



House of Commons  
Regulatory Reform Committee

---

**Themes and Trends in  
Regulatory Reform:  
Government Response  
to the Committee's  
Ninth Report of  
Session 2008–09**

---

**First Special Report of Session  
2008–09**

*Ordered by the House of Commons  
to be printed 10 November 2009*

**HC 597**  
Published on 12 November 2009  
by authority of the House of Commons  
London: The Stationery Office Limited  
£0.00

## The Regulatory Reform Committee

The Regulatory Reform Committee (previously the Deregulation and Regulatory Reform Committee) is appointed to consider and report to the House on draft Legislative Reform Orders under the Legislative and Regulatory Reform Act 2006. Its full remit is set out in S.O. No. 141, which was approved on 4 July 2007.

### Current membership

Andrew Miller (*Labour, Ellesmere Port & Neston*) (Chairman)  
Gordon Banks (*Labour, Ochil and South Perthshire*)  
Lorely Burt (*Liberal Democrat, Solihull*)  
Mr Quentin Davies (*Labour, Grantham and Stamford*)  
Mr James Gray (*Conservative, North Wiltshire*)  
John Hemming (*Liberal Democrat, Birmingham, Yardley*)  
Mrs Sharon Hodgson (*Labour, Gateshead East & Washington West*)  
Mr Stewart Jackson (*Conservative, Peterborough*)  
Judy Mallaber (*Labour, Amber Valley*)  
Dr Doug Naysmith (*Labour/Co-operative, Bristol North West*)  
John Penrose (*Conservative, Weston-Super-Mare*)  
Mr Jamie Reed (*Labour, Copeland*)  
Mr Anthony Steen (*Conservative, Totnes*)  
Phil Wilson (*Labour, Sedgefield*)

### Criteria against which the Committee considers each draft legislative reform order

Paragraph (3) of Standing Order No.141 requires us to consider any draft legislative reform order against the following criteria:

... whether the draft legislative reform order —

- (a) appears to make an inappropriate use of delegated legislation;
- (b) serves the purpose of removing or reducing a burden, or the overall burdens, resulting directly or indirectly for any person from any legislation (in respect of a draft Order under section 1 of the Act);
- (c) serves the purpose of securing that regulatory functions are exercised so as to comply with the regulatory principles, as set out in section 2(3) of the Act (in respect of a draft Order under section 2 of the Act);
- (d) secures a policy objective which could not be satisfactorily secured by non-legislative means;
- (e) has an effect which is proportionate to the policy objective;
- (f) strikes a fair balance between the public interest and the interests of any person adversely affected by it;
- (g) does not remove any necessary protection;
- (h) does not prevent any person from continuing to exercise any right or freedom which that person might reasonably expect to continue to exercise;
- (i) is not of constitutional significance;
- (j) makes the law more accessible or more easily understood (in the case of provisions restating enactments);
- (k) has been the subject of, and takes appropriate account of, adequate consultation;
- (l) gives rise to an issue under such criteria for consideration of statutory instruments laid down in paragraph (1) of Standing Order No 151 (Statutory Instruments (Joint Committee)) as are relevant;
- (m) appears to be incompatible with any obligation resulting from membership of the European Union.

## **Publications**

The Reports and evidence of the Committee are published by The Stationery Office by Order of the House. All publications of the Committee (including press notices) are on the Internet at [www.parliament.uk/regrefcom](http://www.parliament.uk/regrefcom). A list of Reports of the Committee in the present Session of Parliament is at the back of this volume.

## **Committee staff**

The current staff of the Committee are John Whatley (Clerk), Neil Caulfield (Inquiry Manager) and Liz Booth (Committee Assistant).

All correspondence should be addressed to the Clerk of the Regulatory Reform Committee, Delegated Legislation Office, House of Commons, 7 Millbank, London SW1P 3JA. The telephone number for general enquiries is 020 7219 2837; the Committee's email address is [regrefcom@parliament.uk](mailto:regrefcom@parliament.uk).



# Report

---

On 21 July 2009 we published our Ninth Report of the Session 2008-09 entitled “Themes and Trends in Regulatory Reform” (HC 329-I). On 6 November 2009, we received the Government’s response to that Report in the form of a memorandum. We publish the response without comment as an appendix to this Special Report.

# Government response

---

## INTRODUCTION

The Government welcomes the Report of the Regulatory Reform Committee: “Themes and Trends in Regulatory Reform”<sup>1</sup>.

