## **Management Response and Action Plan**

Name of Evaluation Report:	Final Evaluation of the "Project against Economic Crime in Kosovo*"		
Date of Evaluation Report:	23 June 2025	Date of Action Plan:	6 October 2025

## Overall management response to the evaluation:

The Council of Europe's Economic Crime and Cooperation Division (ECCD) took note of the findings of the final evaluation report. The report contains a very positive evaluation for the results of PECK III project confirming the project's significant and multi-layered contribution to advancing the rule of law and enhancing Kosovo's institutional response to economic crime. The scope was to cover all components and activities implemented from 1 July 2020 until the start of the evaluation report in March 2025. It includes five recommendations.

This management response is the one of the Council of Europe. Accepted recommendations and findings of the evaluation will feed into the preparation of the fourth phase of the Project against Economic Crime.

[FOR DECENTRALISED EVALUATIONS] Dissemination plan for the evaluation: please briefly explain how the report will be shared (internally, other CoE entities, donors, beneficiaries etc.), methods (email, events, website etc.), resources, timeframe and person responsible.

The ECCD has accepted fully three recommendations, partially accepted one recommendation related to Institutionalisation of Learning and Knowledge Transfer because the responsibility here does not lie solely with the CoE. Provided that new resources and co-operation possibilities are available, the Council of Europe is ready to further strengthen this area of intervention and support the designated authorities.

The ECCD rejects the recommendation related to further integrating M&E and Gender Expertise starting at project design.

The evaluation report will be shared with the DPC in Strasbourg, and EUD (donor) as well as the main beneficiaries (FIU, APC, AMSCA and Police) together with the final report in early 2026.

The report together with the Management Response will also be published on the PECK III website as well as on the dedicated webpage of the DIO.

Management Decision <sup>1</sup>	Entity in Charge	Planned Actions <sup>2</sup> (determined by Entity)	Justification <sup>3</sup> for Non-Acceptance	Target Date for Action	Person Responsible for Action
<b>Recommendation 1:</b> Address the challenges in the implementation of the Legal and Policy Frameworks Prioritise efforts to address challenges stemming from the implementation of key legislation, particularly the Law on Conflict of Interest and the Law governing the APC, to enhance their enforceability, relevance, and responsiveness to emerging corruption risks.					
□Accepted	ECCD	Third phase of PECK project will end		01/01/2027	Vlora Marmullakaj
☑ Partially accepted		in December 2025. Addressing			
□Rejected		challenges related to the implementation of key legislation, particularly the Law on Conflict of Interest and the Law governing the APC was foreseen under the fourth phase of technical assistance provided there would be clear expectation of its starting due to political considerations.  However, competent authorities would have the responsibility for implementation of the core of this recommendation pending confirmation for any future technical assistance support from the Council of Europe.			

 <sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The management decision is in relation to the Recommendation (Accepted, Partially accepted, Rejected).
 <sup>2</sup> For implementing accepted recommendations.
 <sup>3</sup> For recommendations that are partially accepted or rejected.

As a secondary object	ive, a follow ι	e Sector Compliance Capacity  IP phase should consider offering continued technical assipated guidance, risk-assessment tools, and enhanced super	-	_
⊠Accepted	ECCD	Under PECK III several crucial	01/01/2027	Edmond Dunga
☐ Partially accepted		initiatives were undertaken to		
□Rejected		strengthen private sector		
•		compliance capacity. As noted in		
		the assessment report, the		
		mentoring on risk-based		
		supervision enhanced the FIU's		
		ability to monitor private sector		
		compliance whereas due to the		
		project support CBK transitioned		
		from rule-based to risk-based		
		supervision. However, there are		
		further needs in this area which the		
		CoE will follow up in future		
		technical assistance with the clear		
		understanding that the usual main		
		beneficiaries of the technical		
		assistance would be relevant public		
December of states 2.1.		authorities.		
	ects build interi	earning and Knowledge Transfer nal capacity through the development and handover of modunt institutions.	ular training content, with a focus o	n building national trainer
□Accepted	ECCD	During the PECK III a number of	01/01/2027	Edmond Dunga
☐ Partially accepted		technical tools and manuals were	==, ==, ===	1 12112 2 31163
☐ Rejected		developed including ToT for		
ncjccicu		Institute for Public Administration		
		and Justice Academy. However,		

