EUROPEAN COMMISSION
IMPACT ASSESSMENT BOARD

Brussels, 05.06.2007
D(2007) 5028

Opinion

Title **Impact Assessment on: The Joint EU-Africa Strategy and the Roadmap to the Lisbon Summit**

(draft version of 16 May 2007)

Lead DG **DG DEV**

1) Impact Assessment Board Opinion

(A) Context

The IA accompanies a proposal for a joint EU/Africa Strategy which is led by DG Development. It is a result of the ongoing EU-African Union dialogue. The aim is to establish greater coherence in EU-Africa affairs.

(B) Positive aspects

The IA makes very good use of the proportionate analysis criterion by fully reflecting the political and strategic nature of the document it accompanies. There is limited scope for any analysis of concrete proposals and the IA is fully in line with the guidelines by not adding unnecessary and ill-suited text.

(C) Main recommendations for improvements

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

General recommendation: While maintaining a proportionate approach, there should be a better link from problem definition to objectives and options. An IA is an analytical document and the envisaged benefits compared to ongoing activities should be given more attention.

(1) The impact assessment should provide more information on where existing EU/Africa policies and policy coordination and dialogue arrangements have failed to achieve the envisaged outcome or what the expected benefits of greater coherence are

Commission européenne, B-1049 Bruxelles / Europese Commissie, B-1049 Brussel - Belgium. Telephone: (32-2) 299 11 11.
Office: BERL 6/29. Telephone: direct line (32-2) 2981898. Fax: (32-2) 2965960.

E-mail: impact-assessment-board@ec.europa.eu
Website: http://www.cc.cec/iab/i/index_en.cfm

as compared to the set of current measures and arrangements. While in the vast majority of cases greater coherence is beneficial and fully acknowledging the political and strategic nature of the proposal, the IA should also attempt to spell out what the expected benefits are in more concrete terms.

(2) There is an inconsistency between the problem definition, which refers to issues surrounding poverty, climate change, health, etc, and the objectives which focus on institutional arrangements. The two sections should be brought more in line with each other, probably by focusing the problem definition on the issues addressed in the Communication.

(3) The analysis of the impacts should not be limited to the preferred option. There is a need for more thorough analyses of the other two options.

(4) The foreseen monitoring and evaluation arrangements should be reconsidered to reflect more adequately the aims of the strategy.

(D) Procedure and presentation

It appears that for the type of proposal the IA accompanies all necessary procedural elements have been complied with.

2) IAB scrutiny process

Reference number	2007/DEV/006
Author DG	DG DEV
External expertise used	No
Date of Board Meeting	Written procedure
Date of adoption of Opinion	5 June 2007