Making the railway system work better for society.

DECISION n°257

of the Management Board of the the European Union Agency for Railways amending Annex 2 of the Agency's Impact Assessment Methodology

THE MANAGEMENT BOARD OF THE EUROPEAN UNION AGENCY FOR RAILWAYS,

Having regard to the Regulation (EU) N° 2016/796 of the European Parliament and the Council of 11 May 2016 on the European Union Agency for Railways[1] (hereinafter referred to as "the Agency") and repealing Regulation (EC) No 881/2004, and in particular Article 8§1 thereof,

HAS DECIDED AS FOLLOWS:

Article 1

The Annex 2 (Impact Assessment Template) of Decision n°195 of the Management Board of the European Union Agency for Railways adopting the amended Agency's Impact Assessment Methodology is replaced by the new Annex 2 in annex to this Decision .

Article 3

The present decision shall enter into force on the day following that of its adoption. It will be published on the Agency website.

For the Management Board

The Chairwoman
Clio LIÉGEOIS

---

[1] *OJ L 138 26.5.2016, p. 1-43*

Annex : new Annex 2 (Impact assessment template)

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

1.1. Problem and problem drivers

<What is the main **problem** which this initiative will address? Consider technical, economical and societal aspects.>

<What are the underlying **problem drivers /causes**?>

1.2. Evidence of the problem

<What is the **evidence and magnitude** of the problem and problem drivers?>

<If available, make reference to results of evaluation reports, e.g. ex-post evaluations, early impact assessments etc.>

1.3. Baseline scenario

<What is the likelihood that the problem would persist if no action is taken?>

<How will the problem evolve in the absence of additional action?>

1.4. Main assumptions

<State here any remarks or assumptions that are relevant for clearly delimiting the scope of the problem and baseline scenario.>

1.5. Stakeholders affected

<Who is affected by the problem? Please refer to the relevant **stakeholders**, as appropriate, below. Only select those stakeholders that have a material interest in the topic, either as a decision maker or because of the impact that the stakeholder will experience following a decision.>

Railway undertakings (RU)	☐	Member States (MS)	☐
Infrastructure managers (IM)	☐	Third Countries	☐
Manufacturers	☐	National safety authorities (NSA)	☐
Keepers	☐	European Commission (EC)	☐
Entity Managing the Change (EMC)	☐	European Union Agency for Railways (ERA)	☐
Notified Bodies (NoBo)	☐	Citizens living nearby railway tracks	☐
Associations	☐	Persons with reduced mobility (PRM)	☐
Shippers	☐	Passengers	☐
Ticket vendors	☐	Other (Please specify) …	☐

<Please specify additional details about the selected stakeholder groups, particularly on how homogenous the impacted stakeholder group is in terms of geography and size of the organisations (e.g. SMEs and/or MNEs.>

1.6. Subsidiarity and proportionality

<Why can the problem not be addressed properly by Member States?>

<Why can the problem not be addressed properly through self-regulation?>

<Can the problem be better addressed by EU action?>

2. Objectives

2.1. Specific objectives

<What are the **specific objectives** of this initiative? (The objectives should be as S.M.A.R.T. as possible.)>

<Link the specific objectives to the main categories of safety, interoperability, market access and competitiveness>

3. Options

3.1. List of options

<List the **options** proposed, including the baseline (Option 0).>

<Describe each of the options, including the main changes that their implementation would generate and transition timing.>

4. Impacts of the options

4.1. Qualitative analysis

Stakeholder assessment

<Describe **qualitatively** all different categories of impacts for each of the analysed options. Consider, where appropriate, all the economic, social and environmental impacts of the options. Highlight any impacts which are linked specifically to SMEs and potential impacts on competitiveness. Distinguish between positive and negative impacts, and by category of stakeholder (from section 1.5).>

Option 0 (Baseline)			
Category of stakeholder	*Impact type*	*Description*	*Overall Impact*
…	Positive		Choose an item.
	Negative		
…	Positive		Choose an item.
	Negative		
…	Positive		Choose an item.
	Negative		

Option 1			
Category of stakeholder	*Impact type*	*Description*	*Overall Impact*
…	Positive		Choose an item.
	Negative		
…	Positive		Choose an item.
	Negative		
…	Positive		Choose an item.
	Negative		

Option …				
Category of stakeholder	Impact type	Description		Overall Impact
…	Positive			Choose an item.
	Negative			
…	Positive			Choose an item.
	Negative			
…	Positive			Choose an item.
	Negative			

<The table above describes the impact of each option for the respective stakeholders, as assessed by the evaluator. On top of that, stakeholders may have issued a formal opinion on the assessed topic and, possibly, specific options. In case a formal opinion of the stakeholders exists, mention them here as well.>

Railway system assessment

<The previous table focuses on specific stakeholder groups. The following table asks the evaluator to assess the impact on the railway system level, notably in terms of safety, interoperability, market access and competitiveness (topics that are key to the Agency and European railway legislation). The evaluator is requested to reflect on the specific objectives during the assessment. If a specific objective is formulated that does not fall under the aforementioned categories, the evaluator could add another row. Findings from the previous tables can be repeated below where relevant. >

	Option 0 (baseline)	Option 1	Option …
Safety			
Interoperability			
Market access			
Competitiveness			
… (optional)			
Effectiveness	Choose an item.	Choose an item.	Choose an item.

