

# **Methodological note on RIA scalability: best practices of simplified impact assessments**

This is an excerpt from the interim report on the *Regulatory impact analysis of the introduction of the EC Low Voltage directive into Ukrainian legislation*

Prepared by Dr. Peter Futo

Short term expert at Ukraine-Europe Policy and Legal Advice Centre (UEPLAC)

Kyiv - Budapest

16 January 2008

**Contents**

Information sources and the depth of analysis .....3  
United Kingdom: the three stages of RIA .....4  
UK Case Study: Initial RIA of raising the minimum age of leaving education or training .....5  
    Options .....6  
UK Case Study: Initial RIA of the introduction of the EU Food Law .....7  
Italy: Preliminary vs. Final RIA .....8  
Poland: Summary vs. Extended Impact Assessment .....9  
European Commission: Roadmaps vs. Impact Assessments .....9  
European Commission Case Study: Roadmap to Impact Assessment of Safety of Toys Regulation  
.....10  
    A. Initial impact assessment screening .....10  
    B. Planning of further impact assessment work .....12  
Conclusions .....12

## ***Information sources and the depth of analysis***

This methodological note is about the scalability of the RIA exercise and its outcome. In other words, this is an overview of best practices applied by researchers when addressing the issues of scope and depth of RIA studies.

The aim of this methodological note is to offer methodological knowledge and some practical examples about basic forms of RIA. The following questions are addressed: in what cases and why does this distinction arise, and how is initial RIA different from other stages of assessment (partial / extended and full).

Since RIA should be part of the policy development process, it should begin as early as possible. Therefore the regulatory process often cannot wait until the full range of the above information is collected. Therefore administrations have learnt to build existing or easily accessible information into RIAs that are helpful but not yet complete. In other words, RIA activities are **scalable**, depending on the efforts invested into research and consultation.

Depending on the depth of the above information basis we can speak about Initial RIA, Partial RIA and Full RIA. An Initial RIA is often called “basic” or “preliminary” or “summary” RIA, and an alternative name of a full RIA is “in-depth” or “extended” RIA Study.

According to international experience, the difference between initial and later stages of RIA lies mainly in the fact that the deeper is the RIA, the more detailed is the analysis and the more quantitative is the description of the impacts. Initial RIAs are often made in order to determine, whether the potential impacts forecasted by the initial RIA are high. According to the principle of proportionality, in this case a deeper version of RIA might become necessary.

For each of the addressed various regulatory options, RIAs should generally cover the following dimensions of impacts:

- policy area specific impact
- (general) economic impact;
- business (enterprise) impact;
- social impact (including environmental);
- institutional impact
- budgetary expenditures impact.

A RIA can only be prepared if sufficient information is collected about the following issues:

- Type 1 Information: What is the present regulatory environment of the planned regulation, i.e. what are the regulations in force, how are they enforced today and what is the institutional structure like that is responsible for the enforcement?
- Type 2 Information: What is the statistical size of the group of the affected stakeholders and what is the statistical size of their affected activities? Market research type information about the markets that are affected.

Moreover, in most cases it is necessary to receive feedback from the affected interest groups about the following issues:

- Type 3 Information: What is the existing and potential compliance behavior of the affected stakeholders under the various regulatory options like, (i.e. in case no regulatory intervention is planned, and in the case of implementing the planned regulation)?
- Type 4 Information: What is the size of the associated regulatory burden under the various regulatory options?

Often it is not easy and not straightforward to collect the above information. In public administration organizations such as ministries and subordinated Government agencies there is

ample knowledge about Type 1 Information, but the other Types of information are not immediately available and their collection needs some research and consultation efforts.

A recent survey<sup>1</sup> among 10 EU member states has formulated the following question to public administrations: “In your country is there a distinction between a summary and an extended, in depth impact assessment?” Out of the 10 responding countries, only 2 countries, Finland and Holland have responded with “yes”. However, the notion of “analysis depth” appears in the British, the Italian and the Polish RIA practice as well.

