



Council of the
European Union

**Brussels, 3 November 2016
(OR. en)**

**13668/16
ADD 7**

**POLGEN 126
INST 441
CODEC 1512
PE 100**

COVER NOTE

| | |
|------------------|--|
| From: | Secretary-General of the European Commission, signed by Mr Jordi AYET PUIGARNAU, Director |
| date of receipt: | 27 October 2016 |
| To: | Mr Jeppe TRANHOLM-MIKKELSEN, Secretary-General of the Council of the European Union |

| | |
|----------------|---|
| No. Cion doc.: | SWD(2016) 400 final - Part 2/2 |
| Subject: | COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT Regulatory Fitness and Performance Programme REFIT and the 10 Priorities of the Commission Accompanying the document COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT, THE COUNCIL, THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMITTEE AND THE COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS Commission Work Programme 2017 Delivering a Europe that protects, empowers and defends |

Delegations will find attached document SWD(2016) 400 final - Part 2/2.

Encl.: SWD(2016) 400 final - Part 2/2



EUROPEAN
COMMISSION

Strasbourg, 25.10.2016
SWD(2016) 400 final

PART 2/2

COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT

**Regulatory Fitness and Performance Programme
REFIT and the 10 Priorities of the Commission**

Accompanying the document

**COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN
PARLIAMENT, THE COUNCIL, THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL
COMMITTEE AND THE COMMITTEE OF THE REGIONS**

Commission Work Programme 2017

Delivering a Europe that protects, empowers and defends

{COM(2016) 710 final}

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| INTRODUCTION | 4 |
| PRIORITY 1: A NEW BOOST FOR JOBS, GROWTH AND INVESTMENT | 5 |
| Overview | 5 |
| Initiatives in the area of Agriculture and Rural Development | 14 |
| Initiatives in the area of Environment | 34 |
| Initiatives in the area of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries | 80 |
| PRIORITY 2: A CONNECTED DIGITAL SINGLE MARKET..... | 91 |
| Overview | 91 |
| Initiatives in the area of Communications Networks, Content and Technology | 94 |
| Initiatives in the area of Taxation and Customs Union..... | 114 |
| PRIORITY 3: A RESILIENT ENERGY UNION WITH A FORWARD-LOOKING CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY | 118 |
| Overview | 118 |
| Initiatives in the area of Climate action | 124 |
| Initiatives in the area of Energy | 144 |
| Initiatives in the area of Taxation and Customs Union..... | 162 |
| Initiatives in the area of Transport | 163 |
| PRIORITY 4: A DEEPER AND FAIRER INTERNAL MARKET WITH A STRENGTHENED INDUSTRIAL BASE | 173 |
| Overview | 173 |
| Initiatives in the area of Competition..... | 188 |
| Initiatives in the area of Financial Stability, Financial Services and Capital Markets Union..... | 198 |
| Initiatives in the area of Health and Food Safety | 218 |
| Initiatives in the area of Internal Market, Industry, Entrepreneurship and SMEs .. | 247 |
| Initiatives in the area of Transport | 296 |
| Initiatives in the area of Taxation and Customs | 324 |
| PRIORITY 5: A DEEPER AND FAIRER ECONOMIC AND MONETARY UNION | 345 |
| Overview | 345 |
| Initiatives in the area of Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion | 349 |
| Initiatives in the area of Statistics | 373 |
| PRIORITY 6: A REASONABLE AND BALANCED FREE TRADE AGREEMENT WITH THE U.S. | 382 |
| Overview | 382 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| Initiatives in the area of Trade Policy | 383 |
| PRIORITY 7: UPHOLDING THE RULE OF LAW AND LINKING UP EUROPE'S JUSTICE SYSTEMS..... | 395 |
| Overview | 395 |
| Initiatives in the area of Justice, Consumers and Gender Equality | 399 |
| Initiatives in the area of Communications Networks, Content and Technology | 437 |
| PRIORITY 8: TOWARDS A NEW POLICY ON MIGRATION..... | 440 |
| Overview | 440 |
| Initiatives in the area of Migration and Home Affairs | 442 |
| PRIORITY 10: A UNION OF DEMOCRATIC CHANGE..... | 465 |
| Overview | 465 |
| Initiatives in the area of Environment..... | 466 |

REFIT Scoreboard

Introduction

The REFIT Scoreboard shows the current state of play in the implementation of 231 initiatives for simplification and burden reduction taken by the Commission in its Regulatory Fitness and Performance Programme (REFIT).¹

REFIT aims to make sure that EU law remains fit for purpose and delivers the results intended by policy makers in the most efficient and effective way. It targets removing red tape and lowering costs without compromising policy objectives and EU high standards. REFIT is about regulating better, making EU legislation fit for purpose, simpler and less costly, aiming to ensure a clear, stable and predictable regulatory framework supporting the delivery of our common goals and allowing businesses and our citizens more freedom to pursue their goals.

REFIT initiatives have been taken in nine Commission priority areas covering the whole policy cycle including: evaluations of the performance of EU regulation, Commission proposals for EU legislation, adopted EU legislation and feedback on implementation and results achieved on the ground by Member States and stakeholders. Estimates on regulatory costs and benefits are included wherever this information is available and input by the REFIT Platform is indicated.

Within each policy area, the scoreboard provides a timeline and groups related initiatives by policy area or subject. Each entry includes a summary and information on the state of play at each step of the policy cycle and provides a general indication of progress towards meeting Better Regulation aims.

For a summary of the key elements of the Scoreboard please refer to SWD (2016) 400 final, part 1. In the course of 2017, the Commission is planning to set up a web-based version of the Scoreboard on its Better Regulation Portal. This will improve user-friendliness and allow for more regular updates.

Feedback on the REFIT Scoreboard and on any initiative included in it is welcome at the following website: [Lighten the Load – Have your Say](#)

¹ Information on results of ongoing evaluation is always to be considered as preliminary. Information on the objectives, possible scope and content on Commission initiatives not yet adopted is to be considered as indicative only and subject to change during the preparatory process, notably resulting from impact assessment.

Priority 1: A New Boost for Jobs, Growth and Investment

Overview

1. Overview of REFIT Initiatives in the area of Agriculture

| | Evaluation | Commission Proposal | Legal Act | Implementation |
|--|---|--|--|----------------|
| <u>Simplification of CMO and modernization of the CAP</u> | | Commission proposal Several Regulations in the pipeline for 2016 and 2017 | Legal act 18 Regulations (9 Delegated and 9 Implementing) already adopted | |
| Greening | Evaluation 1) Review after first year of implementation (finalized 2016) 2) Evaluation (expected Q4 2017) | | Adjustment of DA/IA (Expected Q4 2016) Possible adjustment of IA (2017) | |
| Organic Farming | | Commission Proposal 24 March 2014 | Legal Act pending in legislative | |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| | | | procedure6 | |
| State aid rules in agriculture | Evaluation planned for 2017 | | Legal act New legal framework applicable as from 01/07/2014 | Implementation • Application on 01/01/2014 and 01/06/2014 |
| Egg labelling (ABRPlus) | | Commission proposal 1 July 2007 | Legal Act 22 October 2007 | Implementation Applies with effect from 1 July 2007 |
| POSEI programme | Evaluation Ongoing and expected to be finalised Q4 2016 | | | |

2. Overview of REFIT Initiatives in the area of Environment



| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| | Follow-Up evaluation (planned to start in 2017) | | | |
| Waste Policy | Fitness Check 2014 | Circular Economy Proposal 2 December 2015 | Circular Economy Legal Acts (pending) | |
| Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) | | Commission Proposal (Adopted 3 December 2008) | Legal Act (Adopted 4 July 2013) | Implementation Application on 14 February 2014 Transposition Deadline 14 February 2014 |
| Shipments of Waste | | Commission Proposal 11 July 2013 | Legal Act 15 May 2014 | Implementation Application on 1 January 2016 |
| Export for recovery of non-hazardous waste (TRADE) | Evaluation planned in 2018 | | Legal act Adopted on 24 June 2014 | Implementation Application on 18th July 2014 |
| Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) | | Commission Proposal adopted 2012 | Legal Act adopted 2014 | Implementation • Application on 16 May 2017 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|----------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| | | | | Transposition Deadline 16 May 2017 |
| EMAS and EU Eco Label | Fitness Check (ongoing) | | | |
| Environmental Liability | Evaluation (completed in 2016) | Commission Follow-Up | | |
| Infrastructure for Spatial Information (INSPIRE) | Evaluation (completed in 2016) | Follow-Up | | |
| Noise | Evaluation (ongoing) | | | |
| Volatile organic compound emissions - Stage I and Stage II - Petrol Vapour Recovery (VOCs) | Evaluation VOCl (Ongoing) Evaluation VOCII (Ongoing) | | | |
| Protection of Animals used for Scientific Purposes | Review Report (expected Q4 2017) | | | |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Wild animals in Zoos | Evaluation (expected Q4 2017) | | | |
| Flood Risks | Evaluation Planned in 2018 | | | |
| Bathing Water | Evaluation (expected 2019) | | | |
| Marine Environment Policy | Evaluation Planned in 2019 | | | |

3. Overview of REFIT Initiatives in the area of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries

| | Evaluation | Commission Proposal | Legal Act | Implementation |
|--|------------|---|-------------------------------|---|
| Reform of the Common Fisheries Policy | | Commission proposal 13 July 2011 | Legal Act 11 December 2013 | Implementation Applies with effect from 1 January 2014 |
| Common market organisation in fishery and aquaculture | | Commission proposal 13 July 2011 | Legal Act 11 December 2013 | Implementation Applies with effect from 1 January 2014 |
| Technical Measures for the Protection of Marine Organisms | | Commission proposal 11 March 2016 | | |
| Fishing authorisation | | Commission proposal 10 December 2015 | | |
| Fisheries Control Regulation | Evaluation | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | ongoing and planned to be finalised Q4 2016 | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

Initiatives in the area of Agriculture and Rural Development

Simplification of Common Market Organisation and Modernisation of the CAP

| Overall State of Play: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Under implementation</i> | Summary |
|---|---|
| Summary: | <p>Within the simplification exercise of the Common Market Organisation, the Commission reviews current regulations with the aim to simplify and reduce administrative burdens and increase the coherence between different sectors aligning them at the same time with Lisbon Treaty empowerments laid down in the new CMO Regulation. (Reg. 1308/2013).</p> <p>The initiative will rationalise the Commission-level regulations linked to the Regulation on a Common Organisation of the Markets in agricultural products (CMO Regulation) by reducing more than 200 existing Commission Regulations into 40 implementing and delegated acts.</p> <p>In addition, the Commission will take forward work and consult widely on simplification and modernisation of the Common Agricultural Policy to maximise its contribution to the Commission's ten priorities and to the Sustainable Development Goals. This will focus on specific policy priorities for the future, taking account of the opinion of the REFIT Platform, and without prejudice to the Commission proposal to revise the Multiannual Financial Framework.</p> <p>Input of the REFIT Platform:</p> <p>On the Common Agricultural Policy, the REFIT Platform issued three opinions on the efficiency of the CAP, cross compliance and overlaps between Pillars I and II. The REFIT Platform Stakeholder group recommended to carry out a more strategic review of the CAP with a view to ensuring the effectiveness and efficiency of the CAP, while the Government group objected to such a review and, instead recommended to follow the existing evaluation planning established by Regulation 1306/2013. The Commission will be consulting the public throughout 2017 on the simplification and modernisation of</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) to maximize its contribution to the Commission's ten priorities and to the Sustainable Development Goals. This will focus on specific policy priorities for the future, taking account of the opinions of the Refit Platform. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>Savings and benefits of the CMO Simplification could not be quantified given data limitations. A qualitative analysis suggests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher economic efficiency of the EU regulatory framework • Cuts in administrative burden for 1) economic actors 2) Member State administrations 3) Commission services, through the replacement of more than 200 Commission regulations by 40 delegated and implementing regulations². |

² This assessment assumes that it is possible to have a single delegated and implementing regulation for each major heading of the CMO, including 15 Commission Regulations on marketing standards. The work on the latter is currently on hold awaiting evaluation

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18 Regulations (9 Delegated and 9 Implementing) have already been adopted. Another 12 are in the pipeline for 2016 and further 6 for 2017 | <p>Legal acts</p> <p><i>All Commission-level regulations linked to the Regulation on a Common Organisation of the Markets in agricultural products (CMO Regulation)</i></p> <p>Adopted Regulations:</p> <p><u>Olive oil aid:</u> Delegated Regulation (EU) No 611/2014 (11 March 2014)</p> <p>Implementing Regulation (EU) No 615/2014 (6 June 2014)</p> <p><u>Vine plantings:</u> Delegated Regulation (EU) 2015/560 (15 December 2014)</p> <p>Implementing Regulation (EU) 2015/561 (7 April 2015)</p> <p><u>Apiculture:</u> Delegated Regulation (EU) 2015/1366 (11 May 2015)</p> <p>Implementing Regulation (EU) 2015/1368 (6 August 2015)</p> <p><u>Producer cooperation:</u> Delegated Regulation (EU) 2016/232 (15 December 2015)</p> <p><u>Wine programmes:</u> Delegated Regulation (EU) 2016/1149 (15 April 2016)</p> <p>Implementing Regulation (EU) 2016/1150 (15 April 2016)</p> <p><u>Sugar:</u> Delegated Regulation (EU) 2016/1166 (17 May 2016)</p> <p><u>Trade mechanisms – licences:</u> Delegated Regulation (EU) 2016/1237 (18 May 2016)</p> <p>Implementing Regulation (EU) 2016/1239 (18 May 2016)</p> <p><u>Public intervention/Private Storage:</u> Delegated Regulation (EU) 2016/1238 (18 May 2016)</p> <p>Implementing Regulation (EU) 2016/1240 (18 May 2016)</p> <p>Regulations on the pipeline:</p> <p><u>Member States' notifications (ISAMM):</u> CIS completed January 2016. Implementing regulation currently subject to further review</p> |
|--|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p><i>and discussion with MS and SJ. Adoption planned Q4.</i></p> <p><i><u>Fruit and vegetables:</u> Discussion of draft DA/IA with MS nearly concluded, but internal Commission discussions continuing. Adoption anticipated by end Q4.</i></p> <p><i><u>Trade mechanisms – TROs:</u> Discussions of draft DA/IA started with MS. Adoption planned Q4.</i></p> <p><i><u>Carcass classification:</u> Discussion of draft DA/IA with MS nearly concluded. Adoption planned Q4.</i></p> <p><i><u>Trade mechanisms – residual issues:</u> Discussion of a first issues paper with MS June 2016.</i></p> <p><i>School schemes: CIS to be launched shortly. Adoption planned Q4.</i></p> <p><i>Alignment/simplification of Commission implementing regulation on wine registers</i></p> <p><i>Alignment/simplification of Commission implementing regulation on wine quality terms</i></p> <p><i>Possible alignment/simplification of marketing standards</i></p> |
| <i>Which REFIT objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i> | Simplification and Burden Reduction. |
| <i>Which other objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i> | Reduction of error rate, and improved coherence/consistency. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Due to the limited availability of data, the savings could not be quantified. The analysis is mainly qualitative: important reductions are expected in administrative burdens for 1) economic actors 2) Member States' administrations 3) Commission services. |

Greening / Environmental Focus Areas

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Overall State of Play</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Review after one year of application completed</i> • <i>Adjustment of secondary legislation ongoing</i> • <i>Evaluation of basic act planned for Q4 2016 (by end 2017)</i> • <i>Possible revision of main legal act in 2018</i> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p>Summary:</p> | <p>The initiatives in this area should provide a full overview on how this new policy instrument is performing, identify main obstacles to its implementation and come forward with concrete suggestions for simplification leading to reduced administrative costs.</p> <p>The first step was a review carried out in the first half of 2016 assessing how the greening system was applied in its first year. The results of this review were fed into the ongoing process of adjusting the underlying secondary legislation, which is to be finalised by the end of 2016. A Commission report on implementation of EFA is scheduled in 1Q 2017. The Commission is also launching a full-fledged evaluation of the performance of the full set of greening provisions, which is to be completed by end 2017. The results of this evaluation will be used to inform discussion on the post-2020 CAP.</p> <p>Input of the REFIT Platform:</p> <p>The two REFIT Platform opinions on Cross-compliance rules and overlaps between Pillars I and II in the CAP include recommendations from some members of the Stakeholder group that</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>the Commission examines the system of controls applying to Pillar II, introduces "soft measures" (simplification of requirements placed on farmers within the existing framework), possibly leading to the revision of the legislation in the context of a broader CAP review. There was also support from some Stakeholder group members that the Commission examines the possibility to introduce a "more targeted, risk-based and proportionate controls regime" under Pillar II. Some members of the Government group supported urgent review of Pillars I and II with a view to simplification, while others considered it too early to undertake this work that would require modification of the basic acts.</p> <p>The Commission will pay particular attention to these recommendations in the forthcoming evaluation on greening and ensure that there is a primary focus on the direct payments greening component.</p> <p>The overall scope of the evaluation is the full set of green direct payments.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>The Commission will analyse these aspects in future studies on the administrative burden and the costs of managing the Common Agricultural Policy to be launched in 2017. The findings of these studies are to be published before the end of 2018. The efficiency of the greening measures will also be assessed as part of the forthcoming evaluation on greening planned to start in Q4 2016.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Release of SWD(2016) 218</i> • <i>Ongoing work on delegated and implementing regulations</i> | <p>Review after one year of application (SWD)</p> |
| <p><i>Scope</i></p> | <p>The review aimed at assessing the experience after one year of implementation of greening and identifying possible areas for regulatory adjustment at the level of the relevant secondary legislation (Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) No 639/2014, Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 641/2014).</p> |
| <p><i>Evaluation Findings</i></p> | <p>The review identified issues for simplification in the underlying secondary legislation (delegated and implementing acts). These fall into the following categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - better specification or clarification of what is required from farmers and national administrations; - eliminating some burdensome technical requirements (making sure that this does not lead to lowering of environmental benefits); - providing more flexibility or alternative options where this increases the environmental and climate benefits of greening; and - further harmonisation of some requirements and conditions. |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The quantitative assessment of benefits is not possible at such an early stage of greening implementation. After only one year of implementation, sufficient hard data on the costs and burdens associated with the new greening measures is still not available (as explained in the ‘Review of greening after one year’ (SWD (2016) 218).</p> <p>The Commission will analyse these aspects in future studies on the administrative burden and the costs of manage the CAP to be launched in 2017. The findings of these studies are to be published before the end of 2018. The efficiency of the greening measures will also be assessed as part of the forthcoming evaluation on greening planned to start in Q4 2016.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>The adjustment of DA/IA is ongoing and is to be completed by Q4 2016.</i></p> | <p>Commission Delegated / Implementing Acts</p> |
| <p><i>Scope:</i></p> | <p>The review of the first year of implementation of greening identified a number of issues requiring simplification at the level of the relevant secondary legislation. They relate mainly to the need to facilitate procedures for farmers and national administrations with a view to increasing the take up of greening and ensuring its effectiveness and efficiency in meeting its environmental objectives.</p> |
| <p><i>Which REFIT objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>The main policy objective is to facilitate the implementation of greening for farmers and public administrations in view of increasing its take up. For this purpose, it is necessary to clarify some provisions and to simplify the administrative management, without jeopardising the CAP environmental policy objectives and sound financial management.</p> |
| <p><i>Which other objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>The final purpose is to ensure effectiveness and efficiency of the scheme as regards its environmental objectives and facilitate its implementation by farmers and/or national administrations as simpler rules normally reduce the risk of non-compliance.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Quantitative assessment of costs and benefits is not possible at this stage. After only one year of implementation, sufficient hard data on the costs and burdens associated with the new greening measures is still not available (as explained in the ‘Review of greening after one year’ (SWD (2016) 218).</p> <p>The Commission will analyse these aspects, including the benefits and costs of the adjustments to the Delegated and Implementing Acts, in future studies on the administrative burden and the costs of management of the CAP to be launched in 2017.</p> <p>The efficiency of the greening measures will also be assessed as part of the forthcoming evaluation on greening planned to start in Q4 2016.</p> |

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Planned start Q4 2016</i></p> | <p>Evaluation</p> |
|--|--------------------------|

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>Completion Q4 2017</i> | |
| <i>Scope:</i> | <p>The focus of the evaluation is on the full set of green direct payments.</p> <p>The purpose of this evaluation is to evaluate the impacts of the green direct payment scheme as implemented by Member States. The evaluation will give a full overview on how this new policy instrument is performing against its objectives and should provide a solid evidence basis for considering possible policy changes in the greening domain.</p> |
| <i>Evaluation findings:</i> | Expected for Q4 2017 |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Expected for Q4 2017 |

Organic farming

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Overall State of Play</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Proposal in March 2014</i> • <i>Pending in legislative procedure- Legal Act expected early 2017</i> • <i>no challenge to REFIT objectives in legislative procedure</i> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p>Summary:</p> | <p>The initiative aims at modernising and harmonising the internal rules for organic production, the elimination of exceptions and flexibilities. It also aims at improving consumer confidence in organics by adopting provisions for the exclusion of contaminated products and aligning controls with the official controls framework. It creates a level playing field for imported goods. It also simplifies and clarifies the organic farming rules.</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>The Commission proposal foresees elimination of 37 of the current 135 information obligations by operators.</p> <p>Due to the absence of data, the potential savings for operators could not be quantified.</p> <p>The initiative will increase the competitiveness of EU operators by harmonising the rules and eliminating current flexibilities on imports. It will also reduce certification costs for operators, by application of the risk analysis criteria, introduction of group certification and fee transparency.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal from the Commission of 24 March 2014 – COM(2014) 180 | <p>Commission Proposal</p> <p><i>Commission proposal to revise:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91;</i> <i>Commission Regulation (EC) No 889/2008 of 5 September 2008 laying down detailed rules for the implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products with regard to organic production, labelling and control</i> <i>Commission Regulation (EC) No 1235/2008 of 8 December 2008 laying down detailed rules for implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 as regards the arrangements for imports of organic products from third countries</i> |
| <p>Which REFIT objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</p> | <p>The proposal includes the following simplification benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improvements to the overall quality of the legislation including clarifications and the filling of legislative gaps, improved accessibility as the specific organic production rules are gathered in one Annex of the Regulation; production rules: removal of ineffective provisions and simplification of procedures for operators and national administrations, improved harmonisation by limiting exceptions, reinforcement of a risk-based approach on controls; imports: simplification through a compliance regime for control bodies; small farmers: significant simplification through group certification allowing for more proportionate inspection and record-keeping requirements; |
| <p>Which other objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</p> | <p>Review and simplification of the legal framework for organic farming.</p> <p>Specifically, the proposal intends to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> remove obstacles to the sustainable development of organic production in the EU, guarantee fair competition for farmers and operators and improve |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>the functioning of the internal market,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • achieve a level playing field inside the Union and with respect to imported products, • maintain or improve consumer confidence in organic products, • stimulate the growth of the organic market and of the number of corresponding jobs. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Due to the limited availability of data, the savings could not be quantified. |

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>pending in legislative procedure</i> | Legal Act |
| <i>Debate in Legislative Procedure</i> | Inter-institutional discussions have not led to questioning the simplification objectives pursued by the Commission. |
| <i>Outcome of Legislative Procedure</i> | Information not yet available. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

State aid rules in agriculture

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>Overall State of Play</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Legal act adopted in 2013</i> • <i>Application in 2014</i> • <i>Evaluation planned for 2017</i> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The updated State aid rules applicable to the agricultural and forestry sectors and in rural areas in the period 2014 – 2020 are better adapted to the objective of achieving growth in the rural economy and improved business and living conditions in rural areas.</p> <p>The inclusion of further categories of aid in the scope of the agricultural block exemption regulation have led to simpler and speedier State aid clearance procedures. The increased ceilings for de minimis aid also means that Member States now have larger possibilities of granting aid without prior notification to the Commission. De minimis aid is perceived as being a useful tool to react quickly to urgent problems with less administrative costs, in particular as regards aid to SMEs.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Due to the limited availability of data, the savings in terms of reduction of Member States administrative costs could not be fully quantified. However, it should be noted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 85 % of the State aid cases are dealt with as exemptions under the block exemption regulation, since its adoption in 2014, compared to 70 % under the previous regulation. – The increase of the de minimis ceilings by 100 % means a significant reduction of Member States' administrative costs, but there are no figures available to measure this aspect. |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'De Minimis' Regulation: • Adoption by the Commission on 18 December 2013 • Regulation (EU) No 1408/2013. | <p>Legal act</p> <p><i>'De Minimis' Regulation:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Commission Regulation (EU) No 1408/2013 of 18 December 2013 on the application of Articles 107 and 108 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union to de minimis aid in the agriculture sector. This Regulation is replacing Commission Regulation (EC) n° 1537/2007.</i> <p><i>State Aid Guidelines:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>European Union Guidelines for State aid in the agriculture and forestry sector and in rural areas 2014-2020 (2014/C 204/01)</i> <p><i>Regulation on block-exemptions:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Commission Regulation (EU) No 702/2014 of 25 June 2014 declaring certain categories of aid in the agricultural and forestry sectors and in rural areas compatible with the internal market in application of Articles 107 and 108 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (OJ L 193, 1.7.2014, p. 1).</i> |
| <p>Outcome of Legislative Procedure</p> | <p>The legal framework for State aid in the agricultural and forestry sectors and in rural areas became fully applicable on 1 July 2014. The extended scope of the agricultural block exemption regulation has contributed to speedier State aid clearance procedures. That regulation and the new de minimis rules make it easier for Member States to grant aid without prior notification to the Commission.</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>The increase of the de minimis ceilings by 100 % means a significant reduction of Member States' administrative costs, but due to the absence of data, the savings could not be quantified.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Application on 01/01/2014 and 01/06/2014</i> • <i>Evaluation Planned for 2017</i> | <p>Implementation</p> <p><i>'De Minimis' Regulation: applicable since 1 January 2014</i></p> <p><i>State Aid Guidelines and Regulation on block-exemptions: applicable since 1 July 2014</i></p> <p><i>Member States' fulfilment of transparency requirements has been facilitated by way of a new IT tool set up at Commission level.</i></p> |
| <p>Implementation reported</p> | <p>Information provided by Member States on their national aid schemes is available on the State aid Transparency public search</p> |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| <i>by MemberStates</i> | <p>page:</p> <p>https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/competition/transparency/public/search/home/</p> <p>The annual State aid scoreboard provides data on Member States' expenditure under authorised aid schemes: http://ec.europa.eu/competition/state_aid/scoreboard/index_en.html</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>85 % of the State aid cases are dealt with as exemptions under the block exemption regulation, since its adoption in 2014, compared to 70 % under the previous regulation.</p> |

Egg labelling (ABRPlus)

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>Overall State of Play</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Simplification entered into force on 1 July 2007</i> • <i>Cost reductions reported between 9% and 63%</i> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The EU marketing standards for eggs adopted in 2007 provided more legal clarity and flexibility to large and small egg operators. In particular, small egg producers can be exempted from having to mark their producer code on their eggs when they are sold directly to consumers.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The main savings resulted from allowing better business organisation and more proportionate investments for small and large egg operators. Total savings have been estimated at around EUR 600 million.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Adopted on 1 July 2007</i> • <i>COM(2011)626</i> | Commission Proposal |
| <i>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i> | The main objective was to reduce the administrative burden for egg producers and packers. |
| <i>Which other objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Member States can exempt small egg producers from the requirement to mark eggs with the producer code, when the eggs are sold directly to the consumer on a local market; • Introduction of a single 10-day-limit for collecting, grading, marking, packing of eggs and marking of packs, in order to allow producers and packing stations to better organise their daily work by planning the collection, grading marking and packing of eggs in a more rational way; • Introduction of less rigid requirements for equipment for packing stations and increased flexibility for operators for record keeping, in order to facilitate the organisation of business activities. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | The estimated total cost savings at the time of the Commission proposal were EUR 1,29 billion. Taking into account the "business as usual factor", which was considered to be 53 %, the total administrative burden reduction was estimated at around to EUR 600 million. |

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Adopted by the Legislator on 22 October 2007</i> | Legal act <p>Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 December 2013 establishing a common organisation of the markets in agricultural products and repealing Council Regulations (EEC) No 922/72, (EEC) No 234/79, (EC) No 1037/2001 and (EC) No 1234/2007</p> <p>This Regulation replaced Council Regulation (EC) No. 1234/2007 of 22 October 2007 establishing a common organisation of agricultural markets and on specific provisions for certain</p> |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>agricultural products (Single CMO Regulation)</p> <p>Commission Regulation (EC) No 589/2008 of 23 June 2008 laying down detailed rules for implementing Council Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007 as regards marketing standards for eggs</p> |
| <i>Outcome of Legislative Procedure</i> | There were no major changes regarding the marketing standards of eggs in the legal act of 2013 compared to the legal act in 2007. The benefits were retained. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Given that no major changes took place, the estimated savings were did not change. |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Application date 1 July 2007</i> | Implementation |
| <i>Implementation reported by Member States</i> | <p>Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007 (and Regulation (EU) No 1308/2013 which replaced it) introduced simplification options for Member States to exempt producers with less than 50 laying hens from labelling requirement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 11 Member States fully implemented both exemptions. (BG, CZ, EE, IE, IT, CY, LT, PT, SL, SE, UK). A further 5 Member States said that they fully implemented the measure, though it is unclear if they implemented both (EL, ES, HU, NL, SK). 6 Member States partially implemented the measure, which means only one of the exemption requirements (DK, DE, LV, MT, AT, FI). |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | In 5 Member States that fully implemented the requirements cost reductions were estimated to range between 9% and 63% (CZ, LV, SI, SE, UK), while the initial estimation by the Commission predicted savings of administrative burden of around 44%. |

POSEI programme

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>Overall State of Play</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Evaluation expected to conclude Q4 2016</i> | Summary |
| <i>Summary:</i> | An evaluation of the POSEI programme is ongoing, in order to provide an overall assessment of the impacts of the specific agricultural measures carried out for the outermost regions (POSEI programmes) and smaller Aegean Islands (PIME programme). |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Expected Q4 2016 |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Ongoing.</i></p> <p><i>Planned to be finalised Q4 2016.</i></p> | <p>Evaluation</p> |
| <p><i>Scope:</i></p> | <p>Evaluation of the POSEI programmes, covering the entry into force of Regulation (EU) No 247/2006 until at least 2014 for the Outermost Regions: the Canary islands (Spain), the Azores and Madeira (Portugal) and the French overseas departments (Guadeloupe, French Guiana, Réunion, Martinique and Mayotte).</p> <p>It also takes into account the implementation of the Rural Development Programmes for these areas as well as the relevant elements of the direct payments and single CMO regulation and other EU and national legislation having an impact on the performance of the POSEI programmes.</p> <p>Given the similarities in objectives and measures, the evaluation also covers the measures introduced by Regulations (EU) No 1405/2006 and (EU) No 229/2013 for the smaller Aegean islands, until at least 2014.</p> |
| <p><i>Evaluation findings:</i></p> | <p>Expected Q4 2016</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Expected Q4 2016</p> |

Initiatives in the area of Environment

Natura 2000 / EU Nature Legislation

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>Overall state of play</i> <i>ongoing</i> <i>Fitness Check due for Completion Q4/2016</i> <i>Follow-Up not yet determined</i> | Summary |
| <i>Summary:</i> | The Commission carries out a Fitness Check of EU Nature Legislation. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | To be updated when the SWD is finalised |

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <i>Ongoing - Expected to be finalised in Q4 2016</i> | Fitness Check |
| <i>Scope:</i> | Fitness Check of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council Directive 2009/147/EEC on Birds • Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora |
| <i>Evaluation findings:</i> | Results of the Fitness Check are expected in Q4 2016. Natura 2000 Fitness Check Website: http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/legislation/fitness_check/index_en.htm |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | To be updated when the SWD is finalised |

Drinking Water Directive

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>Overall State of Play</i> <i>Evaluation expected to complete Q4 2016</i> <i>Proposal planned for 2017</i> | Summary |
| <i>Summary:</i> | The Commission is evaluating Directive 98/83/EC on the quality of water intended for human consumption. The result of this evaluation should be available during the fourth quarter of 2016. A legislative proposal is planned for 2017. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Expected Q4 2016 |

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <i>Expected to be finalised in Q4 2016</i> | Evaluation |
| <i>Scope:</i> | <p>Evaluation of Directive 98/83/EC on the quality of water intended for human consumption</p> <p>This evaluation follows on from the European Citizens Initiative on the "Right to Water". A study has been contracted to provide support.</p> |
| <i>Evaluation findings:</i> | <p>Information not yet available.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>Information not yet available.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Planned for 2017 (CWP 2017)</i> | Commission Proposal |
| <i>Which REFIT objective(s) will the Commission pursue?</i> | <p>Revision of the Drinking Water Directive.</p> |
| <i>Which purpose will the Commission pursue?</i> | <p>Information not yet available.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings</i> | <p>Information not yet available.</p> |

REACH

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Overall state of play:</p> <p><i>Implementing adopted in 2016</i></p> <p><i>Evaluation to be finalised Q2 2017</i></p> <p><i>Common Understanding Document on REACH/OSH planned for 2017</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p>Summary</p> | <p>The Commission adopted an implementing Regulation in 2016, and evaluation of REACH is ongoing and expected to be completed by mid-2017.</p> <p>Input of the REFIT Platform:</p> <p>The REFIT Platform opinion on the interface between REACH and occupational health and safety recommends that the Commission should raise awareness and issue guidance on the implementation of legislation in this legislation. In response, the Commission will issue a Common Understanding explaining the interface between REACH and OSH legislation. In addition, several evaluations in this area will conclude during 2017 and assess any need for further action.</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>Information not yet available.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| State of Play: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adopted by the Commission on 5 Jan 2016 Commission implementing regulation (EU) 2016/9 | Commission Proposal |
| Which REFIT objectives did the Commission pursue? | <p>Improving the implementation of REACH.</p> <p>The regulation sets rules to make sure that the data-sharing agreements in substance information exchange forums (SIEFs) are clear and comprehensive. Potential registrants joining a SIEF are given the right to request a breakdown of the study and administrative costs that make up the price for the joint registration.</p> |
| Which other objectives did the Commission pursue? | <p>Improving the implementation of REACH</p> |
| Estimated savings and benefits | <p>Due to the limited availability of data, the savings could not be quantified.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| State of Play: On going, planned to be finalised by mid 2017 | Evaluation |
| Scope: | Evaluation of the REACH Regulation 1907/2006/EC |
| Evaluation findings: | Information not yet available. |
| Estimated savings and benefits | Information not yet available. |

European Pollutant release and Transfer register (EPRTR)

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>Overall state of play</i> <i>Evaluation expected to complete Q2 2017</i> | Summary |
| <i>Summary:</i> | The Commission is evaluating Regulation 166/2006/EC concerning the establishment of a European Pollutant Release and Transfer Register. The result of this evaluation will support the report to the Council and the European parliament on the implementation of the E-PRTR that is planned for 2017. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <i>Ongoing - Expected to be finalised in Q2 2017</i> | Evaluation |
| <i>Scope:</i> | Evaluation of Regulation 166/2006/EC concerning the establishment of a European Pollutant Release and Transfer Register |
| <i>Evaluation findings:</i> | Information not yet available. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

Strategic Environmental Assessment

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>Overall State of Play</i> <i>Implementation Report</i> <i>Expected for Q1-2017</i> <i>Follow-Up Evaluation</i> <i>Planned for 2017 -18</i> | Summary |
| <i>Summary:</i> | The Commission is carrying out an implementation report to assess the application and effectiveness of Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment. The implementation report will also assess the potential for simplification. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Expected to be finalised in Q1 2017</i></p> | <p>Implementation Report</p> |
| <p><i>Scope:</i></p> | <p>Implementation report on the application and effectiveness of Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment (SEA Directive)</p> <p>The second implementation report will evaluate the application and effectiveness of the Directive across the EU Member States.</p> |
| <p><i>Evaluation findings:</i></p> | <p>Expected in Q1 2017</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Expected in Q1 2017.</p> |

Waste Policy

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Overall State of Play</p> <p><i>Fitness Check 2014</i></p> <p><i>Circular Economy Package adopted in 2015</i></p> <p><i>Legal Acts: adoption pending</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>A comprehensive FitnessCheck of the acquis in this area in 2014 confirmed that legislation is effective in achieving the environmental and resource efficiency objectives for which they were designed.</p> <p>In 2015, the Commission adopted an ambitious Circular Economy Package, which included revised legislative proposals on waste, to boost competitiveness, foster sustainable economic growth and generate new jobs.</p> <p>The revised legislative proposals on waste set clear targets for increasing recycling and reducing landfilling of waste and establishes an ambitious and credible long-term path for waste management and recycling to stimulate Europe's transition towards a circular economy.</p> <p>Other benefits include:</p> <p>Contributing to the EU's efforts to develop a sustainable, low carbon, resource efficient and competitive economy by maintaining the value of products, materials and resources in the economy for as long as possible, and minimising waste.</p> <p>Protecting businesses against scarcity of resources and volatile prices, helping to create new business opportunities and innovative, more efficient ways of producing and consuming.</p> <p>Creating local jobs at all skills levels and opportunities for social integration and cohesion.</p> <p>Saving energy and avoiding negative impacts on climate, biodiversity, air, soil and water.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>As an indication of the potential benefits, it has been estimated that waste prevention, ecodesign, re-use and similar measures could bring net savings of €600 billion, or 8% of annual turnover, for businesses in the EU, while reducing total annual greenhouse gas emissions by 2-4 %. In the sectors of re-use, re-manufacturing and repair, for example, the cost of remanufacturing mobile phones could be halved if it were easier to take them apart. If 95% of mobile</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | phones were collected, this could generate savings on manufacturing material costs of more than €1 billion. A shift from recycling to refurbishing light commercial vehicles, where collection rates are already high, could save material inputs by €6.4 billion per year (about 15% of material budget) and €140 million in energy costs and reduce GHG emissions by 6.3 million tonnes. |
|--|--|

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <i>Finalised in 2014 - SWD(2014) 209</i> | Fitness Check |
| <i>Scope:</i> | Fitness check of Five Waste Stream Directives accompanying the document Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council reviewing the targets in Directives 2008/98/EC on waste, 94/62/EC on packaging and packaging waste, and 1999/31/EC on the landfill of waste, amending Directives 2000/53/EC on end-of-life vehicles, 2006/66/EC on batteries and accumulators and waste batteries and accumulators, and 2012/19/EC on waste electrical and electronic equipment. |
| <i>Evaluation findings:</i> | The Fitness Check concluded that all five Waste Stream Directives screened have proven to be effective instruments of European waste policy. All the directives assessed have been effective at various degrees in achieving the environmental and resource efficiency objectives for which they were designed. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | A comprehensive assessment of costs and benefits was undertaken as part of the waste policy and targets review under the Circular Economy package, including through modelling. |

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Adopted by the Commission on 2 December 2015</i> • <i>Adoption by the legislator: pending</i> • <i>Savings: 25-30 billion (2015-2035)</i> | Commission Proposal |
| <i>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i> | Administrative burden reduction and simplification of reporting requirements. |
| <i>Which purpose did the</i> | The revised legislative proposals on waste set clear targets for |

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>Commission pursue?</i> | <p>reduction of waste and established an ambitious and credible long-term path for waste management and recycling. Key elements of the revised waste proposal include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A common EU target for recycling 65% of municipal waste by 2030; - A common EU target for recycling 75% of packaging waste by 2030; - A binding landfill target to reduce landfill to maximum of 10% of municipal waste by 2030; - A ban on landfilling of separately collected waste; - Promotion of economic instruments to discourage landfilling ; - Simplified and improved definitions and harmonised calculation methods for recycling rates throughout the EU; - Concrete measures to promote re-use and stimulate industrial symbiosis – turning one industry's by-product into another industry's raw material; <p>Economic incentives for producers to put greener products on the market and support recovery and recycling schemes (e.g. for packaging, batteries, electric and electronic equipment, vehicles).</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Savings: the net social benefits are estimated at 25-30 billion euro for the period 2015-2030 - Job creation – 170.000 direct jobs could be created by 2035, most of them impossible to delocalize outside the EU; - GHG emission reduction – more than 600 millions of tons of green house gas could be avoided between 2015 and 2035; - Positive effects on the competitiveness of the EU waste management and recycling sectors as well as on the EU manufacturing sector (better extended producer responsibility schemes, reduced risks associated with raw material access); - Reinjection into the EU economy of secondary raw materials which in turn will reduce the dependency of the EU on raw materials imports; - Administrative burden reduction by simplifying reporting requirements on Member States saving an estimated 280 man-days per year and exemptions for establishments |

| | |
|--|--|
| | collecting or transporting small amounts of non-hazardous waste. |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Pending in legislative Procedure</i> | Legal Acts |
| <i>Debate in Legislative Procedure</i> | Discussion is on-going in the Council and the European Parliament; trialogues are expected in the first half of 2017. The positions of the Council and the Parliament are divergent what concerns the level of ambition of the targets and some provisions. |
| <i>Outcome of Legislative Procedure</i> | The adoption of the legislative proposals could be expected by end 2017. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>The change in the estimated benefits depends on the level of the targets that will be agreed by the legislator. The impact assesment has shown that higher targets lead to greater benefits.</p> <p>The overall reduction of the administrative burden will depend on the exact content of the obligations that may be eventually adopted by the co-legislators.</p> |

Waste electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE)

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>Overall State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Proposal December 2008</i></p> <p><i>Legal Act 2012: Benefits reduced by legislator</i></p> <p><i>Transposition Deadline : 14 February 2014</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The recast WEEE Directive 2012/19/EU clarifies producer responsibilities and includes an SME exemption for take-back obligations.</p> <p>The Commission's proposal for one single registration for all EU obligations, with interoperability and data-transfer between Member State producer registers was not maintained by the legislator, the associated simplification benefits could therefore not be realized. The introduction of harmonisation elements on registration and reporting in the recast WEEE Directive 2012/19/EU, is expected to reduce administrative burdens.</p> <p>The Commission's proposal for one single registration for all EU obligations, with interoperability and data-transfer between Member State producer registers was not maintained by the legislator, the associated simplification benefits could therefore not be realized.</p> <p>Input from the REFIT Platform</p> <p>In its opinion on Waste electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE) the REFIT Platform recommends that the Commission "take action in order to implement a common harmonised reporting and registration system of EEE producers", that takes enforcement and manageability into account without adding unnecessary burden on the Member States. The Platform further specifies that this action should be carried out in time to allow its implementation by mid-2018. The opinion confirms the evidence gathered by the European Commission and reinforces the need for action.</p> <p>On the basis of the Platform opinion and other evidence gathered, the Commission is planning further simplification and development of reporting and registration arrangements in the first half of 2017. This will give Member States the time to adapt (if needed) their existing national registration systems by mid-2018. A study has been finalised in January 2016 on the format for the registration and</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | reporting and action is planned in the first half of 2017. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>The first reports from the Member States on the implementation of the Directive were submitted by the end of September 2016. Their analysis wil provide information to assess the actual impacts/ benefits from the implementation of the Directive.</p> <p>The adoption of an implementing act establishing the format for registration and reporting and the frequency of reporting to the register provided for in the recast WEEE Directive (Article 16(3)), which is planned to be adopted in 2017, is expected to reduce administrative burdens substantially, especially for producers active in more than one Member State.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Adopted by the Commission on 03/12/2008</i> • <i>Ref COM(2008)810</i> | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</p> | <p>One of the core objectives of the Commission's WEEE recast proposal was the reduction of unnecessary administrative burdens by clarifying that producer responsibilities are based on a European approach. In line with this, it had proposed one single registration for all EU obligations, with interoperability and data-transfer between Member State producer registers.</p> <p>In line with the objective to reduce unnecessary administrative burdens especially for SMEs the proposal provided for distributors with a selling area below 400 square metres to be exempted from requirements to tack-back very small WEEE, though distributors with a larger selling area will have such an obligation.</p> |
| <p>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</p> | <p>The main objectives of the Commission proposal were to improve coherence with existing EU legislation (e.g. Waste Framework Directive), to enhance the implementation and enforcement of current provisions in order to achieve better results concerning especially the collection of WEEE and to lessen the administrative burden on businesses.</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>The overall cost savings from harmonised registration and reporting was estimated to €66.3 million</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Adopted by the Legislator on 4 July 2012</i> • <i>Directive 2012/19</i> | <p>Legal Act</p> |
| <p>Outcome of Legislative Procedure</p> | <p>Negotiations between Parliament, Council and Commission resulted in a compromise which contained a national approach to producer obligations as demanded by the Council, however coupled with</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>harmonisation elements on registration and reporting. With these elements, the recast WEEE Directive 2012/19/EU is expected to cut unnecessary burdens substantially. Proportionally, SMEs are presumed to benefit the most.</p> <p>While the recast WEEE Directive (Article 5(2)c) foresees an obligation for distributors to provide for the collection of very small WEEE free of charge to end-users and with no obligation to buy EEE of an equivalent type, small shops (with a sales surface of up to 400 square metres) are exempt from this obligation to protect them from disproportionate costs.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>The Commission's proposal for one single registration for all EU obligations, with interoperability and data-transfer between Member State producer registers was not maintained by the legislator, the associated simplification benefits could therefore not be realized. No specific quantified update of the estimated savings was performed.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Application on 14 February 2014</i> • <i>Transposition Deadline 14 February 2014</i> • <i>Evaluation Planned for XX</i> | <p>Implementation</p> |
| <i>Implementation reported by Member States</i> | <p>A number of Member States were late in transposing the Directive. The year 2016 is the first year of implementation in all 28 Member States.</p> <p>The first report by Member States shall cover the period from 14 February 2014 to 31 December 2015. The reports shall be made available to the Commission by 30 September 2016. Information on implementation is therefore currently being processed.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>Information not available.</p> <p>The first implementation reports from MS were submitted by the end of September 2016. Their analysis will provide information on the savings from the implementation of the SME exemption for</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>take-back obligations.</p> <p>The introduction in the recast WEEE Directive (Article 16(3)) of the request to the Commission to adopt an implementing act establishing the format for registration and reporting and the frequency of reporting to the register, is expected to reduce administrative burdens substantially, especially for producers active in more than one Member State. The adoption of the implementing act is expected at the end of 2017. Not specific information on the savings from the adoption of the implementing act is available.</p> |
|--|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned for 2017 (CWP 2017) | <p>Implementing act on a standard format and frequency of reporting</p> |
| <p>Which REFIT objective(s) will the Commission pursue?</p> | <p>Legislative - Implementing act on a standard format and frequency of reporting.</p> <p>Input of the REFIT Platform:</p> <p>In its opinion on Waste electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE) the REFIT Platform recommends that the Commission take action in order to implement a common harmonised reporting and registration system that takes enforcement and manageability into account without adding unnecessary burden on the Member States. The Platform further specifies that this action should be carried out in time for allowing implementation by mid-2018.</p> <p>The Opinion confirms the evidence gathered by the European Commission and reinforces the need for action. On the basis of the Platform Opinion and other evidence gathered, the Commission is planning further simplification and development of reporting and registration arrangements for in the first half of 2017. This time schedule will give to Member States the time to adapt (if needed) the existing national registration systems by mid-2018.</p> |
| <p>Which other objectives will the Commission pursue?</p> | <p>Information not yet available.</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>Information not yet available.</p> |

