



Brussels, 7.9.2016  
SWD(2016) 259 final

**COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT**  
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

*Accompanying the document*

**Proposal for a REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE  
COUNCIL**

**establishing a Union certification system for aviation security screening equipment**

{COM(2016) 491 final}  
{SWD(2016) 261 final}

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY SHEET

Impact assessment on a proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on establishing an EU certification system for aviation screening equipment

### A. Need for action

#### What is the problem and why is it a problem at EU level?

This initiative addresses the lack of an internal market for aviation screening equipment. This causes inefficiency and impedes **the competitiveness of European manufacturers** of such equipment.

Without a policy initiative to support the competitiveness of the European manufacturers their market shares on the global market are bound to decrease.

#### What should be achieved?

The proper functioning of the EU internal market for aviation screening equipment and an increase in the global competitiveness of the EU companies.

#### What is the value added of action at the EU level (subsidiarity)?

Member States have, with the Commission, partially addressed this problem through a non-binding cooperation agreement the development of common testing methodologies. This agreement does however not issue certifications. There are no indications that Member States plan a legally binding mutually agreed certification system. EU action is thus necessary. EU action would add value as manufacturers would benefit from an internal market and improve their global competitiveness.

### B. Solutions

#### What are the various options to achieve the objectives? Is there a preferred option or not? If not, why?

Five policy options were developed:

**1. "Baseline scenario"**, the Commission would not launch any initiative. **2. A recommendation** to Member States. **3. "Legislation"** - A legislative proposal which would allow producers to market and sell their products throughout the Union, once certified in one Member State: **3.1. The "old approach"**, **3.2. The "new approach"**, **3.3. The "centralised approach"**.

The **preferred option is 3.1 "old approach"**, which would have significant positive impacts, with broad support among all stakeholders.

#### What are different stakeholders' views? Who supports which option?

Stakeholder groups did not support options 1 and 2. The majority of stakeholders preferred

option 3.3 closely followed by 3.1 and 3.2. Stakeholder groups gave a largely homogeneous reply on these questions.

### **C. Impacts of the preferred option**

#### **What are the benefits of the preferred option (if any, otherwise main ones)?**

Certification would be done in only one Member State. The proposed policy action should: raise EU market efficiency, improve the free movement of goods, improve the choice of customers, reduce the administrative burden, improve time to market and improve the competitiveness of European manufacturers. This should lead to an overall increase of sales of EU manufacturers in third countries and increase overall employment figures in the sector.

#### **What are the costs of the preferred option (if any, otherwise main ones)?**

The reduction of the need to test multiple times a single piece or equipment should lead to a reduction of the number of tests a single laboratory would perform per year, leading to a reduction of income for the laboratories, which should however be lower than the costs savings of the producers.

#### **What are the impacts on SMEs and competitiveness?**

The current legal uncertainty of the current certification system increases the development costs as well as the time to market of aviation screening equipment. Given the limited resources available to an SME, this is a proportionally greater problem for it than for a larger company. The positive impacts of option 3.1 are therefore expected to be higher for SMEs.

#### **Will there be significant impacts on national budgets and administrations?**

No

#### **Will there be other significant impacts?**

No

### **D. Follow up**

#### **When will the policy be reviewed?**

Every five years.