The report is a valuable contribution to the development of the better regulation agenda.

The Government appreciates the continued challenge and support of the Committee as it moves into the next phase of the better regulation agenda refining our approach to risk, getting an even deeper understanding of regulation’s relationship with businesses and consumers and making the most of the strengthened framework of transparency and challenge surrounding the introduction of new policy.

---

1 <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200809/cmselect/cmdereg/329/329i.pdf>

## RESPONSE TO CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### A more balanced approach to Better Regulation

#### Recommendation 1

*We conclude that events in the financial sector do not require a wholesale revision of the fundamental approach to regulation in other sectors. However, there are lessons to be learned. Foremost among these are that regulators should:*

- (a) seek to understand risk more fully and develop the resources to do that, where appropriate looking at whole systems rather than individual problem areas*
- (b) focus more on assessing possible future risks*
- (c) identify areas of hidden risk*
- (d) identify possibilities of conflict of interest in taking decisions*
- (e) seek to anticipate unintended consequences of regulation*
- (f) develop mechanisms for challenging prevailing wisdom and political pressure*
- (g) involve representatives of consumers in such challenge*
- (h) be willing to use their powers more effectively*
- (i) seek to match the experience and weight of those they regulate.*

#### **The Government welcomes this recommendation.**

A key principle set out in Sir Philip Hampton's 2005 report 'Reducing administrative burdens: effective inspection and enforcement'<sup>2</sup> is that "Regulators, and the regulatory system as a whole, should use comprehensive risk assessment to concentrate resources on the areas that need them most."

The Government believes that this principle remains sound, and agrees with the Committee's perspective that the events in the financial sector do not require a wholesale revision of our fundamental approach to regulation in other sectors.

The BRE has examined expert commentary on the causes of the financial crisis and in October 2009 published an article<sup>3</sup> presenting its own perspective on some of the issues the Committee raises and a series of questions for regulators to consider in reviewing their own work.

---

2 <http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file22988.pdf>

3 <http://www.lbro.org.uk/publications-information.html> - Better Local Regulation – New Approaches to Securing Compliance, Page 14

The Committee's criteria, alongside the good practice principles set out in the guidance<sup>4</sup> underpinning the current round of Hampton Implementation Reviews of national regulators, provides an appropriate basis for Select Committees to use in assessing the work of regulators in their own inquiries.

Beyond the work of specific regulators, and their individual Parliamentary scrutiny mechanisms, there is a role for Government in ensuring that good practice in managing risk is identified and shared across departments and regulators, and that the fitness for purpose of specific regulatory systems (looking beyond the level of the individual regulated business) are kept under review.

The Government through the Local Better Regulation Office (LBRO) will continue to build its capability of managing risk and uncertainty for the future at local level and work to promote best practice among regulators to take forward the recommendations listed above.

## Recommendation 2

*In future, analysts and commentators must avoid confusing risk-based regulation and so-called "light-touch" approaches. Risk-based "right-touch" regulation remains a valid approach provided there is:*

- (a) diligence in understanding risk;*
- (b) a willingness to accept some degree of failure (albeit that in certain sectors there must be maximum effort to eliminate failure);*
- (c) an awareness that risk assessments, with their tendency sometimes to lead to a false sense of security, should be subject to appropriate challenge; and*
- (d) the willingness to be intrusive rather than light-touch when **appropriate**. At this stage in the debate, better balance is required in order to ensure an effective delivery of the regulatory reform agenda. The BRE should have a role in promoting to the business world an approach to better regulation that incorporates those principles. (Paragraph 25)*

**The Government accepts the intent of this recommendation, the need for clarity in the debate about risk and regulation, and the need for appropriate levels of challenge within regulators. These are themes that will also be addressed in the work described under Recommendation 1.**

The BRE will continue to work with other Government departments and regulators to promote the importance of an effective risk based approach with business. The joint statement on the benefits of better regulation<sup>5</sup> signed by the Government, business groups, trade unions, consumer groups and regulators on 19<sup>th</sup> October 2009 is an important shared commitment to a balanced regulatory reform agenda.

The BRE will also be working with LBRO, national and local regulators, sponsor departments, business and consumer bodies to see how best to develop a better understanding of managing different types of risk and uncertainty.

