



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
Impact Assessment Board

Brussels,
D(2013)

Opinion

Title

DG RTD - Impact Assessment the objectives, legal status and operational rules of the Clean Sky Joint Undertaking for the period 2014-2024

(draft version of 1 February 2013)*

(A) Context

In 2008, Council Regulation (EC) 71/2008 established the Clean Sky Joint Undertaking, a Public Private Partnership (PPP) between the European Commission and the Aeronautics Industry for a period up to 31 December 2017 with a budget of €1.6 billion, equally shared between European Commission and aeronautics industry. The proposal follows the White Paper "Roadmap to a Single European Transport Area – Towards a Competitive and Resource Efficient Transport System" stipulating that joint European efforts will bring the greatest European added value in areas such as clean, safe and silent vehicles for all different modes of transport and the Commission Communication "Partnering in Research and Innovation" *indicating* that the partnering approach in Public-Private Partnerships (PPP) can help to address major societal challenges and strengthen Europe's competitive position.

The initiative is based on the Commission's proposal for the "Horizon 2020 Framework Programme for Research and Innovation in the European Union (2014-2020)" that provides a basis for future EU PPPs in Research and Innovation. The focus of IAB analysis has been adapted accordingly.

(B) Overall opinion

This report should focus on the remaining follow-up decisions on the Clean Sky Joint Undertaking to be taken at this stage, i.e. how the structure for managing this programme should be organised. It should limit its description of the broader policy and industry context to a short introductory section, and concentrate its problem analysis much stronger on the lessons learned from evaluations and Court of Auditor Reports, showing what has been effective and indicating possible improvements in the management and governance of the programme. Second, it should explain the reason for the 30% CO2 reduction and be clear about the objectives for NOX and noise and discuss the added value of this funding programme in relation to the ETS legislation and other policies in this area. Third, the report should clarify the key differences between the options, and explain that for the comparison of options effectiveness and efficiency are the key criteria. Finally it should identify any groups of stakeholders that have voiced critical opinions and explain how these have been addressed.

* Note that this opinion concerns a draft impact assessment report which may differ from the one adopted

(C) Main recommendations for improvements

(1) Align the problem analysis to the remaining policy choices. Given that key parameters have been already set in the "Horizon 2020" proposal the report should concentrate in its problem description on the actual scope of the intervention, i.e. finding the most suitable governance option for a joint research and development programme. The overview of market and technology developments should be reduced to a short policy context section. Instead the problem definition should build much stronger on the lessons learned from the evaluations that have been completed, including where relevant evaluations of similar projects in other policy areas, and corresponding Court of Auditor Reports. It should show on the basis of evidence what aspects of the current programme have been effective, with regards to achieving the objectives and regional effects. It should clearly identify who has benefited from the existing programme, including an explanation that a considerable part of the benefits actually go to suppliers to the aircraft industry that are much more evenly distributed over EU Member States than the aircraft manufactures. It should present the results of monitoring with the Technology Evaluator and better describe the benefits of demonstrators, using for example the technical results from the Sustainable and Green Engines, and the Smart Fixed Wing Aircraft demonstrators. The report should explain the importance of stimulating the development of new higher risk technologies to ensure their availability in time for the next expected fleet renewal of 2025/2030, and clarify why (emissions) legislation is not enough to ensure that this technology will be developed sufficiently quickly. The report should also strengthen its arguments concerning the threat of international competition, and give a fair indication of public funding awarded to the aeronautics sector in competing countries. The baseline scenario (current Option 1) should be set out in sufficient detail in the problem section, with an explanation that the autonomous 1.5% p.a. reduction in CO2 emissions that is assumed for this scenario is based on expert consensus.

(2) Better explain the objectives. The objectives section should clarify on what analytical and/or practical basis the CO2 and market share targets have been set. It should also explain why setting concrete objectives for NOx or noise levels is complicated because of the trade-offs between the two. The reviewed report should include the targets for these two items, with a discussion of the trade-offs. The discussion of targets for CO2 reduction should clearly explain that the aim to reach 30% reductions is consistent with the proposed development of this technology in time for the next fleet renewal.

(3) Better assess and compare options. The report should explain clearly that although the options may all entail roughly the same costs, they are expected to differ in their effectiveness in stimulating and speeding up the high risk technological development, that is considered indispensable to benefit from the next round of fleet renewal to deliver on the key objectives. It should provide clearer evidence, for example based on comparative analysis with the EU's main competitors, how this type of funding can actually improve the competitiveness of the European aerospace industry. The Report should provide a more detailed account of the social impact of the programme, as well of its benefit across Member States.

Some more technical comments have been transmitted directly to the author DG and are expected to be incorporated in the final version of the impact assessment report

(D) Procedure and presentation

The report should incorporate the results of available interim and ex-post evaluations, and relevant Court of Auditors reports in a more transparent way, preferably in a separate chapter in the problem description. Some issues, such as the benefits of demonstrators should be explained in less technical terms. The report should identify stakeholders (or categories thereof) rather than report percentages and incorporate and discuss where relevant critical input received.

(E) IAB scrutiny process

Reference number	2013/RTD/009
External expertise used	No
Date of IAB meeting	27 February 2013.