

Organisation that provided inputs	Young Researchers of Serbia Voluntary Service of Serbia (MIIS)	Independent Journalists' Association of Serbia (NUNS)	Adventist Development and Relief Agency (ADRA)
Do you think that there are other priority areas or important elements that can still be included in the proposal of the IPA III programme?	We believe that all priorities are present in the proposed structure. However, due to the lack of information on the Green Agenda that is under preparation, and in which the European Commission will define environmental and climate change priorities for the Western Balkans, we are unable to fully confirm that we agree with the thematic priorities for environmental protection. Once the Green Agenda document is adopted, we will have a clear position. The percentage of budget (30%) proposed for Window 3: Green Agenda and sustainable connectivity is very encouraging.	We believe that one very important topic is missing, namely freedom of the media, or freedom of information more widely.	
Do you have any specific suggestions in relation to the preparation process of the strategic response by IPA III beneficiaries?	Civil society involvement is essential at this stage. An example from Serbia - the SEKO mechanism - could be used as a framework for cooperation. We believe that establishing mechanisms such as, or similar to, SEKO would bring great benefits to the planning process at the regional level.	This question is not clear.	
Do you have any specific suggestions related to civil society support being reflected in the programming framework and what can be added or changed to increase that support?	Support to civil society, an objective defined in priority 1 (Enabling environment for civil society and enhancing capacity of civil society), provides a good basis for further, more detailed, planning of support to civil society. It is currently difficult to make specific suggestions because we lack information on specific plans. Regarding financial allocations, we noticed that currently, for window 1, in which civil society is also located, 20% of the total budget is planned. Considering how many important topics are in this window, we think that it will be difficult to allocate sufficient resources to support civil society at the regional level.	Civil society should be involved in all segments of IPA III each in the area of their interest and expertise.	
Do you have any other comments or suggestion?	In regard to the Strategic Response: Our organisation can offer our capacities to mobilize CSOs engaged in the environment and to be involved in the process of		In general, people in the situation of homelessness in Serbia are in a particularly unfavorable position,

	<p>preparing the Strategic Response for both window 3 and part 1 concerning civil society.</p> <p>In addition, we have noted that the planning of some priorities is related to the negotiation chapters, ie the negotiation chapters are mentioned. Given the new methodology introduced by the EC, it is not entirely clear to us how IPA III will follow the negotiating frameworks of different countries (those applying the old one compared to those applying the new methodology)</p>		<p>since there is neither a National housing strategy that adequately recognize, provide mechanisms for the prevention of homelessness nor adequate and timely mechanisms for responding to existing homelessness, nor is there sufficient critical mass in the country's civil society that could be relied on. Homelessness has so far been covered by attempts to address the "Roma issue" systematically, but this phenomenon has not been fully covered.</p> <p>Need 1: for the state and local governments to adequately recognize the problem, come up with systemic solutions</p> <p>Need 2: to allocate funds from both domestic and foreign public funds (IPA, etc.) in this direction. It is also necessary to strengthen the service providers while simultaneously developing sustainable and enforceable system solutions.</p>
--	---	--	--