Shipments of waste

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>Overall State of Play</i></p> <p><i>Proposal 2013</i></p> <p><i>Legal Act 2014</i></p> <p><i>Date of application: 1 January 2016</i></p> <p><i>Savings on the ground exceeded estimations</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The initiative should lead to a reduction in administrative costs by companies and public administrations in the management of waste shipments and at the same time allow for increased repatriation of illegal waste shipments.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Savings were estimated in 2010 at EUR 44 million corresponding to 50% of the administrative baseline burden.</p> <p>These savings were confirmed in legislative procedure. Member States feedback on implementation in spring 2015 showed cost reductions beyond those initially estimated by the Commission totalling up to 70% of the administrative baseline burden for 5 Member States.</p> <p>The evaluation of the Waste Shipment Regulation to be carried out by 2018-19 will assess whether the WSR generates any unnecessary administrative or technical barriers.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Adopted by the Commission on 11/07/2013</i> • <i>COM(2013)516</i> | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p><i>Which REFIT objectives did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>Proposal of a mandatory electronic data interchange between national authorities and operators for waste shipments in order to reduce administrative burden and costs associated with the management of waste shipments and the repatriation of illegal waste shipments.</p> |
| <p><i>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>Strengthen the provisions regarding the enforcement of rules and inspections covered by Regulation (EC) No 1013/2006 with a view to ensuring regular and consistent planning of inspections.</p> <p>Introduce the possibility for competent authorities in Member States to require evidence from waste exporters in order to check the legality of shipments.</p> <p>The initiative should help ensure a more uniform implementation of the Regulation with a focus on problematic waste streams, It should also facilitate the access to raw materials.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>In 2010, the High Level Group of Independent Stakeholders on Administrative Burden estimated that the introduction of an appropriate e-Government system to replace the manual processing of the large amounts of notification and movement documents throughout the Union could generate annual savings of up to €44 million.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Adopted by the Legislator on 15 May 2014</i></p> <p><i>Reference Regulation (EU) No 660/2014</i></p> | <p>Legal Act</p> |
| <p><i>Debate in Legislative Procedure</i></p> | <p>Parliament proposed a mandatory electronic data interchange for the submission of waste shipment related documents, as soon as the relevant technical and organisational requirements have been</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>adopted.</p> <p>The Council rejected the introduction of a mandatory electronic data interchange as Member States prefer to continue with an optional approach. However, the Council proposed that the Commission adopts implementing acts establishing the technical and organisational requirements for an electronic data interchange if this proves to be feasible.</p> |
| <i>Outcome of Legislative Procedure</i> | <p>In order to reach a final agreement, the institutions accepted the position of the Council with some minor modifications. Administrative burden is potentially increased due to the new right of competent authorities to require evidence from waste exporters. This improves the likelihood that the environment objectives of the measure will be attained, albeit at increased cost. The possibility of a system of voluntary electronic exchange of data proposed by the Commission to reduce administrative burden is put back to the time when the Commission can confirm the practical arrangements for such a system. The introduction of a mandatory system, supported by Parliament, would seem possible only after the voluntary system had proven its worth.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>Estimated savings were not updated following the legislative procedure.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Application on 1 January 2016</i></p> <p><i>Date of application:</i> 12/07/2007</p> <p><i>Evaluation Planned for</i> 2018-2019</p> | Implementation |
| <i>Implementation reported by Member States</i> | <p>In 2014, Member States reported that 11 Member States had fully implemented the simplification requirement, while 9 Member States had not implemented it. In view of the planned review of the Waste Shipment Regulation an evaluation is planned for 2018-2019.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>In Member States where these measures were already implemented, analysis in 2014 showed cost reductions beyond those estimated by the Commission.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | The costs and benefits associated with the implementation of the Waste Shipment Regulation for the different stakeholders, at local, national and EU level will be measured in the context of the evaluation planned for 2018-2019. |
|--|---|

Export for recovery of non-hazardous waste

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>Overall State of Play</i> <i>Commission Regulation adopted 2014</i> <i>Evaluation scheduled for 2018</i> | Summary |
| Summary: | <p>The periodic updates according to Art. 37 of the Waste Shipment Regulation were intended to ensure that EU legislation on exports to certain non-OECD countries of non-hazardous waste (Regulation (EC) 1418/2007) is consistent with provisions for import of such waste in these countries. This prevents EU exports being shipped but then rejected in a third country and facilitates smooth trading relationships. Furthermore it avoids the export of certain non-hazardous waste to countries that are not able to process such waste, thus reducing the risk of environmental damage.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>No assessment has been made of monetary savings, but the increased consistency has reduced the possibility of commercial losses due to inconsistencies between EU export and third country import rules.</p> <p>Regulatory Costs and benefits will be assessed as part of the evaluation of Regulation (EC) 1013/2006 (Waste Shipment Regulation) planned for 2018.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <p>Commission Regulation 733/2014</p> <p>adopted on 24 June 2014</p> | <p>Legal Act</p> |
| <p>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</p> | <p>Reduced administrative burden coming from the update and streamline of Regulation 1418/2007 in relation with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensuring legal certainty for economic operators exporting non-hazardous waste from the EU to partner countries; • minimising error-risk |
| <p>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</p> | <p>Periodical update of Commission Regulation (EC) No 1418/2007 on exports to certain non-OECD countries of non-hazardous waste as required by Regulation (EC) No 1013/2006, on the basis of information submitted by partner countries.</p> <p>This update was carried out through Commission Regulation (EU) No 733/2014 of 24 June 2014.</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>Savings have not been estimated. Regulatory Costs and benefits will be assessed as part of the evaluation of Regulation (EC) 1013/2006 (Waste Shipment Regulation) planned for 2018.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <p>Application on 18th July 2014</p> <p>Evaluation Planned for 2018</p> | <p>Implementation</p> |
| <p>Implementation reported by MemberStates</p> | <p>Implementation reporting is made annually in the framework of the general Waste Shipment Regulation..</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>Regulatory Costs and benefits will be assessed as part of the evaluation of Regulation (EC) 1013/2006 (Waste Shipment Regulation) planned for 2018.</p> |

Environmental impact assessment (EIA)

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>Overall State of Play</i></p> <p>Proposal in 2012</p> <p>Legal act in 2014</p> <p>Application in May 2017</p> <p>Annual savings of up to € 26.7 million estimated</p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The initiative lightens unnecessary administrative burdens and makes it easier to identify and assess potential significant impacts, without weakening existing environmental safeguards. The quality of the decision-making process is reinforced, current levels of environmental protection will be improved, and businesses should enjoy a more harmonised regulatory framework.</p> <p>The changes are forward looking, and emerging challenges that are important to the EU as a whole in areas like resource efficiency, climate change, biodiversity and disaster prevention are reflected in the assessment process.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The estimated annual direct savings of this initiative amount to € 4.3 to 5.3 million (Member States authorities) and € 21.4 million (developers). These direct savings were confirmed in the legislative process.</p> <p>Direct administrative savings further to the one-stop shop are expected less than 1% with regard to the baseline scenario, due to its non-mandatory character imposed by the co-legislators.</p> <p>Wider socio-economic benefits (in terms of competitiveness, internal market and decrease in costs on delays) are equally likely to be reduced due to amendments in the legislative process (non-mandatory character of one-stop shop, no mandatory scoping and refusal to harmonise all time-frames at EU level).</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Adopted by the Commission on 26/10/2012</i></p> <p><i>Ref COM(2012)628</i></p> | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p><i>Which purpose did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>The Directive simplifies existing procedures mainly through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the establishment of a mandatory one-stop shop with a view to streamlining the various environmental assessments (resulting from Directives on Nature, water, SEA...). • the introduction of time-frames for specific stages of the EIA process. • the simplification of the screening process. • the introduction of mandatory scoping. |
| <p><i>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>The Directive on Environmental Impact Assessment aims to provide a high level of protection of the environment and to contribute to the integration of environmental considerations into the preparation of projects, plans and programmes with a view to reduce their environmental impact.</p> <p>The Directive ensures public participation in decision-making and thereby strengthens the quality of decisions. The projects and programmes co-financed by the EU (Cohesion, Agricultural and Fisheries Policies) have to comply with the EIA Directive to receive approval for financial assistance.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The above changes should lead to direct administrative savings for Member States' authorities of € 4.3 to 5.3 million and to developers of € 21.4 million per year.</p> <p>In addition, regulatory benefits would be increased in terms of competitiveness in the internal market and in terms of a decrease in costs on delays.</p> |

| | |
|---|-------------------------|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Adopted by the Legislator</i></p> | <p>Legal Act</p> |
|---|-------------------------|

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>on 16 April 2014</i></p> <p><i>Reference Directive</i> <i>2014/52/EU</i></p> | |
| <p><i>Outcome of Legislative Procedure</i></p> | <p>Compared to the proposal, the adopted directive has not retained some important elements for the efficiency objective of the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - specific time-frames for some steps of the decision-making to be set at EU level (especially maximum time-frames) could not be agreed although they would have made the EIA process more streamlined and efficient and would have provided better legal certainty to industry and business; - mandatory scoping was rejected; - The scope of the one-stop shop was limited to the EIA and the Nature Directives (for other Directives, the one-stop shop is only voluntary). In addition, Member States have a margin for discretion to use the one-stop shop; The legislators vested an obligation to the Commission to provide a guidance regarding the setting of any coordinated or joint procedures for projects (streamlining) that are simultaneously subject to assessments under the EIA Directive and the Habitats, Birds, Water Framework and Industrial Emissions Directives. The Commission published the guidance document in the form of a Commission notice on 27.07.2016, OJ 27.07.2016, C 273. |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The direct annual administrative savings for authorities [€ 4.3 to 5.3 million] and developers [€ 21.4 million] are expected to remain.</p> <p>Wider socio-economic benefits (in terms of competitiveness, internal market and decrease in costs on delays) will be more limited (due to the non-mandatory character of one-stop shop, no mandatory scoping and refusal to harmonise all time-frames at EU level) as well as direct administrative savings further to the one-stop shop are expected less than 1% with regard to the baseline scenario, due to its non-mandatory character.</p> |

| | |
|--|------------------------------|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Application on 16 May 2017</i></p> | <p>Implémentation</p> |
|--|------------------------------|

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>Transposition Deadline 16 May 2017</i></p> <p><i>Evaluation Planned for 2024</i></p> | |
| <p><i>Implementation reported by Member States</i></p> | <p>No implementation report foreseen by the Directive.</p> <p>According to the revised Article 12(2), every six years from 16 May 2017, Member States shall inform the Commission, where such data are available, of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the number of projects referred to in Annexes I and II made subject to an environmental impact assessment in accordance with Articles 5 to 10; (b) the breakdown of environmental impact assessments according to the project categories set out in Annexes I and II; (c) the number of projects referred to in Annex II made subject to a determination in accordance with Article 4(2); (d) the average duration of the environmental impact assessment process; (e) general estimates on the average direct costs of environmental impact assessments, including the impact from the application of this Directive to SMEs. |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Impacts will be assessed through an evaluation planned in 2024.</p> |

EMAS and EU Eco-label

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>Overall State of Play</i></p> <p><i>Fitness Check due for Completion Q4/2016</i></p> <p><i>Follow-Up not yet determined</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary</i></p> | <p>The purpose of this initiative is to analyse the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and the EU added value of the EU Ecolabel and EMAS regulations including possible coherence issues and to evaluate and assess the contribution to competitiveness, sustainable consumption and production. In doing so, the fitness check will assess if these regulations are fit for purpose, whether the objectives of these regulations have been met and whether implementation has been done in a cost-effective way.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Information not yet available.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <i>Expected to be finalised in Q4 2016</i> | Fitness Check |
| <i>Scope:</i> | Fitness Check of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regulation (EC) No 1221/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 November 2009 on the voluntary participation by organisations in a Community eco-management and audit scheme (EMAS) • Regulation 66/2010 of the European Parliament and the Council on the EU Ecolabel |
| <i>Evaluation findings:</i> | Expected Q4 2016. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Expected Q4 2016 |

Environmental liability

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>Overall State of Play</i></p> <p><i>Evaluation finalised in 2016</i></p> <p><i>Follow-Up through a Multiannual Rolling Programme</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The evaluation showed that the Environmental Liability Directive (ELD) improved the situation of environmental liability in the EU, at the same time implementation varies significantly between Member States and data on implementation is missing.</p> <p>The Commission will propose a multi-annual rolling work programme to Member States' experts and stakeholders in order to improve the evidence base and help align national solutions.</p> <p>Moreover, the Commission will continue to provide administrative support measures.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Remediation costs for operators average around EUR 42,000 for one environmental liability case if five major cases exceeding EUR 1 million are disregarded. The environmental benefits should according to the applicable economic valuing and equivalency analysis correspond to the remedial and prevention costs.</p> <p>Concrete data regarding benefits, other than the figures on prevented and remedied environmental damage is difficult to draw. The evaluation confirmed that the principle that precaution and prevention helps to avoid remediation costs works.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Finalised in 2016</i></p> <p><i>COM/2016/0204</i></p> <p><i>SWD(2016) 121</i> <i>{SWD(2016) 122</i></p> | <p>Evaluation</p> |
| <p><i>Scope:</i></p> | <p>Evaluation of Directive 2004/35/EC on environmental liability with regard to the prevention and remedying of environmental damage (ELD)</p> |
| <p><i>Evaluation findings:</i></p> | <p>The key findings emerging from this report are that the Directive has improved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the standards of prevention and restoration of environmental damage, • the application of the ‘polluter pays’ principle, • strict liability across the EU for environmental damage, • EU-wide liability for biodiversity damage, and • public participation and access to justice for people affected and NGOs. <p>At the same time, implementation still varies significantly from one Member State to another in terms of the number of ELD cases and the way the Directive is implemented. The observed ‘patchwork’ of environmental remediation, together with the lack of some key data on implementation and on the cost (both administrative and financial security), is a major challenge.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Remediation costs for operators: The total costs of remediation in the EU within the reporting period 2007 – 2013 amounted to around EUR 6 million without five major losses, and EUR 180 million if the five major instances are included. The remediation costs turn on the average for one environmental liability case around EUR 42,000, if the five cases exceeding EUR 1 million are disregarded. The environmental benefits should according to the applicable economic valuing and equivalency analysis correspond to the remedial and prevention costs.</p> <p>Administrative costs for authorities: Only a few Member States provided information and data on administrative costs: The Flemish Region of Belgium indicated EUR 55,000/year (gross) of annual administrative costs, Bulgaria EUR 135,613 per year (265,975 Bulgarian Lev) and Spain overall EUR 20,000 per year in staff costs, and between EUR 684,000 and EUR 2 million of</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | administrative costs of the autonomous communities and cities in Spain. |
|--|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <i>Follow-up through a Multi annual Rolling Work Programme</i> | Commission Follow-Up |
| <i>Follow-Up by the Commission:</i> | <p>The Commission will propose a <u>multi-annual rolling work programme</u> to Member States' experts and stakeholders in order to improve the evidence base and help align national solutions.</p> <p>Moreover, the Commission will continue to provide <u>administrative support measures</u>, such as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) guidance or interpretative notices on key issues ('significance'); (b) training programmes; and (c) helpdesks for practitioners (covering competent authorities, operators, loss adjusters, financial security providers, affected individuals, NGOs, etc.) providing information, assistance and assessment support for risk and damage evaluations. |
| <i>Follow-Up by Member States:</i> | <p>To complement these efforts, the Commission recommends that all Member States undertake to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • support their implementation efforts with proactive initiatives (such as guidance documents, training, electronic tools for risk analysis, baseline setting, financial security models etc.) as some Member States have done already; • exchange administrative experiences and best practices and support each other in capacity-building efforts; • review their interpretation of key provisions of the Directive, in particular in relation to 'significance'; • record data on ELD incidents and publish ELD registers if they have not done so already; • systematically gather the necessary data that can document that the application of the Directive in their country is effective, efficient and in line with the overall situation in the EU. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Follow-Up by the Commission and by Member States will improve implementation and impacts of the ELD and gather the necessary data for the next evaluation which should focus on assessing EU added value, efficiency and effectiveness of the Directive and on the quantification of regulatory costs and benefits. |

| | |
|--|---|
| | A follow-up evaluation is planned for 2021 to 2023 (i.e. the adoption of the next REFIT evaluation is planned between five to seven years after the adoption of the first REFIT evaluation of 2016) |
|--|---|

Infrastructure for Spatial Information (INSPIRE)

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>Overall State of Play</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Evaluation completed 20 July 2016</i> • <i>Follow-Up Actions determined</i> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p>Summary:</p> | <p>The evaluation showed that greater effort at all levels by all actors is needed. To this end, the Commission proposes a number of actions for both Member States and at EU level.</p> <p>This includes a requirement for Member States to step up their efforts in implementation (e.g. on their coordination activities) and review of the effectiveness of their data policies.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The implementation costs reported in the evaluation varied from 0.5 to 13.5 million €/year with most Member States reporting between 2 to 3 million €/year. In most cases this is below the original estimates which ranged from 4 to 8 million €/year in the initial impact assessment.</p> <p>On benefits, Member States reported mostly in qualitative terms. They generally consider that benefits are yet to be fully realised but that they are starting to emerge in terms of improved data access, better cooperation across the public sector, skills and capacity building, less duplication of work, improved information for supporting environmental policy, better e-government services to citizens and business.</p> <p>A few Member States reported quantitative impact assessments, presenting estimates of future benefits.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Finalised 20 July 2016</i> • <i>COM(2016)478, SWD(2016) 243, SWD(2016) 273</i> | <p>Evaluation</p> |
| <p>Scope:</p> | <p>Evaluation of Directive 2007/2/EC establishing an Infrastructure for Spatial Information in the European Community (INSPIRE)</p> |
| <p>Evaluation findings:</p> | <p>The evaluation of the INSPIRE Directive confirms that the overall relevance of the Directive to meeting policy needs in an efficient manner remains high, and is expected to increase with time, given the drive towards a digital economy as set out by the Digital Single Market strategy which includes important elements of the Directive.</p> <p>Good progress in implementation been made in only the few Member States where the necessary investments were made and implementation of the Directive was aligned with wider national action on open data policies and better eGovernment services. The implementation gaps identified are significant and result from accumulated delays in the process, underlining the differences in speed and quality of implementation.</p> <p>As a result, overall effectiveness has suffered. In particular, the significant remaining obstacles created by the data policies in many countries impede effective progress and perpetuate the administrative burden because data cannot be easily shared between administrations. Nonetheless, some Member States have shown that the process is possible and report positively on the resultant benefits, if only in qualitative terms.</p> <p>This is confirmed by the evaluation of efficiency from front-runner Member States that invested in implementation early on, developed more open data policies and aligned the INSPIRE Directive with their national priorities on open data and the drive for eGovernment. Upfront costs however are higher than benefits since data will have to be made available in the required ways first before being used for end-user applications. Many Member States made insufficient investments, probably because of the economic crisis.</p> <p>The evaluation of coherence has uncovered areas needing attention, in particular the development of the data policies creating obstacles in the internal (digital) market which is also of relevance to the ‘free flow of data’ initiative.</p> <p>Finally, future EU added value can be significant. Addressing the above-mentioned issues and focusing on end-user needs and applications in a cross-border and EU context can assist implementation and help prioritise resources and investments.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The evaluation estimated specific regulatory benefits and costs.</p> <p>The reported implementation costs varied from 0.5 to 13.5 million €/year with most Member States reporting between 2 to 3 million €/year. In most cases this is below the original estimates which ranged from 4 to 8 million €/year in the initial impact assessment.</p> <p>The administrative burden relate to the monitoring or reporting obligations under INSPIRE. Four countries(FI, LT, SE, SK) provided estimates of the financial costs of monitoring and reporting combined. SE reported 0.75% (mio€ 0,033 of 4,7, LT 0,9% (mio€ 0,045 of 0.4975) , FI 4% (mio€ 0,067 of 1.63) of the implementation cost. This indicates that the administrative burden appears to be low. Overall, these administrative costs identified for the implementation of the INSPIRE are far lower than the benefits and administrative cost savings that can be achieved through a modern and shared spatial data infrastructure.</p> <p>On benefits, Member States reported mostly in qualitative terms. They generally consider that benefits are yet to be fully realised but that they are starting to emerge in terms of improved data access, better cooperation across the public sector, skills and capacity building, less duplication of work, improved information for supporting environmental policy, better e-government services to citizens and business.</p> <p>A few Member States¹⁴³ reported quantitative impact assessments, presenting estimates of future benefits.</p> |
|---|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>State of play</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Non-legislative follow-up planned for 2017</i> | <p>Commission Follow-Up</p> |
| <p><i>Follow-Up by the Commission:</i></p> | <p>The Commission proposes a number of actions at EU level and at Member State level to improve implementation and impact of INSPIRE.</p> <p>The Commission will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. evaluate the shortcomings of the national data policies in relation to Article 17 of the Directive in more detail and explore synergies with the ‘free flow of data’ initiative under the Digital Single Market with the view to resolving these issues through that; |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>B. review, and possibly revise, the INSPIRE rules, in particular on spatial data harmonisation, to take into account the implementing risks and complexities with a view to reducing them (simplifying requirements);</p> <p>C. assist the Member States in applying and implementing the INSPIRE Directive (simplification of use), e.g. by the use of common tools, and promote priority setting together with the Member States.</p> <p>D. work closely with Member States to explore opportunities arising from the use of existing EU-level funding programmes to help capacity building and close the INSPIRE implementation gaps (e.g. through the Interoperability Solutions Administrations).</p> <p>Other actions in the context of the Digital Single Market will also contribute to implementing the INSPIRE Directive (e.g. the eGovernment Action Plan and the European Interoperability Framework). The Commission together with the Member States will also promote the inclusion of INSPIRE services and data harmonisation in relevant EU initiatives (e.g. Copernicus, Horizon 2020), Commission departments, European agencies and international partners to the EU.</p> <p>These and other relevant actions will be discussed between the Commission departments, assisted by the European Environment Agency and the Member States in the context of the ongoing INSPIRE Maintenance and Implementation Framework following the adoption of this report. "</p> <p>As a result of these discussions, the Commission will propose a multi-annual rolling work programme to Member States' experts and stakeholders in order to implement the proposed actions.</p> |
| <i>Follow-Up by Member States:</i> | <p>Member States should step up their efforts in implementing (e.g. on their coordination activities) and critically reviewing the effectiveness of their data policies. This applies in particular to those Member States lagging behind the most if they are to meet future implementation deadlines. In addition, Member States, in consultation with the Commission, are recommended to:</p> <p>1)give priority to environmental spatial datasets, in particular those linked to monitoring and reporting, and those identified in relevant global processes.</p> <p>2)improve coordination between the national INSPIRE implementation and eGovernment, open data and other relevant processes at national level.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and</i> | <p>Follow-Up by the Commission and by Member States will improve implementation and impacts of INSPIRE and gather the necessary</p> |

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| <i>benefits</i> | <p>data for the next evaluation which should focus on assessing EU added value, efficiency and effectiveness of the Directive and on the quantification of regulatory costs and benefits.</p> <p>A follow-up evaluation is planned for 2021</p> |
|------------------------|---|

Environmental Noise

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>Overall State of Play</i> <i>Evaluation to be finalised</i> <i>Q4 2016</i> | Summary |
| <i>Summary:</i> | The Commission is evaluating Directive 2002/49/EC relating to the assessment and management of environmental noise, the results of this evaluation should be available before the end of 2016. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Expected 2017 |

Volatile organic compound emissions - Stage I and Stage II - Petrol Vapour Recovery (VOCs)

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>Overall State of Play</i></p> <p><i>Evaluations scheduled for completion Q4 2016</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p>Summary:</p> | <p>The Commission is evaluating Directive 94/63/EC on the control of volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions resulting from the storage of petrol and its distribution from terminals to service stations and Directive 2009/126/EC on Stage II petrol vapour recovery during refuelling of motor vehicles at service stations. The results of these evaluations should be available before the end of 2016.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation of Directive 94/63/EC on the control of volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions resulting from the storage of petrol and its distribution from terminals to service stations. • Evaluation of Directive 2009/126/EC on Stage II petrol vapour recovery during refuelling of motor vehicles at service stations |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Expected Q4 2016</p> |

Protection of animals used for scientific purposes

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>Overall State of Play</i> <i>Review Report to be finalised Q4 2017</i> <i>Evaluation scheduled for 2019</i> | Summary |
| <i>Summary:</i> | A review is ongoing. Due to the relatively early timing of the review and the partly delayed transposition into certain national legislations of the Member States (last national legislation adopted only in May 2015), there is only limited experience of the Directive. It is unlikely that the Directive's projected benefits, especially in terms of improved welfare and science, will have fully materialised. Therefore, the focus of the review is on assessing the impacts of the Directive on the basis of preliminary findings in selected targeted areas. A full evaluation will then be carried out in 2019. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Expected to be finalised in Q4 2017</i></p> | <p>Evaluation – review report</p> |
| <p><i>Scope:</i></p> | <p>Report on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directive 2010/63/EU on the Protection of Animals used for Scientific Purposes <p>The Directive took full effect in 2013 with national transposing measures pending for some Member States in the beginning of 2015.</p> <p>As this initiative precedes the submission of data from Member States to feed into the implementation report due in 2019, the focus of this report will in particular be on scientific progress and whether there are any emerging problems with implementation impacting negatively on science or animal welfare. It will also be informed by the European Citizens Initiative.</p> <p>An evaluation is scheduled for 2019.</p> |
| <p><i>Evaluation findings:</i></p> | <p>Expected Q4 2017.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>An evaluation is planned in 2019.</p> |

Wild animals in zoos

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>Overall State of Play</i> <i>Evaluation expected to complete Q4 2017</i> | Summary |
| <i>Summary:</i> | The Commission is evaluating Directive 1999/22/EC relating to the keeping of wild animals in zoos. The result of this evaluation should be available Q4 2017. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Expected Q4 2017 |

Flood risks

| <i>Overall State of Play Evaluation Planned for 2018</i> | Summary |
|---|---|
| <i>Summary:</i> | The Commission will carry-out in 2018 an evaluation of Directive 2007/60/EC on the assessment and management of flood risks. The objective of the Directive is the establishment of a framework for measures to reduce the risks of flood damage. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Expected in 2018 |

Bathing water

| <i>Overall State of Play</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>Evaluation planned for 2019</i> | Summary |
|--|--|
| <i>Summary:</i> | The Commission is planning to evaluate Directive 2006/7/EC on bathing. The result of this evaluation should be available by the end of 2019. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Expected in 2019 |

Marine environment policy

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>Overall State of Play</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Evaluation planned for 2019</i> | Summary |
| <i>Summary:</i> | The Commission is planning to evaluate Directive 2008/56/EC on marine environment policy. The result of this evaluation should be available by the end of 2019. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Expected in 2019 |

Initiatives in the area of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries

Reform of the Common Fisheries Policy

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Overall state of Play</p> <p><i>Proposal adopted on 13 July 2011</i></p> <p><i>Legal act adopted on 11 December 2013</i></p> <p><i>It applies with effect from 1 January 2014</i></p> <p><i>Evaluation Planned for 2020</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p>Summary:</p> | <p>In 2011 a major reform of the EU Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) started which continues efforts to simplify and reduce unnecessary burdens.</p> <p>The proposed simplification objectives were generally supported by the European Parliament and the Council and achieved with no significant variations from the Commission proposal.</p> <p>Major benefits are 1) the simplification of the implementation procedures of the Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) covering from conservation of marine biological resources through market organisation to aquaculture; 2) switch-over from a common to a regional approach of fisheries management (regionalisation) that aims to reduce regulatory burden and increase flexibility, acceptance and ownership by operators and thus better compliance; 3) the simplification of the acquis by integrating in the CFP Regulation the measures on conservation and sustainable exploitation of fisheries resources, the measures on the management of fishing fleets registered in the Community outermost regions and the measures concerning the Regional Advisory Councils.</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>Due to the limited availability of data, the savings could not be quantified. Simplification and reduction of administrative burden were therefore analysed qualitatively.</p> <p>Actual savings will be assessed in the evaluation of the CFP that is planned for 2020.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Proposal adopted on 13 July 2011</i></p> <p><i>COM(2011)425</i></p> | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p><i>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p><u>Simplify the implementation procedures of the Common Fisheries Policy (CFP)</u> covering from conservation of marine biological resources through market organisation to aquaculture.</p> <p><u>Introduce a regional</u> approach to management. Decentralisation and empowerment of stakeholders is expected to increase compliance. The Regulation will set the general principles, overall targets and timeframes, Member States will decide, in cooperation with the local industry, the measures to achieve targets on deadline. This approach will reduce regulatory burden and increase flexibility, acceptance and ownership by operators and thus better compliance.</p> <p><u>Simplify the acquis</u> by integrating in the CFP Regulation the measures on conservation and sustainable exploitation of fisheries resources, the measures on the management of fishing fleets registered in the Community outermost regions; the measures concerning the Regional Advisory Councils; and the Data collection framework (the integration of the latter was not retained in the adopted text).</p> |
| <p><i>Which other objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>To ensure that fishing and aquaculture activities provide long-term sustainable environmental, economic and social conditions and contribute to the availability of food supplies;</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Due to the limited availability of data, the savings could not be quantified. Simplification and reduction of administrative burden were therefore analysed qualitatively.</p> |

| | |
|--|-------------------------|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Adopted by the Legislator on 11 December 2013</i> Regulation (EU) No 1380/2013 | <p>Legal Act</p> |
|--|-------------------------|

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>Outcome of Legislative Procedure</i> | The proposed simplification objectives were achieved with no significant variations from the Commission proposal. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Costs and benefits will be assessed in the evaluation of the CFP that is planned for 2020 |

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>It applies with effect from 1 January 2014 – Regulation (EU) No 1380/2013</i> • <i>Transposition Deadline N/A as it falls under exclusive competence</i> • <i>Evaluation Planned for 2020</i> | Implementation |
| <i>Implementation reported by Member States</i> | <p>Report on the balance between the fishing capacity of their fleets and their fishing opportunities (Article 22) are issued every year since March 2015.</p> <p>Yearly report on the execution of Member States national data collection programmes (Article 25) is also issued.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

Common market organisation in fishery and aquaculture

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>Overall state of Play</i></p> <p><i>Adopted</i></p> <p><i>Proposal adopted on 13 July 2011</i></p> <p><i>Legal act adopted on 11 December 2013</i></p> <p><i>Applies with effect from 1 January 2014</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>As part of the Reform package of the CFP, it reduced 27 legal acts (four Council Regulations and 23 Commission implementing Regulations) to 3 legal Acts (1 co-decided Regulation and 2 implementing acts).</p> <p>The yearly Regulations fixing the parameters for the operation of the intervention mechanisms (i.e. one Council Regulation and 6 Commission implementing Regulations) have been abolished. The 6 intervention mechanisms have been reduced to a single storage one that has strongly reduced the notification and reporting obligations for both Member States and producer organisations.</p> <p>The CMO instruments is financed now by a single fund, the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) instead of the European Agricultural Guarantee Fund (EAGF) and the European Fisheries Fund (EFF).</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Due to the limited availability of data, savings could not be quantified. Simplification and reduction of administrative burden were analysed qualitatively in 2011.</p> <p>Actual savings will be assessed within the evaluation of the CFP that is planned for 2020.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Proposal adopted on 13 July 2011</i></p> <p><i>COM(2011)416</i></p> | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p><i>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>As part of the Reform package of the CFP, it reduces 27 legal acts (four Council Regulations and 23 Commission implementing Regulations) to 3 legal Acts (1 co-decided Regulation and 2 implementing acts).</p> <p>The yearly Regulations fixing the parameters for the operation of the intervention mechanisms (i.e. one Council Regulation and 6 Commission implementing Regulations) are abolished. The 6 intervention mechanisms are reduced to a single storage one. This strongly reduces the notification and reporting obligations for both Member States and producer organisations.</p> <p>The CMO instruments will be financed by a single fund (the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund) instead of the current European Agricultural Guarantee Fund and the European Fisheries Fund.</p> |
| <p><i>Which other objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>To ensure that the common organisation of the common markets for fisheries and aquaculture products contributes to achieving the objectives of the new CFP. It aims to strengthen the competitiveness of the EU industry, improve the transparency of the markets, and ensure a level playing field for all products marketed in the Union.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Due to the limited availability of data, the estimated savings could not be quantified. Simplification and reduction of administrative burden were analysed qualitatively.</p> |

| | |
|--|-------------------------|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Adopted by the Legislator on 11 December 2013</i></p> <p><i>Reference Regulation (EU) No 1379/2013</i></p> | <p>Legal Act</p> |
|--|-------------------------|

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>Outcome of Legislative Procedure</i> | <p>The Regulation contributes to a major simplification of the acquis by integrating 27 legal acts (four Council Regulations and 23 Commission implementing Regulations) into 3 legal Acts (1 co-decided Regulation and 2 implementing acts).</p> <p>In addition, the yearly Regulations fixing the parameters for the operation of the intervention mechanisms (i.e. one Council Regulation and 6 Commission implementing Regulations) have been repealed and the 6 intervention mechanisms are reduced to a single storage one. This increases transparency and despite the new information obligation on fishing gears introduced by the co legislator, the new Regulation strongly reduces the notification and reporting obligations for both Member States and producer organisations as proposed by the Commission. Therefore, the major burden reductions sought by the Commission were achieved, with only a relatively small addition of an information obligation introduced by Parliament.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | No update was performed. |

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <i>Applies with effect from 1 January 2014</i> <i>Transposition Deadline N/A as to it falls under exclusive competence</i> <i>Evaluation Planned for 2020 (as part of the CFP evaluation)</i> | Implementation <p>Application: 1 January 2014, with the exception of Chapter IV on consumer information and Article 45 (Amendments to Regulation (EC) No 1224/2009 'the control regulation') which shall apply from 13 December 2014</p> |
| <i>Implementation reported by Member States</i> | N/A |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Savings will be assessed during the evaluation planned in 2020. |

Technical Measures for the Protection of Marine Organisms

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>Overall state of Play</i></p> <p><i>Proposal adopted on 11 March 2016</i></p> <p><i>Pending in legislative procedure</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary</i></p> | <p>Across all Union sea basins and non-Union waters in which Union vessels operate there are currently more than 30 regulations which contain technical measures. The evaluation of the existing technical measures regulations showed that the current technical measures are overly complex and have been largely ineffective. They do not have clear, well-defined objectives and targets nor do they provide positive incentives which reward responsible practices and incentivise compliance. Control of the measures is costly and the governance structure they operate in currently is inflexible and very much top-down with limited consultation with stakeholders.</p> <p>The commission proposal aims at simplifying the framework of technical measures in the context of the reform of the CFP and making it more effective, by integrating the different technical measures regulations in an overall regulation and implementing rules per sea-basins.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Due to the limited availability of data, the savings could not be quantified. Simplification and reduction of administrative burden were therefore extensively analysed qualitatively but without specific quantitative estimates.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Adopted on 11 March 2016</i></p> <p>COM(2016) 134</p> | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p><i>Which REFIT objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>To develop a new simplified technical measures framework in the context of the reform of the CFP. Integrating the different technical measures regulations in an overall regulation and implementing rules per sea-basins. A similar integration was achieved as regards control in 2009 with dispersed control provisions being gathered into a single consistent instrument. Control techniques will evolve in line with technological developments.</p> <p>The new landing obligation requires existing legal and practical impediments to be removed while the new framework is being developed, the proposal for an “Omnibus Regulation” to amend, among other, the existing technical measures as a first step to adapt the “acquis” to the new CFP.</p> |
| <p><i>Which other objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>Optimise the contribution of technical measures to achieving the key objectives of the new CFP, i.e. to ensure the protection and conservation of marine biological resources and the reduction of the impact of fishing activities on fish stocks and on marine eco-systems provisions</p> <p>Create the flexibility required to adjust technical measures by facilitating regionalised approaches (consistent with the objectives in Union law).</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Due to the limited availability of data, the estimated savings could not be quantified. Simplification and reduction of administrative burden were therefore extensively analysed qualitatively, without defining specific quantitative targets.</p> |

Fishing authorisations

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Overall state of Play</p> <p><i>Proposal adopted on 10 December 2015</i></p> <p><i>Pending in legislative procedure</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p>Summary:</p> | <p>Regulation (EC) No1006/2008 on Fishing Authorisation (the ‘FAR’) deals with authorisations of Union vessels to fish outside Union waters and authorisations granted to third country fishing vessels to operate in Union waters. The revision of the FAR aims at clarifying and simplifying the current provisions, in particular in terms of responsibilities at Union, national and operator level, as well as bringing the FAR in line with the Basic Regulation (Common Fisheries Policy) and the Control Regulation. It proposes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Harmonising procedures to grant fishing authorisations, and clear allocation of tasks to the Commission, Member States and ship-owners. - Simplified system that aims to harmonise highly variable data requirements from Member States and improve the control of the external fishing fleets. - Creation of a database managed by the Commission to increase transparency in the activities of fishing vessels and facilitate the communication of fisheries data in a using a unique standard (UN/CEFACT) - Ensured consistency with the IUU (rules to combat illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing) and control legal frameworks; as well as with the objectives of the external dimension of the CFP policy in terms of sustainability and enforcement. - Deterrence of 'abusive reflagging', meaning, changing the flag with the objective of circumventing the laws, and regulating private authorisations between ship-owners and a third country (granted outside FPA). |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>Due to the limited availability of data, the savings could not be quantified. Simplification and reduction of administrative burden were therefore analysed qualitatively without defining specific targets.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Adopted by the Commission on 10 December 2015</i></p> <p><i>COM(2015)636</i></p> | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p><i>Which REFIT objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>Revision of the current Fishing Authorisation Regulation (FAR) to simplify the current system, harmonise highly variable data requirements from Member States and improve the efficiency of sanctions.</p> <p>The proposed Regulation will ensure consistency between the FAR, the IUU (rules to combat illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing) and control legal frameworks; as well as with the objectives of the External Dimension of the CFP policy in terms of sustainability and enforcement.</p> <p>The proposal will also prevent repetitive and abusive reflagging, meaning, changing the flag with the objective of circumventing the laws, and regulate private authorisations (granted outside FPA) and simplify and clarify tasks between the Commission and Member States' authorities.</p> |
| <p><i>Which other objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>Revision of the current Fishing Authorisation Regulation (FAR) to properly address the objectives of the new Common fishery Policy and to provide consistency with the Fisheries Control Regulation</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Due to the limited availability of data, the estimated savings could not be quantified. Simplification and reduction of administrative burden were therefore analysed qualitatively without defining specific targets.</p> |

Fisheries Control Regulation

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>Overall state of Play</i></p> <p><i>Evaluation Ongoing and expected to be finalised by Q4 2016</i></p> <p><i>Follow-Up Planned for 2017</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The Commission carries out an evaluation and plans a proposal to follow-up in 2017.</p> <p>The evaluation of Regulation (EC) No 1224/2009 (hereinafter ‘the Control Regulation’) responds to the legal obligation in Article 118(3) according to which an evaluation of the impact of this Regulation on the Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) shall be undertaken by the Commission five years after the entry into force.</p> <p>Main goal of this evaluation is to get an overview on the current status of implementation of the Control Regulation in the Member States and its overall impact after five years from entry into force.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>To be updated once the SWD is finalised.</p> |

Priority 2: A Connected Digital Single Market

Overview

1. Overview of REFIT Initiatives in the area of Communications Networks, Content and Technology

| | Evaluation | Commission Proposal | Legal Act | Implementation |
|---|---|---|-----------|----------------|
| | | | | |
| Domain Name Regulation | Evaluation planned | Commission proposal Adoption foreseen Q3 2017 | | |
| Legal protection of databases | Evaluation planned | Commission Proposal Adoption foreseen Q3 2017 | | |
| ENISA (European Union Agency for Network and Information Security) | Evaluation Started in October 2016, planned to be finalised by Q2 2017 | Commission Proposal Adoption foreseen end 2017 | | |
| Audiovisual Media Services Directive | Evaluation | Commission Proposal | | |

| | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|---|
| | Finalised Q2 2016 | 25 May 2016 | | |
| CRM | | Commission Proposal 11 July 2012 | Legal Act 26 February 2014 | Implementation Transposition deadline: 10 April 2016 |
| Satellite and Cable Directive 93/83/ECC | Evaluation 14 September 2016 | Commission Proposal 14 September 2016 | | |
| Framework for electronic communications networks and services | Evaluation 14 September 2016 | Commission proposal 14 September 2016 | | |
| Strengthening Network and Information Security | | Commission Proposal 7 February 2013 | Legal Act 06 July 2016 | Implementation Transposition Deadline 9 May 2018 |

2. Overview of REFIT Initiatives in the area of Taxation and Customs Union



Initiatives in the area of Communications Networks, Content and Technology

Domain Name Regulation

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>State of Play</i> <i>Evaluation and proposal planned for 2017</i> | Summary |
| <i>Summary</i> | Over the past decade, the top Level Domain (TLD) market place has undergone significant changes that provide both strategic challenges and opportunities for the .eu top-level domain (TLD). An evaluation of Regulation EC 733/2002 establishing the “.eu” top-level domain (TLD) and Regulation EC 874/2004 laying down public policy rules concerning the implementation and functions of the .eu top Level Domain will be carried out in 2017. Its result will feed the revision of those two Regulations, with the view to update them and ensure that they remain fit-for-purpose. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Not available yet |

Legal protection of databases

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>Overall State of Play</i> <i>Evaluation planned for 2017</i> | Summary |
| <i>Summary</i> | <p>The DSM strategy sets out the Commission's intention to address the emerging issues of ownership, interoperability, usability and access to data in situations such as business-to-business, business to consumer, machine generated and machine-to-machine data. Furthermore it plans to encourage access to public data to help drive innovation.</p> <p>Against this background, the objective of this evaluation will be (i) to assess whether the Directive still fulfils its policy goals of providing protection of databases, including those not protected under copyright, while taking into account users' legitimate interests and (ii) to determine whether the Directive is still adapted in view of the development of new technologies, new business models based on data exploitation, and emerging policy and legal frameworks on data access and ownership in view of the growing importance of data in today's economy.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Not available yet |

