



**presenting a more detailed overview of relevant EU legislation, the present situation and similar ongoing initiatives in the Member States as well as the activities of other EU actors in the field. Thirdly, it should develop and assess alternative data coverage options with different levels of ambition. Finally, the report should address in greater detail the various limits which might impede EMODNET's operations.**

**During the meeting, DG MARE stated its intention to take on board these recommendations. Given the fundamental nature of the recommendations, the Board would like to examine a revised version of the report on which it will issue a new opinion.**

**(1) Explain what is the expected outcome of the Marine Knowledge Communication with regard to EMODNET** by clarifying whether the Communication aims at (a) screening the different scenarios for an integrated approach on marine data, (b) gaining a political endorsement for the financing or (c) preparing a regulation which defines the operational aspects of EMODNET. The report should also identify the planned follow-up actions after the adoption of the Marine Knowledge Communication. Additionally, given that the study on the costs of marine data infrastructures in the Member States as well as several preparatory actions assessing the technical options and the costs of the planned data network are still ongoing, the report should explain when and how this essential information will be made available for the political decision making process.

**(2) Strengthen the baseline scenario.** Given that the EMODNET data network would build on existing structures, the report should provide a more detailed overview of the relevant EU legislation (such as INSPIRE Directive, the Environmental Information Directive, Public Sector Information Directive), the present situation and similar ongoing initiatives in the Member States as well as the activities of other EU actors (such as Joint Research Centre and European Environment Agency). On this basis the report should better demonstrate (a) whether this fragmented approach leads to inefficiencies in data management and (b) what the potential value added and new services enabled by EMODNET's operations would be.

**(3) Be more specific about the scope of data EMODNET could cover and assess the impacts of alternative options with different levels of ambition.** The report needs to elaborate possible scenarios for EMODNET's data coverage (data to be 'assembled' and data to be 'collected'). Firstly, it should explain better the envisaged incremental approach and identify which sectors and which data (at what kind of resolutions) are planned to be covered at the initial stage. The report should substantiate this choice. Secondly, the report should be more specific about the content of the options to narrow down the range of the potential implementation costs. The analysis should establish the minimum scope of data coverage which would justify the EMODNET initiative to be taken forward. It should also identify other, more ambitious scenarios and attempt to estimate corresponding costs (for example by extrapolating the results of existing studies and preparatory actions). The assessment of options should address also proportionality and subsidiarity aspects. Thirdly, it should be more specific how the expected costs and benefits would be distributed among the different stakeholders (public authorities, universities, private sector entities) as well as between the affected Member States.

**(4) Address in more detail the potential limits of implementing EMODNET.** The report should clarify that EMODNET aims only to provide access to data that has been collected with public funding at marginal cost. Against this background, the report should discuss (a) which incentives could be put in place to encourage the broad participation of different organisations in EMODNET and (b) how to solve the issue that some public bodies have a statutory obligation to earn an income from selling data (as to maximise cost recovery). It should also explain to what extent the legal mandate of certain bodies mentioned in the report (such as the Joint Research Centre, European Environment Agency or International Council for Exploration of the Sea) would enable them to fulfil the role of the secretariat for EMODNET.

**(D) Procedure and presentation**

It appears that all necessary procedural elements have been complied with. All the options considered should be compared against the baseline scenario. Given that the report contains many abbreviations, some of which are not explained, it would benefit from a glossary.

**2) IAB scrutiny process**

Reference number	2009/MARE/003 (catalogue)
Author DG	MARE
External expertise used	No
Date of Board Meeting	15 July 2009
Date of adoption of Opinion	<b>20 JUL. 2009</b>