### ***United Kingdom: the three stages of RIA***

The referred UK methodology<sup>2</sup> clearly specifies the various stages of RIA preparation. The stages are called “initial”, “partial”, and “full / final” RIA. They show significant differences in terms of

- the reliability of impact estimations,
- the extent of consultation on which the statements are based,
- and the specific nature of the recommendations.

The characteristic features of these three stages are as follows:

- *The initial RIA* should inform and ideally accompany the draft regulation to the particular Line Ministry. An initial RIA should inform requests for departmental ministerial agreement to a proposal. It should be proportionate to the impact of a proposal and can consist of a rough and ready analysis based on what is already known. The initial RIA should be based on existing institutional knowledge and on early/informal consultation. An initial RIA can consist of a rough and ready analysis based on what the drafters already know. It should include the drafter’s best estimates of the possible risks, benefits and costs, and should identify areas where more information is needed. The contents of an initial RIA are as follows: Provide a clear statement of the policy objectives and the issue. Describe and, where possible, quantify the scale of the risk (ie the problem to be addressed). Identify regulatory and non-regulatory alternative options, including do nothing/base case. Consider the pros and cons of each option and the fit with existing requirements on the relevant sector. Identify who is affected, including business sectors affected. Identify any issues of equity and fairness. Examine what is already known about the costs and benefits. Identify any potential unintended consequences. Identify distributional impacts. Try to identify markets that may be affected and flag up any potential competition issues. Consider how to secure compliance and whether a review of how it is working is required.
- *The partial RIA* builds on the initial RIA. The partial RIA must be submitted with any proposal needing collective agreement from the Prime Minister’s Office, the Cabinet of Ministers or the associated committees. It must also accompany the formal consultation process with the stakeholders. It should be informed by more discussions, data gathering and informal consultations. It should include refined policy options on regulation, compliance, monitoring, cost and benefit estimates and risk analysis. A Competition Assessment and a Small Firms’ Impact Test is also needed.
- *The full/final RIA* builds upon the analysis in the partial RIA which should be updated in the light of consultation and further information and analysis. It should be submitted with clear recommendations to the Ministers and should accompany legislation when it is presented to Parliament. It should also be placed on the website of the responsible Ministry. It must include a signed declaration from the relevant minister that he/she is satisfied that the benefits of a proposal outweigh the costs. The full/final RIA differs from the partial RIA in the first place not

---

<sup>1</sup> „A comparative analysis of regulatory impact assessment in ten EU countries. A report prepared for the EU directors of Better Regulation Group”. Dublin, May 2004. Italian, Irish and Dutch presidencies of the Council of the European Union.

<sup>2</sup> “Better Policy Making: A Guide to Regulatory Impact Assessment”. Regulatory Impact Unit, Cabinet Office of the Government of Great Britain. Publication date: January 2003.

in its template but in the depth and reliability of the information that it is based on, and in the explicit nature of its recommendations. In particular, wherever possible, the impact estimates in terms of cost, benefit and risk should be accompanied by sensitivity analyses. Full RIAs often use some economic / econometric model to forecast the impacts of the planned regulation. Full RIAs are often the products of a research and consultancy effort that has been outsourced to some organization outside the public administration.

It follows from the above description that in the British RIA tradition there are no significant differences in terms of the template required for each of these three stages.

### ***UK Case Study: Initial RIA of raising the minimum age of leaving education or training<sup>3</sup>***

This Initial RIA was issued in 2007 by the Department of Education and Skills of the United Kingdom. The name of the regulatory initiative is “Raising Expectations”. The document can be downloaded from the Internet. Length of the document: 17 pages. Level of quantification for describing the groups under the impact of the regulation: high. Level of quantification of assessing the impacts themselves: low.

The structure of the document is as follows.

#### **Objective**

To raise to 18 the minimum age at which a young person could leave education or training. This will be done in two stages: to 17 from September 2013; and to 18 from September 2015.