---

4 <http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file48275.pdf>

5 <http://www.berr.gov.uk/whatwedo/bre/benefits/better-benefits/page53245.html>

### Recommendation 3

*We recommend that the Government implement the Risk and Regulation Advisory Council's proposal for a body to challenge excessive regulatory responses to risk either by way of the RRAC's own proposal for a Public Risk Commission or through charging an appropriate existing body with that responsibility. (Paragraph 27)*

**The Government accepts the recommendation in part but does not believe that there is currently a role for a separate new Public Risk Commission.**

The Regulatory Policy Committee (RPC) will provide a transparent, independent challenge to the Government on its policy-making approach, including on issues of public risk. The RPC's initial focus will be the scrutiny of the Government's cost-benefit analysis. During the RPC's initial phase of operation, officials from the RRAC's support team and the Better Regulation Executive will work with the Chair of the RPC to examine how best to embed the RRAC's findings in the Committee's approach.

The Government will respond to the recommendations set out in, 'Response with responsibility: Policy-making for public risk in the 21st century'<sup>6</sup> by the end of 2009.

### Recommendation 4

*We believe that principles-based models of regulation based on promoting right outcomes can have value in promoting simpler and stronger rules. There is no reason why clear fundamental principles cannot overlie well-designed and helpful structures of supporting rules and guidance, with both being appropriately and proportionately enforced. The BRE and/or the Regulatory Policy Committee should have a role in determining the frameworks of regulation that are appropriate in individual instances. (Paragraph 34)*

**The Government accepts this recommendation in part and believes that principles-based models can be effective whilst maintaining that each individual case of regulation needs to be judged on its merits taking into account the particular protections, beneficiaries, regulated firms and markets under consideration.**

Principles-based models of regulation can be very effective in delivering outcomes and have the merit of providing businesses with freedom in how they achieve policy objectives. However in some circumstances, particularly where resources are tight, businesses prefer clear and simple rules that offer them certainty. This was one of the key findings from research carried out with small and medium-sized businesses in the Anderson Review<sup>7</sup>.

The Government will continue to explore in which circumstances principles-based models can be applied most effectively.

The remit of the Regulatory Policy Committee (RPC) will allow it to be able to comment on departmental approaches to individual regulatory frameworks.

---

6 <http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file51459.pdf>

7 <http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file49881.pdf>

## Recommendation 5

*We therefore encourage regulators to seek more active consumer and/or end user involvement, including at board level, and we recommend that the Better Regulation Executive should arrange specific measures to allow for consumer and end user **feedback**. (Paragraph 38)*

**The Government accepts the intent of this recommendation and agrees that the involvement of consumers in the regulatory process is valuable in a number of ways, including providing external challenge.**

A number of models, both statutory and otherwise, exist. Some regulators already include consumer members or committees. For example, in 1998, the Financial Services Authority set up The Financial Services Authority Consumer Panel. This panel represent the interests of consumers in the development of policy for the regulation of financial services. The Food Standards Agency (FSA) also has an Advisory Committee on Consumer Engagement, which was established in 2007. This committee reports annually to the FSA Board on the effectiveness of their engagement with consumers and identifies opportunities to strengthen the engagement processes.

Many Regulators<sup>8</sup> are signed up to the Code of Practice on Consultation<sup>9</sup>, which recommends consumer and end user participation in the policy development cycle. The better regulation website<sup>10</sup> also provides an opportunity for businesses, consumers and citizens to provide end user feedback direct to the relevant policy area within Government.

It is open to regulators to explore mechanisms for involving consumers more widely, in ways to suit their specific operating circumstances, and the Government would encourage them to do so wherever this is appropriate, as provided for in the recently extended Compliance Code<sup>11</sup>.

## Recommendation 6

*The Better Regulation agenda remains a valid project whose aim should be to improve regulatory outcomes for the whole of society. There remains a need to improve results in a way that profoundly shifts perceptions. It seems to us that the BRE needs to develop a stronger role in evaluating how a more sophisticated Better Regulation agenda might best be delivered. (Paragraph 42)*

**The Government accepts this recommendation.**

The World Bank has recently concluded that the UK has the best business environment in Europe and the fifth best in the world. Nonetheless, changing perceptions about regulation is proving challenging. A recent National Audit Office report<sup>12</sup> found that whilst businesses

---

8 <http://www.berr.gov.uk/whatwedo/bre/consultation-guidance/page44420.html>

9 <http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file47158.pdf>

10 <http://www.betterregulation.gov.uk/>

11 <http://www.berr.gov.uk/whatwedo/bre/inspection-enforcement/implementing-principles/regulatory-compliance-code/page44055.html>

12 [http://www.nao.org.uk/publications/0809/complying\\_with\\_regulation.aspx](http://www.nao.org.uk/publications/0809/complying_with_regulation.aspx)

are reporting that individual aspects of complying with regulation have become less burdensome over the last year and there has been some improvement in overall business perceptions of regulation since 2007, only 45% of businesses responding to the survey felt that most regulation is fair and proportionate.