		application of such knowledge and			
		trainers remains inconsistent due			
		to limited institutional absorption			
		and dependency on donor-funded			
		expertise.			
		Provided that new resources and			
		co-operation possibilities are			
		available, the Council of Europe,			
		would be ready to further			
		strengthen this area of intervention			
		and support the designated			
		training authorities.			
Recommendation 4: Pr	_	·			
Engage key institutions		design phase through implementation to ensure loca	relevance, strengthen b		·
⊠Accepted	ECCD	Throughout the implementation,		01/01/2027	Edmond Dunga
☐ Partially accepted		PECK project ensured close			
□Rejected		cooperation and promotion of			
		· ·			
		ownership to beneficiaries. This is			
		ownership to beneficiaries. This is also documented in the evaluation			
		ownership to beneficiaries. This is also documented in the evaluation report whereby evidence from the			
		ownership to beneficiaries. This is also documented in the evaluation report whereby evidence from the desk review and the KIIs confirms			
		ownership to beneficiaries. This is also documented in the evaluation report whereby evidence from the desk review and the KIIs confirms that ownership by PECK III partners			
		ownership to beneficiaries. This is also documented in the evaluation report whereby evidence from the desk review and the KIIs confirms that ownership by PECK III partners was actively ensured from the			
		ownership to beneficiaries. This is also documented in the evaluation report whereby evidence from the desk review and the KIIs confirms that ownership by PECK III partners was actively ensured from the outset and strengthened over time.			
		ownership to beneficiaries. This is also documented in the evaluation report whereby evidence from the desk review and the KIIs confirms that ownership by PECK III partners was actively ensured from the outset and strengthened over time. Authorities such as FIU and APC			
		ownership to beneficiaries. This is also documented in the evaluation report whereby evidence from the desk review and the KIIs confirms that ownership by PECK III partners was actively ensured from the outset and strengthened over time. Authorities such as FIU and APC aligned its internal planning with			
		ownership to beneficiaries. This is also documented in the evaluation report whereby evidence from the desk review and the KIIs confirms that ownership by PECK III partners was actively ensured from the outset and strengthened over time. Authorities such as FIU and APC aligned its internal planning with PECK III objectives to ensure			
		ownership to beneficiaries. This is also documented in the evaluation report whereby evidence from the desk review and the KIIs confirms that ownership by PECK III partners was actively ensured from the outset and strengthened over time. Authorities such as FIU and APC aligned its internal planning with PECK III objectives to ensure mutual reinforcement of priorities			
		ownership to beneficiaries. This is also documented in the evaluation report whereby evidence from the desk review and the KIIs confirms that ownership by PECK III partners was actively ensured from the outset and strengthened over time. Authorities such as FIU and APC aligned its internal planning with PECK III objectives to ensure			
		ownership to beneficiaries. This is also documented in the evaluation report whereby evidence from the desk review and the KIIs confirms that ownership by PECK III partners was actively ensured from the outset and strengthened over time. Authorities such as FIU and APC aligned its internal planning with PECK III objectives to ensure mutual reinforcement of priorities			

		high degree of institutional buy-in		4
		and strategic ownership.		
		and strategie ownership.		
		Ownership was also expressed		
		through partner participation in the		
		Project Steering Committee (PSC),		
		which served as the principal		
		governance body for reviewing		
		plans and making joint decisions on		
		strategic issues.		
		Key competent institutions will be		
		involved from the design phase of		
		any future technical assistance		
		action.  E and Gender Expertise starting at pro-		
	FCCD		There was lack of analysis	
□Accepted	ECCD		There was lack of analysis	
☐ Partially accepted			presented to evidence any adverse impact or gender bias. The fact that	
⊠Rejected			the recommendation is not in line	
			with the agreed action/contractual	
			documents is obvious and very	
			important for a project which is	
			expected to deliver what has been	
			agreed with the donor. The analysis	
			presented in the report supports	
			indeed the opposite conclusion	
			taking into account the positive	
			impact of the human rights	
			approach in a number of activities.	
			The latest annual report also gives	

examples of specific action taking into account gender-related aspects of the implementation of AC and AML/CFT measures (including on the participation, financial inclusion and crime policies, relations with the private sector).

Incorporation of a dedicated monitoring and gender equality specialist for a project (or even in a bigger programme) on economic crime hould clearly be among the agreed actions from the start and will not be feasible from a financial standpoint unless the project is dedicated specifically to the gender impact of the frameworks economic countering crime. **Implementing** this recommendation will render the Council of Europe not competitive compared to other technical assistance providers and has no practical relevance. Dedicated action to focus on gender equality would have required a structured approach and a specific outcome to be included in the logframe of the project. Furthermore, none of the international standard-setting and monitoring bodies in the area of

AML/AC have developed any dedicated and comprehensive review of the gender-related aspects of the application of AC and AML measures. Gender balance (which the project is extensively considering) is the only or among a very few examples of such work by international bodies. GRECO for example focuses on gender balance in its latest horizontal overview. The report notes that "GRECO was pleased to see the majority of the countries make efforts implement the recommendations, applying many good practices and tools to improve women's representation and gender balance in the police forces". noteworthy examples in the AML world emanating from standardsetters and monitoring bodies can be provided. The recommendation of the evaluation requires "evidencebased course correction" without noting or presenting any evidence of adverse effect of the project actions or any further positive action or considerations needed.

That being said, the Council of Europe already has unique expertise in gender mainstreaming stemming from its concern for human rights and work conducted by other parts of the organization on specific aspects (which are taken into account for economic crime as needed – such as women as victims. compensation mechanisms, sextortion as a form of corruption). Extensive standalone action on the part of the ECCD (in cooperation with DPC and other entities) in this area is already noted, rendering external monitoring or advice largely irrelevant and without any practical added value. It is noted that a gender coordinator has already provided relevant support within the Horizontal Facility programme which is related in terms of geographic scope (covering also Kosovo in its regional component) and the advice thereof has been taken into account and incorporated needed as horizontally. Based on this the Council of Europe (the ECCD) has developed (based on horizontal all of overview project implementation activities, more than 50 projects in the area of

	economic crime), very extensive	
	understanding and expertise	
	regarding the gender dimension of	
	its actions. The results of this	
	analysis are informing all ECCD	
	project activities and project design	
	in the economic crime area.	