#### **Background**

Current relevant legal requirements and measures.

Overall number of people affected by the proposal.

Participation in education or training at 16 and 17 years in the UK, as compared with other OECD countries.

Government’s existing aspirations and policies.

Statistics of employment prospects by sectors, depending on the level of education and training of workforce.

Young people not being in education or training: its costs to economy and its negative social side effects.

#### **Rationale for government intervention**

Impacts of skill levels on economic performance, productivity growth, employment, living standards, crime rates, competitiveness UK vs. EU member countries, India and China.

Statistics: Impacts of existing qualifications on wage returns and promotions by gender.

Quantified forecast: there will be a sharp decline in low-skilled jobs up to 2020 whilst the importance of high-tech jobs will increase.

Indicator: what percentage of 17 year old population should participate in education and training by 2015.

#### **Consultation**

Declaration: the Ministry will fully consult on this proposal with all key stakeholder groups.

Fora and channels of planned consultation.

---

<sup>3</sup> This Methodological Note offers only case studies of Initial RIAs. A wide selection of final (in-depth) RIA case studies is available in the Appendix of the following document: „A comparative analysis of regulatory impact assessment in ten EU countries. A report prepared for the EU directors of Better Regulation Group”. Dublin, May 2004. Italian, Irish and Dutch presidencies of the Council of the European Union.

List of Government agencies that have been already consulted.

## **Options**

Option 1 - Do nothing.

Option 2 - Legislation to raise to 18 the minimum age at which a young person could leave education or training including a minimum duty on the employer.

Local authorities could be required to operate a registration system.

Employers should require young people to bring proof that they are participating before appointing them.

## **Benefits and costs**

List of economic sectors and social groups affected.

List of social groups and stakeholders affected by these proposals.

### **Benefits**

- Option 1 - Do nothing. Impacts of existing actions and measures.
- Option 2 - Legislation to raise to 18 the minimum age at which a young person could leave education or training. Initial estimated additional benefit to the economy of around £1,400m for a single cohort of young people (discounted over their lifetime) once a steady state scenario has been reached. This figure is arrived at by taking into account the increased wage returns and better job prospects from higher levels of qualifications and skills.

### **Costs**

- Option 1 - Do nothing. No additional costs to the Budget but the economy as a whole will have to face the (not quantified) costs of a significant proportion of young people not having the skills needed by employers in the future. UK to be left behind on the OECD list. UK to become a less attractive place to do business than it otherwise would be.
- Option 2 - Legislation to raise to 18 the minimum age at which a young person could leave education or training. Costs are additional to those under the 'Do Nothing' alternative are estimated in a semi-quantitative way. The following elements of cost are considered: (a) Costs to employers (costs associated with training; adjusting work patterns; other costs); Potential costs of an incentive to encourage young people who wish to work to participate in education or training; (b) Costs to Government (participation costs, cost of the registration and enforcement system, financial support costs, capacity building costs; and other costs).

## **Small Firms Impact Test**

The costs associated with these proposals will have an impact on micro, small and medium sized enterprises (SME's). In comparison to large business SME's will incur a slightly higher cost.

Number of young employers working at large firms vs. at SMEs.

## **Competition assessment**

All sectors would be affected by the proposed changes. Little or no effect on competition, besides slightly negatively affecting the competitiveness of SMEs. This is an expert estimation without numbers.

## **Enforcement, sanctions and monitoring**

Short description of the enforcement process.

## **Implementation and delivery plan**

Proposal: to implement these changes from September 2013. Legislative tasks during the next Parliamentary session.

## **Summary costs and benefits table**

Estimated annual costs and benefits on top of 'Do Nothing' Alternative are tabulated.

Cell content of the table: additional annual earning per cohort, in terms of Millions of UK Pounds.

Table headings:

- Breakdown of Options: Option 1 (Do nothing) vs. Option 2 (Acceptance of the Proposition).
- Breakdown of benefits: one-off and recurring benefits.
- Breakdown of costs: one-off and recurring costs.

