

Making the railway system work better for society.

Annex 2 : Impact Assessment Template

Choose here the type of IA

<Title>

[The below tables have to be deleted in case the Impact Assessment accompanies another document, e.g. recommendation, opinion.

The Executive Director's signature on the recommendation/opinion suffices for the full packge of documents, however, the accompanying routing slip has to be signed by all required actors to reflect the validation of the document.]

| | Elaborated by | Validated by | Approved by |
|-----------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Name | text | | |
| Position | | | |
| Date | Enter a date. | Enter a date. | Enter a date. |
| Signature | | | |

Document History

| Version | Date | Comments |
|---------|------|----------|
| text | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

Contents

| 1. | Context and problem definition | 3 |
|------|--|---|
| 1.1. | Problem and problem drivers | 3 |
| 1.2. | Main assumptions | 3 |
| 1.3. | Stakeholders affected | 3 |
| 1.4. | Evidence and magnitude of the problem | 3 |
| 1.5. | Baseline scenario | 3 |
| 1.6. | Subsidiarity and proportionality | 3 |
| 2. | Objectives | 4 |
| 2.1. | Strategic and specific objectives | 4 |
| 2.2. | Link with Railway Indicators | 4 |
| 3. | Options | 5 |
| 3.1. | List of options | 5 |
| 3.2. | Description of options | 5 |
| 3.3. | Uncertainties/risks | 5 |
| 4. | Impacts of the options | 6 |
| 4.1. | Impacts of the options (qualitative analysis) | 6 |
| 4.2. | Impacts of the options (quantitative analysis) | |
| 5. | Comparison of options and preferred option | 7 |
| 5.1. | Effectiveness criterion (options' response to specific objectives) | 7 |
| 5.2. | Efficiency (NPV and B/C ratio) criterion | 7 |
| 5.3. | Summary of the comparison | 7 |
| 5.4. | Preferred option(s) | 7 |
| 5.5. | Further work required | 7 |
| 6. | Monitoring and evaluation | 8 |
| 6.1. | Monitoring indicators | 8 |
| 6.2. | Future evaluations | 8 |
| | | |

1. Context and problem definition

| 1.1. | Problem and problem drivers | <what <b="" is="" main="" the="">problem which this initiative will address?> <pre></pre></what> | | |
|------|---|---|--|--|
| 1.2. | Main assumptions | <pre><state any="" are="" assumptions="" clearly="" delimiting="" for="" here="" of="" or="" problem.="" relevant="" remarks="" scope="" that="" the=""></state></pre> | | |
| 1.3. | Stakeholders affected | <pre><who affected="" appropriate,="" as="" by="" from="" is="" list.="" please="" problem?="" refer="" relevant="" stakeholders,="" the="" this="" to=""> </who></pre> <rrank categories="" each="" for="" of="" p="" problem="" relevance="" selected<="" the=""></rrank> | | |
| | | from 1-low to 5-very high. The Agency itself can be considered in the list.> | | |
| | | Category of stakeholder Importance of the problem | | |
| | | | | |
| 1.4. | Evidence and magnitude of the problem | <pre><what and="" drivers?="" evidence="" is="" magnitude="" of="" problem="" the=""> <if assessments="" available,="" e.g.="" early="" etc.="" evaluation="" evaluations,="" ex-post="" impact="" make="" of="" reference="" reports,="" results="" to=""></if></what></pre> | | |
| 1.5. | Baseline scenario | <pre><what action="" if="" is="" likelihood="" no="" persist="" problem="" taken?="" that="" the="" would=""> <how absence="" action?="" additional="" evolve="" in="" of="" problem="" the="" will=""></how></what></pre> | | |
| 1.6. | Subsidiarity and | <why addressed="" be="" by="" can="" member="" not="" problem="" properly="" states?="" the=""></why> | | |
| | proportionality | <why addressed="" be="" can="" not="" problem="" properly="" self-regulation?="" the=""></why> | | |
| | | <can action?="" addressed="" be="" better="" by="" eu="" problem="" the=""></can> | | |
| | | <is address="" agency="" best="" doctor="" problem?="" the="" this="" to=""></is> | | |
| | | <is effort="" expected="" justified="" problem?="" solve="" the="" this="" to=""></is> | | |

2. Objectives

| 2.1. | Strategic and specific objectives | <mark, <b="" appropriate,="" as="">the strategic objective(s) of the Agency with which this initiative is coherent.> Europe becoming the world leader in railway safety Promoting rail transport to enhance its market share Improving the efficiency and coherence of the railway legal framework Optimising the Agency's capabilities Transparency, monitoring and evaluation Improve economic efficiency and societal benefits in railways Fostering the Agency's reputation in the world <pre> </pre> What are the specific objectives of this initiative? (The objectives should be as S M A B T, as possible)> </mark,> |
|------|--------------------------------------|--|
| | | should be as S.M.A.R.T. as possible.)> |
| 2.2. | Link with Railway Indicators | <identify <u="" related="" the="">RIs (if the case).></identify> |