The Government will continue to invest time and resources working to understand perceptions of regulation and the different drivers of them in more detail as the basis for further developing the better regulation agenda. The Government is also working with other countries, in particular the Netherlands and Denmark, in order to share best practice on changing perceptions.

The Better Regulation Executive's report "Better Regulation: better results: maximising the benefits of regulation", published on 19<sup>th</sup> October 2009<sup>13</sup> included both analysis of original research on perceptions and several areas of good practice for departments and regulators in understanding and influencing perceptions, including a map of the drivers of the perceptions of regulation grouped according to the level of control that the Government has to influence them.

Alongside our recent report on the benefits of regulation we published qualitative and quantitative research into public perceptions of regulation that we co-commissioned with the Environment Agency and Health and Safety Executive. This research built both on the annual surveys carried out by the National Audit Office and research that we have carried out previously, for example as part of the Anderson review of guidance.

## Going forward: design and compliance

### Recommendation 7

*We welcome the BRE's work on perceptions of guidance and the Government's acceptance of most of the recommendations in the Anderson Review. We urge the Government to push forward quickly with implementing those recommendations and with further means of promoting and sharing guidance best practice that address the problems we have outlined. Although we appreciate that there might be resource implications and legal constraints, we recommend that the Government encourage regulators and enforcement bodies to be more willing to answer questions from their regulated organisations and consider creative ways to permit without prejudice or off the record discussions on compliance. (Paragraph 47)*

**The Government accepts this recommendation and is driving forward on implementation of the Anderson recommendations.**

The revised Code of Practice on Guidance, published on 21<sup>st</sup> October 2009<sup>14</sup>, incorporates recommendations from the Anderson Review<sup>15</sup> that Government guidance is accompanied by a "Quick-start" guide, should not contain legal disclaimers of liability, and should make clear where users can seek redress if they followed Government guidance which was inaccurate or inconsistent.

---

13 <http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file53252.pdf>

14 <http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file53268.pdf>

15 <http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file49881.pdf>

Further recommendations are also being put into practice such as piloting an insured helpline where businesses can get advice on employment and health & safety regulations. In Spring 2010 the Government will publish a progress report on implementation of all the commitments made in the response to the Anderson Review.

The Government's Regulators' Compliance Code<sup>16</sup>, published in December 2007, encourages regulators to provide clear and accessible guidance to make it easier for regulated entities to understand and meet their regulatory obligations. They should also ensure that the regulated organisations can seek and access such advice without directly triggering an enforcement action.

Sir Philip Hampton's 2005 review, 'Reducing administrative burdens: effective inspection and enforcement'<sup>17</sup> laid a strong emphasis on the need for clear and accessible guidance from regulators. The Statutory Compliance Code for Regulators and guidance for Hampton Implementation Review teams have built upon this principle, and the Government will continue to embed this approach in its continuing work with regulators.

## Recommendation 8

*We welcome the "Trading Places" initiative and the Hampton implementation reviews published to date, and look forward to the further Hampton implementation reviews due for publication this year or early next year. We encourage regulators and the BRE to explore opportunities for joint working including—where appropriate and subject to legal advice—in reporting of infringements outside of their particular jurisdiction. (Paragraph 50)*

**The Government accepts this recommendation and agrees that collaborative working and co-ordination between regulators can enhance effectiveness and efficiency.**

The Government has sought clarification from the Information Commissioner about the legal position for sharing data on non compliant businesses for regulatory purposes.<sup>18</sup> The value of data sharing is also recognised in the Statutory Code of Practice for Regulators and in the Hampton Implementation Review methodology. Several examples show organisations have successfully shared intelligence enabling infringements to be reported outside of their immediate responsibility. For instance, The Gangmasters Licensing Authority uses data gateways to allow key information to be exchanged with its partners such as police forces and HMRC. This permits frequent and meaningful transfers of information across different jurisdictions about companies who are suspected of non-compliance.