## **Declaration and publication**

"I have read the regulatory impact assessment and I am satisfied that the benefits justify the costs."  
Signed by the Secretary of State for Education and Skills

Date 22 March 2007

## ***UK Case Study: Initial RIA of the introduction of the EU Food Law<sup>4</sup>***

This Initial RIA was issued in 2001 by the responsible Line Ministry of the United Kingdom. The document can be downloaded from the Internet. Length of the document: 6 pages. Level of quantification for describing the groups under the impact of the regulation: low. Level of quantification of assessing the impacts themselves: very low.

The structure of the document is as follows.

### **Title of Regulatory Proposal**

Proposed Council/EP Regulation laying down the General Principles of Food Law, establishing the European Food Authority, and laying down Procedures in Matters of Food Safety.

### **Purpose and Intended Effect**

- to establish and define the functions of a European Food Authority (EFA); and
- to harmonise general food law requirements in the Community.

Main EU documents in which these objectives appear.

Key functions and rights of the planned European Food Authority, its role in food safety, trade policy

### **Identify Options**

Only one option: as a Regulation the proposal, once adopted, would be directly applicable in the UK, but the draft text will be the subject of discussions in the EU Council Working Group before adoption.

### **Issues of Equity or Fairness**

New responsibilities on food and animal feed businesses in relation to traceability, and product recall and withdrawal. Special burden on smaller businesses.

### **Identify Benefits**

Increased consumer benefits from safer food, rapid notification of emerging risks.

Food and feed businesses may benefit from a more level playing field in Europe. Because existing anomalies in national legislation will be ironed out will facilitate trade.

### **Quantify and Value Benefits**

---

<sup>4</sup> This Methodological Note offers only case studies of Initial RIAs. A wide selection of final (in-depth) RIA case studies is available in the Appendix of the following document: „A comparative analysis of regulatory impact assessment in ten EU countries. A report prepared for the EU directors of Better Regulation Group”. Dublin, May 2004. Italian, Irish and Dutch presidencies of the Council of the European Union.

No quantification given.

## **Compliance Costs for Business, Charities and Voluntary Organisations**

### **Business Sectors affected**

Summary listing of stakeholders: primary producers, processors, wholesalers, retailers and importers/ exporters, charities and voluntary organisations. Estimates of the numbers of businesses affected in the UK: Farm animal feed producers (405) , Importers and agricultural merchants ( 70) , Farmers (63,000) , Food business establishments (Total number 612,203) Primary producers (8,876) , · Manufacturers/packers ( 17,657)·, Importers/exporters (1,069) , · Distributors/transporters (11,926) , Retailers ( 191,026), Restaurants and other caterers (381,649).

### **Compliance Costs for a Typical Business**

Qualitative assessment: compliance costs will be minimal, except in relation to administrative systems necessary to meet traceability and product recall/withdrawal requirements.

### **Total Compliance Costs**

No readily available information on likely compliance costs, but information is being sought from industry and will be assessed once it is available.

### **Small Business Litmus Test**

No such test made , but planned in the framework of consultation.

### **Other (Government) Costs**

The cost of setting up and running the European Food Agency will be met from Community funds.

UK enforcement authorities already have adequate control measures in place, due to existing obligations under the Food Safety Act and the Food and Feed Controls Directives.

### **Results of Consultation**

Consultation with all interested parties both internal and external has begun, including the Small Business Unit of the Government.

### **Regulatory Impact Assessment**

This is only an Initial RIA. After the consultation process a more complete RIA will be developed.

### **Financial Implications**

Still unknown, depends on the results of the consultation process.

### **Timetable**

Deadlines for communicating the decision to the EU Commission.

