



EUROPEAN COMMISSION  
Impact Assessment Board

Brussels,  
D(2011)

### Opinion

**Title**                                    **DG JUST - Impact Assessment on Justice and Rights of  
Citizenship Programmes**  
**(draft version of 5 August 2011)**

#### **(A) Context**

During the current financial perspective 2007-2013 EU-funding in the area of justice and rights is provided through the following six different programmes: Civil Justice (JCIV), Criminal Justice (JPEN), Fundamental Rights and Citizenship (FRC), Daphne III (DAP), Drug Prevention and Information Programme (DPIP) and by the Sections "Anti-discrimination and Diversity" and "Gender Equality" of the Programme for Employment and Social Solidarity (PROGRESS).

This IA report examines, in accordance with the Communication on the EU Budget Review, all funding instruments and delivery mechanisms in order to streamline funding in support of the policy objectives in the justice and rights area with a focus on European added value and to examine how best to achieve tangible results in delivering benefits to the EU citizens.

The IAB has focused on the policy choices not yet fixed by the June MFF Communication.

#### **(B) Overall assessment**

**The report needs to be improved in several important respects. First, it should strengthen the description of the problems by better reflecting the results of evaluations in particular dealing with any issues relating to the proven effectiveness and EU added-value of the programmes. Second, in relation to options, the report should address the issue of the need for increased focus on policy priorities which was identified by the mid-term evaluation in order to tackle potential overlap with other programmes. Third, the report should better assess the options in terms of their potential impacts on the objectives of the funding. Fourth, the report should present a more operational evaluation arrangement, including an appropriate set of indicators and indicating when and how evaluations will take place.**

**In its written communication with the Board DG JUST accepted to revise the report in line with the recommendations of this opinion.**

### **(C) Main recommendations for improvements**

**(1) Strengthen the analysis of the problem.** While the IA report provides a good overview of the main challenges giving rise to the need for action, the report should include a more concise summary of the specific problems to be addressed. The IA report should better reflect the results of evaluations in particular dealing with any issues relating to the effectiveness and EU added-value of the programmes. The problem definition should better identify any problems with the priorities of the programmes, given overlaps between the programmes themselves and other programmes. Furthermore, while the report largely focuses on the efficiency and management of the programmes, it should also consider whether any issues arise relating to their content. The question of the effectiveness of the current programmes in the context of the results actually achieved should be addressed in greater depth.

**(2) Analysis of options.** The report should consider a broader range of options than the current list which is limited to the alternative numbers of programmes that could be used to improve the efficiency of the management of the programmes. Alternatively, the report should better explain why issues relating to priorities within the programmes are not addressed in depth and should much better clarify the extent to which the choice of the number of programmes has a bearing not just on efficiency but also on the full range of problems identified including those related to effectiveness. In particular, and in light of the results of the public consultation regarding the EU added value of different programme actions, the report should address the issue of the need for increased focus on policy priorities which was identified by the mid-term evaluation in order to address potential overlap with other programmes.

**(3) Assessment of impacts.** The IA report should better demonstrate how the proposed options will address the problems identified including in terms of length of procedures and avoiding overlapping. The report should indicate, where possible in quantitative terms, what would be the effect on administrative burden both for the Commission and other organisations. It should better relate the options to the wide array of problems identified and discuss in particular how the proposed options can help improve the implementation of existing legislation. The report should improve the assessment of the options in terms of their potential impacts on the objectives of the funding. The report should address more explicitly the question of how each option impacts on simplification.

### **(D) Procedure and presentation**

The report should present a more operational evaluation arrangement indicating when and how evaluations will take place. An appropriate set of indicators focused on the results of the programmes should be included.

### **(E) IAB scrutiny process**

Reference number	2011/JUST/056
External expertise used	No
Date of IAB meeting	7/09/2011 (Written procedure)