activities of participating countries is important to achieve broader commitment in cooperation of essential number of stakeholders. * Raising funding sources is of utmost importance for our work. |

## The future

|  |
| --- |
| *Question 27: Based on what has been reported so far in Section 4: what next steps and challenges for better PA governance in the future that the PA finds important to be shared for further consideration (incl. possible solutions to overcome the challenges)?* |
| The PA’s governance is well functioning and information exchange between PACs and SG is permanently guaranteed. Next steps for improving PA governance could be:   * enhanced cooperation between PA 11 and other PAs * better involvement of the Non-EU-Countries * better external communication |