Basic information

1996/2245(INI) INI - Own-initiative procedure	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
ECON Economic and Monetary Affairs, Industrial Policy	MATHER Graham (PPE)	24/04/1996

Committee for opinion	Rapporteur for opinion	Appointed
JURI Legal Affairs, Citizens' Rights	The committee decided not to give an opinion.	
ENVI Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection	KESTELIJN-SIERENS Marie-Paule (Mimi) (ELDR)	19/03/1997

Key events

Date	Event	Reference	Summary
09/02/1996	Non-legislative basic document published	B4-0120/1996	
15/11/1996	Committee referral announced in Parliament		
18/12/1996	Vote in committee		Summary
18/12/1996	Committee report tabled for plenary	A4-0413/1996	
24/04/1997	Debate in Parliament		
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 149-p5
Stage reached in procedure	Procedure completed
Committee dossier	ECON/4/08423

Documentation gateway				
European Parliament				
Document type	**Committee**	**Reference**	**Date**	**Summary**
Non-legislative basic document		B4-0120/1996	09/02/1996	
Committee report tabled for plenary, single reading		A4-0413/1996 OJ C 033 03.02.1997, p. 0022	18/12/1996	
Text adopted by Parliament, single reading		T4-0215/1997 OJ C 150 19.05.1997, p. 0018-0069	24/04/1997	Summary

Stricter rules on impact statement

1996/2245(INI) - 24/04/1997 - Text adopted by Parliament, single reading

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.