### ***Italy: Preliminary vs. Final RIA***

*In Italy* RIA was introduced experimentally by law n. 50/1999 and by the Prime Minister's directive 27-3-2000.<sup>5</sup> In 2003 new RIA guidelines were developed which have partly modified the contents of the Guide published in 2000. With regard to the methodology, the main difference relates to the shift towards a more flexible approach to the evaluation technique to be followed.

---

<sup>5</sup> Quoted from the following document: „A comparative analysis of regulatory impact assessment in ten EU countries. A report prepared for the EU directors of Better Regulation Group”. Dublin, May 2004. Italian, Irish and Dutch presidencies of the Council of the European Union.

The impact assessment process is divided into two different phases. The difference between the *preliminary RIA* and the *final RIA* has to do with the depth of the analysis. In fact, in the first phase a comparison of the pros and cons of multiple options is made and a preferred option is selected. In the second phase the preferred option is subjected to a deeper analysis keeping in mind the possibility that, in the light of new and more detailed information, other options (initially rejected in the first phase) could eventually be judged as being better.

### ***Poland: Summary vs. Extended Impact Assessment***

In Poland In 2000 a Regulatory Quality Team was established which has promoted the establishment of RIA.<sup>6</sup> At the end of 2001 RIA became compulsory for all the bills adopted by the Council of Ministers. RIA covers primary as well as secondary regulations.

The scope of RIA depends on the subject and scope of proposed regulation. There is no formal distinction between summary and extended impact assessment, but the responsible ministry can decide if an extended impact assessment should be prepared, according to the subject and scope of proposed legislation and on the magnitude of the expected impact. In-depth analysis is applied only to drafts which are expected to generate some remarkable social and economic impact. The RIA unit can propose to perform an extended impact assessment. The Council of Ministers can also ask the responsible minister to extend impact assessment, when it considers that RIA is not satisfactory.

### ***European Commission: Roadmaps vs. Impact Assessments***

According to a Decision of the European Commission taken in 2005<sup>7</sup>, a formal Impact Assessment is required for items on the European Commission's Work Programme. All regulatory proposals, White Papers, expenditure programmes and negotiating guidelines for international agreements put on the Work Programme are concerned. In addition, the Commission may, on a case-by case basis, decide to carry out an impact assessment of a proposal which does not appear on the Work Programme. Besides this provision, each Directorate General of the EC is free to choose how to organise its Impact assessment work.

*Proportional analysis.* The impact assessment's depth and scope will be determined by the likely impacts of the proposed action (principle of 'proportionate analysis'). The more significant an action is likely to be, the greater the effort of quantification and monetisation that will generally be expected. The EU methodology advises to perform the analysis of impacts in the following three steps, that are characterized with increasing depth and detail.

- Step 1: Identification of impacts
- Step 2: Qualitative assessment of which impacts are the most significant
- Step 3: Advanced qualitative and/or quantitative analysis of impacts.

Some details about the methods applied in these steps of analysis:

- Step 1 identifies environmental, economic and social impacts of a policy, why they occur and who is affected. Intentional and unintended impacts are differentiated. Links between cause (the action, instrument, etc) and effects (the impacts) are highlighted. The extent by which the proposed action will contribute to reaching the (operational) objective(s) is highlighted, moreover who is affected by the identified impacts and over what timescale the impacts will occur, by carefully identifying 'winners' and 'losers'.

---

<sup>6</sup> Quoted from the following document: „A comparative analysis of regulatory impact assessment in ten EU countries. A report prepared for the EU directors of Better Regulation Group”. Dublin, May 2004. Italian, Irish and Dutch presidencies of the Council of the European Union.

<sup>7</sup> COM(2005)97.