ENISA (European Union Agency for Network and Information Security)

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>Overall state of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Evaluation started Oct 2016 (results expected Q2 2017) and proposal planned for end 2017</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary</i></p> | <p>This initiative focuses on the review of Regulation No 526/2013 (ENISA Regulation) that sets out the mandate, objectives and tasks for the European Union Agency for Network and Information Security.</p> <p>ENISA's Regulation (art. 32) requires the Commission to conduct an evaluation of the Agency by June 2018 and, based on its results, to prepare for a possible revision of the current mandate, due to expire in 2020.</p> <p>The EU cybersecurity landscape is rapidly evolving both on the threat side, with the increase in the frequency, sophistication and potential impact of cyber-threats, and on the policy and regulatory having regard to the recently adopted Directive on Security of Network and Information Systems (NIS Directive) and the priorities set by the Digital Single Market Strategy.</p> <p>Against this background, the Commission will anticipate the review of ENISA's Regulation in order to timely prepare for any decision regarding the extension of the Agency's mandate and any changes to it. The main objective is to assess to the performance and impact of the agency in its current form and if needed propose a modified mandate to best support the EU to achieve network and information security policy objectives.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Not available yet</p> |

Simplification of Audiovisual Media Services Directive

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>Overall State of Play:</i></p> <p>- evaluation May 2016</p> <p>- proposal May 2016 (pending in legislative procedure)</p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The Commission carried out an evaluation and presented a proposal in 2016.</p> <p>The Audio-visual Media Services Directive (AVMSD) aims to create and ensure the proper functioning of a single European market for audio-visual media services, while contributing to the promotion of cultural diversity, providing an adequate level of consumer protection and safeguarding media pluralism. Its evaluation confirmed the need for update and simplification.</p> <p>The Commission proposal introduces new flexibility mechanisms where restrictions only applicable to TV are no longer justified, while at the same time ensuring that consumers will be sufficiently protected in the on-demand and Internet world. This is done while making sure that innovation will not be stifled.</p> <p>The AVMSD will aim at enhancing the protection of minors including in video-sharing platforms, a fair contribution of all media services to cultural diversity, a fair treatment between TV broadcasting and on-demand services and an improved implementation of the Directive including via the revision of the procedures supporting the country of origin principle and the provisions related to the independence of regulators.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Due to the limited availability of data, costs and benefits of the current AVMSD could not be quantified.</p> <p>In relation with the Commission proposal savings are expected to result from the simplification of the country of origin principle in the area of commercial communications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Regulators: savings can be up to EUR 5.3 million per year for the EU. ○ TV broadcasters: economic benefit resulting from the flexibility of the 12 minutes rule can go up to EUR 122 million for one TV broadcaster. Economic benefits related to product placement can go up to EUR 1.2 |

| | |
|--|---|
| | million per year for the EU and for sponsorship up to EUR 441 million for the EU per year. |
|--|---|

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Finalised Q2 2016</i> • <i>SWD(2016)0170</i> • <i>SWD(2016)0171</i> | <p>Evaluation</p> |
| <p><i>Scope:</i></p> | <p>Evaluation of the Audio-visual Media Services Directive (AVMSD) - Directive 2010/13/EU.</p> |
| <p><i>Evaluation findings:</i></p> | <p>The evaluation concluded that there is scope for simplification, specifically of the procedures that support the application of the Country of Origin principle (i.e. the criteria determining jurisdiction over providers and the derogation and cooperation procedures limiting freedom of reception and retransmission in specific cases). Some other rules are no longer fit to attain these objectives, primarily due to market developments and changes in viewing patterns. In particular, the evaluation has shown that there is room for improving and updating the rules on commercial communications.</p> <p>The evaluation has identified two main sets of issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient protection of minors and consumers when consuming videos on video-sharing platforms. • Lack of a level playing field between traditional broadcasting and on-demand services, and internal market weaknesses stemming from the fact that some of the AVMSD rules are not sufficiently precise. |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The frequent changes in legislation and the varying nature of pre-existing legislation at the national level made a quantification of costs exceedingly complex.</p> <p>Industry has been unable to contribute quantitative data on compliance costs stemming from the AVMSD.</p> <p>In the absence of data, the costs and benefits of the current AVMSD could not be quantified.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25 May 2016 • COM(2016)287 | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p>Which REFIT objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Simplify and clarify the procedures to apply the country of origin principle - Improve flexibility and clarity of rules on commercial communications |
| <p>Which other objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enhance consumer and minors protection, in video sharing platforms - Establish more effective and fair rules on promotion of European works - Ensure more effective and fair rules on the protection of minors in on-demand services - Ensure regulatory impartiality across the EU. |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>Savings quantified are related to country of origin principle:</p> <p><u>Regulators:</u> expected savings resulting from the facilitation of the identification of the country of origin.</p> <p><i>Rules on commercial communications no longer fit for purpose:</i></p> <p><u>Regulators:</u> savings can be up to EUR 5.3 million per year for the EU.</p> <p><u>TV broadcasters:</u> economic benefit resulting from the flexibility of the 12 minutes rule can go up to EUR 122 million for one TV broadcaster. Economic benefits related to product placement can go up to EUR 1.2 million per year for the EU and for sponsorship up to EUR 441 million for the EU per year.</p> |

Copyright and licensing of musical works for online use (CRM Directive)

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>Overall State of Play</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - proposal July 2012 - legal act Feb 2014 - transposition April 2016 - evaluation Apr 2021 | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The Directive on collective management of copyright and related rights and multi-territorial licensing of rights in musical works for online use in the internal market (CRM Directive) is expected to improve the functioning of Collective Management Organisations (CMOs), in particular by increasing their transparency and accountability towards their members and right holders.</p> <p>Given that it is essential to create the conditions conducive to the most effective licensing practices by CMOs in an increasingly cross-border context, the Directive prescribes in addition basic conditions for the provision by CMOs managing authors' rights in musical works of multi-territorial licensing for online use.</p> <p>The Commission proposed an optional micro exemption for setting up a supervisory function and for certain financial reporting obligations, this exemption was not retained in legislative procedure.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Due to the limited availability of data, savings (including the micro exemption) could not be further quantified.</p> <p>Implementation monitoring and an evaluation scheduled for 2021 will seek to quantify costs and benefits.</p> <p>Costs: The bulk of yearly compliance costs stemming from the preparation of annual accounts, the annual report and audit of the accounts has been estimated at a relatively low level of EUR 5300 for small collecting societies – this corresponds to 0.4% of an EU average small collecting society's annual turnover.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| State of Play: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Proposal adopted on 11 July 2012</i> • <i>COM(2012)372</i> | Commission Proposal |
| Which REFIT objective(s) does the Commission pursue? | A micro exemption was proposed for setting up a supervisory function and for certain financial reporting obligations. This was an option for Member States to exempt micro-enterprises aimed at minimising the regulatory burden of these companies. |
| Which other objective(s) does the Commission pursue? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ensure the better governance and greater transparency of collective rights management on behalf of rightholders. - facilitate the multi-territorial licensing of online rights of authors in musical works by collective management organisations and make it easier for online service providers to obtain such licences. |
| Estimated savings and benefits | <p>Due to the limited availability of data, savings (including the micro exemption) could not be further quantified.</p> <p>Implementation monitoring and an evaluation scheduled for 2021 will seek to quantify costs and benefits.</p> <p>Costs: Most costs stemming from the application of the Directive's provisions relate to the application of new rules for the handling of funds (no data available), financial reporting and audit (the overall cost is estimated at approximately EUR 4.1 million per year on average for all collecting societies in the EU - depending on the size of the CMO, this would amount to EUR 5300 for small, EUR 14100 for medium-sized and EUR 46,700 per large collecting society.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| State of Play: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Adopted in legislative procedure on 26 February 2014</i> • <i>Directive 2014/26/EU</i> | Legal Act |
| Outcome of Legislative | The optional exemption for micro-companies proposed by the |

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>Procedure</i> | <p>Commission was removed by the legislator.</p> <p>However, the final adopted text strengthens the position of micro-company right holders whose rights are managed by CMOs</p> <p>CMOs manage funds of third parties (right holders) and it is argued that right holders including SMEs should be involved in the monitoring of activities of the CMO management and have access to reliable information.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>The fact that the exemption was removed means that the regulatory burden on micro-enterprises is not expected to be minimised.</p> <p>During the discussions in the Council the issue was raised that the burden would not be too high on micro-CMOs because generally their activity is on a smaller scale and therefore the financial reporting obligation would be proportionally less burdensome (as the financial data would be much simpler than in the case of large CMOs).</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Transposition Deadline: 10 April 2016</i> • <i>Report on the application of the Directive to be done by April 2021</i> | Implementation |
| <i>Implementation reported by Member States</i> | <p>In May 2016, infringement proceedings have been launched against those Member States that had not transposed the Directive into national law. To date, 11 Member States have communicated their national implementing measures to the Commission.</p> <p>According to Article 40 of the Directive, an evaluation / report on the application of the Directive is to be completed by 10 April 2021.</p> |
| <i>Impacts / Savings Confirmed?</i> | No evidence on impacts is provided given the recently expired deadline for transposition. |

Review of the Satellite and Cable Directive 93/83/ECC

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>Overall State of Play</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>evaluation sept 2016</i> • <i>proposal Sept 2016</i> <i>(pending in legislative procedure)</i> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The Commission proposed a revision of the Satellite and Cable Directive in 2016 following to an evaluation.</p> <p>The evaluation was carried out to assess the functioning of the Directive as well as to help in assessing whether the similar mechanisms as set out in the Directive should be extended to cover broadcasters' online transmissions and certain retransmission services.</p> <p>The evaluation showed that the mechanisms put in place by the Directive have facilitated the clearance of copyright and related rights for cross-border satellite broadcasts and for the simultaneous retransmissions by cable of broadcasts from other Member States.</p> <p>It however pointed out that the directive - due to the technology-specific nature of its provisions - does not apply to the new digital technologies used for transmission and retransmission of TV and radio programmes that have emerged in recent years.</p> <p>Building on those findings, the Commission made a proposal for a new Regulation in order to facilitate access to more television and radio programmes from other EU countries.</p> <p>In particular, it introduces the application of the country of origin to some online transmissions of broadcasting organisations, and the collective management of rights to retransmissions by means equivalent to cable.</p> <p>The proposed regulation is expected to enhance consumers' access to TV and radio programmes from other Member States.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Due to the limited availability of data, both the costs and benefits of the current Directive and the savings of the Commission proposal could not be quantified.</p> <p>The proposed regulation is expected to reduce transaction costs for broadcasters and operators of retransmission services whereby enabling them to offer broadcasters' online services across borders/to retransmit TV and radio programmes from other Member States.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalised - 14 September 2016 • SWD(2016)308, SWD(2016)309 | <p>Evaluation</p> |
| <p>Scope:</p> | <p>Evaluation of all the core provisions of Directive 93/83/EEC establishing, respectively, the "country of origin" principle for satellite broadcasting and the two-stop-shop copyright clearing mechanism for cable retransmission (individual licensing by broadcasters combined with mandatory collective management of all other - "underlying" - rights).</p> |
| <p>Evaluation findings:</p> | <p>The evaluation showed that the mechanisms put in place by the Directive have facilitated the clearance of copyright and related rights for cross-border satellite broadcasts and for the simultaneous retransmissions by cable of broadcasts from other Member States.</p> <p>It however pointed out that the directive - due to the technology-specific nature of its provisions - does not apply to the new digital technologies used for transmission and retransmission of TV and radio programmes that have emerged in recent years.</p> <p>Effectiveness: there are indications that the specific mechanisms introduced by the Directive have facilitated the clearance of copyright and related rights for (free-to-view) cross-border satellite broadcasts and for the simultaneous retransmissions by cable of broadcasts from other Member States. Similarly, these mechanisms can be considered to have contributed to ensuring a high level of protection for right holders and have improved, to different extents, access to TV and radio programmes from other Member States. The negotiation and mediation mechanisms established under the Directive have been used to a varying, but overall limited, degree; they were found helpful in the cases where they have been used.</p> <p>EU added value: with regard to satellite broadcasting, the Directive has provided significant added value, since no action with a comparable result could have been taken at the Member State level. As regards cable retransmission, action at the Member State level is possible, but the Directive has provided added value by establishing harmonised rules across the internal market.</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>Despite a limited amount of evidence, the Directive can be considered to have been a cost-efficient and beneficial intervention. It has not created administrative burden or significant compliance / implementation costs for either stakeholders or Member States.</p> <p>The Directive has helped to reduce the transaction costs for the licensors and the licensees. Certain identified specific costs resulting</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>from the application of the Directive (CMO fees charged for managing cable retransmission rights) can be regarded to be outweighed by benefits - savings in transaction costs.</p> <p>However, it was not possible to obtain quantitative data concerning the potential costs and benefits generated by the application of the Directive.</p> <p>This is mainly due to the following factors: (i) the confidentiality of such data; (ii) the difficulty of extracting data concerning the Directive from wider data sets; (iii) the fact that the Directive has been in place for a long time</p> |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <p><i>-adopted on 14 September 2016</i></p> <p><i>-COM(2016)594</i></p> | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p>Which REFIT objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</p> | <p>Building on the experience with the application of the Satellite and Cable Directive, the Commission proposed to adopt a new Regulation which aims at facilitating access to more television and radio programmes online from other EU countries and at facilitating certain retransmissions of television and radio programmes from other Member States.</p> <p>In particular, it introduces the application of the country of origin to some online transmissions of broadcasting organisations, and the collective management of rights to retransmissions by means equivalent to cable.</p> <p>A review of the existing provisions of the Satellite and Cable Directive has not been proposed, as no particular issues with its application have been identified.</p> |
| <p>Which other objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</p> | <p>The Commission pursues the objective to improve cross-border access to television and radio programmes in Europe.</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>Based on the Impact Assessment carried out by the Commission in 2016, the proposed measures would reduce the transaction costs (in particular, for broadcasting organisations and operators of retransmission services), while it is not expected to have disruptive effects on right holders. The introduction of mandatory collective management of rights for certain retransmissions would affect the licensing choices of right holders but only in a limited manner. The proposed measures would enhance consumers' access to TV and radio programmes from other MS and thus bring benefits to consumers.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | However, it was not possible to obtain data for quantification of the estimated costs and benefits (data confidentiality). |
|--|--|

Regulatory framework for electronic communications networks and services

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>Overall State of Play</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Evaluation Sept 2016</i> • <i>Proposal Sept 2016 (pending in legislative procedure)</i> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The EU's regulatory framework for electronic communications is a series of rules which apply throughout the EU Member States. It encourages competition, improves the functioning of the market and guarantees basic user rights. The overall goal is for European consumers to be able to benefit from increased choice thanks to low prices, high quality and innovative services. EU law has helped the prices of telecoms' services fall by around 30% in the past decade. The rules are simple, flexible, technology-neutral and aim at deregulation in the longer term.</p> <p>Building on the evaluation of the framework which dates from 2009, the review of the telecoms framework aims at adapting the current regime to the main market and technological developments occurred in the sector. In recent years, market structures have evolved, with monopolistic market power becoming increasingly limited, and at the same time electronic communications and the telecoms sector in particular have now acquired a vital importance for most sectors of the overall economy. Consumers and businesses are increasingly relying on data and internet access services instead of traditional telephone and other communication services.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The Commission proposal is expected to lead to an increase of investment and consumption with a cumulative effect on growth of 1.45 % and on employment of 0.18% by 2025, assuming the reforms are implemented by 2020. Labour productivity is also expected to increase by 0.8% during the period 2020-2025.</p> <p>In terms of access regulation, the proposal tabled by the Commission is expected to lead to an increase of the period in between successive market reviews from 3 to 5 years, which should increase certainty for stakeholders and reduce administrative costs. Costs savings have been estimated at 10-15% of the current costs involved with market reviews (a saving of up to €7.5m)</p> <p>More consistent spectrum assignment will generate total benefits of €146.5 billion a year. The preferred option for services might contribute to cost savings in the telecoms and many other industries. The only foreseeable additional costs are associated with the number-related obligations imposed on providers of OTT</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | communication services and those related to access to emergency services when a standardised technical solution is available. |
|--|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Finalised 14 September 2016</i></p> <p><i>SWD(2016)313</i></p> | <p>Evaluation</p> |
| <p><i>Scope:</i></p> | <p>Evaluation of: the Framework Directive 2002/21/EC as amended, the Authorisation Directive 2002/20/EC as amended, the Access Directive 2002/19/EC as amended, the Universal Service Directive 2002/22/EC as amended, the BEREC Regulation 1211/2009, the Radio Spectrum Decision 676/2002/EC, the Radio Spectrum Policy Group Decision 2002/622/EC, Decision 243/2012/EU establishing a multiannual radio spectrum policy programme (RSPP).</p> |
| <p><i>Evaluation findings:</i></p> | <p>The specific objectives of the framework (promoting competition, realising the single market and protecting consumer interests) remain valid; most regulatory areas remain relevant e.g., spectrum management and access regulation.</p> <p>The regulatory framework has been effective in delivering a competitive sector overall, with benefits for end-users; the achievements of the framework in protecting end-users and in ensuring a safety net (universal service) are significant;</p> <p>Regulatory consistency has been achieved only to a limited extent;</p> <p>Connectivity has emerged as the underlying driving force for digital society and the digital economy, underpinned by technological changes and evolving consumer and market demands;</p> <p>The benefits of the framework - for most operators, end-users and society as a whole - greatly outweigh the costs of implementing it;</p> <p>A certain level of complexity is unavoidable to ensure a well weighted intervention</p> <p>However, in several areas, administrative burden could be reduced without making the provisions less effective.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Due to the limited availability of data, the costs and benefits of the existing framework could not be quantified.</p> <p>In the absence of reporting requirements imposed by the regulatory framework on Member States and operators regarding administrative costs and burdens, the efficiency conclusions are qualitative, rather than based on actual calculations.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <p>- <i>Proposal adopted</i> <i>14/09/2016</i></p> <p>- <i>COM(2016)590</i></p> | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p>Which REFIT objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The initiative aims to remove legislation which has become obsolete or not necessary, such as a number of <i>lex specialis</i> provisions concerning end-user rights, where the <i>lex generalis</i> provides adequate end-user protection. • It aims at ensuring coherence with other pieces of EU law, such as in the area of audiovisual, consumer and data protection. Furthermore, coherence between regulation aimed at incentivising competitive network roll-out and the EU financing and State aid rules in the sector is reinforced. • It aims at ensuring consistency in particular by recasting four Directives and their amendments (from 1 up to 3 amendments each) into one comprehensive and consistent Directive. <i>Ipso facto</i>, the recasting increases the readability and accessibility of EU electronic communications law. Overall, this has a significant simplification effect. • The initiative seeks to enhance the effectiveness of the framework by harmonising the competences of the national regulatory authorities and by empowering them to act in all areas which are relevant for regulation. • The procedures and steps necessary for imposing <i>ex ante</i> sector specific regulation have been simplified wherever this was possible without compromising the quality and appropriateness of the resulting regulation. |
| <p>Which other objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</p> | <p>The general objective is to ensure that the pro-competitive framework leads to unconstrained connectivity as the basis for a digital single market.</p> <p>The specific objectives are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to contribute to ubiquitous connectivity in the internal market. • to promote competition and user choice in the internal market. • to simplify the regulatory intervention and to achieve |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>internal market coherence.</p> <p>The internal market remains an objective of the framework and underpins each objective of the review.</p> <p>A number of potential synergies and trade-offs between objectives have also been identified.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>The Commission proposal is estimated to lead to an increase of investment and consumption and it is expected that there will be a cumulative effect on growth of 1.45 % and on employment of 0.18 % by 2025, assuming the reforms are implemented by 2020. Labour productivity is also expected to increase by 0.8 % during the period 2020-2025.</p> <p>The Commission proposal is expected to lead to an increase of the period in between successive market reviews from 3 to 5 years, which should increase certainty for stakeholders and reduce administrative costs. Costs savings have been estimated at 10-15% of the current costs involved with market reviews (a saving of up to €7.5m).</p> <p>More consistent spectrum assignment will generate total benefits of €146.5 bn a year. The preferred option for services might contribute to cost savings in the telecoms and many other industries.</p> |

Strengthening Network and Information Security (NIS)

| <i>Overall State of Play: Legal Act Adopted by the Legislator and Benefits Retained</i> | Summary |
|--|--|
| <i>Summary:</i> | <p>The Commission proposed reinforcing cyber-security in the Union by ensuring that all Member States have minimum capabilities and a strategy for a high level of Network and Information Security (NIS) in their territory, and developing the cooperation between competent authorities through the creation of a network between national authorities and the Commission.</p> <p>An exemption for micro-enterprises was foreseen in the original proposal as regards security and notification requirements.</p> <p>Other benefits relate to the effects of increased confidence in the digital economy and a likely cost reduction of security incidents, including malicious attacks.</p> <p>The proposal was adopted by the legislator in July 2016 (Directive (EU) 2016/1148).</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>The directive increases confidence in the digital economy and decreases costs of security incidents, including malicious attacks.</p> <p>According to the World Economic Forum, in the next ten years there is a 10% likelihood of a major Critical Information Infrastructure breakdown with potential economic damages of over \$250 billion.</p> <p>Due to the limited availability of data, estimated savings could not be further quantified.</p> <p>In relations with costs, the total additional NIS compliance costs are estimated to be in the range of EUR 1 to 2 billion. -The total cost for notifying breaches on an annual basis at the EU level is estimated to be EUR 212 500.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Adopted 7 February 2013</i> • <i>COM(2013)48 final</i> | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p><i>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>The proposal includes an exemption for micro-enterprises.</p> <p>Under Article 14(8), microenterprises (as defined in Commission Recommendation 2003/361/EC) are exempted from the security and notification requirements under Article 14(1) and 14(2), which provide that public administrations and market operators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • take appropriate technical and organisational measures to manage the risks posed to the security of the networks and information systems which they control and use in their operations; and • notify to the competent authority incidents having a significant impact on the security of the core services they provide. |
| <p><i>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>The aim of the Directive is to reinforce cyber-security in the Union by ensuring that all Member States have minimum capabilities and a strategy for a high level of NIS in their territory, and developing the cooperation between competent authorities through the creation of a network between national authorities and the Commission.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p><i>Savings:</i></p> <p>Assessing the magnitude of the possible benefits is extremely difficult for a number of reasons as for example the incomplete view of the frequency and gravity of NIS incidents.</p> <p>NIS incidents would have no or little impact when NIS measures are in place. Other benefits are more general and relate for example to the effects of increased confidence in the digital economy. There is a likely contribution to decreasing the costs of security incidents, including malicious attacks. According to the World Economic Forum, in the next ten years there is a 10% likelihood of a major Critical Information Infrastructure breakdown with potential economic damages of over \$250 billion.</p> <p>Due to the absence of data, estimated savings could not be further quantified.</p> <p><i>Costs:</i></p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costs for the Member States: <p>The costs for NIS capabilities and cooperation would vary across the Member States, according to the respective current level of preparedness.</p> <p>Approximately EUR 2.5 million per CERT (Computer Emergency Response Team) in case there is a country that has not yet established national/governmental CERT body.</p> <p>As regards NIS competent authorities, it is likely that Member States would choose to designate existing bodies as competent authorities and assign additional tasks to these bodies. The corresponding additional average costs would be EUR 360 000 per Member State. The total theoretical maximum cost would be EUR 9.72 million across the EU and de facto lower, since some Member States already have coordinating cyber security centers or bodies in place.</p> <p>As regards pan-European cyber-incident exercises, the estimated costs per MS for one exercise (assuming that it takes place every two years) is EUR 55 555.</p> <p>The costs related to the cooperation among the competent authorities within the network would stand at approximately EUR 6000 per year per Member State.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compliance costs for public administrations and key private players concerning security measures: <p>The total additional NIS compliance costs are estimated to be in the range of EUR 1 to 2 billion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costs for public administrations and key private players associated with reporting NIS incidents with a significant impact: <p>The total cost for notifying breaches on an annual basis at the EU level is estimated to be EUR 212 500.</p> |
|--|--|

| | |
|---|-------------------------|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Adopted by the Legislator on 06/07/2016</i> <i>Directive (EU)</i> | <p>Legal Act</p> |
|---|-------------------------|

| 2016/1148 | |
|--|--|
| <i>Outcome of Legislative Procedure</i> | <p>The definition of "operators of essential services" which will be required to take appropriate security measures and to notify serious incidents to the relevant national authority was extended by water and digital infrastructure sectors (initially operators in the energy, transport, banking, financial market infrastructures and health sectors).</p> <p>As regards digital service providers (DSPs) the agreed text covers online marketplaces (equivalent to e-commerce platforms in the original proposal), cloud computing services and search engines. Compared with the original proposal, it does not include internet payment gateways, as these are now covered by the revised Payment Services Directive; application stores, as these are to be understood as being a type of online marketplace; and social networks, as per the Council's political agreement with the European Parliament.</p> <p>Overall, the agreed text endorses the core objectives of the Commission proposal, namely to ensure a high common level of security of network and information systems.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | No changes to the estimated costs and benefits in legislative procedure. |

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Application on 10 May 2018</i> • <i>Transposition Deadline 9 May 2018</i> • <i>Evaluation Planned for 9 May 2021</i> | Implementation |
| <i>Implementation reported by MemberStates</i> | Not available yet. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Not available yet. |

Initiatives in the area of Taxation and Customs Union

VAT Mini One Stop shop

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>Overall state of play</i></p> <p><i>evaluation results expected Q4 2016</i></p> <p><i>Proposal planned for Q4 2016</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The Mini One Stop Shop (2008/8/EC) has been introduced in 2015 in order to simplify the payment of VAT for B2C supplies of telecommunications, broadcastings and electronically supplied services under the new place of supply rules.</p> <p>The emerging findings of the evaluation of the Mini One Stop Shop show that the new rules have been implemented effectively and are widely appreciated by business and the majority of Member States.</p> <p>Building on the success and lessons learnt, the Commission intends to modernize and extent the Mini One Stop Shop to cross-border B2C (Business to Consumer) E-Commerce.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits and benefits</i></p> | <p>It is estimated that the Mini One Stop Shop mechanism has saved business EUR 500 million or EUR 40 000 per business compared to the alternative of direct registration (95% reduction compared to the alternative of direct registration).</p> <p>A proposal to extend and modernise the Mini One Stop Shop is expected to reduce administrative burdens for business by EUR 2.3 billion annually.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>evaluation results expected Q4 2016</i></p> | <p>Evaluation</p> |
| <p><i>Scope:</i></p> | <p>Evaluation of the Mini One Stop Shop (2008/8/EC) which is applied since 1 January 2015.</p> <p>The assessment covers the implementation of the Mini One Stop Shop to ensure that it meets its primary objective of simplifying the payment of tax for B2C supplies of telecommunications, broadcastings and electronically supplied services under the new place of supply rules.</p> |
| <p><i>Evaluation findings:</i></p> | <p>The new place of supply rules for intra-EU supplies of telecommunications, broadcasting and electronically supplied services are an important step in ensuring the destination principle of VAT which is the agreed position of the Commission and Member States. However, it is recognised that the destination principle also makes life more difficult and costly for businesses who are required to account for the VAT due to the Member States of their consumers, and therefore simplification measures are needed.</p> <p>Overall, the emerging findings of the evaluation show that the new rules have been implemented effectively. In particular, the business community has been very satisfied with the introduction of the 2015 changes, Business has recognised the efforts taken to communicate these changes and the issuance of comprehensive guidance material. Business has also recognised the benefits of bringing together business and Member States prior to the introduction of the changes to ensure that these were workable.</p> <p>The introduction of the Mini One Stop Shop is seen by business and the majority of Member States as an essential system for the collection of taxes and making compliance as easy as possible. The timely and relatively error-free introduction of 28 individual but intra-connected IT portals now used by in excess of 12 000 businesses is a significant achievement.</p> <p>It should also be recognised that such a system whereby Member States are collecting substantial tax revenues on behalf of each other is not only a key milestone for the EU VAT system but also for the single market.</p> <p>There are, however, lessons to be learned from the 2015 changes notably regarding the lack of a cross-border threshold as well as the rules for the identification of the location of customers have caused difficulties for micro-businesses and start-up. These issues can be addressed in the new initiative on B2C without causing distortions</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>in the single market. Another key consideration, driven by the spirit of the Digital Single Market (DSM) strategy, is that doing business cross-border should be as similar as possible as doing business within the/your own Member State.</p> <p>In the new proposal scheduled for 2016 to extend the Mini One Stop shop to cross-border supplies of tangible goods, the Commission and Member States intend to consider both the positives and the learning points from the 2015 changes. The need to have clear rules and robust IT specifications together with ongoing support from the Commission services is essential. It is also critical that any changes are communicated to those businesses who will be affected, whether in the EU or in third countries. In this respect, particular attention needs to be focused on SMEs with both the Commission and Member States reaching out to such businesses. In addition, it is essential that Member States introduce a cross-border e-commerce compliance strategy to ensure that any abuses are identified and addressed, and therefore businesses will face a level playing field.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>The Mini One Stop Shop has been very successful with EUR 3 billion paid through it in 2015, representing up to EUR 18 billion in trade and 70% of the total in this sector. This mechanism has saved business in one year EUR 500 million or EUR 40 000 per business (95% reduction compared to the alternative of direct registration), and thus contributed to reducing unnecessary burdens on business.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Planned for Q4 2016</i> | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p><i>Which REFIT objective(s) will the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>Proposal to Modernise VAT for cross-border B2C (Business to Consumer) E-Commerce.</p> <p>The initiative will simplify VAT rules and break down VAT barriers for cross border trade and make it easier for businesses to register and account for VAT in respect of cross-border B2C supplies of goods and services. It is expected that small start-up e-commerce businesses will benefit most.</p> <p>This initiative was recommended by the Commission expert group on taxation of the digital economy. It will facilitate the Digital Single Market and provide a level playing field for business.</p> |
| <p><i>Which other objectives will the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>The proposal will aim at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • extending the current single One Stop Shop mechanism to cross-border (intra-EU and third country) online sales of tangible goods to private consumers, |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • introduce a common EU-wide simplification measure (VAT threshold) to help small start-up e-commerce businesses, • allow for home country controls including a single audit of cross-border businesses for VAT purposes. • remove the import VAT exemption on importation of small consignments from suppliers in third countries, together with the introduction of simplified collection measures. <p>It builds on the REFIT evaluation of the current Mini One Stop Shop.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>The proposal is expected to reduce administrative burdens for business by EUR 2.3 billion annually. It should also be stressed that it is estimated that 430 000 businesses will benefit from the new microbusiness threshold.</p> |

Priority 3: A resilient Energy Union with a Forward-Looking Climate Change Policy

Overview

1. Overview of REFIT Initiatives in the area of Climate Action

| | Evaluation | Commission Proposal | Legal Act | Implementation |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|-----------|----------------|
| Fuel Quality Directive | Evaluation Expected to be finalised in Q1 2017 | | | |
| Heavy Duty Vehicles CO2 emissions monitoring system | | Commission proposal Planned 2017 | | |
| CO2 emissions from cars | Evaluation Finalised in 2015 | Commission proposal Planned 2017 | | |
| CO2 emissions from vans | Evaluation Finalised in 2015 | Commission proposal Planned 2017 | | |


| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------|---|
| | | | | |
| Fluorinated greenhouse gases | | Commission proposal 07 November 2012 | Legal act 01 January 2015 | Implementation Application on 1 January 2015 |
| Verification and accreditation of CO2 emissions | | | Legal act 21 June 2012 | Implementation Application on 1 January 2013 |
| Emissions monitoring and reporting of greenhouse gases | | | Legal act 01 January 2013 | Implementation Application on 1 January 2013 |
| Carbon Capture and Storage Directive 2009/31/EC | Evaluation 15 January 2015 | | | |
| Binding annual greenhouse gas emission reductions by Member States from 2021 to 2030 | Evaluation Finalised in July 2016 | Commission proposal 20 July 2016 | | |

2. Overview of REFIT Initiatives in the area of Energy

| | Evaluation | Commission Proposal | Legal Act | Implementation |
|---|--|--|------------------------------|--|
| Renewable Energy | Evaluation Adoption planned Q4 2016 | Commission proposal Foreseen adoption Q4 2016 | | |
| Review of the Directive 2010/31/EU on the energy performance of buildings (EPBD) | Evaluation Planned for Q4 2016 | Commission proposal Foreseen adoption Q4 2016 | | |
| Regulation of the Supply Agency of the European Atomic Energy Community | | Commission proposal Planned for 4Q 2016 | | |
| Safety Standards for Radiation Protection | | Commission proposal 29 September 2011 | Legal act 5 December 2013 | Implementation Application on 6 February 2018 |
| Energy Union Governance – Planning and Reporting | Evaluation | | | |

| | | | | |
|-------------------|--------------------------|--|--|--|
| obligation | Adoption planned Q4 2016 | | | |
|-------------------|--------------------------|--|--|--|

3. Overview of REFIT Initiatives in the area of Taxation and Customs Union



4. Overview of REFIT Initiatives in the area of Transport



| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| Promotion of Clean and Energy-efficient Road Transport Vehicles ("clean vehicles") | Evaluation External evaluation report finalised September 2015 | Commission proposal Planned for 2017 | | |
| Revision of the Eurovignette Directive 1999/62 | | Commission proposal Planned for 2017 | | |
| European Electronic Toll Service (EETS) | Evaluation SWD planned to be finalised Q4 2016 | Commission proposals Planned for 2017 | | |

Initiatives in the area of Climate action

Fuel Quality Directive

| <i>Overall state of play</i> <i>Evaluation results expected by Q1 2017</i> | Summary |
|---|---|
| <i>Summary:</i> | Evaluation of the Fuel Quality Directive, concerning Directive 98/70/EC relating to the quality of petrol and diesel fuels (the Fuel Quality Directive (FQD)). Evaluation on a number of specific Articles of the FQD (articles 1 to 9a, excluding article 7a to 7e). |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

Heavy Duty Vehicles CO2 emissions monitoring system

| <i>Overall state of play</i> <i>Proposal planned in 2017</i> | Summary |
|---|--|
| <i>Summary:</i> | <p>The Commission is considering a proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the Monitoring of Heavy Duty Vehicles' (HDV) fuel consumption and CO2 emissions with a view to improving purchaser information. - Action to reduce the emissions and energy consumption of HDVs is in line with the Commission priorities set out in the Energy Union Communication and in the Low-emission mobility Strategy.</p> <p>Measures to increase fuel efficiency and reduce CO2 emissions from heavy duty vehicles and buses are envisaged in the Energy Union Communication and in the Low-emission mobility Strategy.</p> <p>Such measures will increase market transparency and ensure a better understanding of CO2 emission levels and fuel consumption from these vehicles. Increasing market transparency will facilitate the uptake of the most energy efficient HDVs, thereby improving EU road transport's competitiveness as fuel represents a significant share of its operating costs. The increased push for fuel-efficient technology should also contribute to the competitiveness of the European HDV industry.</p> <p>This measure is also a necessary step for other medium to long term policy measures, such as emissions standards. This is because neither fuel consumption nor CO2 emission from HDVs are currently measured in a standardised manner.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>Information not yet available.</p> |

CO₂ emissions from cars

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Overall state of play</p> <p>Legal act April 2009</p> <p>Evaluation 2015</p> <p>Proposal planned for 2017</p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p>Summary:</p> | <p>Regulation (EC) No 443/2009 sets out the framework for reducing CO₂ emissions of new passenger cars thereby contributing to meeting the global challenge of keeping climate change below 2° C of pre-industrial levels by reducing GHG (Green Houses Gases) emissions in the EU.</p> <p>Regulation (EU) No 333/2014 amends the 2009 Regulation and defines the modalities of meeting the target of 95 g CO₂/km for new passenger cars. By proposing exemptions from the CO₂ targets for manufacturers with less than 1000 car registrations, the new Regulation reduces administrative burden without negative effects for the overall CO₂ reductions.</p> <p>The Regulations establish a regulatory regime until around 2020 and, because of the long timeframe needed for industry planning, request the Commission to make new proposals for the period after this.</p> <p>The Commission is planning to revise these regulations in 2017.</p> <p>Regulation (EC) No 443/2009 has been subject to a REFIT evaluation (report issued in 2015), together with the similar Regulation on light commercial vehicles (vans).</p> <p>Taken together, cars and vans account for around 15% of EU CO₂ emissions and 17% of final energy consumption.</p> <p>Further action to reduce the emissions and energy consumption is in line with the Commission priorities set out in the Energy Union Communication.</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>The economic benefit of the introduction of a de-minimis threshold for small-volume manufacturers under Regulation (EU) No 333/2014 is to reduce the administrative burden for each manufacturer by around € 25,000 and for the Commission by around €10,000 per application, as the need for a derogation procedure is avoided</p> <p>So far, data on the number of manufacturers that benefitted from the</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>exemption from the targets that was introduced by the legislation is limited and the benefits on the ground of this change cannot be properly assessed yet. In 2015, 24 car manufacturers have made use of the exemption, representing 0.029% of car registrations in that year. There is no data available yet to quantify the actual reduction in administrative burden as it is too early.</p> |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Proposal planned for 2017</i> | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p><i>Which REFIT objective(s) will the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>To reduce the climate impact of cars in line with the requirements of EU climate policy and the 2030 climate and energy framework in a cost-effective, technology and competitively neutral manner while improving the competitiveness of EU manufacturing.</p> <p>Car emissions of CO₂ represent a large share of current EU greenhouse gas emissions. Ensuring that greenhouse gas emissions from these vehicles are reduced forms a key part of the least cost approach to meeting the EU's climate objectives.</p> |
| <p><i>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>Information not yet available.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Information not yet available.</p> |

CO2 emissions from vans

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Overall state of play</p> <p><i>Legal act May 2011</i></p> <p><i>Evaluation 2015</i></p> <p><i>Proposal planned for 2017</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p>Summary:</p> | <p>Regulation (EC) No 510/2011 sets out the framework for reducing CO2 emissions from new light commercial vehicles (vans). Regulation (EU) No 253/2014 sets out the modalities of meeting the target of to 147 g CO2/km for new vans. By proposing exemptions from the CO2 targets for manufacturers with less than 1000 van registrations, the new Regulation reduces administrative burden without negative effects on the overall CO₂ reductions.</p> <p>The Regulations establish a regulatory regime until around 2020 and, because of the long timeframe needed for industry planning, request the Commission to make new proposals for the period after this.</p> <p>The Commission is planning to revise these regulations in 2017.</p> <p>Regulation (EC) No 510/2011 has been subject to a REFIT evaluation (report issued in 2015), together with the similar Regulation on cars.</p> <p>Taken together, cars and vans account for around 15% of EU CO2 emissions and 17% of final energy consumption.</p> <p>Further action to reduce the emissions and energy consumption is in line with the Commission priorities set out in the Energy Union Communication.</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>The economic benefit of the introduction of a de-minimis threshold for small-volume manufacturers under Regulation (EU) No 253/2014 is to reduce the administrative burden for each manufacturer by around € 25,000 and for the Commission by around €10,000 per application, as the need for a derogation procedure is avoided.</p> <p>So far, data on the number of manufacturers that benefit from the exemption that was introduced by the legislation is limited and the benefits on the ground of this change cannot be properly assessed yet. In 2015, 9 van manufacturers have made use of the exemption, representing 0.11% of van registrations in that year. There is no data available yet to quantify the actual reduction in administrative burden as it is too early.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Finalised in 2015</i></p> <p><i>No evaluation SWD (contractor report)</i></p> | <p>Evaluation</p> |
| <p><i>Scope:</i></p> | <p>Evaluation of Regulations 443/2009 and 510/2011 on CO2 emissions from light-duty vehicles</p> |
| <p><i>Evaluation findings:</i></p> | <p>The evaluation support study confirms that the 2015 (cars) and 2017 (vans) emission targets have both been achieved before the deadline and that manufacturers are in a strong position to meet their 2020 targets. It also confirms that the Regulations have a positive impact on emission reductions for cars and vans as well as on energy security. Also, their impact on competitiveness and innovation seems to be positive.</p> <p>Concerning the effectiveness of the Regulations, the evaluation support study highlighted one significant weakness, i.e. the increasing discrepancy between real-world and test cycle emissions. This will be addressed by the switch to a new worldwide harmonised test protocol (WLTP).</p> <p>The problems with the test cycle have also affected the efficiency of the legislation as the benefits have been smaller than they would have been if the divergence between test cycle and real-world performance had not been increasing. The report also highlighted that the costs to manufacturers estimated ex-ante were much higher than has been the case in reality. Both Regulations have generated net economic benefits to society and the targets for both have proved to be much cheaper to reach for manufacturers than predicted. However, lifetime fuel expenditures savings have been lower than expected, mostly because of the increasing divergence between test cycles and real-world emissions performance. These aspects will be considered in the impact assessment supporting the new Commission proposals to revise the legislation.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Both of the Regulations have generated net economic benefits to society. The car CO2 Regulation has abatement costs of -€46 per tonne of CO2 abated, compared to ex-ante estimates of +€32/tCO2 to +€38.7/tCO2. The overall cost effectiveness of the LCV Regulations has been estimated at -€173/tCO2, which compares favourably with the ex-ante estimates of -€38.9/tCO2 to €32.6/tCO2. The LCV CO2 Regulation has also generated net emissions savings, although these are smaller than anticipated, primarily because the baseline emissions used in the Impact Assessment are likely to have been overestimated.</p> <p>Costs to manufacturers have been much lower than anticipated, because abatement technologies have, in general, proved to be less costly than expected. For passenger cars, the ex-post average unit</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>costs associated with meeting the fleet-average 130 gCO₂/km target have been estimated at €183 per car. By contrast, the ex-ante estimates ranged from €430 to €984 per car. For LCVs, average ex-post costs for meeting the 175 gCO₂/km target have been estimated at €115 per vehicle, as opposed to the ex-ante estimate of €1,037 per vehicle.</p> <p>Part of the reason that the ex-ante costs for LCVs were so high is because the level of effort required to reduce emissions to 175 g CO₂/km is likely to have been overestimated for the original Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Lifetime fuel expenditure savings for both cars and LCVs have been lower than originally anticipated in the Impact Assessment, primarily because of the increasing divergence between test cycle and real-world emissions performance. Linked to these fuel expenditure savings are losses in fuel tax revenues. For passenger cars, fuel tax revenues are estimated to have reduced by €22 billion over the time period 2006 to 2013, whilst for LCVs, the reduction in fuel tax revenue over the period 2010 to 2013 is estimated to be €1 billion.</p> |
|--|---|

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Proposal planned for 2017</i> | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</p> | <p>To reduce the climate impact of cars and light commercial vehicles in line with the requirements of EU climate policy and the 2030 climate and energy framework. This should be done in a cost-effective, technology and competitively neutral manner while improving the competitiveness of EU manufacturing.</p> <p>Light commercial vehicle emissions of CO₂ represent a large share of current EU greenhouse gas emissions. Ensuring that greenhouse gas emissions from these vehicles are reduced forms a key part of the least cost approach to meeting the EU's climate objectives.</p> |
| <p>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</p> | <p>Information not yet available.</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>Information not yet available.</p> |

Fluorinated greenhouse gases

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>Overall state of play</i></p> <p><i>Proposal Nov 2012</i></p> <p><i>Legal act adopted Jan 2015</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary</i></p> | <p>The initiative is aiming at a more ambitious legislation on reducing fluorinated greenhouse gas emissions in the Union while keeping a cost-effective approach and respecting the principle of proportionality.</p> <p>Companies that trade (import, export, produce) less than 100 tons of CO₂ equivalent of fluorinated greenhouse gases per annum are exempted from reporting requirements.</p> <p>Member State authorities that need to fulfil new obligations in relation to training and certification programmes of personnel and companies can do so with minimum efforts since the new Regulation allows for adaptations to existing systems, also allowing time for these adaptations to take place (until 2017).</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Reduction of administrative burden for SMEs due to the exemption from reporting requirements. However, savings are expected to be relatively limited since the market of fluorinated greenhouse gases is dominated by a limited number of large suppliers.</p> <p>Mitigation of administrative requirements by allowing for adaptations to existing certification and training systems, in due time.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 07/11/2012 • COM(2012)643 | Commission Proposal |
| <i>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i> | <p>The objective of the Commission proposal was to simplify and clarify Regulation (EC) No 842/2006 by minimising administrative burden while ensuring a higher level of ambition in reducing the use of fluorinated greenhouse gases in the Union.</p> <p>In the Commission proposal, companies that trade (import, export, produce) 1,000 tonnes of CO₂ equivalent or less of fluorinated greenhouse gases per annum are exempted from reporting requirements. This exemption benefits predominantly SMEs.</p> |
| <i>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</i> | <p>The proposed Regulation aimed at reducing the use of fluorinated gases which account for around 2% of all EU greenhouse gas emissions but have a much more potent global warming effect by creating tradeable quotas for their use. The gradual reduction in their use is to be achieved principally by issuing supply quotas to circa 100 large EU firms.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>The benefit is the cost efficient saving of 71 Mt CO₂eq by 2030 or two-thirds of today's HFC emissions. Overall economic effects are small, with the input/output model suggesting a small, positive impact on overall output (up to 0.009%) and GEM-E3 predicting a small decline (up to -0.006).</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopted by the Legislator on 01/01/2015 • Reference Regulation (EU) No 517/2014 | Legal Act |
| <i>Outcome of Legislative Procedure</i> | <p>The impact of the reduction of the reporting threshold from 1000 tons to 100 tons is limited since the market of fluorinated greenhouse gases is dominated by a limited number of large suppliers.</p> <p>However, the replacement of the proposed ban on pre-filling of equipment before import in the EU was replaced by an authorisation</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | system which increased the number of companies affected by the quota-system considerably (now >1500 companies registered). This negative impact has now been mitigated by implementing a flexible mechanism allowing small companies to more easily obtain such authorisations at lower costs and via a userfriendly online tool. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | No update of the savings estimations carried out. |

