

(C) Main recommendations for improvements

(1) Refocus the problem definition. First, the report should give a clear overview of the elements of the baseline scenario which have worked (e.g. progress in recognition of qualification, success of EU programmes) and those which have not (e.g. portability of financial support, social security issues), and analyse why. In this context the problem definition should also clarify why the monitoring arrangements of the 2001 Recommendation were considered to be ineffective. Secondly, the report should discuss in more detail the new opportunities (ICT developments, new partnerships) as well as the challenges (impact of current crisis, new impetus of the social dimension), which have emerged in the last 10 years. Thirdly, it should explain the reasons for the uneven distribution of the flows of young people between the Member States, such as language preferences or perceptions about the quality of education.

(2) Articulate better the link between the problems, objectives and options. The report should demonstrate what the value added of the initiative is, and how it will concretely improve the existing situation. To do so, all the main problems should be reflected in the objectives. For example, currently the objectives do not include the intention to support the participation of young people from disadvantaged backgrounds, nor do they mention the need to enable better comparison of progress between the Member States. Secondly, the report should be more specific about the major elements of the two general policy-change options ('New Council Recommendation' and 'Open Method of Co-ordination'), discuss the potential impacts of these elements and demonstrate how effectively and efficiently they would tackle the identified problems.

(3) Discuss how the uptake of the Recommendation by the Member States can be improved. Given that the report mentions that the 2001 Recommendation has largely fallen into disuse, it should explain why this happened. It should clarify what has changed since then in terms of political commitment and what measures are foreseen to improve the uptake of the new Recommendation by the Member States. In particular, the report should clarify how the 'mobility scoreboard' (monitoring framework within Option 2 'New Council Recommendation') would be set up, how the specific indicators for the scoreboard would be agreed and what would be the related administrative burdens.

Some more technical comments have been transmitted directly to the author DG and are expected to be incorporated in the final version of the impact assessment report.

(D) Procedure and presentation

The report should be accompanied by an executive summary as a separate document, following the structure provided in the Annex 4 of the Impact Assessment Guidelines. In addition, the report should follow more concisely the structure suggested by the Guidelines, avoid repetitions, and always explain the abbreviations used (or add a glossary).

(E) IAB scrutiny process	
Reference number	2010/EAC/003
External expertise used	No
Date of Board Meeting	14 April 2010