EUROPEAN COMMISSION
IMPACT ASSESSMENT BOARD

Brussels, 11 May 2007
D(2007) 4265

Opinion

Title **Impact Assessment on: Public-private dialogue in security research**

(draft version of 28 April 2007)

Lead DG **DG ENTR and DG JLS**

1) Impact Assessment Board Opinion

(A) Context

Following requests from several Member States, third countries, and representatives of the European Parliament, the Commission and the German Presidency announced at a conference on 26 March 2007 the creation of a "European Security Research and Innovation Forum" (ESRIF). This communication is following-up on this announcement and is replacing another Commission communication that was listed in CLWP 2006 and 2007, namely on public-private partnership in the field of European security.

(B) Positive aspects

This case is a good example of how for initiatives with a limited impact the Roadmap can be converted into a proportionate IA report.

(C) Main recommendations for improvements

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

General recommendation: The IA report needs clarifications in some sections, most notably in the problem definition but also in the assessment of policy options.

(1) The problem definition should be more focused and the policy options should refer back to it. It identifies two problems (scattered research and lack of funding), but only the first element is taken up in the analysis of policy options, which should clarify how each of the identified problems is being addressed. On the first issue of scattered research, the IA report should present more information on its scope and nature and it should be explicit about whether this situation is worsening or improving in order to

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

facilitate the monitoring of success or failure of the initiative. The assessment of the no-change option identifies a weakening of the EU's competitive position and negative impacts on environment and employment. It should be apparent from the forward-looking part of the problem definition why and to what extent this is the case. Furthermore the information (quoted from the Group of Personalities report) on the absence of a single EU customer is not clear and should be further explained as well as the reference to the gradual creation of an internal market for security goods and services in the impact analysis of option 3 a/b.

(2) The two sub-options of establishing a forum including the analysis of impacts should be further elaborated. The IA report presents two sub-options in procedural terms (ESRIF set up with/without Commission decision). It would be desirable to present them in terms of subsidiarity/proportionality rather than in political terms as is now the case. Also, any differences, especially budgetary implications in expected effectiveness of the two sub-options should be reflected in the tables that are presented in the IA report.

The impact analysis of the two sub-options of option 3 is the same. In order to allow proper comparison, this should be further developed in order to allow determining the preferred option, without making assumptions about the potential nature of the forum's work that are not substantiated.

(D) Procedure and presentation

It appears that all necessary procedural elements have been complied with.

2) IAB scrutiny process

Reference number	2006/JLS+/012, CLWP 2007 Priority item
Author DG	ENTR-H-4
External expertise used	No
Date of Board Meeting	Written procedure
Date of adoption of Opinion	11 May 2007