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Application on 1 January 2015</i> | Implementation |
| <i>Implementation reported by MemberStates</i> | Data on implementation is not yet available, as the Regulation applied from 1 January 2015. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information pending |

Verification and accreditation of CO₂ emissions

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>Overall state of play</i> Legal act adopted June 2012 | Summary |
| <i>Summary:</i> | The Commission Regulation (EU) N° 600/2012, laying down provisions for the verification of emissions reports, minimises as much as possible the cost of verification by applying a risk-based approach and allowing the waiver in certain cases of the obligation to conduct site visits of EU ETS operators' installations. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Reduced cost of verification for EU Member States and for EU ETS operators through a proportionate approach and a reduced number of site visits. Due to the limited availability of data, the savings could not be quantified. |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 21 June 2012 • Commission Regulation (EU) No 600/2012 | <p>Legal act</p> |
| <p><i>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>The Regulation was proposed in order to establish a simplified system of annual verification and accreditation of CO2 emissions, drawing on national best practices. This system aims at application of a consistent approach based on internationally agreed standards and a proportionate basis including possibility to reduce as much as possible the number of site visits without affecting the robustness of the verifier's opinion.</p> <p>To this end, the Regulation defines conditions for waiving the necessity of site visits to certain installations. It mainly concerns installations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysed through a risk analysis and where all relevant data can be remotely accessed by the verifier • With low emissions, i.e. emitting less than 25,000 tonnes of CO2 per annum • With straightforward processes and systems |
| <p><i>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>This Commission Regulation lays down provisions for the verification of emissions reports submitted pursuant to the EU Emissions Trading System (Directive 2003/87/EC) and for the accreditation and supervision of verifiers.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The cost of verification varies greatly depending on the relative wealth of the country (affecting the wages and other costs), the scale of emissions and the size and complexity of the installation concerned. Due to the limited availability of data, the savings could not be quantified. A recent study commissioned by the European Commission (2016) estimates that the average cost of verification, for EU ETS operators to be ca. 6800 euros per installation. The verification system adds credibility to reported data and reduces the costs that would otherwise be incurred by the Member States (the need for them to validate data, systems and carry out site inspections).</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Application on 1 January 2013</i> | <p>Implementation</p> |
| <p><i>Implementation reported by MemberStates</i></p> | <p>All installations benefit from the risk-based approach forming the basis of the Commission Regulation.</p> <p>The EU Member States are only required to approve the verifier's decision not to carry out a site visit in the case of larger installations. All small emitters (60% of all installations) may waive site visits simply based on the verifier's professional recommendation.</p> <p>The Commission, in consultation with the EU Member States regularly updates its templates and guidance documents with a view to continual improvement of the cost-effectiveness of the system, minimising costs for operators and EU Member States. The most recent update was endorsed on 19/08/2016 concerning further appropriate relaxations possible in the criteria applying to waive of verifier site visits.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Information pending</p> |

Emissions monitoring and reporting of greenhouse gases

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>Overall state of play</i> <i>Legal act adopted in June 2012</i> | Summary |
| <i>Summary:</i> | <p>The Commission Regulation (EU) N° 601/2012 on the monitoring and reporting of GHG emissions, minimises as much as possible the cost of monitoring by, for example, a tiered approach proportionate to scale of emissions, allowed derogations to avoid unreasonable costs, additional derogations for small emitters, and provision for application of simplified monitoring plans.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>Reduced monitoring costs for EU ETS operators and EU Member States thanks to the various dispensations provided by the Regulation, especially simplified monitoring plans. Due to the absence of data, the savings could not be quantified..</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| State of Play: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 21 June 2012 • Commission Regulation (EU) No 601/2012 | Legal act |
| Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue? | <p>Small emitters producing less than 25,000 tonnes CO₂ per annum are automatically allowed to apply a simplified monitoring plan.</p> <p>Aircraft operators are allowed to produce simplified monitoring plans provided they operate 243 flights or fewer over a four month period or produce less than 25,000 tonnes CO₂ per annum .</p> |
| Which other objectives did the Commission pursue? | <p>The Regulation was proposed in order to improve the monitoring and reporting of greenhouse gas emissions to support implementation of Directive 2003/87/EC which established a trading scheme for greenhouse gas emissions.</p> |
| Estimated savings and benefits | <p>Due to the limited availability of data, the savings could not be quantified. The cost of monitoring and reporting varies greatly depending on the relative wealth of the country (affecting the wages and other costs), the scale of emissions and the size and complexity of the installation concerned. A recent study commissioned by the European Commission (2016) estimates that the average cost of monitoring amounts to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For EU Member States: on average ca. 720 euros per installation <p>For EU ETS operators: on average, ca.. 35,000 euros per installation</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| State of Play: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application on 1 January 2013 | Implementation |
| Implementation reported by Member States | <p>The opportunity for Member States to take further advantage of costs savings within the existing regulatory framework is recognised. For example, only six countries (5 EU Member States and Lichtenstein) have so far reported that they have applied the option of allowing installations to use standardised or simplified monitoring plans. In addition, only three countries (2 EU Member States and Iceland) have reported used of a simplified tool developed by Eurocontrol for small aviation emitters. The Commission continues work to raise Member State awareness of</p> |

| | |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| | available cost-saving opportunities. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

Carbon Capture and Storage Directive

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>Overall state of play</i> <i>Evaluation published January 2015</i> | Summary |
| <i>Summary:</i> | The CCS Directive is considered as fit-for-purpose and as putting the necessary regulatory framework in place for safe CO ₂ capture, transport and storage while allowing the Member States sufficient flexibility in the implementation of the CCS Directive. The evaluation found that the guidance documents need to be revised when there is more experience with CCS projects in the EU, which is not expected to happen before 2020. The Commission is following continuously the developments in the sector. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Due to the limited availability of data, it was not possible during the evaluation to assess the efficiency of the CCS Directive. The impact assessment for the CCS Directive estimates the administrative costs to 2030 to be €17.8 million, with 70% of this falling on operators, 26% on Member States and 4% on the Commission. In 2015, the evaluation support study concluded that there has not yet been enough experience of CCS regulation to doubt, or suggest adjustments to those numbers, though the lack of experience also means that they cannot be confirmed. |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Finalised on 15 January 2015</i></p> <p><i>No evaluation SWD (contractor report)</i></p> | <p>Evaluation</p> |
| <p><i>Scope:</i></p> | <p>Evaluation of Carbon Capture and Storage Directive 2009/31/EC</p> |
| <p><i>Evaluation findings:</i></p> | <p>The CCS Directive is considered as fit-for-purpose and as putting the necessary regulatory framework in place for safe CO₂ capture, transport and storage while allowing the Member States sufficient flexibility in the implementation of the CCS Directive. The guidance documents need to be revised once there is more experience with CCS projects.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>At the time of the evaluation, it was not possible yet to provide an answer on the efficiency of the CCS Directive as there was insufficient evidence. The impact assessment for the CCS Directive estimates the administrative costs to 2030 to be €17.8 million, with 70% of this falling on operators, 26% on Member States and 4% on the Commission. In 2015, the evaluation support study concluded that there has not yet been enough experience of CCS regulation to doubt, or suggest adjustments to those numbers, though the lack of experience also means that they cannot be confirmed.</p> |

Binding annual greenhouse gas emission reductions by Member States from 2021 to 2030

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>Overall state of play</i></p> <p><i>Proposal made in July 2016 pending in legislative procedure</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The objective of the Commission proposal is to achieve 30% greenhouse gas emission reductions in the the sectors outside of the EU Emissions Trading System (non-ETS) compared to 2005, in a manner that is fair for Member States given their different capacities, while ensuring cost efficiency and environmental integrity at EU level.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The proposed Regulation will reduce administrative costs associated with compliance monitoring and reporting by approximately €345,000-460,000 per year.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Adopted</i> 20/07/2016 • COM/2016/0482 | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p><i>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>Less frequent compliance checks are recommended in the Commission proposal, i.e. every five years instead of annually, that will significantly reduce the administrative burden for both Member States and the European Commission while maintaining and simplifying annual reporting.</p> |
| <p><i>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>The Commission proposal sets national emission targets for every Member State for 2030 expressed as a percentage reduction from 2005 emission levels as well as access to new flexibilities to achieve those targets cost effectively. Collectively, these national targets give an overall EU reduction of 30% in the sectors covered by the proposal. The 2030 targets range from 0% to -40% compared to 2005 levels.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>It was estimated that a domestic 40% reduction of GHG emissions would lead to additional energy system costs of 0.15–0.54% compared to GDP in 2030.</p> <p>Administrative costs associated with compliance checks will be reduced by approximately €345,000-460,000 per year.</p> <p>There are no direct reporting obligations or other administrative consequences for businesses, SMEs or micro-enterprises.</p> |

Initiatives in the area of Energy

Renewable Energy

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>Overall state of play</i></p> <p>Pending</p> <p><i>Evaluation and legislative proposal planned for adoption end 2016</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p>Summary:</p> | <p>The Commission is evaluating the Renewable Energy (RES) Directive and is planning to make a proposal to follow-up on its results before the end of 2016.</p> <p>The European Council in October 2014 set a binding EU-level target of at least 27% for the share for renewable energy (RES) in final energy consumption in the EU by 2030. The planned Renewable Energy Package, including a proposal for a renewed Renewable Energy Directive will ensure the delivery of the renewable energy target for 2030 as set by the European Council.</p> <p>Preliminary findings of the evaluation of the current Renewable Energy Directive showed a number of shortcomings while confirming the overall effectiveness of the directive. Hence, whilst Member States are on track to meet their nationally binding renewable energy target for 2020, progress towards more streamlined authorisation procedures is limited and the Guarantees of origin scheme is not yet working effectively. Lack of clear provisions on grid access rules, best practice for support schemes and cooperation mechanisms resulted in more costly than necessary renewable energy deployment.</p> <p>The Commission Proposal for a new Renewable Energy Directive will address these shortcomings. It will establish an accountable and reliable system for target achievement, create the market conditions that allow for cost-efficient financing and integration of renewable energy into the market, address remaining challenges with regard to the mainstreaming, deployment, uptake and integration of renewable energy in the EU energy markets, improve the bioenergy sustainability policy and promote cooperation between Member States in regional approaches.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The proposal will ensure the cost-efficient delivery of the binding EU-level target of at least 27% of renewable energy in the EU's final energy consumption.</p> <p>Additional information on the savings will be provided once the Commission proposal has been adopted.</p> |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Publication planned end 2016</i> | <p>Evaluation</p> |
| <p>Scope:</p> | <p>Evaluation of the Renewable Energy (RES) directive (Directive 2009/28/EC on the promotion of the use of energy from renewable sources).</p> <p>The entire Directive was evaluated with the exception of the reporting, planning and monitoring obligations for Member States and Commission which are covered by the parallel REFIT exercise on monitoring and reporting in the energy acquis. It mainly covers the period 2010-2015 (noting that RES Directive already dates back to 2001) and the 28 Member States.</p> |
| <p>Preliminary evaluation findings:</p> | <p>The Directive has met its main measurable objective (Member States are currently on track for 2020 RES targets) and overriding policy objectives (GHG reduction, security of supply, competitiveness).</p> <p>However, the emerging findings of the evaluation indicate that cost effectiveness is compromised by 1) lack of clear provisions for biofuel sustainability 2) lack of detailed guidance on support schemes and cooperation mechanisms 3) changes compared to the original proposal in the finally adopted proposal (Guarantees of origin), but then in return improved again by much faster than anticipated technology cost decreases. The Directive scored well with stakeholders in the Fitness Check concerning the binding common reporting template, less well for administrative costs linked to biofuels sustainability. Coherence with internal market provisions will be looked at in depth in the upcoming review.</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p><u>Benefits:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GHG (Green house Gases): 380 Mt of gross avoided CO₂ emissions at EU level in 2014. Fossil fuel displacement: renewables' production allowed the EU to cut its demand for fossil fuels by 114 Mtoe in 2014 (approximately 10 % of total fossil fuel consumption). • Avoided imported fuel costs: they amounted to around €20bn in 2014 due to increasing use of renewable energy. • Direct influence of RES policies on GDP remains below 0.5% in 2014. Employment in the RES sector has grown in the EU despite the economic crisis and exceeded original |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>estimations. The EU renewable energy industry currently employs 1.11 million workers. The EU is one of the key global players with regard to net employment creation in the renewable energy sector. In 2014, it had the second highest per-capita employment in the area of renewable energy sector, behind Brazil. In the same year, the RES industry had a combined turnover of 144 billion EUR.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 2013, European companies held 30% of all patents for renewable technologies. <p><u>Costs:</u></p> <p>No full quantification possible as Member States are not obliged to submit cost data. Partial quantification based on data availability, see below.</p> <p>Support costs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The EU 28 weighted average RES & CHP support cost tripled from 2008 to 2015. In 2015, Germany recorded the highest rate of RES & CHP support accounting for 6.3 €/kWh (household prices). The smallest amount of the same cost, 0.45 €/kWh, was recorded in Croatia • Spain's annual feed-in premium/feed-in tariff payments of around EUR 6.8 billion in 2013 supported 73.8 TWh of generated electricity. As a result of support scheme reform, this has been reduced to EUR 5.4 billion in 2015 to support 56.9 TWh¹⁷⁹. Germany spent EUR 20.4 billion for the EEG surcharge in 2013 and EUR 21.8 billion in 2015 for approx. 160 TWh of generated electricity. • The reporting obligation in Art 22 of the RES Directive causes median annual costs for Member States at 4,407 Euros with high benefits. (source REFIT energy acquis). The evaluation found the administrative burden from the biofuel sustainability scheme quite significant with one-off costs estimated at 120.000 euros and annual running costs of 40.000 per Member State. |
|--|---|

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Proposal planned for end 2016</i> | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p>Which REFIT objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</p> | <p>Simplification and modernisation to make sure the Renewable Energy Directive remains fit for purpose</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>Which other objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>The initiative will target (jointly with the initiative on energy union governance) ensuring that the new 2030 EU level target is attained collectively, create the market conditions that allow for the cost-efficient financing and integration of renewable energy into the market, address the remaining challenges with regard to the mainstreaming, deployment, uptake and integration of renewable energy in the EU energy markets, improve the bioenergy sustainability policy and promote cooperation between Member States in regional approaches.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Information not yet available.</p> |

Energy performance of buildings

| Overall state of play <i>Evaluation and legislative revision planned for publication / adoption end 2016</i> | Summary |
|--|---|
| Summary: | <p>The Commission is evaluating Directive 2010/31/EU on the energy performance of buildings (EPBD) and is planning to propose a legislative review on this basis including the "Smart finance for smart buildings" initiative (Energy Efficiency package).</p> <p>The energy efficiency contribution to moderation of demand is one of the key dimensions to achieve a resilient Energy Union. In this context especially the buildings sector has an important efficiency potential. The buildings stock is the largest single energy consumer in the EU and represents 40% of EU energy consumption. In addition, about 75% of the housing stock is energy inefficient and has a high cost-effective energy efficiency potential. The REFIT evaluation found that the EPBD resulted in a strengthening of minimum energy performance requirements in building codes in Member States between 2005 and 2013 of e.g. 66% for new buildings in France and 60% for new and existing residential buildings in Ireland.</p> <p>Efficiency could be boosted if renovation rates would increase from the current estimated 0,5-1,2% to above 2%. However there is a need to stimulate investment by buildings owners and to address the issue that financing is often hampered by the small-scale of many building projects.</p> <p>The evaluation revealed relatively limited regulatory failures. It showed that there is however scope for simplifying and streamlining outdated measures, and for enhancing compliance through fine tuning of existing provisions and better linking them with financial support. Additionally the evaluation points to the scope for modernisation of the Directive in the light of technological developments and the need to increase building renovation rates while supporting the decarbonisation of buildings in the long-term.</p> <p>The main objective of the review of the EPBD, including the 'Smart Financing for Smart Buildings' initiative is therefore to address these shortcomings and to promote a greater take-up of energy efficiency in the buildings sector. This will help deliver cost-effective greenhouse gas emission reductions and contribute to ensuring the security of energy supply in the EU. The initiative is</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>also expected to have a positive impact on the overall economy and especially SMEs by improving the competitiveness of European construction and energy services industries while boosting innovation and creating or retaining jobs in Europe.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>In 2013, 37 Mto additional final energy savings in buildings in the households and services sectors were achieved compared to 2007. During the same period, GHG emissions are estimated to have been reduced by 63 Mt CO₂ (i.e. 8% of the 1990 emissions of household and service sector), mainly in the household sector. 72,000 direct and indirect maintained jobs can be associated with the energy renovation of the EU building stock.</p> <p>The Commission proposal is expected to deliver an additional 28 MtoE of energy savings. The transposition of the revised Directive results in additional compliance cost and administrative costs such as an estimated additional €1bn – €3bn average annual investment for installation/upgrading of building automation. However, the removal of the obligation to conduct a study on the feasibility of alternative high efficiency alternative systems for new buildings could lead to cost savings of ca 200 million Euros/year.</p> <p>The simplified inspection regime for Member States authorities is estimated to result in savings of average 200 euros per inspection for ca. 13.5 million occasions of inspections in non-domestic buildings in the 15 concerned Member States during 2020-2030 (assuming full compliance).</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned for Q4 2016 | <p>Evaluation</p> |
| <p>Scope:</p> | <p>Evaluation of Directive 2010/31/EU on the energy performance of buildings.</p> <p>As the transposition deadline was 9 July 2012 and the application deadline for most provisions 9 January 2013, limited data is available about the actual impact of the recast EPBD.</p> |
| <p>Preliminary Evaluation findings:</p> | <p>The evaluation shows that the Directive is effective and is delivering on its general and specific objectives.</p> <p>There is evidence of around 48.9 Mto of additional final energy savings in 2014 in buildings compared to the 2007 baseline of the EPBD. These savings occur mainly within the scope of the EPBD – space heating, cooling and domestic hot water – and a significant part can be attributed to factors influenced by policy interventions. This figure of 48.9 Mto in 2014 is in line with the 2008 Impact Assessment supporting the EPBD, which estimated that the Directive would deliver 60 to 80 Mto of final energy savings by 2020.</p> <p>The evaluation shows that the overall architecture of the Directive, combining minimum requirements and certification, is working, in particular for new buildings.</p> <p>Targets for all new buildings to be of nearly zero-energy by 2020 have proved to set a '<i>future-proof</i>' vision for the sector and mobilise stakeholders accordingly.</p> <p>However, the evaluation identified ways in which national transposition and implementation can be further developed through better enforcement, compliance monitoring and evaluation.</p> <p>At EU level, opportunities for simplification or modernisation of outdated provisions and streamlining existing provisions in the light of technological progress were detected (e.g. in particular, the requirement to assess the technical, environmental and economic feasibility of high-efficiency alternative systems, or the regular inspection of heating and air conditioning systems).</p> <p>In conclusion, the evaluation reveals relatively limited regulatory failures. There is however scope for simplifying and streamlining outdated measures, and for enhancing compliance through fine tuning of existing provisions and better linking them with financial support. Additionally the evaluation points to the scope for</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | modernisation of the Directive in the light of technological developments and the need to increase building renovation rates while supporting the decarbonisation of buildings in the long-term. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p><u>Benefits:</u></p> <p>In 2013, compared to the recast EPBD's 2007 baseline, around 37 Mtoe additional final energy savings were realised in buildings in the households and services sectors (neutralising other factors such as climate , and the economic crisis). During the same period, GHG emissions are estimated to have been reduced by 63 Mt CO₂ (i.e. 8% of the 1990 emissions of household and service sector), mainly in the household sector. 72,000 direct and indirect maintained jobs can be associated with the energy renovation of the EU building stock. The EPBD intervenes in synergy with other EU legislation (notably for product efficiency) and is thus expected to have contributed to such benefits.</p> <p>By design, the EPBD includes provisions to ensure its cost-effectiveness. The cost-optimal benchmarking methodology to steer existing national energy performance requirements towards cost-efficient levels is working. This methodology ensures that Member States are not required to set minimum energy performance requirements which are not cost-effective over the estimated economic lifecycle. Member States have made use of this option.</p> <p><u>Costs:</u></p> <p>Concerning EPCs, certification is sometimes seen as an administrative burden. However, with a relatively limited additional transaction cost (in the range of 85-140 € for an apartment or single family house EPC, valid for 10 years), EPCs are proven to have positively influenced property valuation (in the range of up to 5-10% higher sale or rental prices both for the sale and rental market, hence effectively contributing to the creation of a demand driven market for energy efficiency in buildings.</p> <p>As regards administrative costs, the 2010 revision ensured continuity of national efforts to transpose and implement the 2002 EPBD. The main provisions, scope and structure were therefore retained in a conscious effort to ease transposition of the 2010 Directive and limit related administrative burden. Member States have estimated total costs of national implementation at a level of 160.8M€ for all Member States (without clarifying if these are linked to the recast EPBD specifically).</p> <p>Finally, the 2010 Directive has partially succeeded in ensuring that buyers/tenants/owners receive good quality information at a reasonable cost on the energy performance of buildings and about</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>the performance of their heating and air-conditioning systems (see specific sections below).</p> <p>Due to the diversity and disaggregation of the buildings sector, it remains challenging to acquire good data on building characteristics, energy use, and financial implications of renovation in terms of cost savings or asset values. This lack of data has negative consequences on the market perception of the cost-effective energy saving potential of the EU building stock, on enforcement tracking, on monitoring and evaluation. EPC registers/databases can be a key instrument for reinforced compliance, improve the knowledge on the building stock and better inform policy makers and support the decisions of market players.</p> <p>Enforcement, compliance and implementation represent a challenge for several aspects of the EPBD.</p> |
|--|--|

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <p><i>Proposal planned for Q4 2016</i></p> | <p>Commission proposal</p> |
| <p>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</p> | <p>Simplification and modernisation to make sure the EPBD remains fit for purpose.</p> <p>Review of the Directive 2010/31/EU on the energy performance of buildings (EPBD), including the "Smart finance for smart buildings" initiative (Energy Efficiency package).</p> |
| <p>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</p> | <p>The general objective of the review of the EPBD, including the 'Smart Finance for Smart Buildings' Initiative is to promote greater take-up of energy efficiency in the buildings sector and deliver cost-effective greenhouse gas emission reductions as well as to contribute to ensuring security of energy supply in the Union.</p> <p>Specific objectives of the initiative are (1) to address the shortcomings identified by the evaluation of the EPBD so as to ensure it remains fit for purpose (REFIT component); and (2) to consider the need for additional measures relating to energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy in buildings, with a 2030 perspective; (3) to deliver improved access to funding and stimulate investments ('Smart Financing for Smart Buildings').</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>The Commission proposal is likely to include a proposal to remove the obligation to conduct a study on the feasibility of alternative high efficiency alternative systems for new buildings – under Article 6 of the EPBD- which could lead to cost savings of ca 200 million Euros/year.</p> <p>It further proposes a simplified inspection regime for Member State</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | authorities which are estimated to result in savings of average 200 euros per inspection for ca. 13.5 million occasions of inspections in non-domestic buildings in the 15 concerned Member States during 2020-2030 (assuming full compliance). |
|--|---|

Regulation of the Supply Agency of the European Atomic Energy Community

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>Overall state of play</i></p> <p><i>Proposal planned for Q4 2016</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary and benefits:</i></p> | <p>The Commission is planning a legislative update in order to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - redefine, to the extent necessary, the working methods of European supply agency (ESA), in coherence with the market evolution; - alleviate, to the extent feasible, procedural burdens on market players, though taking due account of Euratom Law requirements; - analyse the past experience on contractual information, with more precise indicators; - concentrate on areas where diversification is still a challenge and further enhance diversification requirements; - better monitor the nuclear material flows in and out of the Community with a view to security of supply. |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The planned actions concern updating the current rules (which have been revisited the last time 40 years ago) with a view to achieving more legal certainty, streamlining procedures and increasing effectiveness and efficiency.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Proposal planned for Q4 2016</i> | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p><i>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>Simplification aspects include the extension of the application of simplified contract procedures from natural uranium to also special fissile materials.</p> <p>Legislative update of the Regulation of the Supply Agency of the European Atomic Energy Community of 5 May 1960 determining the manner in which demand is to be balanced against the supply of ores, source materials and special fissile materials (OJ P 032 11/05/1960 p. 0777-0779, and OJ L 193 25/07/1975 p. 0037-0038)</p> |
| <p><i>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>The existing Rules of the Supply Agency have not been modified since 1975, and therefore it is necessary to update and clarify them to take into account changes in the functioning of the nuclear fuel market. The existing Rules would be repealed and replaced.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Information not yet available.</p> |

Safety Standards for Radiation Protection

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>Overall state of play</i> <i>Proposal adopted Sept 2011</i> <i>Legal act adopted Dec 2013</i> <i>Application Feb 2018</i> | Summary |
| <i>Summary:</i> | <p>The revision merges five Directives to improve their coherence and clarity and to ensure better operational implementation of the requirements.</p> <p>The new Basic Safety Standards Directive offers now in a single document and a coherent and consistent set of definitions and requirements for the protection of workers, patients and members of the public.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>Due to the limited availability of data, the savings could not be quantified. The assessment is qualitative.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Adopted on 29/09/2011</i> • <i>COM(2011)593</i> | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Merging of five Directives to improve the coherence of Euratom legislation. The proposal further improves the clarity of the text and ensures better operational implementation of the requirements. • The new Basic Safety Standards Directive offers now in a single document and a coherent and consistent set of definitions and requirements for the protection of workers, patients and members of the public. |
| <p>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</p> | <p>Modernisation of the European Basic Safety Standards in radiation protection by taking account of the latest scientific knowledge and technological progress, as well as of operational experience with current legislation, and consolidating the existing acquis of Euratom radiation protection legislation into one single piece of legislation, merging five Directives and upgrading a recommendation to become legally binding.</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>Given data limitations, quantification has not been carried out.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Adopted – on track</i> • <i>5 December 2013 – Council Directive 2013/59/EURATOM</i> | <p>Legal Act</p> |
| <p>Outcome of Legislative Procedure</p> | <p>The REFIT objectives (simplification through consolidation) proposed by the Commission have been confirmed in legislative procedure.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Given data limitations, quantification has not been carried out. |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Application on 1 February 2018</i> • <i>Transposition Deadline 6 Feb 2018</i> | Implementation |
| <i>Implementation reported by MemberStates</i> | Implementation will start after the transposition deadline, 6 February 2018. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

Energy Union Governance – Streamlining of Planning and Reporting obligations

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>Overall state of play</i> <i>Fitness Check results expected end 2016</i> | Summary |
| Summary: | The Commission carries out a Fitness check in order to establish an inventory of 91 reporting and planning obligations in the EU energy acquis and to assess whether they should be kept, abandoned or integrated into the new Governance reporting framework. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Administrative burdens on Member States administrations has been quantified at 227 million euros due to reporting and planning obligations duties in 2020-2030 based on current provisions. |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Ongoing - adoption planned end 2016</i> | <p>Fitness Check</p> |
| <p><i>Scope:</i></p> | <p>Assessment of 91 reporting and planning obligations in the EU energy acquis containing reporting and planning obligations for Member States/Commission, with the view to determine whether they should be kept, abandoned or integrated into the new Governance reporting framework.</p> |
| <p><i>Evaluation findings:</i></p> | <p>Preliminary results show that 39 obligations should be kept separate from the streamlined energy union governance reporting, 19 should be repealed, 18 be integrated into the new Governance reporting framework and 15 kept separate.</p> <p>(to be updated)</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Costs occurred by all 28 Member States resulting from all energy planning reporting and monitoring obligations are estimated at 20 million Euros per year.</p> <p>Due to the limited availability of data, benefits could not be quantified but are described qualitatively.</p> |

Initiatives in the area of Taxation and Customs Union

EU legal framework for energy taxation (Energy Tax Directive)

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>Overall State of Play</i> <i>Evaluation planned 2017</i> | Evaluation |
| Summary : | Evaluation of the EU legal framework for energy taxation. |
| Estimated savings and benefits | |

Initiatives in the area of Transport

Combined Transport

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>Overall State of Play</i></p> <p><i>Evaluation finalised on 20 April 2016</i></p> <p><i>Proposal planned for 2017</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p>Summary :</p> | <p>The Commission evaluated Council Directive 92/106/EEC of 7 December 1992 on the establishment of common rules for certain types of combined transport of goods between Member States.</p> <p>In order to further promote intermodal transport in the EU and thus contribute to reducing emissions, the Commission will propose a legislative revision in 2017.</p> <p>The Directive is found to be relevant for its objective to reduce negative externalities, however gaps were identified as regards effectiveness and efficiency. On this basis, the Directive will be revised to improve its efficiency and effectiveness and ensure further promotion of intermodal transport in the EU.</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>A moderate shift of freight away from roads is estimated to create an estimated annual saving of up to EUR 2.1 billion of external costs.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalised - 20 April 2016- • SWD(2016)140 and SWD(2016)141 | <p>Evaluation</p> |
| <p>Scope:</p> | <p>Evaluation of Council Directive 92/106/EEC of 7 December 1992 on the establishment of common rules for certain types of combined transport of goods between Member States</p> |
| <p>Evaluation findings:</p> | <p>The Directive has considerably contributed to the development of the combined transport (CT) market in the EU (CT operations in the EU have quadrupled during the last two decades). However, although the general freight transport volumes have grown continuously, it has not been possible to considerably reduce the share of road transport in the modal split of EU freight transport activities. Therefore there is still a need for fostering modal shift away from road to ensure less negative externalities for society. As road transport continues to be cheaper and more flexible for various reasons, support for the use of alternative modes is still needed.</p> <p>The CT Directive improved the functioning of the internal market and the competitiveness of the CT industry, which in turn helps to reduce negative externalities in the EU. Without EU level action, the cross-border CT services would be faced with barriers resulting from different legal systems making the cross-border CT services uncompetitive at best and causing a reverse shift to road at worst.</p> <p>However, some provisions are not entirely effective due to ambiguous language or limited scope.</p> <p>Inconsistent implementation by Member States and the limitations on enforcement by the Commission are the main elements causing efficiency loss. The provisions on the transport documents are also inefficient.</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>During the period of 23 years that the Directive has provided support to combined transport, considerable growth of the sector has taken place supporting the aim of transport policy and shifting in the magnitude of 2.5 trillion tonne-kilometres of freight away from road. This shift creates a saving of up to €2.1 billion of external costs annually (2011).</p> <p>At the same time, the Directive does not create considerable additional costs to the industry and the costs to national administrations (cost of tax incentives) are considerably lower than the benefits for the society. For example, for Germany, the annual</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | cost for tax reimbursements and exemptions is €2 mio annually. |
|--|--|

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>In preparation for 2017</i> | Commission Proposal |
| <i>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i> | Simplification and improvement of effectiveness and efficiency |
| <i>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</i> | Proposal for the amendment of the Directive 92/106/EEC of 7 December 1992 on the establishment of common rules for certain types of combined transport of goods between Member States, to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Directive as well as ensuring further promotion of intermodal transport in EU. Certain problematic provisions are to be clarified and simplified, which will facilitate their implementation by Member States and bring about a more uniform application across the EU. Extension of the scope will be considered in the impact assessment. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Not yet available |

Promotion of Clean and Energy-efficient Road Transport Vehicles

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>Overall state of Play</i></p> <p><i>planned</i></p> <p><i>External evaluation report finalised in Sep 2015</i></p> <p><i>Commission proposal planned for Q4 2017</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The Commission evaluated Directive 2009/33/EC on the promotion of clean and energy efficient road transport vehicles (the “Clean Vehicles Directive”) and is considering a legislative revision in 2017.</p> <p>The Directive aims to stimulate the market for clean and energy-efficient vehicles by requiring various procurers to take account of lifetime environmental and energy impacts when purchasing road transport vehicles.</p> <p>While the needs at which the Directive is targeted, i.e. the need to decrease transport’s CO2 and pollutant emissions and to increase its energy efficiency and competitiveness, are pertinent, the evaluation showed that tools applied were not able to achieve these goals. The setup of the current Directive prevented it from having significant impacts on the public procurement of all vehicle categories. Due to developments in the services sector, the number of vehicles actually purchased by public entities alone is not high enough to have a substantial impact on the market and promote the up-take of alternative vehicles.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The estimated achieved cost/benefit ratio of the current Directive is very low but remains positive. The benefits of the policy – reflecting CO2 and pollutant emissions reduction and fuel efficiency savings - are estimated to be in the range of EUR 42.6 to EUR 521.1 million, against total costs of around EUR 34.6 to EUR 431.0 million.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>External evaluation report</i> - September 2015</p> | <p>Evaluation</p> |
| <p><i>Scope:</i></p> | <p>Evaluation of Directive 2009/33/EC on the promotion of clean and energy-efficient road transport vehicles</p> |
| <p><i>Evaluation findings:</i></p> | <p>The impacts of the Clean Vehicle Directive are very limited to date due to inter alia its extremely limited scope, the absence of a definition of a “clean vehicle” and the perceived complexity of the monetisation methodology which lead to public authorities using the other given options given where transposition made this possible.</p> <p>Therefore the estimated achieved overall benefit to cost ratio of the Directive is extremely low but remains positive.</p> <p>There is some evidence to suggest that the Directive and the accompanying initiatives have supported best practice exchange.</p> <p>A full repeal of the Directive would be unlikely to have significant practical impacts on the market and the current level of demand for clean vehicles.</p> <p>With a repeal the broader message – provided by the only harmonised methodology for the internalisation of external costs in the acquis – would be lost. A repeal would only be possible together with a linked amendment of the current horizontal public procurement law.</p> <p>For buses, waste collection vehicles and other heavy duty vehicles primarily used by/in the service of public authorities, the potential impact would probably be greater as there is a lack of a wider policy framework to reduce the CO2 emissions of these vehicles.</p> <p>A partial repeal – i.e. retaining only the monetisation methodology in its current format – would bias towards diesel vehicles, which already tends to be the dominant technology in the heavy duty vehicle market.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The estimated achieved cost/benefit ratio is very low but remains positive. The benefits of the policy – reflecting CO2 and pollutant emissions reduction and fuel efficiency savings - are estimated to be in the range of EUR 42.6 to EUR 521.1 million, against total costs of around EUR 34.6 to EUR 431.0 million. As the the monetisation methodology for choosing clean and energy efficient vehicles has not often been used by national authorities the administrative costs associated with the Directive are relatively limited (less than EUR 2.3 million on an annual basis).</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Planned for Q4 2017</i></p> | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p><i>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>The general objective of the legislative revision of the Directive is to increase the demand and deployment of cleaner vehicles thus strengthening the competitiveness of the EU industry while decreasing CO₂ and pollutant emissions of transport.</p> <p>To achieve this goal, the specific policy objectives of this initiative can be defined as (1) increasing the public procurement of all categories of clean vehicles, (2) adjusting the available options to provide adequate incentives to procure/develop cleaner vehicles and (3) adjusting and simplifying the existing monetisation methodology to remove counter-incentives to the procurement/development of cleaner vehicles.</p> |
| <p><i>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>The purpose of the review is to tackle three main problems that were detected by the ex-post evaluation of the CVD concerning (1) the overall functioning of the Directive, (2) its ineffectiveness and inefficiency in reducing GHG and pollutant emissions and (3) the particularly high emphasis on fuel consumption in the monetisation methodology. In turn, it should increase the demand for and deployment of cleaner vehicles thus strengthening the competitiveness of the EU industry while decreasing CO₂ and pollutant emissions of transport.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Information not yet available.</p> |

Revision of the Eurovignette Directive

| <i>Overall state of Play</i> <i>Commission proposal planned for Q2 2017</i> | Summary |
|---|---|
| <i>Summary:</i> | <p>Revision of Directive 1999/62/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 June 1999 on the charging of heavy goods vehicles for the use of certain infrastructures</p> <p>Directive 1999/62/EC provides common rules for deploying road charges applicable to heavy goods vehicles on the TEN-T network and on motorways.</p> <p>Applying the user-pay and polluter-pay principle, the Commission intends to propose improvements for those Member States who choose to use road charging, including for the interoperability of electronic tolling services.</p> <p>The proposed revision of the Directive will address the following objectives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Preserve the TEN-T roads and broader EU road network in good maintenance condition, to avoid disruptions in the European transport system; 2. Reduce congestion on the roads which are of importance for cross-border traffic (TEN-T network); 3. Reduce disparities in road charging policies across the EU to better reflect the real cost of road use including environmental costs; 4. Ensure that road charging schemes do not discriminate non-resident motorists. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>Information not yet available.</p> |

European Electronic Toll Service

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>Overall state of Play</i></p> <p><i>evaluation results expected end 2016</i></p> <p><i>Legislative revision planned planned for 2017</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The Commission is carrying out an evaluation of Directive 2004/52/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the interoperability of electronic road toll systems in the Community. and is considering a legislative proposal within its Work Programme for 2017.</p> <p>Applying the user-pay and polluter-pay principle, the Commission intends to propose improvements for those Member States who choose to use road charging, including for the interoperability of electronic tolling services</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Information not yet available.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <i>evaluation results expected end 2016</i> | Evaluation |
| <i>Scope:</i> | <p>Evaluation of Directive 2004/52/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the interoperability of electronic road toll systems in the Community and Commission Decision 2009/750/EC of 6 October 2009 on the definition of the European Electronic Toll Service and its technical elements (notified under document C(2009) 7547)</p> <p>Directive 2004/52/EC provides for the creation by the market of a European Electronic Toll Service, according to the definition provided in Decision 2009/750/EC.</p> <p>Decision 2009/750/EC defines the European Electronic Toll Service, the deployment of which by the market is mandated in Directive 2004/52/EC.</p> |
| <i>Evaluation findings:</i> | Information not yet available. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <i>Legislative revision planned for 2017</i> | Commission Proposal |
| <i>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i> | <p>Revision of Directive 2004/52/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the interoperability of electronic road toll systems in the Community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directive 2004/52/EC provides for the creation by the market of a European Electronic Toll Service, according to the definition provided in Decision 2009/750/EC. <p>Revision of Commission Decision 2009/750/EC of 6 October 2009 on the definition of the European Electronic Toll Service and its technical elements (notified under document C(2009) 7547)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision 2009/750/EC defines the European Electronic Toll Service, the deployment of which by the market is mandated in Directive 2004/52/EC. <p>The proposed revision will address the following objective:</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | Wide-scale interoperability of electronic tolling services in the EU, thereby facilitating cross-border movement of goods and people by reducing the cost and burden of compliance with the obligation to pay tolls. |
| <i>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</i> | Information not yet available. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

Priority 4: A deeper and fairer internal market with a strengthened industrial base

Overview

1. Overview of REFIT Initiatives in the area of Competition

| | Evaluation | Commission Proposal | Legal Act | Implementation |
|--|---|---------------------------------|------------------------------|---|
| Simplified procedure for Merger Control | Evaluation Planned in 2017 | | Legal act 5 December 2013 | Implementation Applies with effect from 1 January 2014 |
| Merger Control | Evaluation ongoing (following-up on White paper COM(2015)449 final) | | | |
| Simplified Procedure Notice for State Aid | Review Planned to be finalised in 2017 | Communication under preparation | | |
| General Block Exemption | | Commission proposal | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|-----------------|--|--|
| Regulation - extension to ports and airports | | planned in 2017 | | |
|---|--|-----------------|--|--|

2. Overview of REFIT Initiatives in the area of Financial Stability, Financial Services and Capital Markets Union

| | Evaluation | Commission Proposal | Legal Act | Implementation |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|-----------|----------------|
| | | | | |
| Follow-up to Call for evidence – Financial Services Legislation | Fitness Check planned for 2017 | Communication on Follow-Up planned in 2017 (CWP 2017) | | |
| European Market Infrastructure Regulation (EMIR) | | Commission proposal Planned in Q1 2017 | | |
| National discretions in the audit package | Evaluation Planned in 2017 | | | |
| Prudential treatment of investment firms | Evaluation Planned in 2017 | | | |
| Financial Conglomerates Directive | Evaluation planned in Q1 2017 | | | |
| Motor Insurance Directive | Evaluation | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | Planned in 2017 | | | |
| European Long Term Investment Funds (ELTIF) | | Commission proposal adopted 26 June 2013 | Legal act adopted 20 April 2015 | Implementation Entry into force 08 December 2015 |
| Insurance distribution | | Commission proposal adopted 3 July 2012 | Legal act adopted 20 January 2016 | Implementation Date of effect: 22 February 2016 |
| Review of the European Venture Capital (EuVECA) and European Social Entrepreneurship (EuSEF) Fund regulations | | Commission proposal adopted 14 July 2016 | | |
| Review of the Prospectus Directive | Evaluation Finalised on 30 November 2015 | Commission proposal adopted 30 November 2015 | Legal act Pending in legislative procedure | |

3. Overview of REFIT Initiatives in the area of Health and Food Safety

| | Evaluation | Commission Proposal | Legal Act | Implementation |
|---|------------|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| Animal health law | | Commission proposal 6 May 2013 | Legal act 9 March 2016 | Implementation Application on 21 April 2021 |
| Official controls on the agri-food chain | | Commission proposal 6 May 2013 | Residues in live animals – delegated act Planned for 2018 | |
| Plant health | | Commission proposal 6 May 2013 - | Legal act Pending in legislative procedure | |
| Clinical Trials | | Commission proposal 17 July 2012 | Legal act 16 April 2014 | Implementation Application starts from October 2018 / Transition period until 2021 |
| Zootechnical legislation | | Commission proposal | Legal act | Implementation |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| | | 11 February 2014 | 8 June 2016 | Application on 1 November 2018, Article 65 from 19 July 2016 Transposition Deadline 1 November 2018 |
| Veterinary medicines | | Commission proposal 10 September 2014 | Legal act Pending in legislative procedure | |
| Medicated feed | | Commission proposal 10 September 2014 | Legal act Pending in legislative procedure | |
| Food information | | Guidelines and database in preparation | | |
| Nutrition and Health Claims made on Food | Evaluation Ongoing and expected to be finalised by Q1 2018 8 | | | |
| Pesticides | Evaluation Ongoing and expected to be finalised by Q2 2018 | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|-----------------------------|
| General food law | Evaluation Ongoing and expected to be finalised beginning 2017 | | | |
| Feed additive legislation | Evaluation Planned in 2017 | | | |
| Food contact materials legislation | | | | Implementation Follow-up |

