


# Procedure file

Basic information		
INI - Own-initiative procedure	<a href="#">1996/2245(INI)</a>	Procedure completed
Stricter rules on impact statement		
Subject 8.40.10 Interinstitutional relations, subsidiarity, proportionality, comitology 8.70.40 Basic budgetary texts		

Key players			
European Parliament	Committee responsible	Rapporteur	Appointed
	<b>ECON</b> Economic and Monetary Affairs, Industrial Policy		24/04/1996
		PPE <a href="#">MATHER Graham</a>	
	Committee for opinion	Rapporteur for opinion	Appointed
	<b>JURI</b> Legal Affairs, Citizens' Rights	The committee decided not to give an opinion.	
	<b>ENVI</b> Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection		19/03/1997
		ELDR <a href="#">KESTELIJN-SIERENS Marie-Paule (Mimi)</a>	

Key events			
09/02/1996	Non-legislative basic document published	<a href="#">B4-0120/1996</a>	
15/11/1996	Committee referral announced in Parliament		
18/12/1996	Vote in committee		Summary
18/12/1996	Committee report tabled for plenary	<a href="#">A4-0413/1996</a>	
24/04/1997	Debate in Parliament		
24/04/1997	Decision by Parliament	T4-0215/1997	Summary
24/04/1997	End of procedure in Parliament		
19/05/1997	Final act published in Official Journal		

Technical information	
Procedure reference	1996/2245(INI)
Procedure type	INI - Own-initiative procedure
Procedure subtype	Initiative

Legal basis	Rules of Procedure EP 143-p5
Stage reached in procedure	Procedure completed
Committee dossier	ECON/4/08423

## Documentation gateway

Non-legislative basic document	<a href="#">B4-0120/1996</a>	09/02/1996	EP	
Committee report tabled for plenary, single reading	<a href="#">A4-0413/1996</a> <a href="#">OJ C 033 03.02.1997, p. 0022</a>	18/12/1996	EP	
Text adopted by Parliament, single reading	T4-0215/1997 <a href="#">OJ C 150 19.05.1997, p. 0018-0069</a>	24/04/1997	EP	Summary

## Stricter rules on impact statement

The committee adopted the proposal for a resolution by 27 votes to 22, on the basis of the report by Mr Mather (PPE, UK). As a result of the new guidelines on legislative policy, which were adopted by the Commission in January 1996, it was imperative that Parliament give its opinion on the final form of the system for assessing the impact on enterprises; at the same time, this technical mechanism should be made as comprehensive as possible in order to evaluate the costs and benefits of EU regulations on enterprises. This was why the report in question sought to list the main points to be adopted when drawing up rational impact statements, such as those relating to SMEs, for example, by providing for solutions other than regulations or by specifying the reasons why less costly solutions were rejected. In short, the system which was devised should ensure that European legislative and regulatory texts were drawn up to an appropriate standard, while strengthening Parliament's control of their impact on enterprises. ?

## Stricter rules on impact statement

In adopting the report by Mr Graham MATHER (PPE, UK), the European Parliament called for an impact statement to accompany any legislative proposal likely to lead to an increase in costs for small enterprises. This assessment should take an official and legal form and any modification of this assessment system should be subject to prior consultation with Parliament and the Council. Parliament proposed that the assessment appear at the end of the relevant EU legislative proposal and that it be distributed to Parliament, the Council and other European institutions. The assessment should be accessible to the public at large and be easily identifiable (Bullock type presentation). As regards institutional responsibilities, Parliament called on those directorates-general responsible for drawing up legislative acts to consult the Directorate-General for Enterprise Policy in those cases where the proposed legislation had a knock-on effect on SMEs. Parliament took the view that a limited assessment of the probable impact of any regulation should be undertaken before deciding on the appropriateness of the legislation and that no proposal from the Commission should be put to the vote of the Members of the Commission without being accompanied by an assessment of its impact on enterprises. If Parliament and the Council adopted amendments which substantially modified a regulation, the Commission should present a revised version of this assessment. Similarly, the impact assessment should be re-examined on a regular basis. Finally, with regard to its own role, Parliament called for each report which dealt with the examination of a legislative text and included an impact assessment to be duly examined from a cost/benefit point of view and advocated that when a proposal was being examined, the impact assessment should be an integral part of this proposal. It called on the Commission to examine the due financial means for preparing an impact assessment. Lastly, Parliament proposed that after the implementation of a strengthened assessment system, a review of this system should take place after a period of 5 years. ?