

Scrutiny of recent Inception Impact Assessments: ventilation units, roaming charges, batteries legislation

Publication date: June 8th, 2020

The Impact Assessment Institute has scrutinised three European Commission Inception Impact Assessments (IIAs), published between April and May 2020, each revising an existing EU law: ecodesign requirements and energy labelling for ventilation units (two separate IIAs with identical content), prolongation of the Roaming Regulation, legislation on batteries.

Our analysis according to Better Regulation principles (below) has identified good practice alongside a number of concerns to be addressed in the upcoming Impact Assessment drafting.

Key: **Xx** = no material issues identified; **Yy** = issues identified; **Zz** = significant issues identified

IIA title	<u>Review of ecodesign requirements for ventilation units and energy labelling for residential ventilation units</u>	<u>Initiative for reviewing and prolonging the Roaming Regulation</u>	<u>Modernising the EU's batteries legislation</u>
<i>Context and problem definition</i>	Generally balanced, but potential new inputs from evaluation findings should be acknowledged	Generally balanced, comprehensive and clearly presented, subject to robustness of the 2019 review report. Level of detail appears too high for this stage of the process.	More detailed analysis on problem definition would be appropriate, considering background data and analysis already referenced
<i>Objective(s) and policy options</i>	Comprehensive overview of the objectives, not matched by sufficient level of specificity of policy options	Clear and thorough description of the objectives and options under consideration	Generally consistent and relevant, but additional specifics on the objectives, a clearer definition of policy options and more clarity on the relevant legal acts would be necessary
<i>Assessment of expected impacts</i>	Preliminary assessment of impacts appears balanced and relevant, but environmental benefits, the primary rationale for the initiative, are not given commensurate prominence	Preliminary assessment of impacts appears mostly balanced and relevant, but economic impact of potential amendments on mobile operators not addressed. Misplaced passage on subsidiarity and proportionality.	Preliminary assessment of impacts appears balanced and relevant

<i>Background data and sources</i>	Sources of background data not clearly identified	Apparently comprehensive and very well-referenced. Level of detail appears too high for this stage of the process.	Apparently comprehensive and well-referenced
<i>Timeline (respect of Better Regulation rules)</i>	Time to legislation conforms to guidelines. Evaluation Roadmap published after substantial evaluation activity already carried out.	Time to legislative proposal significantly less than Better Regulation guidelines	Time to legislative proposal significantly less than Better Regulation guidelines. Dedicated 12-week public consultation not envisaged.