4. Overview of REFIT Initiatives in the area of Internal Market, Industry, Entrepreneurship and SMEs

| | Evaluation | Commission Proposal | Legal Act | Implementation |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Mutual Recognition for Goods | Evaluation Results expected 2017 | Commission Proposal Planned for 2017 (CWP 2017) | | |
| Public procurement | Evaluation Planned for 2019 | Commission proposal 20 December 2011 | Legal act 26 February 2014 | Implementation Application on 17 April 2014 Transposition 18 April 2016 |
| Standard Procurement Document | Evaluation Planned for 2017 | | Legal act Adopted by the Commission on 5 January 2016 | Implementation linked to that of the Public procurement Directives (see above) |
| Standard Forms for public procurement | | | Legal act 11 November 2015 | Implementation linked to that of the Public procurement Directives (see above) |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| Late Payments Directive | Evaluation Finalised 26 August 2016 | Commission proposal 8 April 2009 | Legal act 16 February 2011 | Implementation Application on 16 March 2013 Transposition Deadline March 2016 |
| Construction Products | Fitness check Ongoing and planned to be finalised end 2017 | Commission proposal 23 May 2008 | Legal act 9 March 2011 | Implementation Application on 1 July 2013 |
| Recognition of professional qualification | Evaluation Planned for 2019 | Commission proposal 19 December 2011 | Legal act 20 November 2013 | Implementation Transposition Deadline 18 January 2016 |
| Enforcement of Intellectual Property Rights | Evaluation Ongoing and planned to be finalised end 2016 | Commission proposal Planned Q4 2016 | | |
| Market surveillance | | Commission proposal 13 February 2013 | Legal act Pending in legislative procedure | |
| Lifts Directive | Evaluation Ongoing, planned to be | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| | finalised by mid-2017 | | | |
| Machinery Directive | Evaluation Ongoing , planned to be finalised by end 2017 | | | |
| Oil Refining industry | Fitness check Finalised Q1 2016 | | | |
| Forest based industries | Cumulative Cost Assessment Ongoing planned to be finalised 2016 | | | |
| Chemicals industry | Cumulative Cost Assessment Finalised 11 July 2016 | | | |
| Chemicals legislation (other than REACH) | Fitness check Ongoing planned to be finalised end 2017 | | | |
| Firearms Directive | Evaluation Finalised Q4 2015 | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| Remedies for public procurement) | Evaluation Ongoing planned to be finalised end 2016 | | | |
| Commercial Agents | Evaluation July 2015 | | | |
| Standardisation | Evaluation 1 June 2016 | | | |
| Pre-packaging | Evaluation 4 July 2016 | | | |
| Glass and ceramics industries | Cumulative Cost Assessment Ongoing to be finalised 2017 | | | |
| Design System | Evaluation planned | | | |
| Aerosol Dispensers | Evaluation planned | | | |
| Liability for defective products | Evaluation planned | | | |
| European Observatory on Infringements of Intellectual Property | Evaluation planned | | | |

| | | | | |
|------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Digital Single Gateway | | Commission proposal Planned in 2017 | | |
|------------------------|--|--|--|--|

5. Overview of REFIT Initiatives in the area of Transport



| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| Road Infrastructure and Tunnel Safety | Evaluation External evaluation report finalised June 2015 | Commission proposal Planned for 2017 (CWP 2017) | | |
| Port Reception Facilities | Evaluation 31 March 2016 | Commission proposal In preparation | | |
| Training, Qualification, Licensing in Road Transport | Evaluation October 2014 | Commission proposal Planned in 2017 (CWP 2017) | | |
| Better Functioning of the Market for Bus and Coach Services | Evaluation Expected 2017 | Commission proposal Planned in 2017 (CWP 2017) | | |
| Enhancement of the social legislation in road transport | Evaluation Expected 2017 | Commission proposal Planned in 2017 (CWP 2017) | | |
| Leasing of Vehicles | Evaluation Results expected 2017 | Commission proposal Planned in 2017 (CWP 2017) | | |
| Maritime Acquis | Fitness check To be finalised Q2 2017 | | | |
| Airport charges | Evaluation To be finalised Q3 2017 | | | |

6. Overview of REFIT Initiatives in the area of Taxation and Customs Union

| | Evaluation | Commission Proposal | Legal Act | Implementation |
|---|---|---|-----------|----------------|
| Common Customs Tariff | | Commission proposal Foreseen adoption by Q3 2017 | | |
| General arrangements for excise duty | | Proposal Planned for 2017 (CWP 2017) | | |
| Excise duties on alcohol and alcoholic beverages | Evaluation Expected to be finalised 2016 | Proposal Planned in 2017 (CWP 2017) | | |
| Tobacco Excise | Evaluation 21 December 2015 | Commission proposal Adoption foreseen Q3 2017 | | |
| Common Consolidated Corporate Tax Base (CCCTB) | | Commission proposal Adoption planned Q4 2016 | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|
| Definitive VAT system for cross border trade | | Proposal Planned for Q3 2017 | | |
| VAT Rates | | Commission proposal planned in Q3 2017 | | |
| SME VAT Package | Evaluation Planned Q1 2017 | | | |
| VAT e-invoicing directive | Evaluation To start in 2018 | | | |
| Refund of value added tax | | Commission proposal 29 October 2004 | Legal act 12 February 2008 | Implementation Application on 1 January 2010 |

Initiatives in the area of Competition

Simplified procedure for Merger Control

| Overall state of play <i>- Application on 1 January 2014</i> <i>- Evaluation 2017 (as part of the evaluation of the Merger Control Regulation)</i> | Summary |
|---|---|
| Summary: | <p>The purpose of the initiative is to simplify and expedite the examination of concentrations that are unlikely to raise competition concerns. This would lead to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) a significant increase in the number of cases reviewed under simplified procedure; and (ii) a reduction in pre-notification periods for both simplified and non-simplified cases. <p>The expected benefits have indeed started to materialise and are expected to continue. The evaluation started in 2016 for merger control will confirm their extent.</p> |
| Estimated savings and benefits | <p>An increase of 5-10% in the number of cases reviewed under simplified procedure has been noted. No precise monetary figures are available but in 2014 the simplified procedure was applied to 68% of all final Commission decisions in mergers, corresponding to an increase of 8 percentage points in the number of simplified decisions compared to 2013.</p> <p>In 2015, the simplified procedure was applied to approximately 70% of all final Commission decisions in mergers. DG Competition expects this trend to continue. Up to July 2016 approximately 73% of all final Commission decisions were adopted under the simplified procedure.</p> <p>Furthermore, there are indications that the new rules on simplified cases and the streamlined information requirements for all cases have resulted in reduced pre-notification periods in both simplified and normal procedure cases.</p> <p>Estimations of savings and benefits will be provided in the framework of the evaluation of certain aspects of the merger control Regulation within the limits of data availability.</p> <p>The evaluation of certain aspects of the merger control Regulation will assess to what extent the Simplification Package (2013) has</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>contributed to the reduction of the burden (in terms of workload and resources spent) incurred by the Commission and businesses for having certain categories of typically unproblematic cases subject to EU merger control and whether there is scope for a further reduction of such a burden without affecting the effectiveness of EU merger control.</p> |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <p><i>Commission Notice on a simplified procedure for treatment of certain concentrations under Council Regulation (EC) No 139/2004. - 5 December 2013</i></p> <p><i>Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 1269/2013-5 December 2013</i></p> | <p>Legal act</p> |
| <p>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</p> | <p>To make the merger rules and procedures less burdensome for businesses.</p> <p>The Commission has reduced the amount of information required for notifying transactions both under the normal and the simplified procedure. Moreover, the simplification package has reduced the in-house work that companies undertake before they notify a merger and could also reduce fees paid to external lawyers by up to one third.</p> |
| <p>Which other objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</p> | <p>As part of the Simplification Package adopted in 2013, the Commission reviewed: (i) the Notice on simplified procedures and (ii) the merger implementing regulation. The objectives include simplifying and expediting the examination of concentrations that are unlikely to raise competition concerns. This is done by widening the scope of its simplified notification procedure to review unproblematic mergers with a view of focussing the Commission's resources on cases that matter from a competition perspective</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>Due to the limited availability of data, savings could not be quantified.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <p><i>It applies with effect from 1 January 2014 –</i></p> <p><i>Evaluation as part of Merger Control Regulation evaluation planned for 2016/2017</i></p> | <p>Implementation</p> |
| <p>Implementation</p> | <p>An increase of 5-10% in the number of cases reviewed under simplified procedure has been noted. No precise monetary figures</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>are available but in 2014 the simplified procedure was applied to 68% of all final Commission decisions in mergers, corresponding to an increase of 8 percentage points in the number of simplified decisions compared to 2013.</p> <p>In 2015, the simplified procedure was applied to approximately 70% of all final Commission decisions in mergers. DG Competition expects this trend to continue. Up to July 2016 approximately 73% of all final Commission decisions were adopted under the simplified procedure.</p> <p>Furthermore, internal analysis points toward the fact that the new rules on simplified cases and the streamlined information requirements for all cases have resulted in reduced pre-notification periods in both simplified and normal procedure cases.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>Information not yet available.</p> <p>Estimations of savings and benefits will be provided in the framework of the evaluation of certain aspects of the merger control Regulation within the limits of data availability.</p> |

Merger Control

| Overall state of play <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>White Paper published 2014 (COM(2014)449 final)</i> • <i>Evaluation results expected 2017</i> | Summary |
|--|---|
| Summary: | <p>Building on some issues identified in the White Paper "<i>Towards more effective EU merger control</i>", the Commission is evaluating the Council Regulation (EC) No 139/2004 on the control of concentrations between undertakings.</p> <p>The White Paper towards more effective EU merger control proposed two areas for action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to close a regulatory gap by allowing the Commission in the future to review at EU level certain acquisitions of non-controlling minority shareholdings that can raise competition concerns, and - to make the case referral system between Member States and the Commission more effective and business-friendly, as well as to streamline and simplify other procedures. <p>These proposals are still under review and further research is being conducted in 2016/2017.</p> <p>Concerning minority shareholdings, a majority of responding private stakeholders (business associations, companies, law firms and lawyers' associations) in 2014 did not consider that there is a gap of sufficient scope as to call for new regulation at this stage. Regarding the other aspects of the White Paper (referrals and simplifying other procedures), the Commission is considering whether these aspects could best be addressed by a legislative proposal or not.</p> |
| Estimated savings and benefits | <p>In the first public consultation, stakeholders (in particular law firms and law associations), estimated the time savings related to streamlining referrals and other procedural aspects of merger control mostly at around 1-2 months.</p> <p>The cost saving were mostly not quantified, however, one law firm estimated them to be 20% - 30% lower than under the current procedure.</p> <p>Information to be completed.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Evaluation results expected 2017</i> | Evaluation |
| <i>Scope:</i> | <p>To follow up to the White Paper an evaluation of procedural and jurisdictional aspects of EU merger control related to Council Regulation (EC) No 139/2004 of 20 January 2004 on the control of concentrations between undertakings started in 2016.</p> <p>The following aspects, only partly covered by the White Paper, will be analysed: (1) the jurisdictional thresholds set out in Article 1 of the Merger Regulation, (2) the procedure for the treatment of certain types of concentrations that generally are not susceptible of raising competition concerns, (3) some aspects of the referral system as set out notably in Articles 4 and 22 of the Merger Regulation, and (4) certain technical aspects of the procedural and investigative framework for the assessment of mergers.</p> |
| <i>Evaluation Findings:</i> | Information not yet available. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

Simplified Procedure Notice for State Aid

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>Overall state of play</i></p> <p><i>Review to be finalised in 2017</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>Review of the Commission Notice on a Simplified Procedure for the treatment of certain types of State Aid ('Simplified procedure Notice') (2009/C136/03)</p> <p>The revision of the Simplified Procedure Notice is expected to remove duplications in the regulatory treatment of certain cases. Before the revision of the GBER (General Block Exemption Regulation), the Notice covered a simplified treatment for notifications of straightforward cases. These cases are now largely covered by the GBER, as a result of which notification is no longer required. Also, part of the scope of the Notice is covered by the Implementing Regulation. This regulatory duplication creates confusion for Member States and is expected to be removed.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>In the period 2009-2016, 82 cases were treated under the Simplified Procedure. In the future, 35 of these cases would no longer need notification due to the GBER revision and 32 would be covered by the simplified treatment existing under the Implementing Regulation (simpler notification form and no need for summary notification publication). The remaining 15 cases would continue to be covered by the simplified procedure under the Code of Best Practice. The reform overall is expected to simplify procedures and avoid different, partially overlapping processes, thus leading to less complexity for Member States and for the Commission.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Planned</i></p> <p><i>Review to be finalised in 2017</i></p> | <p>Communication</p> |
| <p><i>Which REFIT objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>Review of the Commission Notice on a Simplified Procedure for the treatment of certain types of State Aid ('Simplified procedure Notice') (2009/C136/03)</p> <p>The objectives are a reduction of the administrative burden for stakeholders, as well as greater legal certainty as regards the applicable State aid procedures. The Commission must however balance the need for simplification for the least distortive cases with closer scrutiny of cases falling outside the GBER.</p> |
| <p><i>Which other objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>The Simplified procedure Notice sets out the conditions under which the Commission will usually follow a simplified procedure and adopt short-form decisions declaring certain types of State support measures compatible with the common market, and provides guidance in respect of the procedure itself.</p> <p>The objective of this review would be to take account of the evolution of State aid law, decision-making practice, and the experience gained in applying the Simplified Procedure.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>In the period 2009-2016, 82 cases were treated under the Simplified Procedure. In the future, 35 of these cases would no longer need notification due to the GBER revision and 32 would be covered by the simplified treatment existing under the Implementing Regulation (simpler notification form and no need for summary notification publication). The remaining 15 cases would continue to be covered by the simplified procedure under the Code of Best Practice.</p> |

General Block Exemption Regulation: extension to ports and airports

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>Overall state of play</i></p> <p><i>Planned</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>first public consultation was conducted in spring 2016</i> • <i>Adoption of Commission Regulation planned for 1st quarter 2017(CWP 2017)</i> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>General Block Exemption Regulation: extension to ports and airports (Regulation 651/2014).</p> <p>This initiative aims to simplify the application of State aid rules, thus reducing administrative burden and costs and speeding up the implementation of projects. It concerns the revision of Commission Regulation 651/2014 introducing exemption provisions for ports and airports in the Commission Regulation declaring certain categories of aid compatible with the internal market in application of Articles 107 and 108 of the Treaty.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The potential annual regulatory cost-savings that can be achieved by this initiative are estimated at several million Euros for companies and public authorities. The Commission will work with Member States and stakeholders to check whether the potential savings are achieved in practise.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <p>Planned</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under preparation: first public consultation was conducted in spring 2016 • Adoption of Commission Regulation planned for 1st quarter 2017 | <p>Commission proposal</p> |
| <p>Which REFIT objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</p> | <p>Proposal to review the General Block Exemption Regulation (Regulation 651/2014)</p> <p>This initiative aims to simplify the application of State aid rules, thus reducing administrative burden and costs and speeding up the implementation of projects.</p> |
| <p>Which other objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</p> | <p>The Commission aims at codifying its existing decision-making practice on airports and ports. This will increase transparency in the handling of cases in these sectors. By adopting straightforward compatibility rules in the GBER, the Commission will give a clear indication of the conditions to be observed in order to provide legal certainty and to be able to implement the measures quickly. In addition, some further clarifications on existing case practice with regard to aid in outermost regions will be provided.</p> <p>The abolition of the notification requirements and the regulatory codification / clarifications envisaged as part of this initiative should reduce regulatory costs without a significant impact on the amount of State aid granted or on competition in the internal market.</p> <p>The Commission must however balance the need for simplification for the least distortive cases with closer scrutiny of cases falling outside the GBER.</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>The Commission estimates the potential annual regulatory cost-savings that can be achieved by this initiative at several million Euros for companies and public authorities.</p> <p>In the first Advisory Committee meeting with Member State experts in spring 2016, participants were strongly encouraged to submit any</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>data or suggestions for methodologies to calculate the annual regulatory cost-savings which would result from the draft Commission proposal. As of August 2016, no Member State nor any other stakeholder has submitted data or suggestions for a methodology to assess the cost savings.</p> <p>More data will be provided in the legislative memorandum.</p> |
|--|---|

Initiatives in the area of Financial Stability, Financial Services and Capital Markets Union

Call for evidence – Financial Services Legislation

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Overall state of Play:</p> <p><i>Fitness Check ongoing, results expected end 2016</i></p> <p><i>Follow-Up Planned for 2017 (CWP 2017)</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p>Summary:</p> | <p>On 30 September 2015 the Commission launched a "call for evidence" to gather feedback and gauge the cumulative impact and interaction of all the current EU rules governing the financial sector. Through the consultation, the Commission seeks to identify possible inconsistencies, incoherence and gaps in financial rules, as well as unnecessary regulatory burdens and factors negatively affecting long-term investment and growth.</p> <p>The Commission plans a Communication on the results and the follow-up to the call for evidence for end 2016.</p> <p>Input of the REFIT Platform:</p> <p>In the REFIT Platform opinion on financial reporting the Stakeholder group and some members of the Government group support the need to streamline financial reporting to various supervisory authorities to reduce unnecessary administrative burden on financial institutions. This opinion confirms the evidence gathered by the European Commission as part of its Call for evidence and reinforces the need for action.</p> <p>The Commission is planning to carry out a fitness check to review reporting requirements including transaction reporting.</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>Information pending</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned for 2017 | Fitness Check |
| Scope: | <p>Following on the call for evidence, the Commission is planning to carry out a fitness check to review reporting requirements including transaction reporting.</p> <p>This initiative will also address opinions and recommendations by the REFIT Platform.</p> |
| Evaluation findings: | Not yet available. |
| Estimated savings and benefits | Not yet available. |

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned for 2017 (CWP 2017) | Communication |
| Which REFIT objective(s) will the Commission pursue? | The Commission plans a Communication on the results and the follow-up to the call for evidence on the cumulative impact of financial legislation for end 2016. |
| Which other objective(s) will the Commission pursue? | Information not yet available. |
| Estimated savings and benefits | Information not yet available. |

EMIR - European Market Infrastructure Regulation

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>State of Play: Legislative Review Planned for 2017</i> | Summary |
| <i>Summary and benefits:</i> | <p>The Commission is mandated to review Regulation 648/2012 (EMIR) and present any appropriate legislative proposals.</p> <p>The outcome of the public consultation on EMIR and the Call for Evidence on financial regulation carried out by DG FISMA in 2015-2016 justifies the need to amend EMIR in some specific areas to eliminate disproportionate costs/burdens to some derivatives counterparties (i.e. small financials, corporates, pension funds) and to simplify rules without putting at risk financial stability.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Planned</i></p> <p><i>Under preparation adoption foreseen Q1 2017</i></p> | <p>Commission proposal</p> |
| <p><i>Which REFIT objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>The Commission is mandated to review Regulation 648/2012 (EMIR) and present any appropriate legislative proposals. The outcome of the public consultation on EMIR and the Call for Evidence on financial regulation carried out by DG FISMA in 2015-2016 justifies the need to amend EMIR in some specific areas to eliminate disproportionate costs/burdens to some derivatives counterparties (i.e. small financials, corporates, pension funds) and to simplify rules without putting at risk financial stability. The initiative is also related to the ongoing initiative to establish a Capital Markets Union (CMU). Efficient and resilient post-trading systems and collateral markets are essential elements for a well-functioning CMU. Effective and efficient EMIR rules contribute to achieving the objectives of CMU and to the Jobs and Growth agenda in line with the political priorities of the Commission.</p> |
| <p><i>Which other objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>Information not yet available</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Information not yet available</p> |

National discretions in the audit package

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <i>Evaluation Planned for 2017</i> | Summary |
| <i>Summary:</i> | <p>Following the call for evidence, it is planned to review national discretions that member states enjoy in the Audit Regulation.</p> <p>This refers to Capital Requirements Regulation (EU) 575/2013 (CRR) and the Capital Requirements Directive 2013/36/EU ('CRD IV package').</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available |

Prudential treatment of investment firms

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <i>Evaluation Planned for 2017</i> | Summary |
| <i>Summary:</i> | <p>The Commission is mandated to review the CRR in accordance with Articles 493(2), 498(2) and 508(2) and (3) of the CRR in order to determine a more appropriate prudential treatment for Investment firms.</p> <p>An appropriate prudential regime catering for investment firm business models allows for proportionate and calibrated requirements within the Commissions wider CMU and Better regulation agendas.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available |

Financial Conglomerates Directive (FICOD)

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>evaluation planned for Q1 2017</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p>Summary:</p> | <p>The Financial Conglomerates Directive (FICOD) was adopted in 2002 in response to the need to supervise, on a group-wide basis, financial groups/conglomerates providing services and products in different sectors of the financial markets, most importantly to bank-insurance groups.</p> <p>FICOD builds on sectorial legislation relating to banking and insurance and provides supervisors with tools to apply supplementary supervision for financial conglomerates, addressing any blind spots in the sectorial legislation and to avoid the circumvention of prudential requirements set-out in sectorial legislation.</p> <p>Following the financial crisis, FICOD was amended by Directive 2011/89/EU of 16 November 2011 (FICOD 1). This directive was a "quick-fix" aimed at remedying specific crisis related problems but it also contained an obligation for the Commission to carry out a more profound review of FICOD 1, followed by a legislative proposal if necessary. Following this request, the Commission delivered a report in December 2012 identifying a number of aspects of FICOD 1 requiring revision.</p> <p>A review was put on hold pending the negotiations and subsequent adoption of the sectorial legislation on which FICOD builds – namely banking and insurance. Because the sectorial legislation has been in force for a while, and it has been 3 years since the publication of the Commission report, now is appropriate to evaluate whether FICOD 1 is performing according to its objectives.</p> <p>Input of the REFIT Platform:</p> <p>In the REFIT Platform opinion on FICOD a majority of the members recommended a review of the directive with the Stakeholder group focusing in particular on overlapping requirements in the supervisory procedures for financial conglomerates.</p> <p>The Commission will pay particular attention to the Platform's concerns during the ongoing evaluation of the Directive, due to be completed early in 2017.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>expected Q1 2017</p> |

Motor insurance directive

| <i>Overall state of Play:</i> <i>Evaluation planned for 2017</i> | Summary |
|---|---|
| <i>Summary:</i> | <p>The EU Motor Insurance Directive 2009/103/EC is intended to facilitate the aftermath of road accidents for EU residents involved in a road accident in a Member State other than that of their residence.</p> <p>The Directive obliges all motor vehicles in the EU to be covered by compulsory third party insurance (all passengers are covered), throughout the EU</p> <p>Furthermore, the Directive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • abolishes border checks on insurance, so that vehicles can be driven as easily between EU countries as within one country • prescribes minimum third-party liability insurance cover in EU countries • specifies exempt persons and authorities/bodies responsible for compensation • introduces a mechanism to compensate local victims of accidents caused by vehicles from another EU country • requires the quick settlement of claims arising from accidents occurring outside the victim's EU country of residence (so-called "visiting victims") • entitles policy holders to request a statement concerning the claims (or absence of claims) involving their vehicle(s) during (at least) the five years preceding the contract |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>Information not yet available</p> |

European Long Term Investment Funds (ELTIF)

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Proposal adopted 2013</i></p> <p><i>Legal Act adopted 2015</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The European Long-Term Investment Fund, or ELTIF, is a new type of collective investment framework allowing investors to put money into companies and projects that need long-term capital. It is aimed at investment fund managers who want to offer long-term investment opportunities to institutional and private investors across Europe, e.g. in infrastructure projects. To benefit from this cross-border passport the new Funds would have to meet rules designed to protect both investors and the companies and projects they invest in.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>ELTIF would develop a new market for funds targeting long term assets. This would increase investment into the real economy, and provide an alternative source of capital to bank lending.</p> <p>ELTIF offers a secure investment environment for investors seeking exposure to long-term assets. Existing national regimes are not always sufficient to offer the kind of protection retail investors need.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Adopted by the Commission on 26/06/2013</i> • <i>COM(2013)462</i> | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</p> | <p>This regulation will create a harmonised fund for long term investments with a passport. It will enhance cross-border access to long term funding for Europe's real economy. The creation of a European fund with uniform rules and administrative procedures will also simplify the current situation where fragmented and often inconsistent requirements exist in different Member States.</p> |
| <p>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</p> | <p>Create a single market for funds focusing on long-term investment strategies, facilitate the access of retail and institutional investors to long-term assets and increase the financing of long-term projects</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>Given that the framework has an elective approach (i.e. fund managers would chose whether or not to set-up ELTIF), estimating the scale of uptake ex ante is difficult. This decision is directly linked to the perceptions of fund managers of the interest from both institutional and retail investors. Ultimately uptake over the longer term will be determined by sustainable demand from investors. This will also reflect the difficulty of estimating macroeconomic developments that impact investor flows between asset classes.</p> <p>On a general level the following stakeholders would benefit from ELTIF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Businesses – would be able to get more capital from a wider range of investors than they could before; • Fund managers - greater harmonisation would reduce costs for fund managers operating cross-border as this removes differences in treatment between different markets; • Investors big and small – would be able to put money into a wider range of (long term) assets and would be spreading their risks. <p>Due to the absence of data, these estimated savings could not be further quantified.</p> |

| | |
|---|-------------------------|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Adopted by the Legislator on 20</i> | <p>Legal Act</p> |
|---|-------------------------|

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>April 2015</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>: Regulation 2015/760</i> | |
| <i>Outcome of Legislative Procedure</i> | Changes introduced by the co-legislators do not affect the Commission REFIT objectives. They reinforce the approach towards the protection of retail investors and enlarge the range of eligible assets for long-term investments thereby extending the benefits to be achieved. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Due to the absence of data, estimated savings could not be further quantified. |

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Application on 8 December 2015</i> • <i>Transposition Deadline N/A</i> • <i>Evaluation Planned for 9 June 2019</i> | Implementation |
| <i>Implementation reported by Member States</i> | N/A |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | N/A |

Insurance Distribution

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Commission proposal July 2012</i></p> <p><i>Legal Act January 2016</i></p> <p><i>Transposition 2018</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The Insurance Distribution Directive (IDD) introduces new enhanced rules for the protection of consumers. The Directive regulates the way insurance products are sold. It protects consumers by laying down the information that must be provided before a consumer enters into an insurance contract; it imposes conduct of business and transparency rules on insurance distributors; it clarifies procedures and rules for cross-border business and it contains rules for the supervision and sanctioning of insurance distributors in case they breach the provisions of the Directive.</p> <p>The rules apply to the sale of all insurance products. However, in order to protect consumers exposed to investment risk, more prescriptive rules apply to those distributors that sell insurance products that have an investment element, such as unit-linked life insurance contracts.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The Directive lays down conduct of business rules for insurance distributors, regulates their professional competence and lays down improved rules for cross-border activity. The new rules are expected to provide increased legal certainty to insurance distributors, contributing to improved domestic and/or cross-border operations, potentially driving down their operating costs.</p> <p>Due to the limited availability of data, these estimated savings could not be further quantified.</p> <p>The evaluation of the Directive, to be carried out in 2020 is expected to furnish data in particular regarding developments in retail investment product markets.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 July 2012 • Ref COM(2012)360 | Commission Proposal |
| <i>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i> | The proposal makes it easier for ancillary service providers to implement the sales rules. Some exceptions are provided for SMEs, for example giving them a five-year grace period to provide information to customers on the sale of non-life insurance products. |
| <i>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</i> | The main objective of the proposal was to improve consumer protection in the sale of life and non-life insurance products through insurance intermediaries and insurance undertakings. Rules have been introduced to address more effectively the risk of conflicts of interest, including disclosure of remuneration by intermediaries. Sales standards have been strengthened and enhanced requirements have been introduced for the sale of life insurance products with investment elements. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Given the data limitations, quantification of costs and benefits was not possible. The evaluation of the Directive, to be carried out in 2020 is expected to furnish data in particular regarding developments in retail investment product markets. |

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Adopted by the Legislator on 20/01/2016</i> • <i>Reference Directive 2016/97</i> | Legal Act |
| <i>Outcome of Legislative Procedure</i> | <p>The Insurance Distribution Directive (Directive 2016/97/EU) entered into force on 22 February 2016.</p> <p>The changes made by the co-legislators provided additional flexibility for ancillary insurance distributors in the form of a de-minimis exception and simplified conduct of business rules. With regard to the other objectives pursued, the amendments resulted in better protection and improved transparency for consumers and the introduction of specific rules for the sale of insurance-based investment product to ensuring a high standard of investor</p> |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| | protection. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Due to the limited availability of data, savings could not be further quantified. |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Date of effect:</i> <i>22/02/2016</i> • <i>Transposition</i> <i>23/02/2018</i> • <i>Deadline</i> <i>23/02/2021</i> • <i>Evaluation</i> <i>Planned for</i> <i>2020</i> | Implementation |
| <i>Implementation reported by Member States</i> | The transposition deadline of the Directive is 23 February 2018. The first Transposition Workshop with Member States representatives on the Directive is expected to take place on 19 October 2016. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information pending |

Review of the European Venture Capital (EuVECA) and European Social Entrepreneurship (EuSEF) Fund regulations

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>COM proposal adopted on 14 July 2016</i></p> <p><i>Cost savings of 32 MEUR over 5 years estimated</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The EuVECA and EuSEF Regulations introduced a “European Venture Capital Fund” and a “European Social Entrepreneurship Fund” label respectively for funds supporting young and innovative companies or enterprises with the intention of generating positive social impact. The Regulations enable these funds to be marketed cross-border in order to meet their investment needs.</p> <p>The proposed modifications will strengthen a channel of financing through EuVECA and EuSEF funds for SMEs, including social businesses, so that they will be less dependent on banking sector constraints, and will thereby reduce the effect of banks declining credit applications.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The amended EuVECA and EuSEF Regulations will render the two specialised funds more attractive and, thus, reduce costs, and realise economies of scale. Current estimates suggests around €40,500 of cost savings per year per EuVECA and EuSEF fund marketed in Member States and a total of €32 million in five years in cost savings for all new EuVECA funds for the current Commission proposal. The modified rules will further unblock the flow of capital, leading to increased confidence in cross-border investments and to better functioning of the internal market.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>COM proposal adopted on 14 July 2016</i> | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p><i>Which REFIT objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>The proposed measures should increase investments into venture capital and social enterprises via EuVECA and EuSEF funds through (i) removing limitations on larger fund managers to manage EuVECA and EuSEF funds and dual registration requirements, (ii) decreasing costs for EuVECA and EuSEF funds, (iii) broadening the range of eligible assets EuVECA funds may invest in.</p> |
| <p><i>Which other objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>The review of the EuVECA and EuSEF Regulations is closely linked to the Capital Markets Union (CMU) objectives focusing on facilitating SME financing, diversifying sources of financing and strengthening cross-border capital flows. It is also linked to the first and second pillars of the Investment Plan which concentrate on ensuring additional EU funding to SMEs, equity financial instruments under the Programme for the Competitiveness of Enterprises and SMEs (COSME), as well as under Horizon 2020. The Regulations are consistent with other CMU actions, such as the Commission's Investment plan for Europe, to sponsor a pan-European venture capital fund of funds which would invest in a combination of early, later and expansion stage venture capital funds.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The Impact Assessment Report suggests around €40,500 of cost savings per year per EuVECA and EuSEF fund marketed in Member States and a total of €32 million in five years in cost savings for all new EuVECA funds.</p> |

Review of the Prospectus Directive

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Evaluation and proposal adopted in November 2015</i></p> <p><i>Pending in legislative procedure</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The Commission Proposal for a Regulation on Prospectuses intends to (i) reduce the administrative burden of drawing up of prospectus, both for SMEs and for frequent issuers of securities; (ii) make the prospectus a more relevant disclosure tool for potential investors, especially those investing in SMEs; and (iii) achieve more convergence between the EU prospectus and other EU disclosure rules.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Recourse to the new disclosure regime for SMEs is estimated to result in SMEs saving collectively around EUR 45 million per year. About 320 SMEs could benefit from it every year. Additional savings could materialise when the "question and answer" format takes off.</p> <p>Approximately 700 prospectuses per year could benefit from the alleviated disclosure regime for secondary issuances. This could translate into savings of around EUR 130 million per year.</p> <p>Increased recourse to the proposed universal registration document for equity and non-equity prospectuses could result in faster prospectus approvals, increasing the number of prospectuses approved every year in less than 10 working days by 150% (equity) and 70% (non-equity).</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Evaluation published on 30 November 2015 (SWD(2015) 255 final)</i></p> | <p>Evaluation</p> |
| <p>Scope:</p> | <p>Directive 2003/71/EC of 4 November 2003 (as amended by the Directive 2010/73/EU) on the prospectus to be published when securities are offered to the public or admitted to trading</p> |
| <p>Evaluation findings:</p> | <p>The evaluation concluded that the Prospectus Directive can be credited for having facilitated the raising of capital across borders in Europe, thanks to the application of the "single passport" principle which implied that only one set of disclosure documents could be approved by the home country authority and accepted throughout the EU for public offer and/or admission to trading on regulated markets. However, the evaluation showed that the revised Directive has only partially met its objectives of investor protection and market efficiency and that the remedies proposed by the revision at the time were either inappropriate or not bold enough or even absent to address some of the issues noted at the time of the previous revision such as the use of prospectus as a "liability shield". Furthermore, the evaluation identifies unnecessary regulatory burdens that include in particular the cost of preparing a prospectus, which is often considered disproportionate for small issuers, as well as the regulatory burden that the prospectus represents for issuers listed on regulated markets and already subject to ongoing disclosure requirements. Such findings supported the revision of the Directive.</p> <p>The evaluation also concluded on coherence issues with other EU legislation in the area of Financial services and on shortcomings of the Prospectus directive (the legal clarity of some of its concepts and efficiency in establishing the right balance between market efficiency and investor protection (quality, readability and materiality of disclosures).</p> <p>The evaluation showed that EU issuers have shunned the proportionate disclosure regimes introduced by Directive 2010/73/EU (which entered into application in July 2012) to a large extent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - only 94 approved prospectuses were drawn up in 2014 (49 in 2013) under the proportionate disclosure regime for SMEs and Small Caps; - only 49 approved prospectuses were drawn up in 2014 (48 in 2013) under the proportionate disclosure regime for |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>rights issues.</p> <p>These figures should be compared with the total number of prospectuses approved in 2013 and 2014 of respectively 4,014 and 3,838.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>The minimum cost figures for an equity prospectus range from EUR 1 000 to EUR 3 million, with an average of almost EUR 700 000. The maximum amounts range between EUR 10 000 and EUR 4 million, averaging at EUR 1.3 million. Estimates of the costs of a non-equity prospectus are considerably lower with the minimum average of EUR 57 000 and the maximum average at almost EUR 500 000.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p>30 November 2015</p> <p>Ref COM(2015)583</p> | <p>Commission proposal</p> |
| <p><i>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>The reform aimed at making it easier for SMEs to raise capital throughout the EU striking an appropriate balance between investor protection and alleviation of administrative burden.</p> <p>It aimed at removing barriers to capital market financing stemming from the existing prospectus regime and at lowering the cost of financing on capital markets for issuers and offers.</p> <p>It established two alleviated prospectus regimes, respectively for SMEs raising capital outside of regulated markets and for issuers already admitted to trading on regulated markets and SME growth markets. It created an EU "shelf registration" mechanism based on a new type of registration document – the universal registration document (URD) – which aims at simplifying capital-raising by frequent issuers who repeatedly offer securities of all kinds.</p> <p>This revision is a key measure of the Capital Market Union (CMU) in the adopted Investment Plan.</p> |
| <p><i>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>The purpose of this Regulation is to harmonise requirements for the drawing up, approval and distribution of the prospectus to be published when securities are offered to the public or admitted to trading on a regulated market situated or operating within a Member State. The initiative should further help to reduce costs of finance and make cross-border access to capital easier for firms.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Recourse to the new disclosure regime for SMEs could, according to rough estimates, result in SMEs collectively saving around EUR 45 million per year. Potentially 320 SMEs could benefit from it every year. Additional savings above those indicated above could arise if the "question and answer" format takes off.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>Approximately 700 prospectuses per year could benefit from the alleviated disclosure regime for secondary issuances. This could translate into savings of around EUR 130 million per year.</p> <p>Increased recourse to the proposed universal registration document for equity and non-equity prospectuses could result in faster prospectus approvals, increasing the number of prospectuses approved every year in less than 10 working days by 150% (equity) and 70% (non-equity).</p> |
|--|---|

Initiatives in the area of Health and Food Safety

Animal health law

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Overall state of Play</p> <p>Adopted</p> <p>Commission proposal adopted on 6 May 2013</p> <p>Legal act adopted on 9 March 2016</p> <p>Deadline for delegated and implementing acts 21 April 2019</p> <p>Application on 21 April 2021</p> <p>Evaluation Planned for April 2026</p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p>Summary:</p> | <p>The Regulation's main benefit is to improve the legal framework, while preserving essential elements of the <i>acquis</i>, which have ensured for decades the safe and smooth functioning of the EU market of live animals and their products (e.g. semen, ova, embryos, food of animal origin etc.) and have contributed to growth and jobs in the livestock sector and in the agri-food industry. It offers a better legal environment to fight known, as well as emerging transmissible animal diseases, reducing the damage they may cause to animal health, to human health and to the environment. These benefits have not been quantified or monetized.</p> <p>In addition, it also offers possibilities to reduce administrative burdens by allowing the use of new technologies, such as electronic certificates, electronic identification, database interlinks, etc...It also enables to remove some administrative obligations for the operators and the competent authorities, if or where, the health risks involved permit so (i.e. identification and movement of animals, registration and approval procedures).</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and</p> | <p>As this Regulation provides for the general framework all possible</p> |

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| <i>benefits</i> | savings have not been systematically calculated for all measures. The specific objectives will be addressed in delegated and implementing acts which, where relevant, will be accompanied by detailed estimations of savings. For example, the savings concerning the movement of animals for direct slaughter were estimated to be up to EUR 7 mio for bovine animals, EUR 19 mio for pigs and EUR 13 mio for poultry. |
|------------------------|---|

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Proposed 6 May 2013</i></p> <p><i>COM(2013) 260</i></p> | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p><i>Which REFIT objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>This Regulation is removing some burdensome administrative procedures, such as compulsory approval by the Commission of national contingency plans for certain animal diseases or surveillance programmes for poultry establishments.</p> <p>It also reduces administrative burdens by making use of new technological tools and removing unnecessary administrative obligations where the health risks involved permit (identification and movement of animals, registration and approval procedures).</p> <p>Specific administrative burden reduction which can possibly be laid down in delegated and implementing acts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • removal of the requirement for movement certificates for low-risk movements (e.g. movements for direct slaughter); • reduction of administrative obligations if increased biosecurity and surveillance measures are implemented; • possibilities for Member States to no longer require approval for certain low-risk operators or transporters; • possibilities for certain operators to derogate from registration and record keeping obligations. |
| <p><i>Which other objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing a modern, single framework providing for a consistent animal health policy and proportionate, sound and efficient animal health rules to ensure a safe and smooth functioning of the internal market for live animals and animal products. • Legislative simplification (39 legal acts to be streamlined into one basic act); • Emphasis on prevention in order to improve the animal health status in the Union, to reduce disease-related losses for farmers, other operators and national and Union budgets, and to possibly reduce the use of antimicrobials in animals; • Offering better tools to deal with traditional and emerging transmissible animal diseases, reducing the damage they may cause, including to human health and the environment; • More flexible and risk based measures, including prioritisation of the EU intervention, depending on available resources (e.g. animal disease prioritisation and categorisation) <p>The Regulation will provide the general framework, the specific objectives will be addressed through subsequent delegated and implementing acts.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and</i></p> | <p>Possible annual savings achieved by removing the requirement for animal health certificates for the movement of animals for direct</p> |

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| <i>benefits</i> | <p>slaughter were, according to the Impact Assessment estimated up to EUR 7 mio for bovine animals, EUR 19 mio for pigs and EUR 13 mio for poultry. This data will be updated and complemented by a more comprehensive cost-benefit study.</p> <p>The Commission has in 2016, in view of preparation of a delegated act, launched a study providing more precise economic analysis of possible benefits that can be achieved by removing the requirement for animal health certificates for animals being moved between Member States for direct slaughter.</p> <p>The proposal aims at the prevention of potential financial losses caused by outbreaks of diseases which could significantly damage the agriculture and related sectors. From 2000 – 2010 the EU has contributed over EUR 1 billion for emergency measures compensating animal keepers.</p> |
|------------------------|---|

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Adopted 9 March 2016</i></p> <p><i>Regulation (EU) 2016/429</i></p> | Legal Act |
| <i>Outcome of Legislative Procedure</i> | <p>All the main objectives and details of the original proposal have been preserved.</p> <p>Possibilities and exemptions, enabling to release burdens and costs for registering and record keeping for some small scale and low risk operators, as well as for intra-EU trade certification of certain commodities were in the negotiation, successfully preserved.</p> <p>Request from EP to introduce compulsory registration of dogs and cats was not retained as such... According to the Regulation, the Commission now has the possibility, but is not obliged to adopt such measure (by delegated act).</p> <p>A strong request from some Parliamentary groups and stakeholders (NGOs) for the Commission to adopt such a delegated act still persists.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | The original provisions were fully preserved. |

Official controls on the agri-food chain

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>Overall state of Play</i></p> <p><i>Commission proposal adopted on 6 May 2013</i></p> <p><i>Pending in legislative procedure</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The proposed Regulation aligns existing rules on official controls along the agri-food chain by eliminating regulatory overlaps. It applies the risk based approach to all areas of the food chain and thus broadens the scope of the current rules, introducing an integrated comprehensive system which reduces unnecessary administrative burden caused by duplication of efforts. Hence the proposed new regulation provides the prerequisites for a more targeted, rationalised and efficient response to non-compliances.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>More efficient controls and higher rates of compliance with agri-food chain requirements are expected to result in savings for competent authorities and for law abiding businesses. The integration of the system of official controls at borders will generate cost savings as a result of a more efficient use of resources.</p> <p>Due to the limited availability of data, the savings have not been quantified.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Proposed 6 May 2013 - COM(2013)265</i></p> | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p><i>Which REFIT objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better allocation and use of resources collected through fees. The generalisation of risk based official controls across the entire agri-food chain will allow cross sector risk assessments and prioritisations of controls. In addition full transparency on the calculation and use of fees and arrangements on their efficient use will increase the accountability of competent authorities. • Obligation for competent authorities to perform official controls as much as possible in a manner that minimises the burden on enterprises. • Exemption of microenterprises from mandatory official control fees. • Mandatory consultation of operators by competent authorities on the method of calculation of fees. • Creation of a common set of integrated, harmonised and modernised rules and tools for official controls of animals and goods at their entry into the Union. |
| <p><i>Which other objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a single framework for all official controls along the entire agri-food chain (1 Regulation replacing 7 Directives, 2 Regulations and 1 Decision) ; • Modernise, harmonise, simplify and clarify the system ; • Strengthen enforcement tools ; • Improve efficiency of controls ; • Tackle food fraud ; • Ensure appropriate resources for control authorities ; • Improve transparency on official controls and their financing. |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Due to the limited availability of data, the estimated savings were not quantified during the impact assessment process. No significant additional costs are expected to be generated by the new act which will produce a range of benefits linked to better enforcement of agri-food law (for example: reduction of fraud, more targeted controls, easier and more efficient enforcement cooperation across borders) .</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <p>Pending</p> <p><i>In legislative procedure</i></p> | <p>Legal Act</p> |
| <p>Outcome of Legislative Procedure</p> | <p>15 June 2016 political agreement by the co-legislators. To be formally adopted, towards the end of the year</p> <p>REFIT benefits intended by the Commission with its proposal from 2013 have largely been retained,</p> <p>A more risk-based approach provides for better allocation and use of control resources. Efficiency will improve also by the streamlining of the legislative framework and strengthened provisions on administrative assistance and cooperation across borders. Coordination and cooperation is supported by an integrated computerised information system.</p> <p>Member States are required to be fully transparent on the calculation of fees collected from operators. Food operators will have to be consulted on the method of calculation. A harmonised set of criteria, on which the calculation of fees should be based, contribute to a level playing field.</p> <p>Systematic border controls of food containing products of animal origin, and post mortem inspections in slaughter houses, will be performed by appropriately trained professionals not necessarily by official veterinarians. This should contribute to a more efficient use of available resources. .</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>Given data limitations, further quantification has not been possible.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <p>planned for 2018</p> | <p>Official controls on the agri-food chain– Residues in Live Animals and Animal Products – Delegated act</p> |
| <p>Which REFIT objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</p> | <p>The political agreement just reached in legislative procedure on the Official Controls Regulation will repeal Directive 96/23/EC and will enable Member States to move from a very prescriptive to a risk-based residue monitoring system also in this area. Member States views on to how achieve a more efficient control system through risk based monitoring and better use of control resources will be fed into the preparation of further implementing legislation to be adopted under the new Official Controls framework.</p> <p>Preparations will start in 2017 for a new delegated act under the Official Control Regulation expected to be formally adopted in legislative procedure around the end of this year. The delegated act would cover risk based monitoring of residues of veterinary</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>medicines. It is indicated that the delegated act would be unlikely to be adopted by the Commission before mid-2018. There is no outlook for EU action on fees covering inspections or any other aspect of official controls.</p> <p>Input of the REFIT Platform:</p> <p>In the REFIT Platform opinion on monitoring residues of veterinary medicines in foodstuffs of animal origin, a majority of the members of the Government group and some members of the Stakeholder group recommend that the Commission adopts general rules for Member States on risk-based sampling. Both groups agree that the recommendation should not be seen as undermining policy objectives.</p> |
| <i>Which other objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i> | Information not yet available. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

