

20 September 2019

Joint Legislative Portal (JLP)
State of Play and Timeline

State of Play

- In order to implement paragraph 39 of the IIA on Better Law-Making on the development of a Joint Legislative Portal (JLP), the three institutions agreed in principle on a **Concept Paper** in October 2017. This Concept paper sets out some initial elements on what the content and functionalities of the future JLP should be, the idea of a phased approach whereby the OLP files would be the first ones to be included, its financing and governance structure, as well as on the further steps.
- Throughout the first half of 2018, the institutions worked on the **Business Case**, the justification for the proposed project on the basis of its expected benefits.
- In the Autumn of 2018, it became evident that in order to be able to carry out a complete and thorough analysis in the Business case, certain issues regarding some of the main aspects of the proposal - namely its technical feasibility, funding and governance aspects - needed to be more thoroughly addressed already at this stage. The finalisation of the Business case was therefore put on hold for the institutions to be able to examine these issues in greater depth. Extensive dialogue and consultations between the institutions followed.
- On **20 March 2019**, an **interinstitutional meeting** (project managers) took place, where discussions focussed on how to move forward, looking jointly at the different possibilities as regards (1) *technically feasible options*, (2) *funding* and (3) *governance structure*.
- Several intertwined possibilities were looked at on the main matters at hand, and it was decided that they needed to be further developed as follows:

(1) *Technically feasible options*:

I - "EUR-LEX+": development by the PO;

II - "Legislative Observatory+": development by the EP.

(2) *Funding*: funding alternatives linked to the technically feasible options, such that as regards development costs, under I funding would come from the ISA² programme and under II the EP would be covering a larger share of the costs. Decisions regarding funding also needed to consider the different share of the burden by the different institutions as regards running/maintenance costs and required internal adaptations.

(3) *Governance structure*: the envisaged structure would imply a sort of *dual system*: a technical level group and a high-level group. Whatever is eventually decided as regards the technically feasible options and the funding, the governance structure should guarantee that the project remains steered jointly by the three institutions, thus ensuring full ownership by EP, CONS and COM. Where this would involve any form of outsourcing, the appropriate safeguards would need to be included into the system so that it remains in control of the three institutions.

- A template covering the technical specifications was created, in March 2019, to allow comparability between the two technically feasible options.
- At the beginning of June 2019, both the **EP and OP proposals** for the development of the JLP were sent to the three institutions.
- On **9 July 2019**, another **interinstitutional meeting** (project managers) took place. Both the EP and the PO presented their respective offers for the development of the portal, and this was followed by a Q&A session. A first discussion on possible ways forward then took place between the designated representatives of the three institutions.
- In the course of the discussions, participants have highlighted a number of criteria as relevant, which they might take into account when evaluating the offers: user accessibility and user-friendliness; joint ownership and visibility; adequate governance; accuracy and clarity of the information on process and products; easy 'management' of the JLP and its evolutions; development and maintenance costs; timeline for the JLP to be operational.
- The institutions also made it clear that they have to take into account the technical internal adaptations and costs required to link their systems to the JLP.

- It ensued from the discussion that, there is still a divergence between the - preliminarily expressed - positions of the European Parliament (supporting the Legislative Observatory+ option) and of the Commission (preferring the EUR-LEX+ option). The Council has not expressed any preference yet.

Next steps

- agreement on this state-of-play document by project managers (end of July if possible);
- clarifications from COM DG DIGIT on option I "EUR-LEX+" with/without ISA² funding and from the EP on option II "*Legislative Observatory+*", with more precise specifications on the EP share;
- the development of a revamped Business case;
- internal discussions within each institution to set a definite position as regards the technically feasible options, funding and governance;
- in case of persisting divergences, escalation of the discussion and decision-making to a higher hierarchical level;
- interinstitutional decision, by the end of this year, on the launch of the JLP development;
- based on the interinstitutional decision, finalisation of the technical specifications.

Reference documents

1. PO offer and slides used on 9 July.
2. EP offer and slides used on 9 July.