

RIA Training 18-20 November, 2008, Ankara

Session 11 – EU RIA case study

Each group is asked to read and analyse the EU RIA on prepacked products (SEC(2004)1298). Each groups should identify the potential strength and weaknesses in the RIA for the criterias and questions listed below. Findings will be presented and discussed with all participants and instructors in the end.

	Criterion	Assessment
1	<p>Problem identification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How concretely was the problem described, its extent and who is affected? • Were the hierarchy and linkages between problems examined? • Did the IA examine how the problem would evolve if the current EU approach were to continue? 	
2	<p>Setting of objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How concretely were the objectives described? • Were objectives set at different levels (e.g. general / specific / operational)? • How specific, measurable and realistic are the objectives set? • Did the IA check whether the objectives are consistent with other policies? 	
3	<p>Choice of policy options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How well did the IA identify all feasible and relevant policy options to meet the objectives, including “no EU action” or “no policy change”? • Did the options identified focus on the Instrument (form of intervention) to be used (e.g. regulation as well as alternatives)? • Which options were short listed for further analysis, and which were discarded early in the process, and on what justification? 	
4	<p>Assessment of economic impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How well did the IA identify the most important direct and indirect economic impacts of the different options? • Did it make it explicit why these (and not other) impacts were assessed? • In what level of detail were these impacts assessed? • Were they assessed in qualitative, quantitative, and/or monetary terms? • Were any limitations to the assessment (e.g. because of lack of data) made explicit? 	
5	<p>Assessment of environmental impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How well did the IA identify the most important direct and indirect environmental impacts of the different options? • Did it make it explicit why these (and not other) impacts were assessed? • In what level of detail were these impacts assessed? • Were they assessed in qualitative, quantitative, and/or monetary terms? • Were any limitations to the assessment (e.g. because of lack of data) made explicit? 	
6	<p>Assessment of social impacts:</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How well did the IA identify the most important direct and indirect social impacts of the different options? • Did it make it explicit why these (and not other) impacts were assessed? • In what level of detail were these impacts assessed? • Were they assessed in qualitative, quantitative, and/or monetary terms? • Were any limitations to the assessment (e.g. because of lack of data) made explicit? 	
7	<p>Assessment of external impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How well did the IA identify the most important direct and indirect external impacts (impacts on third countries) of the options? • Did it make it explicit why these (and not other) impacts were assessed? • In what level of detail were these impacts assessed? • Were they assessed in qualitative, quantitative, and/or monetary terms? • Were any limitations to the assessment (e.g. because of lack of data) made explicit? 	
8	<p>Quantification of impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall, what was the level of quantification of impacts (in each of the dimensions listed above)? • Was the methodology and data used for quantifying impacts (and any caveats or limitations) made explicit? • Was the quantification expressed in absolute or relative terms? • Why were certain impacts quantified, but not others? Does this seem justified given the nature of the impacts and available data? 	
9	<p>Monetisation of impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall, what was the level of monetisation of impacts (in each of the dimensions listed above)? • Was monetisation only done for financial costs that are easily expressed in monetary terms, or was it also attempted for other impacts (e.g. environmental) that are more difficult to monetise? • Was the methodology and data used for monetising impacts (and any caveats or limitations) made explicit? • Why were certain impacts monetised, but not others? Does this seem justified given the nature of the impacts and available data? 	
10	<p>Assessment of administrative burden:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were administrative costs for complying with information obligations quantified? • If so, what methodologies were used? What level of effort was needed? How precise are the results likely to be? 	
11	<p>Overall balance of the assessment of impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given the nature of the proposal and its content, was sufficient attention given to impacts in all dimensions ? • Was a differentiation made between short and long term impacts? • Were the risks and uncertainties in the policy choices (including obstacles to compliance) considered? • What might have been the reasons for any imbalances? Do they seem justified? 	

12	<p>Ranking / comparison of options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were the impacts of the examined options summarised in a useful, comparable way, preferably in table format? • Were possible trade-offs and synergies identified? • Were the results of the quantification / monetisation of impacts used for identifying trade-offs between options and/or ranking the options? • Is the preferred option clearly stated, and if so, is the choice sufficiently justified? 	
13	<p>Monitoring, evaluation and ex-post assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did the IA define some core indicators for the key policy objectives? • Did the IA describe briefly how the data needed for the monitoring of the intervention's implementation and effects are to be collected? • Did the IA outline the nature, frequency and purpose of subsequent evaluation exercises? • Have any monitoring tools / provisions for ex- post assessment (i.e. for verifying how well the IA assessed the impacts it anticipated) been used since the proposal was adopted? 	
14	<p>Clarity and structure of the IA report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the IA report clearly structured? • Is the IA report written so that a non-specialist is able to follow the argumentation and understand the impacts? • Is the length of the IA report reasonable (normally no more than 30 pages excluding annexes)? 	
15	<p>Stakeholder Consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were the relevant stakeholders identified and consulted, and if so, when and how? • How were the results of the stakeholder consultation summarised and used in the IA report? 	