The Retail Enforcement Pilot<sup>19</sup> also demonstrates that officers from one discipline can report failures in compliance to officers in a different discipline who are qualified to take appropriate action. In addition, the Primary Authority scheme<sup>20</sup>, launched in April 2009, provides local authority regulatory services departments across the country with

---

16 <http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file45019.pdf>

17 <http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file22988.pdf>

18 <http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file45414.pdf>

19 <http://www.berr.gov.uk/whatwedo/bre/inspection-enforcement/implementing-principles/retail-enforcement-pilot/page44050.html>

20 <http://www.lbro.org.uk/lbro-projects-primary-authority.html>

intelligence on national businesses through a secure website. The Government and the Local Better Regulation Office (LBRO) have invested in the regional Trading Standards and Environmental Health Co-ordination Network which encourages regulatory services to be shared across council boundaries.

The Government is currently consulting<sup>21</sup> on proposals to use the Legislative Reform Order (LRO) mechanism to amend legislation governing the sharing of information between the organisations responsible for enforcing workplace rights and related legislation. If the LRO is made it will create new legal gateways which will increase the extent to which officers can share information and intelligence and contribute to more targeted and efficient enforcement activity.

## Recommendation 9

*We recommend that the BRE seek ways further to improve consistency and quality of IAs including through more thorough and proactive business validation. We welcome the Minister's statement that post-implementation review will be the norm. The BRE should monitor compliance with departmental commitments to conduct them. (Paragraph 53)*

**The Government accepts this recommendation in part. The Government is currently revisiting the Impact Assessment and Post Implementation review processes and believe that the BRE, alongside other stakeholders, should monitor compliance with departmental commitments to conduct them.**

Changes made to the Impact Assessment template in 2007 have improved the consistency of the information provided. This has enabled the reporting, for the first-time, of a cross government benefit-cost ratio<sup>22</sup> for new regulations enacted in 2008-09, and a quantified Forward Programme<sup>23</sup> of future regulations.

The Impact Assessment template and the associated Impact Assessment guidance for policy makers are currently being revised to further improve information and reporting requirements as Government continues to improve the IA process across all areas of policy development, including; consultation, policy design and post-implementation review.

The Government has set up the Regulatory Policy Committee to provide independent external scrutiny on policy development. The RPC's remit will allow it to comment publicly on the benefits and costs of policy decisions, which will further increase the transparency of regulatory decision making across Government and promote further improvements in the underlying analysis of expected policy outcomes.

The Government will continue to encourage formal public consultations to be conducted in line with the Code of Practice on Consultation<sup>24</sup>, criterion 3, which stipulates that IAs are to be carried out for most policy decisions and included in the consultation document.

---

21 <http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file53063.pdf>

22 <http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file53280.pdf>

23 <http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file53203.pdf>

24 <http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file47158.pdf>

The BRE will continue to collaborate with Departments, via the network of Better Regulation Champions and Better Regulation Units in each Department, to support and encourage high quality impact assessments which underpin policy-making decisions. The BRE will also continue to communicate its expectations on post-implementation review through these networks.

This engagement with policy-makers on impact assessments and post-implementation reviews complements, but does not replace, the Government's approach to promoting the post-legislative scrutiny<sup>25</sup> of Acts.

The Government believes that post implementation review is key way of learning lessons to inform future policy making, based on the reality of policy implementation on the ground. The Government intends to continue to embed post implementation reviews and post-legislative scrutiny and to monitor progress. One way in which the Government will seek to improve its ability to do so systematically is through enhancements to the Impact Assessment library.

## Recommendation 10

*The Government should expedite the setting up and rapid entry into full operation of the new regulatory committees announced on 2 April 2009, together with publication of cumulative regulatory costs and benefits in accordance with its stated intention, and with terms of reference that will permit a full contribution to the regulatory evaluation process. In accordance with our recommendations on greater consumer involvement, the external Regulatory Policy Committee's membership should allow for a voice for sectors other than solely the business sector and for consumer and end user interests. (Paragraph 58)*

### **The Government accepts the Committee's recommendation.**

A new better regulation sub-committee of the National Economic Council – NEC (BR), has been established this year taking on the responsibilities of the Panel for Regulatory Accountability. The new committee has a remit in the current economic environment, to look carefully at the timing of planned new regulation with the aim of avoiding the introduction of new regulation unless there is a clear case for action now. On 15<sup>th</sup> October, the Government published for the first time its Forward Regulatory Programme<sup>26</sup>, and on 21<sup>st</sup> October, it published cumulative benefit-cost information and a benefit-cost ratio<sup>27</sup> for new regulation enacted in 2008-09.

