



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
IMPACT ASSESSMENT BOARD

Brussels,
D(2012)

Opinion

Title

DG ENTR - Impact Assessment on: Proposal for a Regulation concerning the setting up and operations of European space surveillance and tracking service

(Resubmitted draft: version of 8 May 2012)

(A) Context

Space infrastructures and derived services have become critical to the European economy, policies and society. The Commission's Communication 'Towards a space strategy for the European Union that benefits its citizens', adopted in April 2011, identified the protection of these infrastructures as one of the major issues for the future involvement of the EU in space. Despite some existing capabilities, Europe lacks operational space surveillance and tracking (SST) services and is to a large extent dependant on information on space objects orbiting the Earth and collision risks provided by third parties. This impact assessment accompanies the proposal related to the setting up and operations of European SST services.

(B) Overall assessment

The report has been improved along the lines of the recommendations issued by the Board in its first opinion. However, there are several issues that should be further strengthened. Firstly, the report should further clarify some aspects of the policy options, in particular the relationship between the actors involved in the European SST service provision and those benefiting from the services. Secondly, it should better analyse the funding-related aspects and assess in greater detail the risk of budgetary constraints at EU and Member State levels. Finally, the report should identify the preferred policy option, or explain why such a conclusion cannot be made.

(C) Main recommendations for improvements

(1) Further strengthen some elements of options. The revised report now provides a clear overview of the provisions related to the governance, data policy, services and funding for different policy options. Nevertheless, it should still more clearly spell out the relationship between the Member States participating in the consortium and actively involved in the European SST service provision (including their incentives) on the one side, and other Member States and third countries on the other side, in terms of the access

of the latter to the SST services. The report should also better explain why the concerns of some Member States about the SST structures being dominated by a group of asset owning countries under the baseline scenario, do not seem to exist under the preferred option, where the same countries would have a leading role within the proposed consortium.

(2) Better analyse the funding related aspects. The report should better assess the risk of possible budgetary constraints at EU and especially at Member State level, given that the participation of Member States in funding seems to be critical for the successful set-up of the European SST services for policy options 2 and 3. In this context, it should indicate to what level the envisaged SST system could be downscaled (e.g. in terms of the aimed reduction of the collision risk factor or in terms of new infrastructure needs) and still provide the services corresponding to the identified user needs. The possibility of financial contributions from the private sector should be discussed in greater detail.

(3) Identify the preferred policy option. Based on the comparison of options in terms of the effectiveness, efficiency and coherence criteria provided in section 7, the report should identify the preferred policy option. In case such a clear-cut conclusion cannot be made the report should rank the options on the basis of the evaluation criteria which have been used, for instance by adequately amending the summary tables in section 7. Finally, the safety impacts should be consistently mentioned under all options and not only under the baseline.

(D) Procedure and presentation

All procedural aspects appear to be respected. The length of the report should be brought closer to the recommended page limit, by avoiding repetitions.

(E) IAB scrutiny process

Reference number	2012/ENTR/021
External expertise used	No
Date of Board Meeting	Written procedure The present opinion concerns a resubmitted draft IA report. The first opinion was issued on 20 April 2012.