1. DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS

id	Setup Type	Software at the EP	Software at the CEU	Common Exchange	Pros +	Cons -
1.1	Separate development	EP developed editor, storage, rendering	CEU developed editor, storage, rendering	EP and CEU will separately develop integration to common platform (e-TrustX, IMMC, IFC)	- Clear budgetary and administrative boundaries - EP can benefit from leveraging of the e-Palriament developed platform (editor, storage and rendering)	- Delivery synchronisation risk
1.2	CEU takes LegisWeb editor (LEOS)	EP developed editor, storage, rendering	CEU adopts LegisWeb editor, storage and rendering (LEOS) and integrates to CEU technical environment	EP and CEU will separately develop integration to common platform (e-TrustX, IMMC, IFC)	- Clear budgetary and administrative boundaries - EP can benefit from leveraging of the e-Palriament developed platform (editor, storage and rendering)	- Delivery synchronisation risk - Dependant on Commission delivery - Features synchronisation risk
1.3	EP develops everything on joint business requirements and functional specifications	EP developed editor, storage, rendering	EP developed editor, CEU adapts and integrates in CEU technical environment for storage and rendering	EP will develop integration to common platform (e-TrustX, IMMC, IFC)	- Syncronisation of delivery - Early discovery of functional issues/gaps - Both parties actively participate in the business requirements and functional specifications - EP can benefit from leveraging of the e-Palriament developed platform (editor, storage, rendering and future transfer platform)	- Not clear budgetary and administrative boundaries risk - Joint definition of buisness requirements and functional specifications may lenghten the approval process - Joint business requirements and functional specifications may be incompatible with EP or CEU constraints - Delay in solution acceptance due to integration challenges in CEU - Different roles, responsibilities and commitment (budget & resources) may lead to unbalanced business requirements (incomplete or exaggerated) - Complexity in solution design so that it accommodates integration of institution specific features
1.4	EP and CEU develop together a common full-stack product (editor, storage, rendering and exchange)	Joint developed editor, storage and rendering	Joint developed editor, storage and rendering	Joint developed integration to common platform (e-TrustX, IMMC, IFC)	- Syncronisation of delivery based on the same product - Early discovery of functional issues/gaps - Both parties actively participate in the buisenss requirements and functional specifications - No specific integration developments needed	- No leveraging of the e-Palriament developed platform (storage and rendering) - High communication and coordination efforts - Complexity in solution design so that it accommodates integration of institution specific features
1.5	EP and CEU develop together common components (editor and exchange) and separate integration of storage and rendering	Joint developed editors and EP developed storage and rendering	Joint developed editors and CEU developed storage and rendering	Joint developed integration to common platform (e-TrustX, IMMC, IFC)	- Early discovery of functional issues/gaps - Both parties actively participate in the business requirements and functional specifications - EP can benefit from leveraging of the e-Palriament developed platform (storage and rendering)	- High communicaiton and coordination - Complexity in solution design so that it accommodates integration of institution specific features - No reuse of e-Parliament editor and future transfer platform
1.6	EP develops everything (discounted)	EP developed editor, storage, rendering	EP developed editor, storage and rendering on behalf of CEU	EP development and integration on behalf of CEU	- No dependancy to CEU project administration and decision making - Early discovery of functional issues/gaps	- More time and effort on EP - May have issues accessing CEU infrastructure and integrating applications - Buy-in and adoption of the solution from CEU - CEU acceptance of the final product
1.7	CEU develops everything (discounted)	CEU developed editor, storage, rendering on behalf of EP	CEU developed editor, storage and rendering	CEU development and integration on behalf of EP	- No dependancy to EP project administration and decision making - Early discovery of functional issues/gaps	- More time and effort on CEU - May have issues accessing EP infrastructure and integrating applications - Buy-in and adoption of the solution from EP - EP acceptance of the final product

2. FINANCING OPTIONS (in addition to own funding secured by involved institutions)

id	Setup Type	Software at the EP	Software at the CEU	Common Exchange	Pros +	Cons -
2.1	Development takes place under (partial) direct ISA financing	Same as 1.3, 1.4, 1.45	Same as 1.3, 1.4, 1.5	Same as 1.3, 1.4, 1.5	Same as 1.3 1.,4, 1.5	Same as 1.3, 1.4, 1.5
2.2	Development takes place under (partial) indirect ISA financing	To be considered	COM developed editor, CEU adapts and integrates in CEU technical environment for storage and rendering; or Joint developed editors and CEU developed storage and rendering	Joint developed integration to common platform (e-TrustX, IMMC, IFC)	Clear budgetary benefits, Syncronisation benefits between 4CT and the Common drafting platform initiatives, this leading to better resource allocation	Addittionnal administrative steps - Dependency on COM project administration and decision making -Delivery timeline might need to adjusted to that those of the Commission