[redacted] **(SANTE)**

From: [redacted] (SANCO)
Sent: 06 March 2014 15:08
To: [redacted] (SANCO)
Subject: FW: EDs roadmap
Attachments: 2014 01 15_Draft Roadmap for the criteria to identify EDs_input SG-rev2 clean.doc

From: [redacted] SG)
Sent: 06-03-14 14:07
To: [redacted] (ENV); [redacted] (SANCO)
Subject: EDs roadmap

[redacted]

As you know [redacted] sent though some comments on the draft roadmap. I have further adapted these to reflect more clearly how the SG thinks the IA work should be presented.

In short, we do not wish to prevent you looking at the elements of the large array of options you had previously described but we wish to present this in a simpler manner that does put into question the adopted legislation.

The Roadmap indicates the two key options for the criteria (with/without potency) but indicates that there will be a detailed assessment of the impacts on the *coherence* between the various legislative acts resulting from the application of the criteria. This will allow the identification of problems (such as no socio-economic exclusion in the PPPR) and can be used to justify the College proposing one or more limited flanking measures to ensure coherence. In this approach, the Roadmap does not immediately call into question the validity of the parent legislation but allows for analysis to justify any necessary changes to the legislation.

I would propose that we meet early next week to discuss the Roadmap. Please let me know your availability (alas [redacted] is now on leave so I will be following this for both DGs in his absence).

Once the Roadmap is agreed, I think that it would be good to call an ISG meeting where it would be useful to discuss (1) the Roadmap; (2) the questions for the public consultation; (3) an outline of an impact assessment with all the relevant placeholders so that DGs are reassured that "their" points will be addressed.

[redacted]

[redacted]

European Commission
Secretariat General
[redacted]