



COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

Brussels, xxx  
SEC(2007) 527

**AVIS DU COMITE DES EVALUATIONS D'IMPACT**

**Impact assessment of the European Space Policy**

**Accompanying document to the**

**COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE COUNCIL AND THE  
EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT**

**European Space Policy**

**{COM(2007)212}  
{SEC(2007)504}  
{SEC(2007)505}  
{SEC(2007)506}**



EUROPEAN COMMISSION  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT BOARD

Brussels, 19 February 2007  
D(2007) 1590

## Opinion

**Title**                      **Impact Assessment on: European Space Policy (draft version of 1 February 2007)**

**Lead DG**                      **DG ENTR**

### **1) Impact Assessment Board Opinion**

#### **(A) Context**

The Communication on the European Space Policy is a CLWP 2007 strategic initiative. It was preceded by the Framework Agreement (2003) for EU-European Space Agency cooperation, the publication of a Green Paper and White Paper (2003) on European Space Policy and a Communication of the European Commission 'European Space Policy - Preliminary Elements' (2005). The Competitiveness Council of the EU and the Ministerial Council of the ESA, meeting under the auspices of the EC-ESA Framework Agreement in June 2005, confirmed the need for outlining a European Space Policy, and this communication is a joint product of both organisations.

#### **(B) Positive aspects**

**(1)** Notwithstanding the recommendations hereinafter for a more clear-cut problem definition, the IA is particularly rich. A clear dynamic perspective is given and future problem drivers and tendencies in the field of competitiveness and access to space are analysed in great detail which succeeds in providing an articulate picture for the policy makers.

**(2)** Input from the stakeholder consultations (both the consultations held during the preparation of the previous Green Paper and the subsequent more focused consultations) is well integrated. Justification is provided in cases when views were not taken into account.

#### **(C) Main recommendations for improvements**

*The recommendations below are listed in order of descending importance. Some more technical comments will be transmitted directly to the author DG.*

**General recommendation: The IA report needs some reworking in order to bring out better how the objectives pursued relate to the underlying problems, the feasible option(s) in relation to the possible scenarios, as well as the challenges for further**

### **cost-benefit analysis.**

**(1) The IA report should better clarify what the preferred option entails.** The description of the status quo (baseline), the objectives (and how these relate to the problems identified), and the proposed measures need to be clarified - the IA report is supposed to be meaningful as a stand-alone document. Moreover, it needs to be made clear that GMES and Galileo (and their costs and benefits) are fully part of the preferred option and not considered to be part of the status quo.

**(2) The feasibility of the various policy options needs to be addressed early on in the assessment.** This could lead to the development of a single option (the proposed strategy) but with the analysis focused on the components of this option (i.e. the suboptions). If it is obvious beforehand that certain policy options are politically unfeasible, for instance because they fall outside the mandate that was given to the Commission, this ought to be addressed and taken to its conclusion as part of the problem definition. Alternatively, the options should have a logical and explicit link with the problem definition and should be assessed in detail before being discarded. Such an approach would ensure that options that score better in the overall comparison are explicitly contrasted with the option that is considered feasible, given the political constraints. In this context, a better structured problem definition broken down by the different market segments (space launching, non-commercial, commercial and military satellites) could help sharpen the analysis and evaluating the different options.

**(3) The IA report should at least give some qualitative analysis of the costs or cost elements associated with the strategy.** The IA report should avoid giving the impression that the projected benefits will be delivered at zero cost, notably for the GMES. However, it is understood and in line with the principle of proportionate analysis that the cost analysis will be developed later when more specific initiatives and associated funding will be proposed.

**(4) The linkage between policy options and market scenarios needs clarification.** Some of the market scenarios seem to presuppose a particular policy option. More could also be done to explain on which assumptions these market scenarios were developed, and that these are building on well-known or widely accepted sources (such as OECD work).

**(5) The discount rate used needs explanation.** It is not in line with the IA guidelines, but this can be accepted provided that it is explicitly specified that this was not a deliberate choice of the Commission as it has based itself on existing work produced by external resources.

#### **(D) Procedure and presentation**

The IA report generally follows the format set out in the IA Guidelines, but the "comparison of options" is missing.

## **2) IAB scrutiny process**

Reference number	ENTR/2007/008
Author DG	ENTR H-2
External expertise used	No
Date of Board Meeting	14 February 2007
Date of adoption of Opinion	16 February 2007