Plant health

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>Overall state of Play</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Commission proposal adopted on 6 May 2013 - Pending in legislative procedure | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary</i></p> | <p>The rules on a more proactive regime are expected to lead to better prevention from entry of pests into the EU territory, and to the earlier detection and eradication of pests outbreaks. The qualitative benefits of such a policy will consist in a more sustainable plant production, and protection of EU environment and landscapes.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The proposal aims at the prevention of potential financial losses caused by outbreaks of pests which could significantly damage agriculture and other plant related sectors. From past outbreaks we know that these can amount up to EUR 25 billion worldwide.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Proposed 6 May 2013</i></p> <p><i>COM(2013)267</i></p> | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p><i>Which REFIT objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simplification and harmonisation of plant passports and other types of certification; plant passport and official certification labels to be included in one document • Joint registration of professional operators dealing with all types of plants / plant reproductive material • Joint certification schemes for plant reproductive material and plants subject to plant health provisions |
| <p><i>Which other objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>Codification and simplification of procedures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seven Council Directives are replaced by a single Regulation • Better protection against new plant pests while streamlining rules • Harmonisation, simplification and modernisation of plant passport system: number of entries will be cut by more than half, plant passport unique may now be replaced by hologram or chip from the operator, operator responsibility for traceability of lots has been introduced • Possibility of including the plant passport in the official label issued for plant reproductive material in accordance with provisions set out in the existing Directives on seeds and other propagating material (Seeds and Propagating Material Directives). |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The proposal reflected the conclusions of the Impact Assessment, which selected the option of increased costs for a proactive regime with a view to achieve increased savings from the prevention of devastating pest outbreaks. Therefore a cost increase of up to EUR 50 mio for the EU (at the level of MS, operators and EU budget) would avoid financial losses which could amount up to EUR 25 billion per outbreak.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Pending in legislative procedure</i></p> | <p>Legal Act</p> |
| <p><i>Outcome of Legislative</i></p> | <p>First reading completed. Adoption/entry into force is expected early</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>Procedure</i> | <p>2017</p> <p>The European Parliament and the Council introduced stricter rules on imports of plants/plant products from non-EU countries..</p> <p>Those rules are expected to restrict imports of entire plants, fruits, vegetables, cut flowers etc entailing additional costs for importers and traders of those goods. On the other hand, EU producers will profit from the reduction of the phytosanitary risk caused by the import of those goods and the increased share of their goods in the EU market. Neither the Council nor the EP provided for a precise quantification of those costs and benefits. The Commission will submit a report with a cost-benefits analysis of the new import rules within 5 years after the entry into force of that Regulation.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>The Council and EP accepted the basic logic of the Regulation which implies higher expenditures for proactive actions (e.g. surveys, prioritisation of pests, contingency plans, expanded certification) to achieve higher gains through the prevention of devastating outbreaks of pests. Due to the limited availability of data, the estimated savings have not been updated to reflect the agreed final text.</p> |

Clinical Trials

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>Overall state of Play</i></p> <p><i>Commission proposal adopted on 17 July 2012</i></p> <p><i>Legal act adopted on 16 April 2014</i></p> <p><i>Application starts from October 2018</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary</i></p> | <p>The general policy objective of Clinical Trial Regulation is to strengthen knowledge and promote innovation in clinical research to ensure that the EU remains an attractive place for clinical research thereby increasing the competitiveness of the EU, while protecting the safety and wellbeing of subjects. The Regulation will facilitate multinational trials with less administrative and bureaucratic hurdles and provide for the involvement of subjects in the procedure for the assessment of a clinical trial application.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>During the Impact Assessment process in 2012 savings were estimated as follows: an annual reduction in administrative burden of EUR 267 mio and an annual reduction in compliance costs of EUR 540 mio.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <p><i>Proposed 17 July 2012</i></p> <p>COM(2012) 369 final</p> | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p>Which REFIT objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitating the work of all actors, especially SMEs, by creating a unique set of rules applicable across Europe. • Reduction of administrative burden through the creation of a one-stop shop (submit a single set of documents via a single portal) for the authorisation of clinical trials. • Improving transparency and legal certainty of the authorisation process through clear rules and binding deadlines |
| <p>Which other objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</p> | <p>Ensure that Europe remains an attractive place for clinical research by providing a single set of harmonised rules. The agreed proposal provides for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • streamlined application procedures via a single entry point, • single authorisation procedure for all clinical trials, • improved conditions for conducting multinational clinical trials, • strengthened rules on the protection of patients and informed consent; • more transparency on the conduct and results of the clinical trial, • possibilities for the Commission to conduct controls in Member States and third countries to ensure the rules are being properly supervised and enforced |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>During the Impact Assessment process in 2012 savings were estimated as follows: an annual reduction in administrative burden of EUR 267 mio and an annual reduction in compliance costs of EUR 540 mio</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <p>Adopted 16 April 2014 - Regulation (EU) 536/2014</p> | <p>Legal Act</p> |
| <p>Outcome of Legislative Procedure</p> | <p>All REFIT objectives have been achieved. Only the timelines for the authorisation of clinical trials have been extended compared to the</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | initial proposal following the amendments introduced by Council which may have a small impact on the reduction of cost (positive or negative). However such a possible impact has not been assessed. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Due to the limited availability of data, the estimated savings have not been updated to reflect the agreed final text. |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>IT tool which is pre-requisite for application is under development by EMA</i></p> <p><i>Application starts from October 2018. A transition period will apply (Directive + Regulation) up to September 2021 for all provisions</i></p> <p><i>Reporting obligation 2023</i></p> <p><i>Evaluation Planned for Oct 2026</i></p> | <p>Implementation</p> |
| <p><i>Implementation reported by Member States</i></p> | <p>No data available yet.</p> <p>Establishment of baseline to be used in later evaluation planned for 2017</p> <p>This encompasses collection and monitoring of data relating to the following indicators :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clinical trials per year, by phase and by sponsor status; • Number of Member States involved per clinical trial per year; • Number of subjects in clinical trials in the EU per year; • Number of medicinal products authorised by the European Commission per year; <p>Pharmaceutical R&D expenditure in Europe, USA and Japan (depending on figures given by EFPIA (European Federation of Pharmaceutical Industries and Associations)).</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>No data available yet</p> |

Zootechnical legislation

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>Overall state of Play</i></p> <p><i>Commission proposal adopted on 11 February 2014</i></p> <p><i>Legal act adopted on 8 June 2016</i></p> <p><i>Application on 1 November 2018, Article 65 from 19 July 2016</i></p> <p><i>Transposition Deadline 1 November 2018</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>This Regulation provides a single legal framework for the rules applicable to the breeding, trade and entry into the Union of breeding animals (bovine, porcine, ovine, caprine and equine species) and their germinal products. It incorporates the updated acquis and creates the legal base for official zootechnical controls and activities. The purpose of the Regulation is also to promote cross-border activities of breed societies, focus the scope on the breeding of livestock, clarify a number of technical issues and protect genetic diversity.</p> <p>The format of a Regulation was chosen to ensure harmonised application of the measures and to prevent trade problems previously encountered due to national transposition.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Given data limitations, further quantification has not been possible.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Proposed 11 February 2014</i></p> <p><i>COM(2014)5</i></p> | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p><i>Which REFIT objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>The proposed Regulation intends to clarify and simplify the current legislation. Simplification aspects include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • recognition and listing of breed societies and breeding operations in Member States and third countries, • approval of breeding programmes, • conditions for entering purebred breeding animals in breeding books, and their classification according to merits, and for the registration of hybrid breeding pigs in registers, • rules on performance testing and genetic evaluation, • content of zootechnical certificates for breeding animals and their semen, ova and embryos. |
| <p><i>Which other objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to consolidate existing rules for the promotion of free trade in breeding animals and their germinal products, and to update those rules to technical advances and established practices; • to promote cross-border activities of breed societies providing their services under fair competition conditions; • to align these rules with the requirements of the Lisbon Treaty; • to simplify the legislative framework in a single Regulation replacing 8 species-specific Directives, which are largely identical but in parts confuse with different language and terminology; • to establish rules on official controls and activities following the principles of the Regulation on official controls |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>not applicable (codification)</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Adopted 8 June 2016</i></p> <p><i>Regulation (EU) 2016/1012</i></p> | <p>Legal Act</p> |
| <p><i>Outcome of Legislative Procedure</i></p> | <p>In general, Council's and Parliament's positions supported the main REFIT objectives of the proposal.</p> <p>Only the few following amendments proposed by the Council and agreed by the European Parliament and by the Commission have a minor impact on REFIT objectives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional reasons for the authorities to refuse the approval of a breeding programme of a new breed society, or the extension of the geographical area of activity of a breeding programme into another Member State, if this would jeopardise the breeding programme carried out on that breed by an existing breed society in general, or as regards the characteristics of the breed, or the overall objectives of that breeding programme; • Removal of the proposed empowerment to adopt delegated acts on the zootechnical rules affecting breeding animals of species other than bovine, porcine, ovine, caprine and equine species; • Removal of the provisions on dispute settlement between breeders and breed societies and delegated the settling of such disputes to breed societies and Member States on the basis of subsidiarity; • Introduction of definitions of “breed” and “breeding programme”; • Simplification of the proposed provisions on official controls. <p>However all the main objectives and a large part of the details of the original proposal have been preserved.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>not applicable (codification)</p> |

| | |
|--|------------------------------|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Application on 1 November 2018, Article 65 from 19 July 2016</i></p> | <p>Implementation</p> |
|--|------------------------------|

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| <i>Transposition Deadline</i> <i>1 November 2018</i> <i>Evaluation</i> <i>Based on the experience</i> <i>with implementation, an</i> <i>evaluation is considered</i> <i>5 years after application</i> | |
| <i>Implementation reported</i> <i>by MemberStates</i> | Not applicable yet. |
| <i>Estimated savings and</i> <i>benefits</i> | Not applicable yet |

Veterinary medicines

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Overall state of Play</p> <p>Commission proposal adopted on 10 September 2014</p> <p>In legislative procedure</p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p>Summary:</p> | <p>The implementation of the following measures should significantly reduce the administrative burdens on the industry and bring savings for the competent national authorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • measures to simplify the requirements regarding packaging and labelling; • variations procedures; • pharmacovigilance; • simplification of the mutual recognition procedure; • changes to the "cascade" system; • harmonisation of "legacy" products (products that are already on the market in the EU). <p>Extending the period of data protection for veterinary medicines should stimulate innovation and consequently improve the availability of novel veterinary medicines, including antimicrobials and medicines for limited markets.</p> <p>It is also expected that overall these measures would free resources from the pharmaceutical industry for re-investment in new product development, therefore indirectly having a positive effect on the availability of novel medicines for companion and farmed animals.</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>The Impact Assessment shows that the main savings will originate from the activities with the highest administrative burden i.e. packaging and labelling; authorisations, renewals and variations to existing marketing authorisations and pharmacovigilance reporting. The existing administrative burden of EUR 537 mio should be substantially reduced. The IA shows that the total estimated savings would amount to at least EUR 145 mio a year.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Proposed 10 September 2014</i></p> <p><i>COM(2014) 558 final</i></p> | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p><i>Which REFIT objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>This proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reduces red tape for placing and maintaining on the market of veterinary medicines, • facilitates internet retail of veterinary medicines across the Union, <p>SMEs benefit from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the overall simplification measures and in particular from the harmonisation of clinical trials for veterinary medicines, • the introduction of national helpdesks to advice on authorisation issues. |
| <p><i>Which other objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>The revision of the legislative framework on veterinary medicines aims at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reducing administrative burdens to business, • providing better rewards for innovative products, • improving the functioning of the internal market and increasing the availability of veterinary medicines for animals, • respond to the problem of antimicrobial resistance by allowing to restrict or refuse marketing authorisations and reserve certain critical antimicrobials for use in human medicine only. |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The value of the existing annual administrative burden in million Euros by activity (baseline: 2009) is the following: Packaging and labelling (184); New Marketing authorisation (MA) (91); Variations (134); Renewing a MA (70) and Pharmacovigilance (59). • The new provisions should reduce significantly these amounts: A risk-based pharmacovigilance system would allow a reduction of administrative burdens of around EUR 47 mio per year. The deletion of the requirement for renewal would allow an economy of EUR 68 mio per year and the review of the procedures for variations an economy of EUR 11 mio per year. |

Medicated feed

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Overall state of Play</p> <p>Commission proposal adopted on 10 September 2014</p> <p>In legislative procedure</p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p>Summary:</p> | <p>The modernisation of the outdated Directive for production and use of medicated feed will remove barriers due to different national manufacturing rules. It will reduce administrative burden and compliance costs for the industries, allow the use of medicated feed in EU livestock farming at more competitive prices and open up an important innovation potential in novel medicated feed (pet food)</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>If Commission Proposal would be adopted; this would result in cost savings in medicated feed production of EUR 12 mio.</p> <p>The gross margin increase due to better market access and innovation would reach EUR 30 mio(short term, conservative estimate, midterm far beyond). The new proposal would also incur a reduction of resources/admin burden (not quantified) for industry directly and midterm for competent authorities.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Adopted 10 September 2014</i></p> <p><i>COM (2014) 556</i></p> | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p><i>Which REFIT objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>This proposal will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make medicated feed available to farmers and pet owners at a competitive price • Harmonise manufacturing standards; • Reduce production costs due to the possibility for anticipated production of medicated feed (before the concrete prescription is available) • Remove national barriers for innovative, "novel" medicated feed. <p>SMEs will benefit from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More legal clarity on residues of veterinary medicines in feed • Less administrative burden to cope with different national standards for manufacturing medicated feed • Market potentials in new applications such as medicated pet food |
| <p><i>Which other objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The smooth functioning of a competitive and innovative internal market for medicated feed; • a high level of protection of animal and public health. |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The costs and economic benefits are not evenly distributed over EU as the status quo is diverging: In those parts with currently few rules for manufacturing of medicated feed, an increase in production costs of roughly EUR 20 mio can be expected. In the rest of the EU expected cost savings will be over EUR 30 mio.</p> <p>The expected benefit of the innovation potential is in the short term in the order of EUR 30 mio but can reach mid term several hundred million EURO.</p> |

Food information

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>Overall state of Play</i> | Summary |
| <i>Under preparation</i> | |
| <i>Summary:</i> | The initiative concerns the Commission assistance for implementation and application of food information rules set out in Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 such as e.g. guidance document, questions and answers on the application of the Regulation or specific databases. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Not applicable as the initiative relates to the Commission assistance to the implementation and application of food labelling rules. |

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <i>Under preparation</i> | Implementation |
| <i>Implementation reported by Member States</i> | National measures on allergen/intolerance labelling have been adopted in 20 Member States. |
| <i>Commission assistance to implementation and application of food labelling rules</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions and answers document by Commission on the application of the Regulation to be available by end of 2016 • Guidance document by Commission relating to the provisions on allergens and the quantitative ingredients declaration to be available by end of 2016 • Database by Commission on EU and national requirements on food labelling to be available by end of 2017 |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Not applicable as the initiative relates to the Commission assistance to the implementation and application of food labelling rules. |

Nutrition and Health Claims made on Food

| <i>Overall state of Play Evaluation results expected 2018</i> | Summary |
|--|---|
| <i>Summary:</i> | <p>The Commission is evaluating Regulation (EC) 1924/2006 on nutrition and health claims made on foods with regards to nutrient profiles and health claims made on plants and their preparations</p> <p>The evaluation will contain an assessment of</p> <p>i) whether the provisions in Regulation (EC) No1924/2006 related to nutrient profiles and health claims on plants and their preparations are still fit for purpose; and of</p> <p>ii) the general framework for the plants and their preparations used in food.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

Pesticides

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>Overall state of Play</i></p> <p><i>Evaluation ongoing and planned to be finalised in Q4 2018 / Q1 2019</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The Commisison is carying out an evaluation of legislation on Pesticides covering Maximum Residue limit setting and placing on the market of plant protection products.</p> <p>The evaluation covers Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009 and Regulation (EC) No 396/2005 from their application until mid-2016. It covers amongst others the approval and authorisation procedure for pesticides and the provisions for setting maximum residue limits for pesticides.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Information not yet available</p> |

General food law

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>Overall state of Play</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Fitness check Ongoing and expected to be finalised Q2 2017</i> | Summary |
| <i>Summary:</i> | <p>The Commission is carrying out a FitnessCheck of the General Food Law.</p> <p>The Fitness Check of Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 - the general food law – covers an assessment of the implementation and functioning of the basic principles set out therein such as traceability, responsibilities, the crisis management system as well as the rapid alert system and the European Food Safety Authority.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>Information not yet available.</p> |

Feed additive legislation

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <i>Planned 2017</i> | Evaluation |
| <i>Scope:</i> | Evaluation of the Feed additive Regulation (EC) No 1831/2003 |
| <i>Evaluation findings:</i> | Information not yet available |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available |

Food contact materials

| <i>State of Play:</i> <i>Planned</i> | Implementation follow-up |
|---|--|
| <i>Scope:</i> | <p>Regulation (EC) No 1935/2004 on materials and articles intended to come into contact with food</p> <p>Implementation at EU-level of the legislation on food contact material will be further strengthened, in order to ensure a well-functioning internal market while ensuring a high level of protection from health risks.</p> <p><i>Input of the REFIT Platform:</i></p> <p>In its opinion on materials and articles intended to come into contact with food, the majority of members recommend that the Commission issues a common European requirement for a declaration of compliance for all types of food contact materials.</p> <p>The Commission will examine how the recommendations of the Platform could be addressed in the context of its implementation follow-up of EU food contact materials legislation and it plans to follow up on the opinion on veterinary medicinal residues in foodstuffs through a new delegated act planned for adoption before the entry into application of the new Official Control Regulation which is foreseen for adoption in legislative procedure later this year.</p> |
| <i>Evaluation findings:</i> | Not yet available. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Not yet available. |

Initiatives in the area of Internal Market, Industry, Entrepreneurship and SMEs

Mutual Recognition for goods

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>Overall state of play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Planned for adoption in 2017 (CWP 2017)</i> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary</i></p> | <p>The Commission carries out an evaluation of the application of the mutual recognition principle in the field of goods and the Mutual Recognition Regulation (EC) No 764/2008) and is planning a proposal in the framework of its work programme for 2017. In 2017, the Commission will act to strengthen the single market in goods, notably by facilitating the mutual recognition and addressing the increasing amount of non-compliant products on the EU market through REFIT revisions of the relevant legislation. This will allow entrepreneurs to offer their products more easily across borders while offering incentives to boost regulatory compliance and restoring the level playing field to the benefit of businesses and citizens.</p> <p>The emerging findings of the evaluation of mutual recognition of goods suggest that the functioning of the principle is not optimal. Therefore, the Commission considers a follow-up initiative to achieve a fairer and deeper single market for goods through more and better mutual recognition. Issues of consideration in this context include legal certainty for businesses and national authorities when using the mutual recognition principle; communication and cooperation among users and the role of Product Contact Points and the risk for businesses to see market access denied.</p> <p>Mutual recognition is key for a proper functioning of the single market for goods through the elimination of technical obstacles to a genuine free movement. The principle of mutual recognition itself is embedded in Articles 34 and 36 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), and its further elaboration resulted from established case law.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Information not yet available.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <i>Ongoing, to be finalised 2017</i> | Evaluation |
| <i>Scope:</i> | Evaluation of the application of the principle of mutual recognition in goods in the non-harmonised area and of the Mutual Recognition Regulation (EC) No 764/2008) |
| <i>Findings:</i> | Information not yet available. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <i>Planned 2017</i> | Commission Proposal |
| <i>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i> | Revision of the Mutual Recognition Regulation, to achieve a fairer and deeper single market for goods through more and better mutual recognition. Issues of consideration in this context include legal certainty for businesses and national authorities when using the mutual recognition principle; communication and cooperation among users and the role of Product Contact Points and the risk for businesses to see market access denied. |
| <i>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</i> | Information not yet available. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

Public procurement

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Overall state of Play</p> <p><i>Adopted</i></p> <p><i>Commission proposals adopted on 20 Dec 2011</i></p> <p><i>Legal act adopted on 26 February 2014</i></p> <p><i>Application on 17 April 2014</i></p> <p><i>Transposition deadline: 18 April 2016</i></p> <p><i>Evaluation Planned for April 2019</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p>Summary:</p> | <p>The Commission proposed in December 2011 to simplify public procurement procedures, Parliament and Council supported these objectives, the proposals became effective on 17 April 2014. The initiative delivers a modern and effective set of procurement rules including the creation of a European Single Procurement Document which is a standardised self-declaration that greatly facilitates participation in procurement procedures.</p> <p>Every year, over 250 000 public authorities in the EU spend around 14% of GDP on the purchase of services, works and supplies.</p> <p>To create a level playing field for all businesses across Europe, EU law sets out minimum harmonised public procurement rules. These rules organise the way public authorities and certain public utility operators purchase goods, works and services. They are transposed into national legislation and apply to tenders whose monetary value exceeds a certain amount. For tenders of lower value, national rules apply. Nevertheless, these national rules also have to respect the general principles of EU law.</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>The new Directives make public procurement in Europe more efficient, with smarter rules and more electronic procedures. Authorities that have already made the transition to eProcurement report savings between 5 and 20%. With EU Member States spending yearly more than €1.9 trillion for procurement each 5% saved could return almost €100 billion to the public purse.</p> <p>Given the complexity of the market and the regulation, the Commission did not estimate the overall savings of its proposal. However, savings stemming from specific policy options and various individual provisions were estimated and can be found in the</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>impact assessment.</p> <p>Building on the results of the Administrative Burden Reduction Programme (ABR), the follow-up study ABR+ estimated, for the provision related to only the winning bidder providing the original documents of eligibility, a decrease in administrative burden ranging between 29% and 58% in 5 Member States (CY, DE, PT, SK, NL).</p> <p>In its upcoming evaluation in 2019 the Commission will verify the economic effects of the Directives on the internal market, in particular in terms of factors such as the cross border award of contracts and transaction costs, resulting from the application of the thresholds.</p> |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Proposed by the Commission on 20 Dec 2011</i></p> <p><i>COM(2011)0896, COM(2011)0895 and COM(2011)0897</i></p> | <p>Commission Proposals</p> |
| <p><i>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>Simplification of procedures and reduction of administrative burden via:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific measures for SMEs: Bidders for public tenders can provide self-declarations, rather than original documents or certificates, showing that they meet eligibility criteria. Only the winning bidder would be asked to provide the original documents. • Breaking tenders down into smaller lots is encouraged. • Reduction of the limitation of maximum turnover requirements to a maximum twice the contract value. • Greater use of e-procurement is encouraged. |
| <p><i>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>Simplification of procedures and greater flexibility to make public procurement more efficient and more strategic, respecting the principles of transparency and competition to the benefit of both public purchasers and economic operators. Introduction of a stable legal framework for concessions, offering legal security for economic operators and contracting authorities. Creation of a level playing field for concessions across Europe. Introduction of transparency and equal treatment of economic operators bidding for concessions.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Given the complexity of the market and the regulation, the Commission did not estimate the overall savings of its proposal. However, savings stemming from specific policy options and various individual provisions were estimated and can be found in the impact assessment.</p> |

| | |
|---|-------------------------|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Adopted by the Legislator on 26 February 2014</i></p> <p><i>Directive 2014/24/EC of</i></p> | <p>Legal Act</p> |
|---|-------------------------|

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 February 2014 on public procurement</i></p> <p><i>Directive 2014/25/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 February 2014 on procurement by entities operating in the water, energy, transport and postal services sectors</i></p> <p><i>Directive 2014/23/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 February 2014 on the award of concession contracts</i></p> | |
| <p><i>Outcome of Legislative Procedure</i></p> | <p>The Council did not accept the 'European Passport Procurement' that Commission had been proposing as an instrument for the simplification of documentation requirements. Member States found that such an additional document would create new administrative burden and would be at odds with new technological developments towards online databases making documents directly available to contracting authorities.</p> <p>The European Single Procurement Document (ESPD) was introduced instead as an alternative means of achieving the same objectives of simplification of documentary requirements.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>No update of the estimated savings was performed following the changes in legislative procedure.</p> |

| | |
|--|------------------------------|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Application on 17 April 2014</i></p> <p><i>Transposition deadline: 18 April 2016</i></p> | <p>Implementation</p> |
|--|------------------------------|

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>Evaluation Planned for April 2019</i> | |
| <i>Implementation reported by Member States</i> | Current state of implementation: 17 Member States still need to implement at least one Directive in full; in 3 further Member States, measures have been adopted but have either not entered into force yet or have entered into force since April 2016. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>In its upcoming evaluation in 2019 the Commission will verify the economic effects of the Directives on the internal market, in particular in terms of factors such as the cross border award of contracts and transaction costs, resulting from the application of the thresholds.</p> <p>In relation with the specific measure linked to the winning bidders to provide the original documents of eligibility: the follow-up in the ABRPlus exercise covered the provisions described in COM(2011)896 of the requirement that only the winning bidder needs to provide the original documents of eligibility (such provisions are now incorporated in the new Directives).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Twelve Member States already implemented the relevant provisions between 2007 and 2014 even though MS only need to transpose the directive by April 2016 (DE, IE, ES, CY, LV, LT, MT, NL, AT, PT, RO, SK). - For 2 Member States the degree of implementation is unclear while 10 Member States have not yet implemented the provision (EL, SE). - One Member States indicated that they include additional requirements when implementing the provision that can lead to an increase in administrative burden (CZ). <p>In 5 Member States cost reductions were estimated to range between 29% and 58% (CY, DE, PT, SK, NL), while the initial estimation by the Commission predicted savings of administrative burden of 50%.</p> |

Standard Procurement Document

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>Overall state of Play</i></p> <p><i>Legal act adopted on 5 January 2016</i></p> <p><i>Evaluation Planned for 2017</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>Commission Implementing Regulation on the European Standard Procurement Document (introduced by the new Public Procurement Directives).</p> <p>The Commission introduced a European Single Procurement Document as a standardised self-declaration to facilitate participation in procurement procedures.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>No solid data available therefore the savings could not be quantified. According to information from Finland, the use of ESPD may save between 2 to 3 hours per business participating a public procurement procedure. An evaluation is planned for 2017 which will assess the extent of the savings realised.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Adopted by the Commission on 5 January 2016</i></p> <p><i>Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2016/7</i></p> | <p>Commission Implementing Regulation</p> |
| <p><i>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>Commission Implementing Regulation on the European Standard Procurement Document (introduced by the new Public Procurement Directives).</p> <p>Reduction of the administrative burden related to the tendering procedure: all businesses will be able to self-declare electronically that they meet the necessary regulatory criteria or commercial capability requirements through a standardized form, and only the winning company will need to submit all the documentation proving that it qualifies for the contract. This will not only improve cross-border participation but also national procedures where no alternative solution was in place.</p> <p>A free, web-based system was developed for Member States and businesses. The system which is hosted by the Commission but also made available as open source, is already reused in the federal service provided in Netherlands. Other countries like Slovenia also plan to reuse the code.</p> |
| <p><i>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>Follow-up of the new legislative framework on public procurement - simplification of the administrative formalities of the tender procedure</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>There was no impact assessment made for this proposal, as the ESPD was introduced during the trialogue in the public procurement directives therefore there is no quantification of the estimated savings.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Application or Transposition</i></p> <p><i>Evaluation Planned for 2017</i></p> | <p>Implementation</p> |
| <p><i>Implementation reported by Member States</i></p> | <p>Use of the ESPD is linked to the implementation of the Public Procurement Directives. Currently 17 Member States still need to implement at least one Directive in full; in 3 further Member States,</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | measures have been adopted but have either not entered into force yet or have entered into force since less than 1½ month. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>Use of the ESPD linked to the implementation of the Directives; consequently, no quantification possible at the current state of implementation (see above).</p> <p>According to information from Finland, the use of ESPD may save between 2 to 3 hours per business participating a public procurement procedure.</p> <p>An evaluation is planned for 2017 which will assess the extent of the savings realised.</p> |

Standard forms for public procurement

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>Overall state of Play</i></p> <p><i>Legal act adopted on 11 November 2015</i></p> <p><i>Update Planned for 2017</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>Commission Implementing Regulation – update to the standard forms for public procurement (introduced by the new Public Procurement Directives).</p> <p>The standard forms will facilitate the publication of notices linked to public procurement and contribute to improve the quality of the notices.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>No specific quantification has been carried out as this act as it implements the rules described in the Directives governing public procurement. A further update of the forms is planned for 2017. Since 1800 notices are published daily by Tenders Electronic Daily, even minor increases in savings per notice are likely to have non-trivial impacts.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <p><i>Adopted by the Commission on 11 November 2015</i></p> <p><i>Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2015/1986</i></p> | <p>Commission Implementing Regulation</p> |
| <p>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</p> | <p>Commission Implementing Regulation – update to the standard forms for public procurement (introduced by the new Public Procurement Directives).</p> <p>Reducing administrative burden.</p> |
| <p>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</p> | <p>Better competition through better access to information by economic operators, and ensuring non-discrimination thanks to higher transparency.</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>No quantification has been carried out, as it is implementing the rules described in the Directives governing public procurement. A further update of the forms is planned for 2017. Since 1800 notices are published daily by Tenders Electronic Daily, even minor increases in savings per notice are likely to have non-trivial impacts.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Application on Transposition</i> • <i>Update Planned for 2017</i> | <p>Implementation</p> |
| <p>Implementation reported by Member States</p> | <p>Use of the new standard forms linked to the implementation of the Directives; current state of implementation: 17 Member States still need to implement at least one Directive in full; in 3 further Member States, measures have been adopted but have either not entered into force yet or have entered into force since early 2016.</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>Use of the new standard forms linked to the implementation of the Directives; consequently, no quantification possible at the current state of implementation (see above).</p> |

Late Payments Directive

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>Overall state of Play</i></p> <p><i>COM proposal adopted on 8 April 2009</i></p> <p><i>Legal act adopted 16 February 2011</i></p> <p><i>Application on 16 March 2013</i></p> <p><i>Evaluation finalized 26 August 2016</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The Late Payment Directive (Directive 2011/7/EU) is a recast of Directive 2000/35/EU which has been repealed. It improves the effectiveness and the efficiency of remedies for late payment through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the establishment of maximum payment periods both in B2B and in transactions where the debtor is a public administration; • a straightforward entitlement to interests and compensation for late payment, • the definition of unfair commercial practices. <p>These provisions are also expected to reduce administrative burdens for claiming payments (especially in cross border transactions), improve cash-flow, and reduce the risk of bankruptcy for individual companies.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The recent evaluation of the Directive showed that each day of reduction in payment delays results in savings of €158 million in costs for financing to EU businesses have been estimated Thanks to the Directive the average payment period in business transactions in the EU has dropped by more than 10 days since 2013.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Adopted by the Commission on 8 April 2009 - COM(2009)126</i></p> | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p><i>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>The initial proposal aimed at providing creditors with instruments that enabled them to fully and effectively exercise their rights when paid late, and by confronting public administrations with measures that would effectively eliminate late payment practices. These objectives were to be achieved through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the introduction of an entitlement to the recovery of administrative costs and compensation for internal costs incurred due to late payment • In the case of public administrations, the proposal aimed at shortening payment periods through the harmonisation of periods for payment by public authorities to businesses and at reinforcing disincentives to late payment by a flat compensation rate from the first day of the delay amounting to 5% of the invoiced amount in addition to the interest for late payment and the compensation for recovery costs • Finally, the proposal also abolished the possibility to exclude claims for interest of less than €5. |
| <p><i>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>Proposal for recast of Directive 2000/35/EC on combating late payment in commercial transactions.</p> <p>The Directive aimed at improving the cash flow of European business, especially SMEs, which is particularly important in times of economic downturn. It also aims at facilitating the smooth functioning of the internal market via the elimination of related barriers to cross-border commercial transactions</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The impact estimated that by harmonising the period of payments by public authorities to businesses (PA2B), the additional liquidity for business would amount to almost € 180 billion</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Adopted by the Legislator on 16 February 2011 - Directive 2011/7/EU</i></p> | <p>Legal Act</p> |
| <p><i>Outcome of Legislative</i></p> | <p>The EP, supported by the Council, introduced a possibility for</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>Procedure</i> | <p>Member States to extend the time limit of payments by public authorities to businesses up to a maximum of 60 calendar days for any public authority which carries out economic activities of an industrial or commercial nature or public entities providing healthcare.</p> <p>The compensation fee was eventually set as a flat sum of at least €40 (or equivalent) , instead of the scale of fees (varying according to the invoice amount), as in the initial proposal</p> <p>Capping of payment terms for B2B contracts at 60 days (provided that this is expressly agreed and it is not grossly unfair for the creditor) was introduced by the EP and confirmed by the Council.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | No changes to estimated savings in legislative procedure. |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Application on 16 March 2013</i></p> <p><i>Transposition Deadline March 2016</i></p> <p><i>Evaluation published on 26 August 2016</i></p> | Implementation |
| <i>Implementation reported by MemberStates</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The last national implementing measure was communicated to the Commission in August 2014. As of May 2016, the Directive is fully and correctly transposed in all the MS. <p>Some Member States have either maintained or brought forward provisions that are more favourable to the creditor than the Directive, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In B2B transactions, some MS have set up, by law or by court decisions, maximum payment terms • In PA2B transactions , some MS have not made use of the option to extend payment terms for certain public sectors (i.e. healthcare) to up to 60 days • In some MS, the statutory interest rate is increased of more than 8% percentage points (from the reference rate) • Some Member States have introduced additional support measures, either voluntary or compulsory, to support the objectives of the Directive, such as: prompt payment codes, |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| | electronic invoicing, mandatory reporting of average payment periods, penalties/fines |
| <i>Evaluation Findings</i> | <p>An evaluation was published on 26 August 2016 - SWD(2016)278.</p> <p>The main conclusions of the Report are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Directive has raised awareness about the issue of late payment, which currently features high in national political agendas. • The Directive has proven to be effective, as it has contributed to the reduction of the average EU payment periods, both in B2B and P2A transactions. However, the average term of 30 days is still not respected across the EU, and more efforts need to be done by the MS. • The Directive has proven to be efficient, with very limited regulatory costs for business and public authorities. • The Directive is coherent with other EU policies, as it has concurred to create a more favourable environment where business can grow and become competitive • There is general consensus that the Directive has generated significant added value. Payment practices have been streamlined across the EU, removing uncertainty, thus creating the right conditions for more cross-border transactions. • On the basis of this background the Report concludes that there is no evidence justifying a revision of the Directive for the time being: it should be maintained in its current form to allow all its effects to bear fruits. <p>The Report has also identified some areas for improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the B2B area, where the Directive has maintained a certain flexibility to protect the freedom of contracts, it is necessary to frame more clearly certain key concepts and limit unfair commercial practices. The evaluation has revealed in fact that in B2B transactions creditors are more reluctant to exercise their rights, mostly out of fear of damaging their business relationships. This is often the case for SME who do not have the bargaining power to withstand or expose unfair commercial practices. • Encourage the development in the MS of initiatives that support the objectives of the Directive (transparency, mediation, incentives for timely payment – e.g. naming/shaming) • Setting up systems to monitor, and report performance and progress such as average payment periods, based on a |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>common methodology with guidance and support from the Commission</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and exchange best practices, with the support of the Commission |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>According to the Commission's Report on the implementation of the Directive, it is too early to state whether the Directive has had the expected impacts on businesses liquidity. In fact, in view of the current economic context, it is difficult to isolate the effects that can be attributed solely to the Directive. On this point, the Commission's Report concluded that more time is needed to allow the Directive to bear fruit.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the following aspects can be certainly ascribed to the Directive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thanks to the Directive the average payment period in business transactions in the EU has dropped by more than 10 days since 2013. • Costs associated with applying correctly the Directive are more relevant for businesses than for PA, who have a more steady stream of liquidity. Business who were paying previously late, should now pay, in average, in 60 days. The cash transfer resulting from shorter payments terms amounts to larger sums of money to be released. However this is quickly offset by the expected benefits, as these same businesses will also be paid within shorter delays. For each day of reduction in payment delays, €158 million are saved by EU businesses in finance costs. |

Construction Products Regulation

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Overall state of Play</p> <p><i>Proposal 23 May 2008</i></p> <p><i>Legal Act adopted 9 March 2011</i></p> <p><i>Application 1 July 2013</i></p> <p><i>Implementation Report July 2016</i></p> <p><i>Fitness check Ongoing, to be finalised end 2017</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p>Summary:</p> | <p>The Construction Products Regulation (Regulation (EU) 305/2011) aims at consolidating the Single Market for construction products, by means of simplifying the existing previous framework and creating a common system for the marketing of construction products to be used in a uniform manner by economic operators and Member State authorities, and thus enhancing the efficiency of the system compared with the previous Directive.</p> <p>Benefits of the technical tools of the Regulation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the Declaration of Performance delivers information on the performance of a product - the Assessment and Verification of Constancy of Performance is a system defining how products are assessed and how the constancy of the assessment results is controlled - clearer roles for Notified Bodies and Technical Assessment Bodies. <p>This is expected to increase the competitiveness of the European construction sector as a whole and facilitate the drive towards a level playing field also for the smallest enterprises.</p> <p>The recent implementation report concluded that, as the CPR has been implemented for a relatively short period only, not all the objectives the CPR was aiming at have been achieved yet. Most of the challenges reported relate to implementation difficulties and delayed adaptation by stakeholders. It is not possible for the time being to draw definite conclusions on the performance of the legislation. The Commission considers that further work is considered to improve implementation, particularly at national level.</p> <p>Input of the REFIT Platform:</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>Opinion on the Construction Products Regulation (CPR), recommended that the Commission gives priority consideration to the problems of overlapping and repetitive requirements and the need for clear and full European standards covering all requirements for construction products in the ongoing Fitness Check of the Construction sector.</p> <p>The Commission is conducting a Fitness check of the construction products sector, with a particular focus on identifying any overlapping and repetitive requirements imposed by EU regulation. In its recent report on the implementation of the Regulation, the Commission has, also in accordance with the Platform opinion, called for further dialogue with stakeholders on the role of European standards.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>The net annual benefits of the Commission proposal were expected to range between +145 to +555 million euros at the time of the proposal put forward by the Commission. Studies are ongoing to assess the magnitude of real savings over the implementation period.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <i>Adopted by the Commission on 23 May 2008 – COM(2008)311</i> | Commission Proposal |
| <i>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i> | <p>Building on the experience gained through the application of Construction Products Directive, the Regulation includes a number of measures aimed at clarifying the system and simplifying the procedures for assessment and verification of the performance of products.</p> <p>Simplification measures included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • micro-enterprises can choose simpler ways of showing that any one-off construction product put on the market meets applicable product performance requirements. • Specific simplified measures are foreseen for dealing with individual and non-series products. • The procedures for obtaining a European Technical Assessment (ETA) are simplified and clarified. • European standardisation bodies and Technical Assessment Bodies are encouraged to replace testing in the harmonised technical specifications by other less onerous methods. <p>These measures were expected to significantly reduce the administrative cost of placing construction products on the European market without decreasing the levels of safety for construction works.</p> |
| <i>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</i> | <p>Facilitate the circulation and use of construction products on the Single market.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>The net annual benefits were estimated in the impact Assessment to range between +145 to + 555 million euros for the preferred option.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <i>Adopted on 9 March 2011</i> <i>Regulation (EU) 305/2011</i> | Legal Act |
| <i>Outcome of Legislative</i> | <p>The simplification objective intended by the proposal was realized</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>Procedure</i> | in the adopted act. A simplified regime for micro-enterprises through the use of simplified assessment methods has been established, albeit with additional administrative requirements which have reduced its value for micro-enterprises. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Due to the limited availability of data, there was no update of the estimates following the legislative procedure |

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <i>Application on 1 July 2013</i> <i>Implementation report July 2016</i> | Implementation |
| <i>Implementation by Member States</i> | COM(2016) 445 - this implementation report concluded that, as the CPR has been implemented for a relatively short period only, not all the objectives the CPR was aiming at have been achieved yet. Most of the challenges reported relate to implementation difficulties and delayed adaptation by stakeholders. It is not possible for the time being to draw definite conclusions on the performance of the legislation. Further work is considered necessary by the Commission to improve implementation, particularly at national level. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Studies are ongoing to quantify the costs and benefits of the CPR. Data are expected by Q4 2016-Q1 2017 |

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <i>Ongoing, to be finalised end 2017</i> | Fitness Check |
| <i>Scope:</i> | <p>Fitness Check on the construction sector, with a focus on the following 15 EU legislative texts in the policy fields of Internal Market, Energy Efficiency, Environment and Health & Safety:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Construction Products Regulation (No 305/2011) – Professional Qualifications Directive (2005/36/EC) – Services Directive (2006/123/EC) – Late Payments Directive (2011/7/EU) – Energy Efficiency Directive (2012/27/EU) – Energy Performance of Buildings Directive (2010/31/EU) – Ecodesign Directive (2009/125/EC) |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Energy Labelling Directive (2010/30/EU) – Renewable Energy Sources Directive (2009/28/EC) – Occupational Safety and Health Framework Directive (89/391/EEC) – Directive on the Manual Handling of Loads (90/269/EEC) – Directive on Temporary or Mobile Construction Sites (92/57/EEC) – Asbestos Directive (2009/148/EC) – Waste Framework Directive (2008/98/EC) – Environmental Impact Assessment Directive (2011/92/EU) |
| <i>Findings:</i> | Information not yet available. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

Recognition of professional qualifications

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>Overall state of Play</i></p> <p><i>Commission proposal adopted on 19 December 2011</i></p> <p><i>Legal act adopted on 20 November 2013</i></p> <p><i>Transposition Deadline 18 January 2016</i></p> <p><i>Evaluation Planned for 2019</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The Professional Qualifications Directive (Directive 2005/36/EC) provides the European framework for the recognition of professional qualifications essential in the context of the free movement of professionals. In 2011, the Commission proposed a targeted revision of the Directive, and in 2013 an amending Directive was adopted by the legislator, aiming at simplifying the rules organising the recognition of professional qualifications.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>In 2011 the Commission estimated different cost savings in its SWD accompanying the proposal. Such savings relate to a reduction of the time national authorities need for assessing qualifications. There could be potential savings for citizens and businesses with the more limited use - as a consequence of the European Professional Card which has begun to be implemented in relation to certain professions by way of implementing acts - of the hard copies of the so-called certificates of conformity/good standings requested.</p> <p>Taking into consideration the combined effect of the whole package, one could tentatively consider that the modernisation of the Directive could reduce the costs linked to the assessment of the requests by 10%.</p> <p>Although difficult to calculate, the potential savings for citizens and businesses are real among other examples, the disappearance - as a consequence of the European Professional Card - of the certificates of conformity requested today would actually save up to € 80 per professional. Moreover, the decrease of the translation costs will also be important and will benefit citizens.</p> <p>As the Directive has not been fully transposed in all the Member States, it is too early to quantify the real savings brought about by the Directive.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Adopted by the Commission on 19 December 2011 – COM(2011)883</i></p> | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p><i>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>Lighter requirements for recognition of professional experience: clarification and simplification of the conditions for temporary provision of services and mutual recognition of qualifications, extending the scope of automatic recognition and introduction of the partial access concept as well as of recognition of professional traineeships.</p> <p>Easier information-sharing among Member States through IMI (Internal Market Information system).</p> <p>A European Professional Card (EPC) recognition procedure is introduced in order to facilitate recognition of qualifications; this is an electronic procedure based on IMI. The use of IMI becomes compulsory for administrative cooperation in this field.</p> <p>Access to information and electronic procedures: the scope of the PSCs under the Services Directive was clarified and MS must ensure that all recognition procedures can be accomplished on line.</p> <p>Transparency and mutual evaluation of regulated professions aiming at modernising regulation.</p> |
| <p><i>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>Simplification of the rules organising the recognition of professional qualifications, reinforcing the safety and protection of patients/consumers and introducing a mutual evaluation exercise of regulated professions through which Member States were invited to actively perform a review and to modernize their regulations governing access to professions or professional titles.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>All these measures will facilitate and accelerate recognition procedures and improve access to the professions.</p> <p>The use of IMI for administrative cooperation between competent authorities and for the EPC and also the use of the point of single contact will reduce the administrative burden and costs for professionals (as explained in the 2011 impact assessment outlined above). Moreover, it will not lead to additional cost for the Member States, as the decision to cover all professions within the Professional Qualifications module of IMI by the end of 2012 was already taken. The use of points of single contact will also lead to cost savings in Member States (as explained in the 2011 impact assessment outlined above). . Taking into consideration the</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>combined effect of the whole package, one could tentatively consider that the modernisation of the Directive could reduce the costs linked to the assessment of the requests by 10%.</p> <p>The potential savings for citizens and businesses are real among other examples, the disappearance - as a consequence of the European Professional Card - of the certificates of conformity requested today would actually save up to € 80 per professional. Moreover, the decrease of the translation costs will also be important and will benefit citizens.</p> <p>Finally, a more flexible and transparent regulatory environment in Member States should also have a positive impact on the employment situation, in particular for young people, and to enhance economic growth, especially since professional services amount to around 9% of the GDP in the Union.</p> |
|--|---|

