



**(2) Clarify the baseline scenario and the content of the options.** The report should clearly indicate which of the options will serve as the baseline scenario including a presentation of existing cooperation arrangements at other levels as well as ongoing and expected international developments (Participating States and UN level). It should also provide information on the actual share of civil protection measures currently coordinated by the EU as part of the total measures. It should furthermore clearly describe the content and functioning of the various options (i.e. instruments/mechanisms) and present the different views of stakeholders on the options considered. In this context the report should explain why a broader set of options might not be feasible for all instruments of the mechanism. The report should also contrast the current financial allocation with the allocation under the MFF proposal and should indicate the foreseen financial allocation for the various instruments under the policy change options. Issues related to transport coordination (such as public procurement etc.) should be presented in more detail.

**(3) Improve the analysis of impacts and the comparison of options.** The report should provide a more substantive impact analysis of the options (for all instruments) by including a detailed description of the available evidence and the underlying assumptions. The report should provide greater clarity on the distribution of economic, social/employment and environmental impacts. It should also explain whether synergy effects are to be expected from the various elements of the civil protection framework. The report should include a general analysis of costs (including labour) and administrative burden for the different instruments of the mechanism. In comparing the options, the report should establish a clear set of comparison criteria and compare options against the baseline. The report should better substantiate the presentation of the preferred option(s) by clearly stating the advantages, the value added and trade-offs compared to the baseline scenario.

**(4) Better present the monitoring and evaluation arrangements.** The report should corroborate the monitoring and evaluation arrangements by presenting the indicators currently placed in annex K in the main text of the report. In doing so, the report should better link the output indicators to the objectives and include current performance levels. The report should further clarify the monitoring and evaluation responsibilities of Members States and of Participating States.

**(D) Procedure and presentation**

In terms of presentation, the structure of the report should be better aligned with the impact assessment guidelines by presenting the objectives, the impacts analysis and comparison of options in separate chapters with sub-headings for the different instruments of the framework. The report should link the results presented in some of the tables more closely to the discussion of impacts in the main text. The report should avoid repetitions and it should also present a more detailed reference to the cited earlier impact assessment report. A list of acronyms and (executive) summaries of the studies should be added to the report.

**(E) IAB scrutiny process**

Reference number	2011/ECHO/002
External expertise used	No
Date of IAB meeting	21/09/2011