



COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

Brussels, xxx
SEC(2007) 952

AVIS DU COMITE DES EVALUATIONS D'IMPACT

Proposal for a

DECISION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL

**establishing an action programme for the enhancement of quality in higher education
and the promotion of intercultural understanding through co-operation with third
countries (Erasmus Mundus) (2009-2013)**

**{COM(2007) 395 final}
{SEC(2007) 949}
{SEC(2007) 950}**



Brussels, 10 May 2007
D(2007)

Opinion

Title **Impact Assessment on: Erasmus Mundus action programme (2009-2013)**

(draft version of 7 April 2007)

Lead DG **DG EAC and DG AIDCO**

Impact Assessment Board Opinion

(A) Context

The IA refers to a proposal that would continue (and extend) the existing Erasmus Mundus programme, which was introduced in 2004 and expires at the end of 2008.

The initiative is jointly presented by DG EAC and DG AIDCO because the new programme will incorporate into Erasmus Mundus the current "External Cooperation Window" by DG AIDCO for EU-Third country cooperation in higher education.

(B) Positive aspects

The IA describes in a comprehensive way the problem the proposal is designed to tackle and its objectives. It discusses in a proportionate way the potential strengths and weaknesses of each of the options presented, and summarizes them clearly.

(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, the analysis should be underpinned by more information on how existing data and studies have been used for this impact assessment, and on how the proposed new measures would add value compared to the current programme.

(1) The impact assessment should provide more information on how and to which extent the results of the mid-term evaluation of the current Erasmus Mundus programme, the stakeholder survey, as well as the external study for the ex-ante evaluation were used to

support the analysis carried out in this report. It should indicate in particular whether the four sub-options under option 2 are inseparably linked and which other potential (sub-) options have been discarded. More monitoring data from the current programme phase should be included (in an annex).

(2) The main text of the IA report should indicate whether the budget increase for the programme is a given fact or whether it follows logically from the definition of (sub)options. In the latter case, options 1 and 2 (including sub-options) should be compared in terms of budgetary implications.

(3) More information should be provided as to the benefits of the proposed sub-option 2.4 (Integration of the External Cooperation Window) and how the identified disadvantages of the integration would be mitigated.

(4) The IA report could usefully elaborate on the possibilities for simplifying the structure and/or implementation of the programme.

(D) Procedure and presentation

It appears that all necessary procedural elements have been complied with. The open on-line stakeholder consultation has been limited to a six weeks period (instead of eight weeks, which is the minimum standard normally applied by the Commission) but in view of the other stakeholder events carried out in preparing the second phase of Erasmus Mundus, this seems acceptable.

(1)

(2)

IAB scrutiny process

Reference number	EAC/2007/001
Author DG	DG EAC
External expertise used	No
Date of Board Meeting	Written procedure
Date of adoption of Opinion	10 May 2007