



Brussels, 11 SEP. 2009
D(2009)

Opinion

Title **Impact Assessment on: Global monitoring for environment and security (GMES): Challenges and next steps for the Space component**

(draft version of 31 July 2009)

Lead DG **DG ENTR**

1) Impact Assessment Board Opinion

(A) Context

Following the 2008 Communication "GMES: we care for a safer planet", the Commission adopted on 20 May 2009 a proposal for a Regulation aiming to establish a legal basis for the GMES programme and EC funding of GMES initial operations for the period 2011-2013. On 29 May 2009 the 6th "Space Council" recalled the need to define, at national and European levels, a sustainable funding approach for the GMES space component based on an assessment of the overall financing needs for this infrastructure. This impact assessment accompanies the proposal for a communication analysing the specific challenges for the space component of GMES for the period after 2013. It aims to identify the possibilities to ensure the sustainability of Earth observations through the operations of the current satellite infrastructure, its timely renewal and further infrastructure developments.

(B) Positive aspects

The report is written in clear language and is accessible to the non specialist reader.

(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 and are expected to be incorporated in the final version of the impact assessment report.

General recommendation: The report should provide a firmer justification for dealing with the space component of GMES separately from the in situ and service components, and be more explicit about the interactions among these three

components. It should make clear that the costs and benefits of GMES depend on variations in all its components, not only the space component. It should justify further the option of full Community ownership and funding of the GMES space infrastructure, and indicate that alternative forms of ownership will be examined for the other components. The timing of the proposal should be explained better.

During the IAB meeting, DG ENTR agreed to make the necessary changes in the impact assessment on this basis.

(1) Be more explicit about the interactions of the GMES space component with its two other components. Make clear that the costs and benefits of GMES depend on all its components. The report should provide a firmer justification for setting the focus on the long-term arrangements for the GMES space component separately from the in situ and service component. It should be more explicit about the interactions among these three components. In the cost-benefit analysis of GMES, the report should make clear that the benefits expected to arise from GMES are driven by variations in all the GMES components, and not only by the modifications in the financing scheme of the space component which are analysed in this report.

(2) Clarify the issue of ownership and funding of the space infrastructure and other components. Given that the foreseen Communication aims to identify the challenges for the GMES space component until 2030, the report should justify further the option of full Community ownership and funding of the space component. It should indicate that alternative forms of ownership, such as the co-funding by other public entities or by the private sector, will be examined for the other components.

(3) Explain better the timing of the proposal. The report should in particular explain how this proposal fits in the context of the future Commission initiative concerning the Basic Act for exploitation of GMES post-2013.

(D) Procedure and presentation

The report should present more clearly the positions of various stakeholders on different options for the exploitation and renewal of the GMES space component after 2013.

2) IAB scrutiny process

Reference number	2009/ENTR/034 (catalogue)
Author DG	DG ENTR
External expertise used	No
Date of Board Meeting	9 September 2009
Date of adoption of Opinion	11 SEP. 2009