3. Options

| 3.1. | List of options | <list <b="" the="">options proposed, including the baseline (Option 0).></list> |
|------|------------------------|--|
| | | Note: In the case of opinions with a very narrow technical focus (e.g. clarification of legal texts) , where multiple options cannot be identified, fill in Chapters 3 and 4 only with one option, demonstrating that no alternative options could be analysed. Do not fill in Chapter 5. |
| 3.2. | Description of options | <describe changes="" each="" generate.="" implementation="" including="" main="" of="" options,="" that="" the="" their="" would=""></describe> |
| 3.3. | Uncertainties/risks | <what (risks)="" are="" each="" main="" of="" options?="" the="" uncertainties=""> <which aspects="" evidence?="" may="" more="" require=""> <which (some="" may="" not="" of)="" options?="" stakeholders="" support="" the=""></which></which></what> |

4. Impacts of the options

| 4.1. | Impacts of the options (qualitative analysis) | analyzed option and environm are linked spe | ditatively all differe ons. Consider, when ental impacts of the cifically to SMEs and e impacts between akeholder.> | re appropriate, e options. High d potential impa | all the econ light any im acts on comp | omic, social pacts which petitiveness. |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| | | Category of stakeholder | | | Option* | |
| | | | Positive impacts | | | |
| | | | Negative impacts | | | |
| | | | Positive impacts | | | |
| | | | Negative impacts | | | |
| | | Overall | Positive impacts | | | |
| | | <i>assessment</i> (input for section 5.1) | Negative impacts | | | |
| | | | able, as appropriate | e, for each of th | e options ar | nalyzed |
| (quantitative analysis) (quantitative analysis) (quantitative quantitative quantification.> | | | | | | |
| | | Category of stakeholder | | Option 0 (baseline) | Option 1 | Option |
| | | stukenoider | Benefits (euro) | (buseline) | | |
| | | | Costs (euro) | | | |
| | | | Benefits (euro) | | | |
| | | | Costs (euro) | | | |
| | | Overall | Benefits (euro) | | | |
| | | | Costs (euro) | | | |
| | | (NPV) and the | e quantification ab e Benefit/Cost (B/C tailed calculations ir |) ratio for a 20 | | |
| | | B/C ratio (inp | ut for section 5.2) | | | |
| l | | | | 1 | | |

5. Comparison of options and preferred option

| 5.1. | Effectiveness criterion (options' response to specific objectives) | <based findings="" from<br="" on="" the="">various options respond to response to 5-very high re (effectiveness).></based> | the specific o | bjectives, fro | om 1-very low |
|------|---|--|--|----------------------|------------------|
| | | | Option 0 (baseline) | Option 1 | Option |
| | | <specific 1="" objective=""></specific> | | | |
| | | <specific objective=""></specific> | | | |
| | | Overall score | | | |
| | | Effectiveness (average score) | | | |
| 5.2. | Efficiency (NPV and B/C ratio) criterion | <based findings="" from<br="" on="" the="">various options as follows:</based> | NPV <=0 | the overall e | fficiency of the |
| | | | Option 0 (baseline) | Option 1 | Option |
| | | Efficiency | | | |
| 5.3. | Summary of the comparison | <use next="" summ<="" table="" th="" the="" to=""><th>narize the outcor</th><th>nes of sectior</th><th>is 5.1 and 5.2.></th></use> | narize the outcor | nes of sectior | is 5.1 and 5.2.> |
| | companson | | Option 0 (baseline) | Option 1 | Option |
| | | Effectiveness | | | |
| | | Efficiency | | | |
| | | Overall rating | | | |
| 5.4. | Preferred option(s) | <based on="" overall="" rating<br="" the="">no quantification of impact based on the effectiveness of <if indi<br="" no="" option,="" preferred="">further and the discarded op</if></based> | s was possible, riterion.> cate the remain | conclusions | may be drawn |
| 5.5. | Further work required | <indicate and="" c<br="" further="" work="">conclusion. Are there uncert</indicate> | | | |

6. Monitoring and evaluation

| 6.1. | Monitoring indicators | <what and="" any="" are="" implementation="" indicators="" indicators.="" make="" monitor="" of="" option?="" other="" possible="" railway="" reference="" relevant="" selected="" the="" to=""> <what and="" are="" data="" for="" frequency="" is="" measurement="" possible="" sources?="" the="" what=""></what></what> |
|------|--------------------------|---|
| 6.2. | Future evaluations | <are envisaged?="" evaluations="" ex="" future="" initiative="" of="" post="" this=""> <when and="" trigger?="" under="" which=""></when></are> |