



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
Impact Assessment Board

Brussels,
D(2010)

11 OCT. 2010

Opinion

Title **Impact assessment on Communication on Sport**
(draft version of 27 September 2010)

(A) Context

Article 165 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) gives the EU a new competence for sport. Article 165 calls on the EU to contribute to the promotion of sporting issues and provides that EU action should be aimed at developing the European dimension in sport. The Commission has been reflecting on how best to fulfil its role in this area and has undertaken a comprehensive consultation process. It now intends to propose a suitable initiative to implement these new provisions. The aim of the impact assessment is to help to prepare this initiative.

(B) Overall assessment

The report is of acceptable quality, providing a thorough justification for its preferred option. The assessment of its likely impacts reflects the uncertainties involved. It has been significantly improved following the Board's earlier opinion to better explain the lessons from previous experience, practical actions being considered and stakeholder views. The change in preferred option that rejects a spending programme at this point is welcome given that evaluation evidence on the related preparatory actions is not yet available. Some further amendments should be made to clarify which Members States have made good progress already, to further clarify consultation findings and to better explain plans for developing monitoring indicators.

(C) Main recommendations for improvements

(1) Further clarify why EU action can add value: The variation in current practices by Member States should be further described, perhaps by annexing a table that indicates those which already have national plans on physical activity or other sport issues or well-developed policy coordination structures if this is known. This additional information should provide a basis on which to clarify further where EU action can add value, and to inform decisions on priorities.

(2) Further clarify consultation findings: the report should summarise the publicly expressed views of Member States in the relevant Annex as they are key stakeholders. The description of stakeholder views in the Annex should be checked to ensure that the codes for the questions which received most positive responses are listed accurately.

(3) Indicate how monitoring indicators will be developed: The report should indicate what plans have been made to collect data for the monitoring indicators presented (for example: who will collect data, what type of data and with what frequency, who will process and present it). The report should also briefly describe the process that will be used to develop and then produce additional indicators to track progress on the other objectives (e.g. engaging excluded groups, doping, free movement).

(D) Procedure and presentation

The Annexes should be more clearly cross-referenced in the main text. The expected impact on administrative costs should be explicitly stated, even if no significant effects are foreseen. The executive summary should briefly summarise the reasons why a financial programme is not considered appropriate at this time, so this information is accessible to readers who rely on translations.

(E) IAB scrutiny process

Reference number	2010/EAC/011 [also related to 2011/EAC/012]
External expertise used	No
Date of IAB meeting	Written procedure The present opinion concerns a resubmitted draft IA report. The first opinion was issued on 3 September 2010



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
IMPACT ASSESSMENT BOARD

Acting Chair

03 SEP. 2010

Brussels,
SG-C2/HMcC/sq

**NOTE FOR THE ATTENTION OF MR TRUSZCZYŃSKI
DIRECTOR GENERAL, DG EAC**

Subject: Opinion of the Impact Assessment Board on the draft impact assessment report on the Communication and Decision on Sport

Please find in annex the opinion of the Impact Assessment Board on the draft impact assessment report on the above mentioned subject. I hope you find the recommendations useful. Let me especially draw your attention to the Board's request to receive a revised draft of the IA report, on which it will then issue another opinion.

I suggest that you include a paragraph in the final version of the impact assessment report referring to the Board's examination and briefly explaining if and how the Board's recommendations have led to changes compared to the earlier draft. Such a cross-reference will contribute to the coherence of the file as it goes into the inter-service consultation and is presented to the College.

Let me recall that it is the responsibility of your service to ensure that the second Board's opinion is uploaded in CIS-Net alongside this first opinion, and that they are both submitted to the Registry together with the corresponding initiative, the impact assessment and the executive summary when they are introduced for adoption by the College. More detailed instructions are available on the SG Manual of Operating Procedures.

Please note that once the College has adopted the corresponding initiative, the Board's opinion will be published on the Europa website, unless you inform us of the reasons - in accordance with Regulation 2001/1049 - why this should not be done in this particular case prior to the date of adoption. Please send (a copy of) such a request to the Impact Assessment Board to the Ares address ve_sg.IAB or in case you are not using Ares yet, to mailbox: IMPACT ASSESSMENT BOARD.

Marianne Klingbeil

Encl. Opinion of the Impact Assessment Board

Copies C. Martinez Alberola (President's cabinet), C. Day, M. Servoz, F. Genisson, J. Watson, L. Tholoniati (SG), Board members and alternates



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
Impact Assessment Board

Brussels,
D(2010)

03 SEP. 2010

Opinion

Title **Impact assessment on Accompanying document to the
Communication and Decision on Sport**

(draft version of 29 July 2010)

(A) Context

Article 165 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) gives the EU a new competence for sport. Article 165 calls on the EU to contribute to the promotion of sporting issues and provides that EU action should be aimed at developing the European dimension in sport. It is the Commission's role to develop and propose a suitable initiative to implement these new provisions. The aim of the impact assessment is to help to prepare this initiative.

(B) Overall assessment

Although considerable efforts have been made to consult widely and to collate available research, the report should be significantly improved in a number of respects. It should better demonstrate why EU action can add value in the field of sport policy. This reasoning should reflect experiences with the White Paper and preparatory actions and should highlight more clearly where coordination opportunities with high value added remain. The report should explain why new programme funding is appropriate despite the fact that evaluation of similar activities will not be completed for some time. The content of options in terms of envisaged actions should be more clearly explained so that it is easier to understand what they would mean in practice and so that they can be better assessed and compared.

The IAB recommends that DG Education and Culture submits a revised version of the IA report, on which the IAB will issue a new opinion.

(C) Main recommendations for improvements

(1) Stronger reasons why EU action can add value and respects Subsidiarity: The report should better explain the added value of the proposed activities, chiefly by outlining in the problem definition where both Commission contributions to policy

development and to fund transnational learning have appeared most effective or appropriate thus far and where key coordination opportunities remain. This should reflect on experiences with the White Paper and funding of preparatory actions. It would be useful to include a table describing what is currently being funded as well as a description of what is contained in the informal guidelines. The variation in current practices and results by Member States should be indicated using available data. The report should justify why it is important to proceed with a new financial programme before the funding of preparatory actions has been evaluated.

(2) Better definition, assessment and comparison of options: The report should explain the reasons for considering options with these levels of ambition (an extra €3m, €10m or €20m spend per year). It should fully assess the option which excludes programme spending. The report should also describe the content of the options in greater detail, including the transnational activities/topics eligible for programme funding and the selection criteria to be used (e.g. engagement of less developed Member States, value of learning to be shared etc). On that basis the report should present a more precise assessment of likely practical outputs and possible outcomes of each option, and should explain the uncertainties involved. This should help to show more clearly the link between the previously identified coordination problems and the impacts (i.e. intervention logic) and should also facilitate a better comparison of the effectiveness, efficiency and coherence of the options.

(3) Better integration of consultation findings: the report should better reflect the main findings from the consultation, adding relevant findings and stakeholder positions to the options and impacts sections. It should provide a clearer presentation of stakeholder views in the relevant Annexe.

(D) Procedure and presentation

Comparison tables should present options relative to the baseline. Much of the present text on chains of events that might occur under multiple options should be moved into an Annexe or replaced with a short summary or diagram in the context section which highlights the main ways in which sport contributes to Government goals (§5.1).

(E) IAB scrutiny process	
Reference number	2010/EAC/011 and 2011/EAC/012
External expertise used	No
Date of IAB meeting	1 September 2010