



Brussels, 13 FEB. 2009
D(2009) 1162

Opinion

Title **Impact Assessment on: Recommendation on ICT and Energy Efficiency**

(draft version of 28 January 2009; resubmission)

Lead DG **DG INFSO**

1) Impact Assessment Board Opinion

(A) Context

In 2005 the Commission issued a Green Paper on energy efficiency, followed in October 2006 by an energy-efficiency Action Plan which was endorsed by the European Council in March 2007 with the objective of saving 20% of the EU's energy consumption, compared with projections, for 2020. In May 2008 the Commission adopted a first Communication on ICT for energy efficiency which initiated a consultation and partnership-building process with a view to identifying opportunities for EU measures, quantifying their potential benefits, and stimulating business-led and partnership initiatives which could be developed at EU-level.

(B) Positive aspects

The report has been considerably redrafted since the first opinion that the Board issued. Especially the inclusion of ongoing developments and existing instrument in the baseline scenario has been improved and the document shows awareness of the costs and the level of support for the possible ingredients for the Recommendation.

(C) Main recommendations for improvements

The recommendations below are listed in order of descending importance.

General recommendation: The revised draft report takes into account most of the recommendations that the Board made in its first opinion. It still needs to indicate the relevance of this initiative for achieving the 20% energy efficiency target, and summarise the main actions that the Commission will take to encourage take-up of the proposed Recommendation. Furthermore the readability of the report could be

improved by better focussing the section about the selection of policy instrument.

(1) Compare the chance of reaching the 20% target in the baseline scenario with that under the preferred option. Given the fact that the 20% energy efficiency target for 2020 appears to be the main justification for this initiative, the report should indicate how big the risk is to fall short of that target with ongoing developments and existing policy instruments (as included in the baseline scenario). The report should also assess the magnitude of the contribution that this initiative could make towards the target, and whether it is more than marginal.

(2) Specify the (main) actions that the Commission will take to support implementation of the Recommendation. The report announces that the Recommendation will be accompanied by a Communication which sets out what the Commission intends to do to support implementation of the Recommendation. It is recommended to include some basic information about the main actions that the Commission will take, for instance with regard to establishing common methodologies and tools, the roll-out of smart metering. The information provided with regard to green public procurement can serve as a model.

(D) Procedure and presentation

Section 4 (policy options) and section 5 (analysis of impacts and comparison of options) could be much reduced in length by focusing more on the choice of policy instrument, while leaving the analysis of the substance of the measure to section 6 (sub-options under the preferred policy instrument). This would help to avoid duplication.

2) IAB scrutiny process

Reference number	2009/INFSO/002 (Catalogue initiative)
Author DG	INFSO-C-3
External expertise used	No
Date of Board Meeting	Written procedure
Date of adoption of Opinion	13 FEB. 2009 The present opinion concerns a resubmitted draft IA report. The first opinion was issued on 27 October 2008.