The first Chair of the Regulatory Policy Committee, Michael Gibbons OBE, has been appointed and the Government is in the process of appointing three committee members who will be drawn from a variety of backgrounds, bringing a range of perspectives. The Director and secretariat staff have also been appointed and took up their posts throughout October.

---

25 [http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/secretariats/economic\\_and\\_domestic/legislative\\_programme/guide\\_html/post-legislative\\_scrutiny.aspx](http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/secretariats/economic_and_domestic/legislative_programme/guide_html/post-legislative_scrutiny.aspx)

26 <http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file53203.pdf>

27 <http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file53280.pdf>

## Recommendation 11

*The external Regulatory Policy Committee should take measures to validate impact assessments and cost-benefit analyses with input from affected parties and should be given means to provide such parties with incentives to offer properly quantified advice. The BRE should support it in that work. (Paragraph 59)*

### **The Government accepts the Committee's recommendation in part.**

The Regulatory Policy Committee (RPC) will initially focus on providing advice to Government on whether the assessment of the benefits and costs of new regulations are robust and proportionate. This will involve scrutinising impact assessment for the top regulatory measures across government, working closely with individual Government departments and providing detailed advice to Parliament at key stages in the process.

Responsibility for liaising with stakeholders and ensuring good quality quantified input to impact assessments lies with the relevant Government department, and should take place through both ongoing contacts and formal public consultation process.

The RPC is likely to consult stakeholders as part of its independent scrutiny process.

The Government remains committed to effective consultation with affected parties as this brings to light valuable information. The Consultation Code of Practice<sup>28</sup> states the possibility of longer periods of consultation.

*“if the policy under consideration is particularly complex, consideration should be given to the feasibility of allowing a longer period for the consultation .... So that consultees can take advantage of the full consultation period and prepare considered responses.”*

The Consultation Code of Practice also stresses the importance of the clarity of scope of formal public consultations and provides recommendations on reducing the burden of consultation.

To ease the administrative burden of responding to consultations, the Government will consider further ways that response processes can be streamlined, for example response templates may ease the burden of participation. Some departments are already adopting greater use of e-engagement.

## Recommendation 12

*To assist in maximising objective but effective challenge to EU-sourced legislation, we recommend that the BRE:*

*(a) revisit the recommendations in our previous report regarding a feasibility study on EU regulatory reform objectives and the need to increase BRE influence on EU regulatory reform (including by means of a permanent representation in Brussels) and as a matter of urgency*

*(b) explore means of improving and bringing forward in time the UK's input into EU impact assessments. (Paragraph 64)*

---

28 <http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file47158.pdf>

**The Government accepts the principle of the Committee's recommendation and continues to work to reinforce the EU's better regulation agenda.**

This year the Commission updated its Impact Assessment (IA) guidelines with key improvements that the UK lobbied for with other Member States. This included extending the scope of measures subject to IA, including comitology proposals, a greater focus on quantifying costs and benefits and a stronger emphasis on assessing impacts on SMEs and on administrative burden level.

The Government's 'Transposition Guide'<sup>29</sup> asks departments to work with the FCO's UK Representation to the EU (UKRep) to consider at the earliest possible stage how a European proposal will be implemented and enforced in the UK, and, to try to shape European Commission policy before proposals are published. To reinforce this process the BRE's current update of the IA process, mentioned above in response to Recommendation 9, Page 13, will encourage departments to proactively provide data from UK IAs to inform the European Commission's IA evidence base. The BRE is also in constant contact with the European Commission to encourage the use of robust quantitative analysis in the development of its proposals.

It is also important to identify implementation issues at an early stage. Tools such as the Implementation and Enforcement of Environmental Law's (IMPEL) practicability and enforceability checklist<sup>30</sup> can be used to ensure better regulation principles are built into European law. The checklist can be used at any stage in the process of developing or revising EU law. IMPEL and the Network of Heads of EU Environmental Protection Agencies (EPAs) are currently reviewing their respective checklists with the view to finalising a joint 'better regulation' checklist by early December 2009.

*6 November 2009*

---

29 <http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file44371.pdf>

30 [http://ec.europa.eu/environment/impel/cluster\\_3.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/environment/impel/cluster_3.htm)