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Adopted in legislative procedure on 20 November 2013 - Directive 2013/55/EU</i></p> | Legal Act |
| <i>Outcome of Legislative Procedure</i> | The adopted Directive includes all of the main REFIT objectives proposed by the Commission. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Estimations of savings were not modified by amendments in legislative procedure. |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Transposition Deadline 18 January 2016</i></p> <p><i>Evaluation Planned for 2019</i></p> | Implementation |
| <i>Implementation by Member States</i> | In September 2016, the directive is fully implemented in 10 Member States only. Absence of transposition of partial transposition deprive professionals from the benefits of the directive. This is why the Commission has initiated infringement procedures against Member States which have not fully implemented the Directive. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | As the Directive has not been fully transposed in all the Member States, it is too early to quantify the real savings brought about by the Directive. |

| | |
|--|--|
| | An evaluation is scheduled for 2019 that will assess the extent of the savings realised. |
|--|--|

Enforcement of Intellectual Property Rights

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>Overall state of Play</i></p> <p><i>Evaluation On going, planned to be finalised end 2016</i></p> <p><i>Legislative proposal planned for end 2016</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary</i></p> | <p>The proposal will aim at enhancing civil law protection of intellectual property rights and reduce the fragmentation resulting from their enforcement. It will also aim at providing a better and faster access to civil law measures for IP rightholders in case of an infringement of their rights at improving legal certainty and at providing a fair balance between the different fundamental rights concerned.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Information not yet available.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <i>On going, planned to be finalised end 2016</i> | Evaluation |
| Scope: | <p>Evaluation of Directive 2004/48/EC on the enforcement of intellectual property rights (IPRED), covering the last 5 years (2010-2015) and all 28 MS, will provide an assessment on whether the measures, procedures and remedies provided by the Directive are fit for purpose and are still achieving their objectives, in particular in the fast developing digital environment. While no instrument provided for by the Directive has been excluded from the evaluation, particular attention will be given to issues already identified as problematic. Previous consultations led to the conclusion that a number of key provisions of the Directive might not function properly or might not be delivering the expected results, in particular in the online environment and in a cross-border context. These included the right of information, provisional and precautionary measures, injunctions, damages, legal costs and publication of judicial decisions.</p> |
| Evaluation findings: | Information not yet available. |
| Estimated savings and benefits | Information not yet available. |

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <i>Planned</i> | Commission Proposal |
| Which REFIT objective(s) will the Commission pursue? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better and faster access to civil law measures for IP rightholders in case of an infringement of their rights • Enhance legal certainty through codification of the relevant jurisprudence of the Court of Justice of the EU |
| Which other objectives will the Commission pursue? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance civil law protection of intellectual property rights (IPR) • Reduce fragmentation of civil law enforcement rules for IPR |
| Estimated savings and benefits | Information not yet available. |

Market surveillance

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>Overall state of play:</i> <i>Commission proposal 2013, pending in legislative procedure</i> | Summary |
| <i>Summary</i> | <p>The proposal for a Regulation on Market Surveillance of Products aims at strengthening the enforcement of EU product legislation (safety rules and other) to keep unsafe and non-compliant products from the EU market.</p> <p>Together with the proposal for a Regulation on Consumer Product Safety, the proposal aimed to overcome fragmentation and inconsistency of rules in the field of product safety and market surveillance.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>Due to the limited availability of reliable data or estimates regarding the number of unsafe and non-harmonised consumer products, and the number of non-compliant harmonised products data, savings could not be quantified.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>State of Play:</i> Proposal 13 February 2013 - COM(2013)75 | Commission Proposal |
| <i>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity regarding procedures leading to product recall or withdrawal subject to the principle of proportionality, right to be heard and access to legal remedies. • Clarification of the regulatory framework for market surveillance in the field of non-food products with the merging of rules on market surveillance of the General Products Safety Directive 2001/95/EC, Regulation (EC) 765/2008 and many sector-specific pieces of Union harmonisation legislation into a single legal instrument that applies horizontally across all sectors; • Establishment of a uniform framework for enforcement activities by national authorities, avoiding double checks of products and improving cooperation between authorities and economic operators; • Streamlined procedures for the notification of dangerous products, and synergies between the existing Rapid Alert Information System (RAPEX) and the Information and Communication System for Market Surveillance (ICSMS). |
| <i>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better protection of business, in particular SMEs, against unfair competition from non-compliant products and better protection of consumers against unsafe products; • Establishment of a framework for regular consultation with business (incl. SMEs) and other stakeholders on implementation, including through the European Market Surveillance Forum; |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Due to the limited availability of reliable data or estimates regarding the number of unsafe and non-harmonised consumer products, and the number of non-compliant harmonised products data, savings could not be quantified. |

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pending in legislative procedure | Legal Act |
| <i>Debate in Legislative Procedure</i> | The 1 st reading position was adopted on 15 April 2014: No amendment was made to the REFIT objectives. Some amendments |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>concerning penalties could be counter-productive to a level playing field for businesses.</p> <p>On 9 July 2014, the Commission issued its opinion on the individual amendments proposed by the European Parliament accepting 58 amendments in their entirety and 47 amendments partially or in principle subject to modifications whilst rejecting 28 amendments.</p> |
| <i>Outcome of Legislative Procedure</i> | The negotiations are stalled due to divergent opinions of Council Member regarding the proposed mandatory labelling of the product's country of origin in Article 7 of the Consumer Product Safety Regulation proposal which is negotiated as a package with the Market Surveillance proposal. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Not applicable. |

Lifts Directive

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>Overall State of Play:</i> <i>Evaluation on going , planned to be finalised by mid 2017</i> | Summary |
| <i>Scope:</i> | Evaluation of Directive 95/19/EC on lifts |
| <i>Evaluation findings:</i> | Information not yet available. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

Machinery Directive

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>Overall state of Play:</i> <i>Evaluation ongoing , planned to be finalized by end 2017</i> | Summary |
| <i>Scope</i> | Evaluation of Directive 2006/42/EC on Machinery |
| <i>Evaluation findings</i> | Information not yet available. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

Oil Refining industry

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <p><i>Fitness check finalised Q1 2016</i></p> <p>SWD(2015)284/2</p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p>Scope:</p> | <p>Sectoral Fitness check – assesement of the impact of 10 relevant EU legislation on the petroleum refining industry (the Renewables Energy Directive, the Energy Taxation Directive, the EU Emissions Trading System, the Fuels Quality Directive, the Directive on Clean and Energy Efficient Vehicles, the Industrial Emissions Directive, the Strategic Oil Stocks Directive, the Marine Fuels Directive, the Energy Efficiency Directive and the Air Quality Directive.</p> |
| <p>Evaluation findings:</p> | <p><u>Benefits:</u> No regulatory gaps, overlaps, inconsistencies or obsolete measures leading to excessive administrative burdens have been identified. Evidence of synergies have been noted with the reporting obligations under the fuel quality legislation that are in line with the other reporting obligations part of the enforcement system for the air quality of road transport emissions.</p> <p><u>Costs:</u> The costs borne by the refining sector can be considered proportionate relative to the benefits achieved. Nonetheless, the average cumulative cost resulting from the impact of the legislation considered is estimated to account for up to 25% of the total net loss of competitiveness of the sector in terms of the decline in the observed net margin.</p> <p>This indicates that there are other factors present that taken together had a stronger influence on the economic performance of the refining sector. Some of these factors are plant-specific such as the configuration, size and location of refineries. Other factors include the relatively high level of input costs of refineries and in particular, energy costs and the high variability of the relative quantities of petroleum products produced by refineries as well as diverse input costs such as revenues, operating costs, and, therefore, net margins. Legislative follow-up is not foreseen. The results of this fitness will feed broader evaluations of the overall performance of the relevant EU measures such as e.g. the evaluation of the Fuel Quality Directive.</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>According to the findings of the consultant, it may be assumed that the regulatory costs increased from 2000 to 2008 and thereafter stabilised. The identified impact of regulation on the costs of the performance of refineries primarily implies the diversion of some revenues towards regulatory compliance investments and operating costs rather than towards other investments and operational adjustments to improve competitiveness. Some of the more efficient refineries have been able to absorb these costs and remain profitable, but this has not been the case for the others.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>The results of this fitness check will feed broader evaluations of the overall performance of the relevant EU measures such as e.g. the evaluation of the Fuel Quality Directive.</p> |
|--|--|

Forest based industries

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Overall state of Play:</p> <p><i>Cumulative cost assessment ongoing planned to be finalised 2016</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p>Scope</p> | <p>Cumulative cost assessment of the cost impacts of the most relevant EU legislation and policies for the EU forest-based industries (woodworking and pulp and paper) between 2005 and 2014. The EU legislation analysed was prioritised from over one hundred acts and grouped in eight policy areas or “legislative packages”. These included: competition; climate & energy; environment; forest-related; employment; product-related; transport; trade. (NB competition policy was later discarded as having no or negligible costs and trade policy was not found to be relevant for the woodworking sub-sector).</p> <p>In addition, an analysis of the industries’ cost structures will be made in relation to key international competitors (Brazil, China, and USA).</p> |
| <p>Preliminary Findings</p> | <p>The regulatory costs differ considerably within and across F-BI sub-sectors.</p> <p>The variability of costs across the different F-BI sub-sectors is significant and reflects differences in product groups and their production chains. The highest cost by far as a percentage of added value is observed in wooden containers and packaging, amounting to 16.4% (average annual figure over 2005-2014), and the lowest in builders’ carpentry and joinery, at 1.3%. The cost for wood-based panels represents 10.8% of the sub-sector’s added value, for pulp 5%, for paper and paperboard 4.2% and for sawn-wood 2.6%.</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>See above – to be updated once the report is adopted.</p> |

Chemicals industry

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>Overall state of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Cumulative cost assessment finalised 11 July 2016</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Scope:</i></p> | <p>Cumulative cost assessment of the most relevant EU legislation and policies relevant for the European chemicals industry between 2004 and 2014.</p> <p>The EU legislation analysed covered 70 pieces of legislation, grouped into seven packages based on their overarching and specific policy objectives.</p> |
| <p><i>Findings:</i></p> | <p>Total direct costs borne by the subsectors covered by the study during the period represent around 2% of their turnover and 12% of the value added. Relative to Gross Operating Surplus (GOS), which can be used as a proxy for profit, this represents as much as 30% of this value, indicating that legislation cost is among the important factors shaping the profitability of the EU chemical industry. The data generated will be used in the upcoming evaluations of the legislations screened by this exercise.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>See above.</p> |

Chemicals legislation (other than REACH)

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>Overall state of Play:</i> <i>Fitnesscheck ongoing , to be finalised end 2017</i> | Summary |
| <i>Scope:</i> | <p>Fitness Check on the most relevant chemicals legislation³ (excluding REACH) as well as related aspects of legislation applied to downstream industries.</p> <p>The legal scope includes horizontal chemicals legislation, as well as chemicals-related aspects in worker safety, transport environmental protection and product-specific legislation.</p> |
| <i>Findings:</i> | Information not yet available. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

³ DG GROW and DG ENV are co-responsible for this fitness check.

Firearms

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <p><i>Evaluation finalised Q4 2015</i></p> <p>COM(2015)751</p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p>Scope:</p> | <p>Evaluation of Directive 91/477/EEC on control of the acquisition and possession of weapons as amended by Directive 2008/51/EC of the EP and of the Council of 21 May 2008 (Firearms Directive)</p> |
| <p>Findings:</p> | <p>The evaluation concluded that the Firearms Directive has positively contributed to the functioning of the internal market and minimised the risks associated with the civilian firearms market. Legislation at EU level has also contributed to the creation of an EU identity for all producers, dealers and brokers operating within the sector that currently share common requirements and standards. However, the Directive sets only minimum requirements which has resulted in important differences in Member States' implementation of the Directive (in particular regarding marking, deactivation, convertability of alarm weapons). These differences have been identified by the study as sources of security or market concerns.</p> <p>On this basis, on 18 November 2015, the European Commission adopted a package of measures to strengthen rules for the acquisition and possession in the EU, address loopholes to prevent criminal use of legal firearms and better track legally held firearms, strengthen co-operation between MS and ensure that deactivated firearms are rendered inoperable. Discussions of the Commission's proposal for a revision of the Firearms Directive (91/477/EEC) are ongoing with the Council of the EU and the European Parliament.</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>Due to the limited availability of data, the costs and benefits could not be quantified and their analysis is mainly qualitative.</p> <p>In terms of efficiency, the overall results have been achieved at reasonable costs. The directive does not prescribe any major investment. Costs related to the implementation of different provisions serve various objectives and are distributed fairly among interested stakeholders. The administrative burden and costs perceived by stakeholders are more linked to the different and sometimes inefficient administrative procedures implementing the directive at national level rather than to the Directive itself.</p> <p>Evidence gathered throughout the study highlights how firearms represent a very complex sector, historically regulated at national level. The added value of the Directive lies in the common regulatoru framrowkr for firearms regulation that would not have been achieved through national or bilateral itnerventions.</p> |

Remedies Directive (Public Procurement)

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>Overall state of Play:</i> <i>Evaluation ongoing, planned to be finalised end 2016</i> | Summary |
| <i>Scope</i> | Evaluation of Directive 2007/66/EC amending Council Directives 89/665/EEC and 92/13/EEC with regard to improving the effectiveness of review procedures concerning the award of public contracts |
| <i>Findings</i> | Information not yet available. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

Commercial Agents

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Overall state of Play:</p> <p><i>Evaluation finalised July 2015</i></p> <p><i>SWD(2015)146</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p>Scope</p> | <p>Evaluation of Council Directive 86/653/EEC of 18 December 1986 on the coordination of the laws of the Member States relating to self-employed commercial agents</p> |
| <p>Findings</p> | <p>The Directive affects growing market across a wide range of industrial sectors. It is estimated that in 2012 there were some 590 000 commercial agents in the EU, practically all SMEs, generating a combined turnover of € 260 billion (ca. 3 % of total commercial turnover) and providing employment to over 1 million people.</p> <p>The conclusion of the evaluation is that the Directive meets its objectives of facilitating cross-border activities and functions well. The Directive's benefits outweigh its costs, it remains relevant and continues to have EU added value. Based on these findings, it is recommended that the Directive is maintained in its current form.</p> <p>Legislative follow-up is not foreseen.</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p><u>Benefits:</u> Although it is difficult to assess the impact of a Directive that was adopted almost 30 years ago in quantitative terms, there are strong qualitative indications that the Directive has had a significant impact on facilitating cross-border activities and creating a single market for commercial representation, and thus meeting its aims.</p> <p>A significant increase in the number of commercial representation relationships made across borders over the last 20-30 years is a good indicator for the Directive's actual market impact.</p> <p>Long-term data is available for Germany and Austria. The proportion of German agents representing principals from other EU Member States went from 26.5 % in 1984 to 68 % in 2014. A study from Austria shows that the share of Austrian commercial agents operating in at least one other country increased from 12 % in 2000 to 39 % in 2014, while the share of foreign principals using Austrian commercial agents increased from 30 % to 64 % in the same period.</p> <p><u>Costs:</u> Qualitative stakeholder feedback shows that the Directive does not cause administrative burden. Nevertheless, it could entail additional operational costs for principals as it ensures a minimum standard for the protection of commercial agents — at least in those Member States where a similar degree of protection was previously not granted to agents. This applies to the UK, Ireland and Sweden. The main element of this protection is that principals must pay indemnity or compensation after termination of the contract.</p> |

Standardisation

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <p><i>Evaluation finalised COM(2016)212 and SWD(2016)126 (1 June 2016</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p>Scope</p> | <p>Evaluation of Regulation (EU) No 1025/2012 on European Standardisation</p> |
| <p>Findings</p> | <p>Overall, no major problem in the application of the Regulation had been identified. However, some areas for improvement have been identified. The Commission is considering how to best tackle them, in particular via the Joint Initiative on Standardisation that aims at promoting the coherent implementation of the Regulation through non-legislative actions in co-operation with the main actors of the ESS. Legislative follow-up is not foreseen.</p> |
| | <p><u>Costs:</u> Since 2014 the EU financing of standardisation is about 18 million EUR per year. According to an estimation of the European Standardisation Organisations, the industry experts alone spend around more than 900 million EUR each year to participate in voluntary standardisation work at international, European and national level.</p> <p>The Regulation did not add any additional costs to the European Standardisation System other than the participation of Annex III organisations (SMEs; consumers, trade unions; environmental interests) in European standardisation. These costs are partially offset by grants offered by the Commission to the corresponding organisations which provide for an additional value to the European standardisation in terms of efficiency and effectiveness.</p> <p><u>Benefits:</u> A number of studies at national level indicate the economic benefits of standardisation in general. These include a share in the increase of labour productivity growth between 27.1% and 37.4% and a share in GDP growth between 23.5% and 28.4% (Studies, publication year, Member State: DIN, 2000, Germany; AFNOR, 2009, France; Cebr, 2015, UK).</p> |

Pre-packaging

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <p><i>Evaluation finalised</i></p> <p>COM(2016)438 and SWD(2016)219 (4 July 2016)</p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p>Scope:</p> | <p>Evaluation of the legal framework for pre-packaging (Directive 2007/45/EC on nominal quantities for pre-packed products, Directive 75/107/EEC on bottles used as measuring containers and Directive 76/211/EEC on the making-up pre-packaged products (by weight or volume))</p> |
| <p>Findings:</p> | <p>The evaluation has demonstrated that the EU legal framework for pre-packaging is fit for purpose and that the Directives are effective, efficient, relevant, coherent with other EU policies and have EU added value. While the Commission considers that there is no need to propose amendments, it will discuss the results of the evaluation with stakeholders and follow them up in order to improve application of the Directives.</p> <p>All Member States have transposed and fully implement the Directives. Differences in national implementation are publicly documented; these concern administrative and production control processes that do not lead to different outcomes as regards the harmonised products placed on the market.</p> <p>In the light of the variations in national implementation, the Commission will also seek to promote the exchange of good practice between stakeholders and develop guidance.</p> <p>In order to promote the effectiveness of market surveillance, in particular on imports, administrative cooperation on the Directives will be enhanced through EU financial support for meetings of the competent authorities in line with Regulation (EC) No 765/2008.</p> <p>The Commission will discuss with stakeholders the issues raised as regards technical aspects and relevant international standards, and take appropriate action, e.g. develop guidance.</p> <p>In order to raise consumer awareness, the Commission will provide more information on the meaning of the 3-mark and the e-mark.</p> <p>Legislative follow-up is not foreseen.</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p><u>Benefits:</u> The evaluation showed that all three Directives continue to be relevant and are generally considered efficient and effective, with significant added value for all stakeholder groups (consumers,</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>industry and national authorities). They are perceived as beneficial in terms of contributing to consumer protection, fostering competitiveness and supporting the single market. They are also coherent with, and complement, other EU and national legislation. As a result, they enjoy widespread support from all stakeholder groups.</p> <p><u>Costs:</u> It is estimated that the total one-off cost of the marking Directives across the EU 28 at € 440 million (=1.3% of annual value added). The majority of these costs would, however, also be incurred in the absence of the optional marking Directives since the requirement to indicate nominal quantity would remain. Most of these costs were incurred a long time ago but given the relatively low cost of weighing equipment, new market entrants are unlikely to perceive costs as an obstacle to taking up the markings.</p> |
|--|--|

Glass and ceramics industries

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>Overall state of Play:</i> <i>Cumulative cost assessment ongoing to be finalised 2017</i> | Summary |
| <i>Scope:</i> | Cumulative cost assessment of the most relevant EU legislation for the EU glass and ceramics industries |
| <i>Findings:</i> | Information not yet available. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

Design System

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>Overall state of Play:</i> <i>Evaluation expected to be finalised Q2 2017</i> | Summary |
| <i>Scope</i> | Evaluation of Directive 98/71/EC on the legal protection of designs and of Regulation 6/2002 on Community Designs |
| <i>Findings</i> | Information not yet available. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

Aerosol Dispensers

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>Overall state of Play:</i> <i>Evaluation planned 2017</i> | Summary |
| <i>Scope</i> | Evaluation of Directive 75/324/EEC on aerosol dispensers |
| <i>Findings</i> | Information not yet available. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

Liability for defective products

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>Overall state of Play:</i> <i>Evaluation planned 2017</i> | Summary |
| <i>Scope</i> | Evaluation of Council Directive 85/374/EEC concerning Liability for Defective Products (LDP) as modified by Directive 1999/34/EC |
| <i>Findings</i> | Information not yet available. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

European Observatory on Infringements of Intellectual Property

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>Overall state of Play:</i> <i>Evaluation planned 2017</i> | Summary |
| <i>Scope</i> | Evaluation of Regulation No 386/2012 – European Observatory on Infringements of Intellectual Property |
| <i>Findings</i> | Information not yet available. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

Digital Single Gateway

| Overall state of Play <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Commission Proposal Planned for 2017</i> | Summary |
|--|--|
| Summary: | <p>The proposal for a Digital Single Gateway will extend and integrate European and national online portals to work towards a Single Digital Gateway. It is included in the Communication on a 'Digital Market Strategy for Europe' of May 2015.</p> <p>Input of the REFIT Platform:</p> <p>In the REFIT Platform opinion on Points of Single Contact most members of the Government group recommend the establishment of a single entry point for business in each Member State to assist companies operating in the Single Market. These members and the Stakeholder group also support that the Commission establishes minimum criteria for the performance of Points of Single Contact and that this exercise is integrated into the preparations of the Single Digital Gateway proposal and aligned with other relevant initiatives such as the services passport.</p> <p>As outlined in the Digital Single Market and Single Market Strategies, it is planned that the Digital Single Gateway initiative in 2017 will introduce detailed, quality requirements in a user-friendly way into one platform, mainstreaming relevant EU and national on-line information.</p> |
| Estimated savings and benefits | <p>Information not yet available.</p> |

Initiatives in the area of Transport

Recording Equipment in Road Transport

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Overall state of Play</p> <p><i>Proposal adopted on 19 July 2011</i></p> <p><i>Legal act adopted on 1 March 2014</i></p> <p><i>Application date: 2 March 2016</i></p> <p><i>Evaluation Planned for June 2020</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p>Summary:</p> | <p>Regulation (EU) No 165/2014 on recording equipment in road transport requires the use of digital (smart) tachographs in new vehicles above 3.5 tons , incorporating satellite and short-range communication modules, as well as enhanced cryptography and sealing.</p> <p>The new smart tachograph is expected to bring about a reduction on the number of tachograph manipulations, having in turn an immediate effect on road safety (saving lives) and a reduction of the costs associated to road accidents. The incorporation in the tachograph of a short-range communication module for transmission of data to enforcers will help the latter to better target the vehicles to be halted in the course of a roadside check, hence enhancing efficiency in the use of the budget earmarked to enforcement</p> <p>Regulation 165/2014 builds on the work of the administrative burden reduction (ABR) programme.</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>The economic impact of Regulation (EU) No 165/2014 is expected to result in a reduction of administrative burden of EUR 415.5 million.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| State of Play: 19 July 2011 - COM(2011)451 | Commission Proposal |
| Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The further use of digital tachographs will improve enforcement of rules and reduce the administrative burden for transport companies, which use tachographs, in the medium and long term. • The so-called "form of attestation of activities", major source of administrative burden according to stakeholders, is no longer compulsory. • Member States should have the option to exempt lorries of less than 7.5 tons from the tachograph regulation if they carry materials, equipment or machinery for the driver's use in the course of his work and used within a radius of 100 km and provided that driving the vehicle is not the driver's main activity (mainly craftsmen). |
| Which other objectives did the Commission pursue? | The initiative updates legislation on the digital tachograph linking up to satellite positioning systems and to public control authorities. |
| Estimated savings and benefits | Reduction of administrative burden of EUR 515.5 million were envisaged that would be felt in particular by SMEs. |

| | |
|--|--|
| State of Play: Regulation (EU) No 165/2014 Adopted on 1 March 2014 | Legal Act |
| Outcome of Legislative Procedure | The final Regulation does not include a provision on the merger of tachograph driver cards with driving licences which weakens the foreseen reduction of administrative burden. However, the new Regulation did suppress the compulsory nature of the "form of attestation of activities". The option to exempt craftsmen driving within a radius of 50 km from their base has been extended into a right to Member States to grant an exclusion of vehicles used by craftsmen within a radius of 100 km from the base of the undertaking from the need to equip the vehicles with a tachograph, thereby substantially improving on the Commission proposal. |
| Estimated savings and | No specific update provided following the legislative procedure even though the reduction of administrative burden is weakened. |

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| benefits | However, given that driver and tachograph cards are not merged, it is therefore necessary to deduce EUR 100 million from the estimated savings provided in the impact assessment supporting the Commission proposal (EUR 515.5 million) |
|-----------------|---|

| | |
|---|---|
| State of Play: <i>Entry into force: 1 March 2014</i> <i>Application date: 2 March 2016, except Art 24, 34, and 45: 2 March 2015</i> <i>Evaluation Planned for June 2020</i> | Implementation |
| Implementation reported by MemberStates | All MS have communicated to the Commission the necessary information on type-approval authorities, approved workshops and workshop cards. In addition, LT, RO, DE, LV, SE, NL, HR, HU, AT, EL, BE have informed about the adoption of national rules for the implementation of Regulation 165/2014. |
| Estimated savings and benefits | Not available yet |

Market access rules in road freight transport

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>Overall state of Play</i></p> <p><i>Evaluation to be finalised in October 2016</i></p> <p><i>Legislative proposal under preparation for 2017</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The evaluation found that the applicable legislation on market access rules in road freight transport is partly effective with difficulties encountered in the practical application and enforcement.</p> <p>On this basis, the Commission is working on proposals aiming at clarifying and simplifying certain provisions of Regulations (EC) No 1071/2009 and 1072/2009. The corresponding amendments would facilitate their implementation by Member States, decrease administrative burden and bring a more uniform application across the EU</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The evaluation found that the savings of the Regulations are with EUR 8-14 mio substantially lower than the expected EUR 172 mio estimated initially at the time of the adoption due to the late implementation of the European Register of Road Transport Undertakings. Costs for setting up national registers were 70% lower than estimated.</p> <p>Savings from the new Commission proposals will be reported when available.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <i>To be finalised in October 2016</i> | Evaluation |
| <i>Scope:</i> | <p>Evaluation of Regulations (EC) 1071/2009 on access to the occupation of road transport operator and 1072/2009 on common rules for access to the international road haulage market</p> <p>This evaluation builds on the work of the administrative burden reduction programme.</p> |
| <i>Evaluation findings:</i> | <p>The evaluation concluded that overall the Regulations provide an appropriate framework to achieve the objectives of more harmonised conditions for access to the profession and to the international road transport market. Regulation (EC) No 1072/2009 was partly effective in achieving its original objective of enhancing compliance with the requirement of the temporary nature of cabotage.</p> <p>However, significant issues were encountered. The main difficulties were linked to the practical application and enforcement of the principles laid down in the Regulations. Differences in interpretation of their provisions by Member States and hauliers, inconsistencies in enforcement practices and lack of cooperation between Member States hinder the effective enforcement of the Regulations and bring about legal uncertainty for the operators.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>The benefits experienced to date due to reductions in administrative costs are EUR 8 million to €14 million per annum and thus much lower than the amount originally anticipated EUR 175 million. This is due both to the fact that not all of the Member States' national electronic registers are interconnected yet to the European Register of Road Transport Undertakings (ERRU) leading to the insufficient use of ERRU by Member States which are already connected. However, the total cost of setting up national electronic registers and interconnecting them with ERRU is with €22.1 million, around 70% lower than the ex-ante cost estimates of €73 million.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <i>Under preparation review foreseen in 2017</i> | Commission proposal |
| <i>Which REFIT objective(s) did the</i> | <p>The amendments envisaged would reduce the administrative burden both for public authorities and private operators. On the one hand,</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>Commission pursue?</i> | they would make it easier for control authorities to enforce the existing legislation. Better use of existing control tools is likely to reduce the duration of checks, whereas targeting of checks thanks to the technical capabilities of the digital tachograph will increase detection levels. On the other hand, operators would enjoy increased certainty when planning their transport operations, thanks to the application of uniform control provisions throughout the EU. |
| <i>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</i> | The proposals would aim to clarify and simplify certain provisions of Regulations (EC) No 1071/2009 and 1072/2009. The corresponding amendments would facilitate their implementation by Member States and bring a more uniform application across the EU. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Some level of quantification is planned, based on individual examples. The heterogeneity of the practical market circumstances across Member States stands in the way of a more generalised, monetised approach |

Training and certification of seafarers

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>Overall state of Play:</i> <i>Evaluation expected to be finalised by Q1 2017</i> | Summary |
| <i>Scope:</i> | Evaluation of Directive 2005/45/EC on the mutual recognition of seafarers' certificates issued by the Member States and of Directive 2008/106/EC on the minimum level of training of seafarers. |
| <i>Evaluation findings:</i> | Information not yet available. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

Safety Rules and Standards for Passenger Ships / Small Crafts

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>Overall state of Play</i> Fitness check adopted on 16 October 2015 | Summary |
| <i>Summary:</i> | The fitness check showed that the EU passenger ship safety legislation has resulted in improved safety of life but there is scope to remove outdated, ambiguous or disproportionate requirements, and to further improve the effectiveness of search and rescue operations. Based on its recommendations, the Commission identified a set of follow-up actions to improve and simplify the common rules on safety of ships carrying passengers in EU waters. Amendments to the existing legislation was proposed in 2016 related to the safety rules and standards of passenger ships COM(2016)369, the registration of passengers on boards and reporting formalities COM(2016)370, as well as on inspections and safe operation on board of ro-ro ferries COM(2016)371. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | The maximum saving potential related to the overlaps between various inspection regimes has been estimated in the fitness check at annually EUR 1 million (i.e. reduction of 770 self-standing inspections/surveys under Directive 1999/35/EC per year for the entire EU, if the same number and type ships continue in service as today), part of which has been already carried out in practice by combining the various types of inspections. |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>16 October 2015</i></p> <p><i>COM(2015)508 final and SWD(2015)197 final</i></p> | <p>Fitness check</p> |
| <p><i>Scope:</i></p> | <p>Fitness Check of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directive 2009/45/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 6 May 2009 on safety rules and standards for passenger ships • Directive 2003/25/EC on specific stability requirements for ro-ro passenger ships • Directive 1999/35/EC on a system of mandatory surveys for the safe operation of regular ro-ro ferry and high-speed passenger craft services • Directive 1998/41/EC on the registration of persons sailing on board passenger ships operating to or from ports of the Member States of the Community |
| <p><i>Evaluation findings:</i></p> | <p>The fitness check showed that the key objectives of the EU passenger ship safety legislation related to passenger safety and internal market remain highly relevant. However, it also revealed that these objectives can, in some instances, be delivered in a simpler and clearer manner.</p> <p>The potential to simplify, clarify and repeal a number of ambiguous, outdated or overlapping requirements has been identified in certain areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complexity and administrative burden: Mandatory surveys for the safe operation of regular ro-ro ferries have been found to significantly overlap with other types of surveys and inspections (namely flag State surveys and port State control inspections). The format of the safety standards for domestic passenger ships is outdated and not aligned with international requirements. • Ambiguity and lack of transparency: A number of provisions, definitions and requirements are ambiguous to such extent that in certain cases they may hinder an effective implementation of the legislation. • Disproportionate requirements for small ships: The prescriptive EU standards applicable to small steel ships only (i.e. covering ca. 70 out of 1950 small ships) have been evaluated as disproportionate and do not provide sufficient EU added value to be retained. However, in order to |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>facilitate access for EU manufacturers to the wider EU market, some stakeholders raised the possibility of developing guidelines or a code for all small vessels.</p> <p>It also showed reduced effectiveness of search and rescue operations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outdated support for search and rescue operations: The current requirements, for accurate passenger data to be stored and readily available in the company's system ignores the development of information systems for data exchange at national level. Furthermore, the recorded data does not always include all necessary information. • Safety-related issues necessitating further assessment have been identified. <p>Importantly, some of these issues may be better first dealt with at the international level, before further action at the EU level can be envisaged, particularly as regards the review of applicable damage stability requirements.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>The maximum saving potential has been estimated in the fitness check at EUR 1 million (i.e. reduction of 770 self-standing surveys under Directive 1999/35/EC per year for the entire EU, if the same ships continued in service as today), part of which has been already realised in practice by combining the various kind of inspections. In addition the main simplification potential identified by the fitness check consists of non-measurable aspects such as legal clarity, certainty and simplicity, facilitating the implementation, monitoring and enforcement of rules in place.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Proposal planned for 2017 (CWP 2017)</i> | <p>Commission Proposal – Small Crafts</p> |
| <p><i>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>Proposal for a council Recommendation to facilitate and simplify the construction and cross-border trade of small passenger vessels as well as their registration. Follow-up to the REFIT Fitness Check on EU passenger ship safety legislation (COM(2015)508).</p> |
| <p><i>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>Information not yet available.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Information not yet available.</p> |

Road Infrastructure and Tunnel Safety

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Overall state of Play</p> <p><i>Evaluation finalised in June 2015</i></p> <p><i>Commission proposal planned for 2017</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p>Summary</p> | <p>The Directive has had a positive influence on road tunnel safety management. In particular, the Directive has raised awareness of the problem of tunnel safety, has prompted investments that successfully complement other road safety measures, it is credited with improving the capacity of tunnel managers and emergency services to manage dangerous events and to prevent and mitigate the effects of accidents and fires and it has triggered research into new solutions and technologies. However, the TEN-T road tunnels over 500m are to a large extent not yet in compliance with its requirements and so the minimum safety standard prescribed by the Directive is not yet in place. Some of the Member States with a large number of tunnels will have to face significant challenges in meeting the 2019 deadline for tunnel refurbishment.</p> <p>Building on those results, the Commission is assessing how to best improve road safety across the EU through improved road and tunnels infrastructure safety management practices and the use of innovative techniques. It is also assessing how to reduce administrative burden on Member States while improving the efficiency of legislation and ease of implementation for road infrastructure managers..</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Benefits due to improved tunnel safety have not been quantified.</p> <p>The costs of achieving compliance have been significant in some Member States. Infrastructure costs vary according to factors that include the rigour of pre-existing national standards and the tunnel's condition. Operational costs are more evenly spread.</p> <p>An impact assessment is currently assessing in how far integrating tunnel safety requirements with road safety requirements can lead to further reduction of administrative burden.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Finalised June 2015 – external evaluation report</i></p> | <p>Evaluation</p> |
| <p><i>Scope:</i></p> | <p>Evaluation of Directive 2004/54/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on minimum safety requirements for tunnels in the Trans-European Road Network</p> |
| <p><i>Evaluation findings:</i></p> | <p>The principal conclusion is that the Directive has had a positive influence on road tunnel safety management. In particular, the Directive has raised awareness of the problem of tunnel safety, has prompted investments that successfully complement other road safety measures, it is credited with improving the capacity of tunnel managers and emergency services to manage dangerous events and to prevent and mitigate the effects of accidents and fires and it has triggered research into new solutions and technologies. However, the TEN-T road tunnels over 500m are to a large extent not yet in compliance with its requirements and so the minimum safety standard prescribed by the Directive is not yet in place. Some of the Member States with a large number of tunnels will have to face significant challenges in meeting the 2019 deadline for tunnel refurbishment.</p> <p>Relevance: The Directive’s objectives and requirements align well to the problems they are intended to address; some adjustments could further improve the fit.</p> <p>Coherence: Directive 2004/54/EC is a coherent component of the acquis, although there is some support for integration with Directive 2008/96/EC on road infrastructure safety management. Such integration could help achieve a more comprehensive approach to the management of road infrastructure safety. An impact assessment process was launched in August 2016 with a view to delivering the findings by Q4 2017.</p> <p>Effectiveness: Some measures are recognised as having made a particular contribution to reducing the consequences of incidents in tunnels; the aggregate impact of the Directive is harder to determine.</p> <p>Efficiency: The costs of achieving compliance have been significant in some Member States. Infrastructure costs vary according to factors that include the rigour of pre-existing national standards and the tunnel’s condition. Operational costs are more evenly spread.</p> <p>EU Added Value: The Directive has delivered EU added value, effecting changes that go beyond what might have been achieved by national action alone.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Costs for the refurbishment of tunnels and the administration (e.g. safety inspections) have been quantified for a number of Member States. The figures show a wide range of variation across Member States. The quantification of benefits due to improved safety of tunnels is not available. |
|--|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>State of Play:</i> | Commission Proposal |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Proposal planned for 2017(CWP 2017)</i> | |
| <i>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i> | Reduction of administrative burden on Member States while improving the efficiency of legislation and ease of implementation for road infrastructure managers. |
| <i>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</i> | <p>Improvement of road safety across the EU through improved road and tunnels infrastructure safety management practices and the use of innovative techniques.</p> <p>Contribution to the development of the physical and digital infrastructure necessary for the proper functioning of advanced vehicle safety technologies.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

Port Reception Facilities

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>Overall state of Play</i></p> <p><i>Planned</i></p> <p>Evaluation completed on <i>31 March 2016</i></p> <p>Commission proposal under preparation</p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The evaluation showed that Directive has reached its main objective, i.e. to reduce discharges of ship generated waste and cargo residues at sea. It has also demonstrated clear EU added value, but it has not reached its full potential in this respect. Key concepts and obligations in the Directive have been interpreted differently by the Member States. Furthermore, there is insufficient exchange of information, hampering monitoring and enforcement of the Directive. Finally, administrative procedures for reporting and exemptions are burdensome on both ports and port users, due to inconsistencies between the EU and international legal framework. To address shortcomings identified in the evaluation, the Commission is working on a possible legislative revision.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The benefits from complying with the Directive (primarily based on avoiding garbage discharges at sea) largely outweigh the costs of implementation. The difference between benefits and costs is estimated at 71 million EURO annually.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>31 March 2016</i></p> <p><i>COM(2016)168 final</i></p> | <p>Evaluation</p> |
| <p><i>Scope:</i></p> | <p>Evaluation of Directive 2000/59/EC on port reception facilities (PRF) for ship-generated waste and cargo residues</p> |
| <p><i>Evaluation findings:</i></p> | <p>The approach of the PRF Directive has been relevant with its objective and has been partially effective, efficient and coherent. Although it has demonstrated clear EU added value, it has not reached its full potential in this respect. In line with the main evaluation findings, issues were identified that could be addressed in a possible review of the PRF Directive.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incomplete tracking of waste delivered and different systems for tracking complicates monitoring progress to the objectives of the PRF Directive. • Inadequacies in port reception facilities due to insufficiently consultation of port users • Inefficiencies at the interface between handling waste on ships and in ports. • Intransparency in waste fees charged to port users mainly due to a large variety of cost recovery systems . • Administrative burden due to inconsistent notification forms, differences in scope and definitions between the international (MARPOL) and the EU legal framework, and differences in exemption procedures. Insufficient enforcement of the mandatory delivery of ship generated waste to PRF. Inconsistencies between the PRF and PortStateControl frameworks for inspection have resulted in uncertainty as regards the legal conditions and scope of PRF inspections. |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The comparison of the benefits of “garbage not discharged at sea”, which were based on an estimation of clean-up costs, to the annual costs related to the implementation of the PRF Directive, which were primarily associated with the requirement of the waste notification and the development of the waste reception and handling plans has shown that the benefits largely outweigh the costs of implementation. The difference between benefits and costs, estimated at 71 million EURO annually, is primarily based on the avoidance of garbage discharges at sea and would be significantly larger if benefits from avoiding oily waste and sewage discharges were also included in the estimation. It should however be noted that these are very general estimates, and there are significant data limitations when it comes to estimating exact quantities of waste discharged at sea.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>In preparation</i></p> <p><i>Planned for 2017</i></p> | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p><i>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>Reduce administrative burden associated with the functioning of the Directive</p> <p>Simplify the administrative framework and procedures by seeking more alignment with the MARPOL Convention (on which the Directive is based)</p> |
| <p><i>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To ensure the availability of adequate facilities • To provide effective (cost) incentives to deliver waste at port reception facilities • To harmonise and update definitions and forms • To clarify the rules for exemptions <p>To remove barriers to effective and efficient enforcement</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The IA support study will try to quantify the baseline scenario, by estimating (potential) discharges of waste at sea. This will be achieved by applying a dedicated model, which will estimate expected waste deliveries for a group of 40 ports, the data of which will be compared to actual waste deliveries reported for these 40 ports, based on which the waste discharges at sea can be calculated. This should form the basis for benefits expected from improving the Directive in particular incentivisation / enforcement of delivery of ship generated waste to PRF.</p> |

Training, Qualification, Licensing in Road Transport

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>Overall state of Play</i></p> <p><i>Evaluation finalised in October 2014</i></p> <p><i>Commission proposal planned for Q4 2016</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>Directive 2003/59/EC on the initial qualification and periodic training of drivers of certain road vehicles for the carriage of goods or passengers has been implemented in the Member States without major problems. It has improved labour mobility and contributes to ensuring the free movement of drivers. The Directive effectively contributes to its main objective in ensuring the road safety together with the legislation mentioned above.</p> <p>However, while the ex post evaluation has shown that the Directive has an overall positive effect on the sector, it also identified shortcomings hindering the effectiveness and coherence of the legal framework and undermining the original objectives of the Directive. Building on those findings, the Commission is working on revising the Directive.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>In the evaluation the costs increase related to the Directive was estimated at EUR 1.8 billion per year or EUR 500 per driver per year of which 44% are born by enterprises and 45% by the drivers. Savings in reduced fuel use were estimated at EUR 4 – 7 billion per year, or at EUR 1,100 to 1,900 per driver per year. Overall potential benefits including in addition reduced costs of traffic accidents and reduced emissions were estimated to EUR 7 - 10 billion per year.</p> <p>The impact assessment foresees costs savings, that could account, over the period 2018 – 2030, for EUR 2.3 million and 6.7 million for businesses and drivers respectively, with the new proposal. Furthermore, by revising the training system by reviewing the content of initial and periodic training cost of a total of EUR 14 million, for 2018 – 2030, could be mitigated.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <i>finalised October 2014</i> | Evaluation |
| <i>Scope:</i> | Evaluation of Directive 2003/59/EC on the initial qualification and periodic training of drivers of certain road vehicles for the carriage of goods or passengers. |
| <i>Evaluation findings:</i> | <p>The evaluation concluded that the Directive had been implemented in the Member States without major problems; it has improved labour mobility and contributes to ensuring the free movement of drivers. The evaluation furthermore confirmed that the Directive effectively contributes to its main objective in ensuring the road safety together with the legislation mentioned above.</p> <p>Furthermore, while the ex post evaluation has shown that the Directive has an overall positive effect on the sector, it also identified shortcomings hindering the effectiveness and coherence of the legal framework and undermining the original objectives of the Directive. The main identified shortcomings were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) difficulties for drivers to benefit from a recognition of completed/partial training undergone in another Member State; 2) content of the training only partially relevant for drivers' needs; 3) difficulties and legal uncertainties in the interpretation of exemptions and 4) inconsistencies of minimum age requirement in the Directive on training of professional drivers (2003/59/EC) and the Directive on driving licence (2006/126/EC). <p>The evaluation also identified uncertainty regarding whether it is possible to combine professional drivers training with other trainings required under EU law (i.e. the training required to drive dangerous goods, training on passenger rights and animal welfare). It also showed that respondents were not clear regarding use of Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) in the training (e-learning/blended learning).</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | The costs increase related to the Directive was estimated at EUR 1.8 billion per year or EUR 500 per driver per year of which 44% are born by enterprises and 45% by the drivers. Savings in reduced fuel use were estimated at EUR 4 – 7 billion per year, or at EUR 1,100 to 1,900 per driver per year. Overall potential benefits including in addition reduced costs of traffic accidents and reduced emissions were estimated to EUR 7 - 10 billion per year. |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Expected Q4 2016</i></p> | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p><i>Which REFIT objective(s) will the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>Revision of Directive 2003/59/EC on the initial qualification and periodic training of drivers of certain vehicles for the carriage of goods and passengers. Follow-Up to an evaluation completed in July 2016.</p> <p>By ensuring smoother administrative practices for mutual recognition administrative costs for business and administrations could be reduced.</p> |
| <p><i>Which other objectives will the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>The general objective of the initiative is to ensure that the Directive more effectively contributes to safety provisions as laid down in the EU common transport policy and the Policy Orientations on Road Safety and that it complies with the principles of the Internal Market and facilitates the free movement of professionals active in the sector.</p> <p>Three specific objectives have been identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensure smooth administrative practises for mutual recognition in Member States; - Ensure that the training content better targets recent technological developments, road safety and fuel efficiency; - Improve legal clarity of the Directive and coherence with other EU legislation. |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>A revision would make it possible to resolve the issues related to mutual recognition at the lowest costs. This is estimated at EUR 6.3 million for the period of 2018 – 2030. This change will bring benefits to the industry in terms of the costs savings, which account over the period 2018 – 2030 for 2.30 million and 6.7 million euros for businesses and drivers respectively. Furthermore, it will make the training system more effective by revising the content of initial and periodic training to provide for further safety and environmental benefits. This will mitigate the costs (in total EUR 14. 10 million for 2018 – 2030) related to the change of the content.</p> |