Coherency assessment

<The Better Regulation Guidelines prescribe that evaluations assess the coherence of an option vis-à-vis the wider legal framework, both on a national, EU, and international level. The level of detail of the assessment should be adjusted to the type of change that is assessed. The table below could be used to summarise the results.>

	Option 0 (baseline)	Option 1	Option …
Policy analysis			
Coherence	Choose an item.	Choose an item.	Choose an item.

4.2. Quantitative analysis (optional)

<If possible, and especially in the case of a FIA, **quantify** the benefits and costs for each of the analysed options per category of stakeholder and overall.>

<Note that there is a strong case to split the stakeholder groups into distinct subgroups if the impacts are unbalanced, for instance due to reasons of geography or different organisation sizes.>

<Based on the quantification above, provide the **Net Present Value (NPV)** and the **Benefit/Cost (B/C) ratio** for the relevant forecast years in the table below. Please add the detailed calculations, including relevant parameters, assumptions, formulas used and sources, in an annex.>

<The evaluator shall decide on the most appropriate form to present information in case relevant quantitative data exists but no full monetisation can occur.>

Category of stakeholder	Impact type	Option 0 (baseline)	Option 1	Option …
…	NPV			
	B/C ratio			
…	NPV			
	B/C ratio			
…	NPV			
	B/C ratio			
Overall	NPV			
	B/C ratio			

<Based on the results the most efficient option(s) shall be identified.>

5. Comparison of options and preferred option

5.1. Comparison of options

<Summarise the results of the analyses in Chapter 4 in a table. An example is shown below>

	Option 0 (baseline)				Option 1				Option …			
Stakeholder impact	RU	IM	ECM	…	RU	IM	ECM	…	RU	IM	ECM	…
Effectiveness	Rather low				Rather high				Very high			
Coherence (optional)	Neutral				Neutral				Rather high			
NPV (optional)	-10 mEUR				5 mEUR				20mEUR			
B/C ratio (optional)	0.95				1.02				1.10			

Colour legend	Very low/neg.	Rather low/neg.	Neutral	Rather high/pos.	Very high/pos.

5.2. Preferred option(s)

<Identify the preferred option based on the comparison. If no quantification of impacts was possible, conclusions may be drawn based on the qualitative criteria.>

<If no preferred option can be identified, indicate which options should be discarded and which considered further.>

<If there are any distributional impacts (e.g. geographical differences) to be considered, they should be highlighted here.>

<Are there unbalanced benefits/costs between or within stakeholder groups? Is there a case for migration measures?>

<Is the expected effort justified to solve this problem?>

5.3. Risk assessment

<Provide a risk level assessment in the table. Table examples added below for LIA and FIA>

Risk level assessment (LIA example)			
Risk variables	Option 0	Option 1	Option …
IA Inputs	Choose an item.	Choose an item.	Choose an item.
IA Outcomes	Choose an item.	Choose an item.	Choose an item.

Risk level assessment (FIA example)			
Risk variables	Option 0	Option 1	Option ..
Data: Baseline	Choose an item.	Choose an item.	Choose an item.
Method: Forecast 2025	Choose an item.	Choose an item.	Choose an item.
Method: Forecast 2030	Choose an item.	Choose an item.	Choose an item.
Implementation (stakeholder support)	Choose an item.	Choose an item.	Choose an item.

<Add explanations why the risk was assessed as Medium or High. Low requires no additional explanation.>

<In case of implementation risks, consider what barriers exists that need to be addressed (e.g. financial, cultural, legal, knowledge, market dynamics, etc.).>

<The outcome of sensititivy analyses should be referred to in this section.>

5.4. Further considerations

<Recommended further steps needed prior to decision making.>

6. Monitoring and evaluation

6.1. Monitoring indicators

<What are the possible indicators to monitor the implementation of the selected option? Make reference to the railway indicators and any other relevant indicators.>

6.2. Future evaluations

<Are future ex-post evaluations of this initiative anticipated?>

<When and under which conditions?>

<What does the intervention logic look like?>

<The evaluator shall export the content of this section to a separate IA evaluation overview file.>

7. Sources and methodology

7.1. Sources

Desk research	☐	Interviews	☐
ERA database	☐	Meetings	☐
External database	☐	Survey	☐

<Provide additional information on the consulted sources.>
7.2. Methodology (optional)
<Provide additional information on how the input was analysed.>

Annex 1 Additional information