

EUROPEAN COMMISSION Impact Assessment Board

> Brussels, D(2011)

<u>Opinion</u>

<u>Title</u>

DG ECHO – Impact Assessment for the review of the Civil Protection Framework

(draft version of 25/08/2011)

(A) Context

The EU Civil Protection Mechanism was created in 2001 as a 'Community Mechanism to facilitate reinforced cooperation in civil protection assistance interventions.' The Mechanism is a comprehensive tool covering the prevention, preparedness and response aspects of the disaster management cycle. Its main role is to support and coordinate the deployment of Member States' in-kind assistance (teams, experts and equipment) to countries requesting international assistance in major disasters. This applies to all types of disasters (natural and man-made) within and outside the EU. This impact assessment discusses policy options to revise the EU Civil Protection Mechanism Decision and the Civil Protection Financial Instrument linked to it, including all relevant aspects of ex-ante evaluation required for revising EU financial instruments.

The IAB has focussed on the policy choices not yet fixed in the MFF June package.

(B) Overall assessment

The report requires further work on several important aspects. Firstly, the report should improve the problem definition by providing more evidence of the size and seriousness of the problems. Secondly, the report should clarify the baseline scenario and the content of the policy change options and should clearly indicate diverging stakeholder views. Thirdly, the report should analyse the different options in greater detail and should clearly describe the comparative advantages and value added of the preferred option(s) using a clear set of comparison criteria. Finally, the report should spell out more extensively the monitoring and evaluation arrangements.

(C) Main recommendations for improvements

(1) Strengthen the problem definition. The report should present a more precise and evidence-based analysis of the specific problems, for instance by including representative examples and statistical data and by better integrating the results from the external study. This should include a description of the existing civil protection mechanisms and an analysis of its shortcomings.

Commission européenne, B-1049 Bruxelles - Belgium. Office: BERL 6/29. E-mail: impact-assessment-board@ec.europa.eu

(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