- Step 2 identifies the most important impacts by applying causal models, assigning likelihoods (e.g. low, medium or high probability) that the identified impact will occur (or conversely the risk that the impact will not occur). The irreversibility and the approximate magnitude of each impact is assessed (e.g. low, medium or high).
- Step 3 offers an advanced in-depth analysis of impacts. These can take a number of forms, building on the analysis and results of Step 2. In-depth qualitative analysis of selected impacts which focuses on selected impacts or chains of impacts about which both qualitative and quantitative data are collected and analysed qualitatively, typically using a case study/scenario approach. This type of analysis can be implemented on its own, though in reality it is generally used in conjunction with a quantitative analysis of impacts. Quantitative analysis of impacts uses techniques, varying from simple extrapolation - based for instance on previously derived coefficients - through to proper quantitative modelling. Essentially, the aim is to understand the extent of the impacts of the policy options and to estimate the costs and benefits in monetary form when this is feasible.

*Roadmaps.* Many key elements for a formal impact assessment are generally already available in early stages of the policy process. Therefore, to help plan the impact assessment work, the Commission has requested its own services to establish ‘Roadmaps’ for the initiatives they have put forward before these initiatives have been submitted to higher level for a of the administration. Roadmaps should ideally be circulated to other Directorates-General (DGs) sufficiently early. The Roadmaps are published in parallel with the working programme of the Commission, so external stakeholders can anticipate the timing of the policy preparatory work and be ready to provide input.<sup>8</sup>

Roadmaps provide the following types of information:

- What data are available, what complementary data are needed, and how they will be produced.
- What is the estimated time required for completing the IA
- Brief statement on the likely impacts of each policy option
- Who is likely to be affected
- Which impacts have to be analysed by further analysis
- Who has to be consulted and how (consultation plan)
- Is there a need for establishing a co-operation among various services of the Commission

### ***European Commission Case Study: Roadmap to Impact Assessment of Safety of Toys Regulation***

This Roadmap has been published as one of the 98 roadmaps in the publication cited above.

The full text of the published Roadmap follows.

Title of the proposal: Revision of Directive 88/378/EC on the safety of toys.

Expected date of adoption of the proposal: 3rd/4th quarter 2006.

#### **A. Initial impact assessment screening**

1. What are the main problems identified? Are they unlikely to be solved satisfactorily by the sole action of Member States? (principle of subsidiarity – necessity test)

- need to update certain essential safety requirements and introduce new ones to improve the safety of toys;

<sup>8</sup> A list and the full text of all Roadmaps produced in 2006 are published in the following document: ‘Commission Work Programme 2006, Roadmaps’ Brussels 2005 p 209. Downloadable from the following Internet address: [http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/practice\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/practice_en.htm)

- need to clarify and enforce the obligations of the person who places the toy on the market, and in particular the importer;
- clarification of the relationship between the Directive on the Safety of toys and the General Product Safety Directive (RAPEX and safeguard clauses, administrative co-operation);
- improve the conditions for a more coherent approach in enforcement by Member States, in particular in the area of market surveillance;
- provide the Commission and the Member States with the appropriate organisation to address issues raised by the implementation of the Directive in an efficient manner;
- clarification on whether some specific new products are covered or not by the Safety of Toys Directive (for instance, video-games peripherals); Directive 88/378/EC is a total harmonisation Directive. There is no specific national legislation. Better enforcement of the legislation on the safety of toys can take place through co-operation. However, the other identified problems require changes in the current legislation.

## 2. What are the main policy objectives?

The main policy objectives are the simplification of the current legislation, the improvement on the safety of toys by clarifying essential safety requirements, the improvement in the functioning of the Internal Market by developing conditions for a better common approach by national market surveillance authorities in the implementation of the legislation in force.

## 3. What are the policy options? What regulatory or non-regulatory instruments could be considered?

Option 1: No changes in the current policy and in the current Directive.

Option 2: Improvement of the implementation of the current Directive by promoting joint initiatives by the market surveillance and customs authorities of different Member States.

Option 3: Revision of Directive 88/378/EC on the safety of toys.

## 4. What are the impacts likely to result from each policy option and who is affected? Which impacts are likely to warrant further analysis (cf. list of impacts in the impact assessment guidelines)?

Option 1: the problems identified under 1 will persist. In particular, grey zone areas involving essential safety requirements, namely related to chemicals and noise, will remain, legislative simplification will not take place, better organisation will not be available.

