



EUROPEAN COMMISSION  
IMPACT ASSESSMENT BOARD

Brussels, 7 May 2007  
D(2007) 4083

### Opinion

**Title**                      **Impact Assessment on: White Paper on Sport**

**(draft version of 4 April 2007 )**

**Lead DG**                      **Education and Culture**

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

### **(A) Context**

The role of sport has been recognised in the European Council's Amsterdam Declaration (1997), Nice Declaration (2000) and Aarhus Declaration (2003) which call on the Community to give consideration to the characteristics of amateur sport, to the preservation of voluntary sport structures, as well as to the social, educational and cultural functions inherent to sport. The Nice Declaration points out that certain specific characteristics of sport, such as internal cohesion and solidarity, fair competition and the protection of the moral and material interests of sportsmen and –women, should be taken into account in EU policies. Moreover, EU Sport Ministers unanimously welcomed the Commission's intention to launch a policy initiative on the role of sport in Europe.

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

The IA report announces future analytical work, including impact assessment for concrete policy proposals. This is a good practice as it should allow interested stakeholders to provide relevant input.

The stakeholder consultations were extensive and are taken into account in the IA report. A regular feedback from stakeholders is also foreseen at the implementation phase of some of the actions, which is welcome.

### **(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: The preferred option presented in the IA report seems to have more the character of a Communication than a White Paper. If the White Paper option is to be retained, the IA should make clearer what the new actions being proposed are (including legislative ones), what their value added is and at what level (Community or MS) they will be carried out. More specifically:**

**(1) Policy options should better reflect identified problems.** The IA should establish a clear hierarchy of the most relevant problems and corresponding actions. The 25 actions currently listed in the IA report should be regrouped around these problems. It also needs to be clearly explained which of these actions are ongoing and which will be new. Then the IA should demonstrate how the proposed actions contribute to solving the problems.

**(2) Impacts should be analysed for all options.** The impact analysis cannot be limited to the preferred option. The analysis should be undertaken at the level of individual key actions, and not at the level of the White Paper as a whole. In case most of the proposed actions are already ongoing, an analysis of impacts of providing improved co-ordination by the Community should be performed.

**(3) Implications for administrative burden need to be clarified.** The IA report should make clear whether some of the proposed actions (developing a statistical method to measure economic impact of sport; developing information and verification system for transfers; monitoring implementation of measures against corruption, fraud and money laundering) are likely to entail any significant increase in administrative costs. If so, the Standard Cost Model needs to be applied.

**(D) Procedure and presentation**

No IA Roadmap has been produced and made public. The IA report should clarify how the external expertise has been accommodated.

**2) IAB scrutiny process**

Reference number	2007/EAC/018 (catalogue item)
Author DG	EAC
External expertise used	No
Board Meeting	2 May 2007
Date of adoption of Opinion	7 May 2007