



COMMISSION DES COMMUNAUTÉS EUROPÉENNES

Bruxelles, le 8.7.2008  
SEC(2008) 2283

**AVIS DU COMITÉ DES ÉVALUATIONS D'IMPACT**

COMMUNICATION DE LA COMMISSION AU PARLEMENT EUROPÉEN, AU  
CONSEIL, AU COMITÉ ÉCONOMIQUE ET SOCIAL EUROPÉEN ET AU COMITÉ DES  
RÉGIONS

**VERS UNE PROGRAMMATION CONJOINTE DANS LA RECHERCHE: TRAVAILLER  
ENSEMBLE POUR RÉPONDRE PLUS EFFICACEMENT AUX DÉFIS COMMUNS**

{COM(2008) 468}  
{SEC(2008) 2281}  
{SEC(2008) 2282}





Brussels, 14 MAI 2008  
D(2008) 3934

## Opinion

**Title**                      **Impact Assessment on: Communication on Joint  
Programming in Research**

**(draft version of 14 April 2008)**

**Lead DG**                      **DG RTD**

### **1) Impact Assessment Board Opinion**

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

Towards Joint Programming in Research is one of the five policy initiatives planned by the Commission in 2008 as a follow-up to the Green Paper "The European Research Area: New Perspectives". With the Green Paper on the European Research Area (ERA), the European Commission launched a broad institutional and public debate on what should be done to create a unified and attractive European Research Area, which would fulfil the needs and expectations of the scientific community, business and citizens. This initiative responds to the dimension "Optimising research programmes and priorities" referred to in this paper.

#### **(B) Positive aspects**

The report is well structured, clearly drafted and its objectives are well defined. It gives a broad overview of the results of stakeholders' consultations. The author DG has provided a detailed written response to the Board's quality checklist, and will make many of the changes requested.

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

*The recommendations below are listed in order of descending importance. 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.*

**General recommendation: The IA report should develop the options in order to make the differences between them more distinct. It should explain in greater detail the extent to which the preferred option addresses the reluctance of public bodies and other stakeholders to take forward the integration of national public research, including their concerns about the loss of financial control. The issue of the**

**gathering of missing information should be given more attention.**

**(1) Develop the options in order to make the differences between them more distinct.** The difference in the degree of centralisation at the EU level of the Joint Programming (JP) governance under options 3 and 4 should be clarified, and in particular the role of the Commission in option 4 and the role of the Member States in option 3. Furthermore, option 4 should clearly explain the selection of themes and instruments (and in particular whether: (i) the selection will be based on National Intelligence Reports, (ii) a Joint Report by the Commission and Member States is foreseen, (iii) the decisions will be taken by consensus). The link between the options and the current Open Method of Coordination should also be better explained. The report should also make clear the differences in the bottom-up involvement of stakeholders (such as higher education institutions) under each option. Although the main focus of the initiative is on the cooperation between public sector bodies, the report should be more specific on the role of the private sector in the various options, as well as on the impact of this initiative on public-private cooperation in research. The report should clarify why the preferred option does not address directly the issue of legal and administrative barriers hampering the process of JP and chooses instead to create the process that stimulates the Member States to remove the obstacles themselves.

**(2) Explain in greater detail the extent to which the preferred option addresses the reluctance of public bodies and other stakeholders to take forward the integration of national public research.** The report should explain in particular the reasons of the concerns of public bodies and other stakeholders about the loss of financial control over integrated cross-border programmes under the status quo option (see Annex 4) and clarify how and to what extent the preferred option would reduce such concerns.

**(3) Explain in greater detail the issue of the gathering of missing information.** Given that the success of the initiative seems to depend on the ability to collect full information about research programmes in the Member States, the options should describe with greater precision how the process of gathering this information will be organised. It should clarify why recent efforts to obtain this data have only been a partial success. The report should also clarify if the process of the gathering of missing information about research programmes in the Member States entails costs and/or the possible administrative burden.

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

It appears that all procedural requirements have been complied with. The problem definition should not prejudge the final outcome of the analysis.

## 2) IAB scrutiny process

Reference number	2008/RTD/035 (priority initiative)
Author DG	RTD
External expertise used	No
Date of Board Meeting	Written procedure
Date of adoption of Opinion	<b>14 MAI 2008</b>