Option 2: Effective enforcement would be improved with positive results for the responsible toy manufacturers and consumers.

Option 3:

- Economic impact – many of the proposed modifications are considered to improve the efficiency of the directive thus contributing to benefit all involved parties. However, the impact of possible modifications on chemicals essential safety requirements will need to be examined. Furthermore, the impact assessment study concluded also that a positive impact on reducing the level of counterfeiting was to be expected.
- Social impact – consumers are likely to benefit most from legislative greater efficiency, clarification of safety provisions and transparency.
- No environmental impacts are expected from this proposal pending the possible modifications in the area of chemicals.

Different possible modifications to the Directive were assessed by an impact assessment study carried out by an outside consultant (see [http://europa.eu.int/comm/enterprise/toys/index\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/enterprise/toys/index_en.htm)). It states that “the complexity of the structure of the toy market makes it impossible to develop meaningful aggregate estimates

of the likely costs of the existing Toys Safety Directive, and proposed modifications to it, on the sector as a whole;...” The cost-benefit analysis was approached through case studies, available in the above mentioned web-address.

## **B. Planning of further impact assessment work**

5. What information and data is already available? What further information needs to be gathered? How will this be done (e.g. internally or by an external contractor) and by when? What type and level of analysis will be carried out (cf. principle of proportionate analysis)?

An impact assessment study of the main changes to the Directive has been completed in 2004 by an outside consultant (see [http://europa.eu.int/comm/enterprise/toys/index\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/enterprise/toys/index_en.htm)).

A call for tender for a study on certain chemicals used in toys has been launched in order to obtain elements for the revision of the chemicals part of the directive. The study will be finalised by the Summer 2006. Progress in this study will allow to assess whether further work in the area of impact assessment is needed.

6. Which stakeholders & experts will be consulted, how and at what stage?

The revision is discussed with the Member States experts and stakeholders (industry/consumers) as well as with standardisation organisations within the Expert Group on Toys Safety. A public consultation on the revision will be organised once the chemicals study has been completed and enough elements for the impact assessment are available.

7. Will an inter-service steering group be set up for the IA?

The impact assessment study was followed by a steering group with the participation of other services of DG ENTR and DG SANCO. The chemicals study will be followed by a inter-service group with the participation of DG ENTR chemicals Unit and of DG SANCO.

## **Conclusions**

Several RIA administrative cultures have successfully institutionalised the preparation of preliminary simplified regulatory impact assessments. The role of these documents is

- To formulate preliminary regulatory and non-regulatory options for tackling the problem
- To provide summary information about the legal and institutional background and about the likely impacts of the proposal
- To inform public administration instances, drafters and external stakeholders at the early stage of the policy process
- To highlight availability or lack of data for estimating the impacts
- To highlight if there is a need for conducting a deeper impact assessment, or, on the contrary, there is no such a need, because the likely impacts of the proposal will be negligible.
- To clarify the various stages of the ensuing policy process.

The production of these simplified RIA documents has evolved according to the administrative cultures. The content and length of these documents depends on the needs of the respective policy processes of the governments.

The best practices of simplified RIA guidelines show that for simplified RIAs it is sufficient to respond to a list of maximum 10 questions. The case studies in this Methodological Note offer some ideas about how to select these questions.

Regarding the content, scope and detail of preliminary or basic RIAs, public administrations have consciously abstained from setting too high standards, in order to facilitate the timely production of these documents.

- The depth of information about legal and procedural matters corresponds to the level of detail of an Executive Summary.
- These RIAs offer only some summary information about the size of groups affected by the proposal and about the impacts themselves. The level of measurement of this type of information is typically very low. In other words, in most cases the simplified or preliminary RIAs contain only robust and qualitative information about these matters, and it is rather an exception when statistical information is offered about the size of the groups affected or quantitative estimation is given about the forecasted likely impacts.