Better functioning of the market for bus and coach transport

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>Overall state of Play</i></p> <p><i>Evaluation results expected Q4 2016</i></p> <p><i>Commission proposal planned for Q4 2017</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The Commission carries-out an evaluation and is planning a legislative revision of Regulation (EC) No 1073/2009 on common rules for access to the International market for coach and bus services and amending Regulation (EC) No 561/2006.</p> <p>This initiative aims to open the domestic coach markets to competition and to ensure non-discriminatory access to terminals and other infrastructure.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p><i>To be updated when available</i></p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> Ongoing and planned to be finalised Q1 2017 | Evaluation |
| <i>Scope:</i> | Evaluation of Regulation (EC) No 1073/2009 and its effects over the period 2009-2014. |
| <i>Evaluation findings:</i> | Preliminary results have identified two key problems for the functioning and further development of the internal market for passenger coach services: the persistence of significant differences in rules on access to national markets for regular services, and specific barriers to competition caused by discrimination in access to terminals in some Member States. It presumes that free access to domestic markets for passenger coach services will improve the competitiveness of international services. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Due to the limited availability of data, these costs and benefits could not be further quantified. |

Enhancement of the social legislation in road transport

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>Overall state of Play</i></p> <p><i>Evaluation ongoing, results expected Q4 2016</i></p> <p><i>Proposal Planned for Q4 2017</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary</i></p> | <p>The Commission is carrying out an evaluation and considers revision of Regulation (EC) No 561/2006, Directive 2002/15/EC and Directive 2006/22/EC in order to ensure a genuine level playing field for the road transport industry and adequate working conditions</p> <p>This initiative is complementary and supportive to other ongoing road transport initiatives, notably linked to internal market rules (in particular Regulation 1071/2009 on access to the occupation of road transport operator and Regulation 1072/2009 on access to the international road haulage market).. A fair balance is necessary between, on the one hand the objective of internal market, aiming at ensuring a genuine level playing field for the transport industry and, on the other hand, the objective of ensuring adequate working conditions to workers.</p> <p>This initiative contributes to two priorities of President's Juncker's political guidelines, namely those on creating "A deeper and fairer internal market" and on "Jobs, Growth and Investment".</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>To be updated when available</p> |

Leasing of Vehicles

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Overall state of Play</p> <p><i>Evaluation to be finalised end 2016</i></p> <p><i>Commission proposal planned for 2017 (CWP 2017)</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p>Summary:</p> | <p>Evaluation and Revision of Directive 2006/1/EC on the use of hired vehicles without drivers for the carriage of goods by road in order to optimise the allocation of resources, increase the flexibility in organising freight transport operations and hence companies productivity. This revision follows-up on an evaluation concluded in 2016.</p> <p>The proposal is likely to focus on removing outdated restrictions on the use of hired goods vehicles and thus at opening up new possibilities for operators and leasing/hiring companies alike.</p> |
| <p>Savings</p> | <p>Information not yet available.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> Ongoing and planned to be finalised 2017 | Evaluation |
| <i>Scope:</i> | Evaluation of Revision of Directive 2006/1/EC on the use of hired vehicles without drivers for the carriage of goods by road. |
| <i>Evaluation findings:</i> | The emerging findings of the evaluation suggest that the applicable legislation for hired vehicles for the carriage of goods is not achieving its maximum possible effectiveness, as it is only providing for a minimum level of liberalisation, leading to a patchwork of rules governing the use of hired goods vehicles in the EU. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> Planned for 2017(CWP 2017) | Commission Proposal |
| <i>Which REFIT objective(s) will the Commission pursue?</i> | Revision of Directive 2006/1/EC on the use of hired vehicles without drivers for the carriage of goods by road in order to optimise the allocation of resources, increase the flexibility in organising freight transport operations and hence companies productivity. This revision follows-up on an evaluation concluded in 2016. |
| <i>Which other objectives will the Commission pursue?</i> | Information not yet available. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

Maritime acquis

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>Overall state of Play</i> <i>Ongoing</i> | Summary |
| <i>Summary</i> | The fitness check will assess the policy area in maritime transport that is building the core in ensuring maritime transport safety and efficiency. The fitness check will pay particular attention to identifying any synergies (e.g. improved performance, simplification, lower costs, reduced burdens) or inefficiencies (e.g. excessive burdens, overlaps, gaps, inconsistencies and/or obsolete measures) within the group of measures and help to identify the cumulative impact of the interventions covered, covering both costs and benefits. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <i>To be updated when available</i> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p>Ongoing, to be finalised Q1 2017</p> | <p>Fitness check</p> |
| <p><i>Scope:</i></p> | <p>Taken together the policy area in maritime transport covered by the fitness check forms, in accordance with international rules, the core in ensuring maritime transport safety and efficiency:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flag State - the first line of defence (for ensuring vessels are fit for purpose in the first place), • Port State control - the second line of defence (carrying out verification spot checks), • Coastal State obligations under international law supported by EMSA systems (for ensuring vessel traffic monitoring and appropriate exchange of information between responsible authorities), • Reporting formalities obligations from ships/ship masters to land based authorities and reduction of administrative burden, • And, should an accident happen, accident investigation (resulting in safety recommendations in the interest of further improving the regime and the effectiveness of applicable rules). <p>The fitness check will look more closely at the interaction between the concerned legislative acts and their implementation – including the supportive role the European Maritime Safety Agency (EMSA) can play – to check whether and how the objectives of competitiveness and quality shipping can be better supported and mutually reinforced, while also considering the international rules and conventions on which they are based and that they enforce.</p> <p>The fitness check will pay particular attention to identifying any synergies (e.g. improved performance, simplification, lower costs, reduced burdens) or inefficiencies (e.g. excessive burdens, overlaps, gaps, inconsistencies and/or obsolete measures) within the group of measures and help to identify the cumulative impact of the interventions covered, covering both costs and benefits.</p> |
| <p><i>Evaluation findings:</i></p> | <p>To be updated when available</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>To be updated when available</p> |

Airport charges

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>Overall state of Play:</i> Evaluation planned for 2017 | Summary |
| <i>Summary</i> | <p>The Commission is planning an evaluation of Evaluation of Directive 2009/12/EC on airport charges.</p> <p>The evaluation is assessing whether the Directive on Airport charges is achieving its objectives in the least burdensome manner. The evaluation covers in particular in how far the Directive provides for greater transparency on how airport charges are calculated; it ensures that airports do not discriminate among airlines in the application of airport charges.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | To be updated when available |

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> Planned for 2017 | Evaluation |
| <i>Scope:</i> | <p>Evaluation of Directive 2009/12/EC on airport charges;</p> <p>The purpose of this evaluation is to assess whether the Airport Charges Directive has achieved its objectives, notably as regards non-discrimination between users and greater transparency, as well as whether the means intended to reach these objectives, namely the provisions on consultation on charges between airports and airlines and on the functioning of the independent supervisory authorities have proven appropriate. The evaluation will assess to what extent EU regulation of airport charges as foreseen by the Directive is still relevant to the current needs. The evaluation is aimed to provide not only an up-to-date overview of the application of the Directive in the Member States and to enquire into the benefits it delivered, but should seek to identify areas of concern in its implementation (if any), based on existing evidence and taking into account the current market reality.</p> |
| <i>Evaluation findings:</i> | To be updated when available |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | To be updated when available |

Initiatives in the area of Taxation and Customs

Common Customs Tariff

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Overall state of Play</p> <p><i>Recast planned for Q3 2017</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p>Summary:</p> | <p>Recast of Council Regulation (EEC) No 2658/87 of 23 July 1987 on the tariff and statistical nomenclature and on the Common Customs Tariff.</p> <p>The proposal concerns adjustments of legal and technical nature, mainly to align the Regulation to the Lisbon Treaty. It therefore contributes to certain administrative burden reduction. The proposal does not entail any new policy development.</p> |
| <p>Savings</p> | <p>Not applicable (recast)</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Planned for Q3 2017</i></p> | <p>Commission proposal</p> |
| <p><i>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>Recast of Council Regulation (EEC) No 2658/87 of 23 July 1987 on the tariff and statistical nomenclature and on the Common Customs Tariff - Commission Proposal.</p> <p>This initiative will contribute to simplification and burden reduction by increasing clarity and improving the readability of the regulation.</p> |
| <p><i>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>The aim of the recast is mainly to align Council Regulation (EEC) No 2658/to the Lisbon Treaty, to modernise outdated provisions for the sake of clarity and to improve the readability of the regulation. Changes are therefore limited to what is made absolutely necessary by the evolution of the legal environment</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Not applicable (recast)</p> |

General arrangements for excise duty

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>Overall state of Play</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>proposal planned for 2017 (CWP 2017)</i> | Summary |
| <i>Summary:</i> | Revision of Directive 2008/118/EC to align and ensure coherence between customs and excise legislation, improve legal certainty and ensure the uniform application of EU legislation. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

Excise duties on alcohol and alcoholic beverages

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>Overall state of Play</i></p> <p><i>Planned evaluation to be finalised Q3 2016</i></p> <p><i>proposal planned for Q4 2017</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The Commission evaluated Directive 92/83/EEC and considers a revision of the Directive as a result of the evaluation.</p> <p>A report to the Council has been prepared, making recommendations for possible improvements in Directive 92/83/EEC.</p> <p>The improvements which have been identified would reduce administrative burdens and costs for both Member States and economic operators and reduce distortion within the internal market, and also address anti-fraud objectives.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Due to the limited availability of data, costs and benefits of the current Directive could not be quantified.</p> <p>Evidence collected in the evaluation shows that the lack of clarity of certain provisions (e.g. in the area of classification) can lead to legal uncertainty over the treatment of specific products, which in turn, can result in additional costs to businesses.</p> <p>The savings of the potential revision will be the subject of further analysis in the Impact Assessment if appropriate.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p>To be finalised Q4 2016</p> | <p>Evaluation</p> |
| <p>Scope:</p> | <p>Evaluation of Council Directive 92/83/EEC.</p> |
| <p>Evaluation findings:</p> | <p>The Directive has proven to be effective and generally appropriate for enabling adequate collection of excise duties for the large majority of stakeholders. Overall, the evaluation found that the current structures generally allow for neutral conditions of competition. At the same time, the evaluation findings conclude that some distortions within the internal market which must be acted upon.</p> <p>The preliminary recommendations for change centre around several main areas : clarification of the classification of alcohol and alcoholic beverages in the "fermented beverage" category; improvement and clarification of the rules supporting the exemptions applied to denatured alcohol; examination of the extension of the rules for reduced rates for small producers of all alcohol</p> <p>Following the results of the evaluation, the Commission is considering a potential revision of the Directive. A report to the Council has been prepared, making recommendations for possible improvements in Directive 92/83/EEC. The improvements which have been identified would reduce administrative burdens and costs for both Member States and economic operators and reduce distortion within the internal market, and also address anti-fraud objectives.</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>Due to the limited availability of data, costs and benefits could not be quantified. The evaluation did not identify direct unnecessary administrative and compliance costs for tax administrations and economic operators. However, the evidence collected shows that the lack of clarity of certain provisions (e.g. in the area of classification) can lead to legal uncertainty over the treatment of specific products, which in turn, can result in additional costs to businesses.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planned for adoption Q4 2017 • | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p>Which REFIT objective(s) did the</p> | <p>Aims to ensure proper functioning of the internal market and free movement of goods within the EU, to protect public health, and to</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>Commission pursue?</i> | prevent and correct distortion of competition. |
| <i>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</i> | Information not yet available. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

Tobacco Excise

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>Overall state of Play</i></p> <p><i>Planned</i></p> <p><i>evaluation concluded in December 2015</i></p> <p><i>COM proposal planned for Q3 2017</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>Revision of the Tobacco Council Directive 2011/64/EU.</p> <p>Based on the evaluation's findings and recommendations, the following problems have been identified and are expected to be addressed in the possible revision of the Directive:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Divergent treatment for some tobacco/new products and substitution. For instance current definitions do not take the development of new (tobacco) products into account while borderline products have been introduced to the market with the aim of being classified in a product category with a lower excise duty rate compared to competing products. 2. The Minimum Excise Duty (MED) rules are applied differently by Member States 3. Raw tobacco replaces some of the products covered by the Directive without a system of proper control. The evaluation study reported that raw tobacco was sold at retail level without excise duty and diverted from the legal to the illegal circuit. 4. Dual classification systems for excise and customs for the same products as the study reported that raw tobacco was sold at retail level without excise duty and diverted from the legal to the illegal circuit. <p>Building on those results, the Commission is working on a possible revision of the Directive that would reduce administrative burdens and costs for both Member States and economic operators and reduce distortion within the internal market. .</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Due to the limited availability of data, costs and benefits of the existing Directive could not be quantified during the evaluation. The savings expected to be brought of the revision will be the subject of further analysis in the Impact Assessment.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> Finalised on 21 December 2015 COM (2015) 621 | Evaluation |
| <i>Scope:</i> | Evaluation of Council Directive 2011/64/EU on the structure and rates of excise duty applied to manufactured tobacco. |
| <i>Evaluation findings:</i> | <p>Overall, the evaluation found that the current structure and level of rates generally allow for neutral conditions of competition and the free setting of prices within the internal market. At the same time, the evaluation findings show that some distortions within the internal market are created through differentiated application of the Minimum Excise Duty (MED), the inconsistent treatment of e-cigarettes and certain manufactured tobacco products and the tax induced substitution between and within product groups.</p> <p>The evaluation has also identified unnecessary administrative and compliance costs for tax administrations and economic operators. These costs result from certain definitions which can lead to legal uncertainty over the treatment of specific products. In addition, the application of different definitions of tobacco products for excise duty and for customs purposes has been found to be problematic, in particularly for Small and Medium Enterprises as this translates into double entries and legal uncertainty.</p> <p>Finally, with certain exceptions, the Directive has proven to be effective and generally appropriate for enabling adequate collection of excise duties for the large majority of manufactured tobacco products.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Due to the limited availability of data, the costs and benefits could not be quantified during the evaluation. |

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned for 2017 | Commission Proposal |
| <i>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i> | Building on the results for the evaluation, the initiative aims to contribute to the prevention and correction of distortion of competition and to reduce administrative burden/costs for economic operators and tax authorities. The initiative also should ensure that competition in the different categories of manufactured tobacco belonging to the same group is not distorted by the charging of tax. |
| <i>Which other objectives</i> | The initiative will also contribute to the strengthening of the fight against fraud and tax evasion – in line with the Action Plan on |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <i>did the Commission pursue?</i> | VAT. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

Common Consolidated Corporate Tax Base (CCCTB)

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>Overall state of Play</i></p> <p><i>Planned</i></p> <p><i>Proposal planned for Q4 2016</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary</i></p> | <p>In parallel with its Work Programme for 2017, the Commission is re-launching the Common Consolidated Corporate Tax Base with a compulsory common tax base as the first step.</p> <p>The re-launched CCCTB initiative aims to reform corporate taxation in the EU. It should ensure that profits are taxed where economic activity takes place and value is created. In this way, the CCCTB is envisaged to reduce the opportunities of engaging in aggressive tax planning. At the same time, the CCCTB will retain the business friendly features of the pending proposal for a Directive of 2011, having the aim to lower tax compliance costs for companies and tackle the inefficiencies that derive from the fragmentation of the internal market. The two objectives, i.e. anti-tax avoidance and business facilitation, are not mutually exclusive but instead, should be expected to both contribute to a better functioning of the internal market.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Preliminary assessments indicate that time costs for setting up a new subsidiary in a Member State are estimated to decrease 62-67% for the CCCTB. Focussing on recurring costs, i.e. ignoring one-off switching costs, the Impact Assessment estimates a decrease in time spent on compliance activities by 8% after implementation of the CCCTB. Based on these time reductions one could endeavour a rough calculation of the order of total cost savings that would result under the CCCTB. If 5% of medium-sized companies expand abroad, a one-off cost saving of around EUR 1 billion could be expected. If all multinational entities apply the CCCTB recurring compliance costs could go down by about EUR 0.8 billion.</p> <p>There are already measures included in the CCTB (Allowance for Growth and Investment and enhanced deductions for research and development) which will provide advantages for business in the EU. There will also be compliance cost benefits deriving from the common rules for the tax base calculation. Yet, there is no quantification of the benefits for the first step.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adoption planned Q4 2016 | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p><i>Which REFIT objective(s) will the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>CCCTB reduces time and resources spent on tax compliance for businesses operating in the EU.</p> |
| <p><i>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>The CCCTB features as an effective tool against tax avoidance, which can also ensure that income be attributed to where the value is created, through a formula based on three equally weighted factors (i.e. assets, labour, and sales). Since these factors are attached to where a company earns its profits, they are more resilient to aggressive tax planning practices than the widespread transfer pricing methods for allocating profit.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Preliminary assessment shows that time costs for setting up a new subsidiary in a Member State are estimated to decrease 62-67% for the CCCTB. Focussing on recurring costs, i.e. ignoring one-off switching costs, the Impact Assessment estimates a decrease in time spent on compliance activities by 8% after implementation of the CCCTB. Based on these time reductions one could endeavour a rough calculation of the order of total cost savings that would result under the CCCTB. If 5% of medium-sized companies expand abroad, a one-off cost saving of around EUR 1 billion could be expected. If all multinational entities apply the CCCTB recurring compliance costs could go down by about EUR 0.8 billion.</p> |

Towards a definitive VAT system for cross border trade

| <p>Overall state of Play</p> <p><i>Planned for adoption in Q3 2017 (CWP 2017)</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
|--|---|
| <p>Summary:</p> | <p>The VAT system has been unable to keep pace with the challenges of today's global, digital and mobile economy. The current VAT system for intra-EU trade, which was intended to be a transitional system, is fragmented, complex for the growing number of businesses operating cross-border and leaves the door open to fraud: domestic and cross-border transactions are treated differently and goods or services can be bought free of VAT within the single market. Therefore, compliance costs are significantly higher in single market trade than in domestic trade, while complexity is stifling business, especially small and medium-sized businesses. Cross-border fraud accounts for EUR 50 billion of revenue loss each year.</p> <p>As set out in the Commission Action Plan on VAT, the Commission will table legislative proposals in 2017 which will re-establish the principle of taxation of cross-border supplies and extend the current One Stop Shop (OSS) system to cover cross-border B2B supplies of goods. EU business making cross border supplies will declare and pay the tax through the OSS. However, compliant businesses, certified by their tax administrations, will continue to be liable for VAT on goods purchased from other EU countries. As compliant businesses represent the vast majority of taxable persons involved in cross-border transactions, this would significantly reduce the amounts of VAT channelled through the One Stop Shop and would make it easier for businesses to adapt. Such an initiative will constitute the first step towards the implementation of the definitive VAT regime for cross-border supplies under which taxation will cover all cross-border supplies so all supplies in goods and services within the single market, either domestic or cross-border, will be treated the same way.</p> <p>Input of the REFIT Platform:</p> <p>In the REFIT Platform opinion on reverse charging within VAT the Stakeholder group recommended to withdraw the use of the reverse charge mechanism and replace it with a simpler and more basic VAT regime in the EU. Some members of the Government group consider that reverse charging may continue to be necessary to combat fraud or that other measures would be required to achieve the same objective.</p> <p>The Platform also adopted an opinion on the documentary proof required for VAT in intra-EU trade. The Stakeholder group recommends reducing the burden on businesses of producing different documents in relation to intra-EU trade. Some members of the Government group consider that reducing documentary</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>obligations is too risky in light of VAT fraud, while others agree with the Stakeholder group recommendation.</p> <p>As set out in the 2016 Commission Action Plan on VAT, the Commission plans to table legislative proposals in 2017 which will re-establish the principle of taxation of cross-border supplies and extend the current Mini One Stop Shop (MOSS) system to cover cross-border business-to-business supplies of goods. EU business making cross border supplies will declare and pay the tax through the One Stop Shop (OSS). However, compliant businesses, certified by their tax administrations, will continue to be liable for VAT on goods purchased from other EU countries. As compliant businesses represent the vast majority of taxable persons involved in cross-border transactions, this would significantly reduce the amounts of VAT channelled through the One Stop Shop and would make it easier for businesses to adapt. Such an initiative will constitute the first step towards the implementation of the definitive VAT regime for cross-border supplies under which it is planned that taxation will cover all cross-border supplies so all supplies in goods and services within the single market, either domestic or cross-border, will be treated the same way</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>Such a system should reduce cross-border fraud by about EUR 40 billion (80%) a year in the EU. This will enable tax administrations to concentrate resources on other challenges. Some significant simplification measures will be taken to accompany this change. Collectively, businesses should save an average of around EUR 1 billion a year.</p> |

VAT rates

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Overall state of Play:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commission proposal planned for adoption in Q3 2017 (CWP 2017) | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p>Summary</p> | <p>Policy modernisation</p> <p>Expanded application of subsidiarity principle</p> <p>The Action Plan proposes to reform EU rules on VAT rates to allow Member States greater freedom in setting reduced rates in the context of a VAT system based on the destination principle. The main benefits are a more extensive application of subsidiarity and an expected reduction in infringement procedures on reduced rates.</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>Information not yet available.</p> |

SME VAT Package

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>Overall state of Play</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Evaluation and proposal planned for adoption in Q4 2017 (CWP 2017)</i> | <p>Summary/ Commission proposal</p> |
| <p><i>Summary</i></p> | <p>The initiative to review the SME scheme forms part of the Single Market Strategy , adopted in October 2015 and of the VAT Action Plan adopted in April 2016. It is linked to the VAT definitive regime and e-commerce proposals and depends on the results of the reflection and work on these two projects.</p> <p>The purpose of the review is to come up with a proposal comprising a comprehensive simplification package that includes both VAT exemption and simplification measures. The proposal may be accompanied by a Commission recommendation.</p> <p>The overall objective is to reduce the administrative burden on small enterprises, to contribute to the creation of an environment favourable to their growth and cross-border trade and to provide a level playing field for EU business.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Information not yet available.</p> |

VAT Invoicing directive

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>Overall state of Play</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Commission Proposal in 2009, adopted in 2010, transposition in 2012</i> • <i>Benefits likely to be reduced in legislative procedure, evaluation planned for 2018</i> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The measure provided the acceptance by tax authorities of electronic invoices under the same conditions as applied to paper invoices and creating a set of harmonised rules by reducing the options previously allowed for Member States and thus enabled companies to reduce the cost of issuing and processing invoices by switching to a fully electronic invoicing system.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The estimated savings was up to €18 billion. The directive is in force since 2013 and has been implemented by all Member States. A full evaluation is foreseen for 2018.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 28/01/2009 • COM(2009)21 | Commission Proposal |
| <i>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i> | <p>Suppressing additional requirements on invoices and enabling wider use of electronic invoicing.</p> <p>The aim of the proposal was to increase the use of electronic invoicing, reduce burdens on business, support small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs) and help Member States to tackle fraud. The proposal simplifies, modernises and harmonises the VAT invoicing rules. In particular, it eliminates the current barriers to e-invoicing in the VAT Directive by treating paper and electronic invoices equally.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>Estimated savings €18 billion.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Adopted 13 July 2010</i> • <i>Reference</i> Council Directive 2010/45/EU | Legal Act |
| <i>Outcome of Legislative Procedure</i> | <p>The main elements of the proposal, i.e. equal footing of the paper and electronic invoices, no technical restriction on issuance of e-invoices and no legal obstacles to the transmission and storage of e-invoices were achieved.</p> <p>Council could not agree on further simplification as proposed by Commission and Parliament, such as the simplification of the content of invoices, their storage, as well as self-billing and outsourcing). Council also decreased the ceiling for use of simplified invoices to EUR 100. The proposed standardised date for chargeability to tax and invoicing date was also not accepted in full.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>Benefits are likely to be reduced. No update of the estimated savings was carried out. An evaluation is planned for 2018.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Application on</i> Date of effect: 01/01/2013; Application See Art 2 • Date of transposition: 31/12/2012 • <i>Evaluation Planned for 2018</i> | <p>Implementation</p> |
| <p><i>Implementation reported by Member States</i></p> | <p>The Directive provides several provisions for Member States to enable electronic invoicing. Member States have transposed the Directive into national law between 2011 and 2013. Only one Member State had implemented as late as 2014.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>pending</p> |

Refund of value added tax (ABR+)

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>Overall state of Play</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Adopted by the Legislator on 12 February 2008</i> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>Council Directive 2008/9/EC (the Refund Directive) allows for non-established taxable persons to reclaim VAT on business expenses incurred in another Member State via an electronic web portal set up in their own Member State. This replaces the paper based system aiming also at simplifying the process for businesses and providing greater legal certainty by the imposition of deadlines together with interest payments on late payments by the Member State of refund.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The estimated savings are €447 million / annually. Cost savings reported by Member States were reported to range between 30% and 35% while the initial estimation by the Commission predicted savings of administrative burdens of 63%.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 29/10/2004 • COM(2004)728 | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</p> | <p>The Directive lays down the detailed rules for the refund of VAT to taxable persons not established in the Member State of refund suppressing the obligation to fill out paper forms. With the new rules applicants are able to file their applications electronically in their own Member State. The electronic procedure replaces the previous paper-based procedure which was slow, cumbersome, and costly ensuring a quicker refund to claimants.</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>The initial estimation by the Commission predicted savings of administrative burdens of 63%. Or €447 million.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopted by the Legislator on 12 February 2008 • Reference Council Directive 2008/9/EC | <p>Legal Act</p> |
| <p>Outcome of Legislative Procedure</p> | <p>The electronic procedure and the estimated deadline for refund is an improvement compared to the previous mechanism. However, the numerous options to Member States added at the request of Council lead to difficulties in interoperability and to inconsistencies between the IT systems of Member States delaying the full roll out of the system.</p> <p>Member States were obliged to make available on 1st January 2010 the web portal via which taxable persons submit their applications for refund. However, some Member States were late in launching their web portals, whilst other Member States have had a number of technical problems, both leading to a situation in which taxable persons had not been able to submit their refund applications.</p> <p>Because of these delays, and in order to safeguard the taxpayer's fundamental right to deduct VAT, the Commission adopted a proposal for a Directive COM/2010/381/FINAL to give more time to taxpayers to introduce their requests for VAT refund by postpone the deadline for submission of VAT refund requests related to 2009 from September 2010 to March 2011. The Proposal was adopted by</p> |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| | the Council, resulting in Council Directive 2010/66/EU of 14 October 2010. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Not available |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Application on</i> Date of effect: 01/01/2010; Entry into force Date pub. See Art 30 • <i>Transposition</i> <i>date 01/01/2010</i> • <i>Deadline See</i> <i>Art 29</i> | <p>Implementation</p> |
| <i>Implementation reported by Member States</i> | The Directive provides several provisions for Member States to enable electronic invoicing. Member States have transposed the Directive into national law between 2011 and 2013. One Member State had implemented as late as 2014. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | In five Member States cost reductions were estimated to range between 30% and 35% (ES, FR, CY, LV, SE), while the initial estimation by the Commission predicted savings of administrative burdens of 63%. |

Priority 5: A Deeper and Fairer Economic and Monetary Union

Overview


1. Overview of REFIT Initiatives in the area of Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion

Evaluation

Commission Proposal

Legal Act


Implementation



| | | | | |
|--|--|--|----------------------------------|--|
| Occupational Health and Safety | Evaluation Expected to be finalised Q4 2016 | | | |
| Information and consultation of workers | Fitness check published 26 July 2013 | Commission proposal under consideration | | |
| Working time | | Commission Communication Planned for 2017 | | |
| Posting of workers – Enforcement Directive | | Commission proposal adopted 21 March 2012 | Legal act adopted 15 May 2014 | Implementation Date of effect 15 May 2014 |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| Written Statement Directive | Evaluation Expected to be finalised Q4/2016 | Commission proposal Planned for 2017 | | |
| Temporary Agency Work | Evaluation Finalised in March 2014 | | | |
| Part-time work and Fixed Term Work | Evaluation planned to be finalised in 2017 | | | |

2. Overview of REFIT Initiatives in the area of Financial Stability, Financial Services and Capital Markets Union



| | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|---------------------------------------|---|
| | | adopted on 4 June 2006 | adopted on 14 June 2006 | September 2006 |
| Annual accounts of micro-enterprises | | Commission proposal adopted on 26 February 2009 | Legal act adopted on 14 March 2012 | Implementation Date of effect: 10 April 2012 |
| Cross-border payments | | Commission proposal Planned Q4 2017 | | |

3. Overview of REFIT Initiatives in the area of Statistics



Initiatives in the area of Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion

Occupational Health and Safety

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Evaluation results expected Q4 2016</i> • <i>Communication on Evaluation results and follow-up expected Q4 2016</i> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The Commission is carrying out a comprehensive ex-post evaluation of 24 EU Directives on Health and Safety at Work aiming at a wide evaluation of the legislation, including in terms of benefits and costs, research and new scientific knowledge:</p> <p>Evaluation of Council Directive 89/391/EEC of 12 June 1989 on the introduction of measures to encourage improvements in the safety and health of workers at work and 23 related directives.</p> <p>The final outcome of the evaluation is expected by the end of 2016.</p> <p>Its results may lead to initiatives to improve the regulatory framework.</p> <p>The Commisison is planning a Communication to set-out the results of the evaluation and the possible follow-up.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Information not yet available.</p> |

Information and consultation of workers

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>- fitness check concluded in July 2013</i></p> <p><i>- proposal under consideration</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The fitness check of the three directivesDirectives on information and consultation of workers found that the three EU Directives are generally relevant, effective, coherent and mutually reinforcing. It also pointed to some shortcomings impacting their functioning. They relate mainly to the scope of the Directives (as a significant part of the workforce is excluded), their implementation that could be improved and discrepancies among the definitions of some concepts across the three directives. On this basis, the Commission has been considering a possible codification/recast of the three directives. Consultations, starting with a first stage consultation of the EU social partners in 2015.</p> <p>In the same period, the EU social partners in the sector of central government administrations also negotiated an Agreement extending information and consultation rights by setting minimum standards adapted to the specificities of their sector. In February 2016, they formally asked the Commission to transform their Agreement into a Council Directive. The Commission before deciding whether or not to submit a proposal for a Council Directive extending information and consultation to central government administrations, will carry out a proportionate impact assessment of the Agreement, examining in particular the representativeness of its signatories, the legality of the clauses of the Agreement vis-à-vis the EU law,legal framework and the respect of the subsidiarity and proportionality principles. Results are expected in 2017.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The Fitness Check concluded that the benefits that the three Directives on information and consultation of workers generate are likely to outweigh the costs.</p> <p>Given data limitations, quantification of costs and benefits has not been possible.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SWD(2013)293 – published 26 July 2013 | <p>Fitness Check</p> |
| <p><i>Scope:</i></p> | <p>Fitness check covering the three Directives on information and consultation of workers at national level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directive 2002/14/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 March 2002 establishing a general framework for informing and consulting employees in the European Community • Council Directive 98/59/EC of 20 July 1998 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to collective redundancies • Council Directive 2001/23/EC of 12 March 2001 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the safeguarding of employees' rights in the event of transfers of undertakings, businesses or parts of undertakings or businesses <p>This fitness check aimed at identifying excessive burdens, overlaps, gaps or inconsistencies which may have appeared since the adoption of three above mentioned EU Directives.</p> |
| <p><i>Evaluation findings:</i></p> | <p>The Fitness Check concluded that the Directives are generally relevant, effective, coherent and mutually reinforcing and broadly fit for purpose. They prescribe minimum requirements and are flexible enough to be adapted to the specific contexts and industrial relations systems of the EU/EEA countries. Moreover, they seem to have contributed to cushioning the shock of the recession and to better preparing and managing restructurings during the crisis. Information and consultation at company level has become important for solving problems, including maintaining employment and lowering adjustment costs through the use of internal flexibility.</p> <p>The Fitness Check also pointed to some gaps and shortcomings:</p> <p>1.Scope - As far as the scope is concerned, a significant share of the workforce is not covered by the provisions, due to the exclusion of small businesses, of public administration and of seafarers at the time of the Fitness Check.</p> <p>2.Implementation - There is also room for improvement regarding the application, particularly in countries with less-developed social dialogue traditions, by promoting an information and consultation culture among social partners, strengthening institutions, promoting agreements on information and consultation, disseminating good</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>practices, raising awareness and ensuring enforcement.</p> <p>3. Definitions - Particular issues relating to the definitions of the concepts of 'information' and 'consultation' were identified. Those definitions could be better aligned among the different Directives.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>The evidence gathered for the purpose of the fitness check pointed to several significant economic benefits that can be derived from information and consultation at the workplace. Notably, there are positive operational and organisational outcomes (e.g. better communication with the employers / promotion of trust and partnership, reduction of conflicts, better change anticipation, better change management).which can in turn have a positive impact on staff performance and, eventually, on a company's performance, reputation and competitiveness.</p> <p>On the other side, both employers and employees' representatives incur costs, relating to the support provided to representatives including time off work for carrying out information and consultation.</p> <p>Overall, on the basis of the available qualitative evidence and stakeholders' assessments, it may be concluded that the benefits are likely to outweigh the costs incurred.</p> <p>Given data limitations, quantification of costs and benefits has not been possible.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>under consideration</i> | Commission Proposal |
| <i>Which REFIT objective(s) will the Commission pursue?</i> | <p>Consolidation/recast to make EU law simpler, more accessible and more readable improving thus awareness and compliance.</p> <p>Standardized definitions are likely to render the application of EU law in this field easier and contribute to a more effective exercise of the rights and obligations of all actors concerned.</p> |
| <i>Which other objective(s) will the Commission pursue?</i> | <p>Taking into account the results of the social partner's consultation, a codification/recast of three Information and Consultation directives would improve the coherence of definitions. A possible initiative could also propose to modify the scope of application of the Directives, with a specific consideration to the current exclusion of public administrations. At the same time, the Commission does not aim at revising the thresholds for setting up Information and Consultation bodies as set in the Directives.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | To be provided when available |

Working time

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Interpretative communication and implementation report planned for 2017</i> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The Commission services are finalising the review of the Working Time Directive with a view to present the outcome of this process in 2017, together with a new implementation report and if appropriate, specific follow-up.</p> <p>The preparatory work envisages to clarify the legal framework on working time, taking into account the challenges arising from new working patterns and continuing to provide appropriate health and safety protection of workers, with due consideration of the objective of better reconciliation of work and private life.</p> <p>There are concerns of persisting cases of non-conformity as well as lack of legal certainty which entail costs for workers (in terms of health and safety, productivity, work-life balance, etc.) but also to employers and public authorities.</p> <p>By aiming at simpler and clearer rules, the follow up to the current review should allow alleviating administrative burden by clarifying the existing flexibility already available in the Directive and ensuring long-term legal certainty which will reduce the need for successive changes to national, regional or local legal texts and work organisations.</p> <p>Aiming at keeping and reinforcing a stable environment to stakeholders will help avoid major disruption of current legal and economic arrangements, and the ensuing contracts and practises.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Information not yet available.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planned for 2017 | Follow up to the Review |
| <i>Which REFIT objective(s) will the Commission pursue?</i> | Clearer and simpler rules easier to understand and apply by workers and employers, including SMEs and public services. |
| <i>Which other objective(s) will the Commission pursue?</i> | Not yet determined. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Not yet determined. |

Posting of workers – Enforcement Directive

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>- proposal (enforcement)</i> <i>March 2012</i></p> <p><i>- legal act (enforcement)</i> <i>May 2014</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The Directive 2014/67/EU on the enforcement of Directive 96/71/EC concerning the posting of workers in the framework of the provision of services and amending Regulation (EU) No 1024/2012 on administrative cooperation through the Internal Market Information System ('the IMI Regulation') sets out a range of new measures to improve the implementation, application and enforcement in practice of Directive 96/71/EC. It is expected to favour administrative cooperation and improve instruments against frauds and abuses, by improving legal clarity, reducing the frequency of judicial litigation and/or their efficient solution.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower risk of judicial disputes thanks to clearer rules on control measures. • Shorter time for dispute resolutions due to new tools for administrative coordination and exchange of information. <p>Given data limitations, savings to business could not be quantified</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • COM(2012)131 • 21 March 2012 | <p>Commission proposal</p> |
| <p>Which REFIT objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</p> | <p>The proposal aimed at simplifying application and enforcement of the existing legal framework, SMEs are expected to benefit from better enforcement and level playing field and fairer competition.</p> <p>The proposal included the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • make the information on the terms and conditions of employment generally available in a "clear, comprehensive and easily accessible way" and in several languages; • Codification of existing case law by providing an exhaustive list of national control measures Member States may impose on posting businesses, including for instance, a list of documents that service providers can be required to keep at the work place; • Requirement that inspections should primarily be based on regularly drawn up risk assessments, thus making inspections more effective and reduce costs for companies in non-risk sectors; • Introduction of a limited system of joint and several liabilities in subcontracting chains in the construction sector. In order to reduce the possible impact on businesses, in particular SMEs, companies who had undertaken due diligence should not be held liable. <p>The proposal included obligations for Member States to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide information requested by another MS in the context of administrative cooperation within short deadlines (24 hours or at the latest within 2 weeks); • ensure that the procedures and formalities relating to the posting of workers can be completed easily by undertakings, at a distance and by electronic means to limit the administrative burden on companies. <p>Costs for translation of information on applicable working conditions into the main languages of posted workers: average of ca. EUR 90,000 (one-off costs) and EUR 180,000 (repetitive costs per year). Costs to the public budget correspond to savings for private enterprises and workers, as they do not need to translate documents on their own.</p> <p>Setting up a system of joint and several liability in sub-contracting may entail indirect costs up to about EUR 100,000 in some countries, related to the behavioural change of enterprises doing</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | market research a priori to select virtuous subcontractors. Costs could be however mitigated over time due to behavioural change and the exclusion of companies undertaking due diligence (which was not factored in the IA). |
| <i>Which other objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i> | The proposal aims to ensure more effective protection of workers, increased legal certainty and transparency for service providers thus facilitating cross-border service provision and building up confidence in the Single Market. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Savings are linked to the lower risk of judicial disputes thanks to clearer rules on control measures and shorter time for dispute resolutions due to new tools for administrative coordination and exchange of information. Given data limitations, savings to business could not be quantified. |

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directive 2014/67/EU • 15 May 2014 | Legal Act |
| <i>Outcome of Legislative Procedure</i> | The adopted Directive contains a balanced package of measures guaranteeing a better protection of posted workers and a more transparent and predictable legal framework for service providers. This will clarify and simplify procedures and ensure a better level playing field from which all SMEs will benefit. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | In comparison to the original Commission proposal, the final text of the Directive agreed by the co-legislator does contain a number of modifications increasing administrative burden on companies and imposing a number of new obligations on public authorities. Costs / reductions of savings of these modifications have not been quantified. |

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <i>State of Play:</i> Date of effect: 15 May 2014 Entry into force: June 2014 Date of transposition): 18 June 2016 Deadline for reporting on | Implementation |
|---|-----------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------------------------|
| application: 18 June 2019 | |
| <i>Implementation reported by MemberStates</i> | Information not yet available. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | |

Written Statement Directive

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Evaluation expected to be finalised in Q4 2016</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>According to preliminary results, the REFIT evaluation shows that the current Directive achieved EU added value. It increases certainty for both employers and employees. It contributes to the protection of workers and transparency on labour markets, with subsequent effects on the functioning of the internal market and the mobility of European workers.</p> <p>Preliminary results also show however that the Directive's effectiveness is hampered by several factors: gaps in the personal scope of the Directive (e.g. some new forms of employment); gaps in the 'information package' to be notified; issues of enforcement of the Directive, notably as to means of redress in case of non-compliance. The Commission is currently finalizing the evaluation report and will then consider how best to improve the effectiveness on the basis of those findings, against the background of the proposed EU Pillar of Social Rights.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The emerging findings of the evaluation show that the notification of a written statement to employees is not a disproportionate burden compared to the benefits it brings, e.g. legal certainty for both sides and less litigations.</p> <p>The average one-off administrative cost per employed person for all company sizes is estimated at 34 euros.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expected to be finalised Q4/2016 | Evaluation |
| <i>Scope:</i> | Evaluation of the Directive 91/533/EC on an employer's obligation to inform employees of the conditions applicable to the contract or employment relationship |
| <i>Evaluation findings:</i> | Preliminary results show that the Directive has been effective in achieving its objectives to some extent. However, it appears that many workers in the EU do not receive a written confirmation of their working conditions or do not receive all the information they would need in a timely manner. The Directive's effectiveness is hampered by several factors: gaps in the personal scope of the Directive (e.g. domestic workers or some new forms of employment); gaps in the 'information package' to be notified; issues of enforcement of the Directive, notably as to means of redress in case of non-compliance. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>The emerging findings of the evaluation show that the notification of a written statement to employees is not a disproportionate burden compared to the benefits it brings, e.g. legal certainty for both sides and less litigations.</p> <p>The average one-off administrative cost per employed person for all company sizes is estimated at 34 euros.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <i>Proposal Planned for 2017</i> | Commission proposal |
| <i>Which REFIT objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i> | <p>It is planned to propose a review of the existing Directive to take account of the conclusions of the REFIT evaluation, reinforce the take-up of existing EU social rights in the field of labour law and address needs arising from the current and future world of work.</p> <p>Such an initiative shall be first subject to a consultation of European Social Partners, as per Article 154 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Data not yet available.. |

Temporary Agency Work

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Evaluation completed in March 2014</i> • <i>no follow-up foreseen</i> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>Evaluation of Directive 2008/104/EC on temporary agency work.</p> <p>The report on the application of the Directive concluded in general Member States seem to have correctly implemented the Directive. This being said, its goals have not yet been fully achieved given that Member States continue to apply certain derogations from the principle of equal treatment and maintain most restrictions and prohibitions on the use of agency work.</p> <p>As regards issues of simplification and burden reduction, most Member States consider that the Directive does not give rise to significant additional costs on national authorities, temporary-work agencies or user companies, including SMEs. For their part, employer organisations notably refer to costs linked to the insufficient transposition of certain provisions of the Directive.</p> <p>The report finds that it is not necessary to amend the Directive at this stage. The Commission will focus on ensuring proper implementation and consider appropriate recommendations in the frame work of the European Semester, if the Commission identifies either obstacles to growth and competitiveness in its assessment of national obstacles to the activity of temporary-work agencies or if the Commission identified unfounded derogations to the principle of equal treatment.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The report on the application of the Temporary Agency Work Directive highlights that most Member States consider that the Directive does not give rise to additional costs on national authorities, temporary-work agencies or user companies, including small and medium-sized businesses.</p> <p>Due to data limitations, regulatory benefits and costs could not be further quantified.</p> |

Part-time work and Fixed Term Work

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Evaluation to be finalised in 2017</i> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The Commission carries out an evaluation to assess to what extent the directives on Part-time work and Fixed Term Work have been able to meet their original objectives and are fit for purpose in the light of the requirements of an evolving EU labour market in terms of providing an appropriate balance between flexibility and job security and ensuring fair and effective transitions to workers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council Directive 97/81/EC of 15 December 1997 concerning the Framework Agreement on part-time work concluded by UNICE, CEEP and the ETUC, Council Directive 1999/70/EC of 28 June 1999 concerning the framework agreement on fixed-term work concluded by ETUC, UNICE and CEEP <p>Employers, employees and public authorities as well as society at large can accrue benefits from the use of part-time and fixed-term work, notably through a greater flexibility in the organisation of working-time and improved work and family life balance.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The evaluation will assess the costs and benefits generated by the directives for employees, employers and public authorities, and assesses whether the two directives resulted in any disproportionate additional burden or administrative costs for employers.</p> |

International accounting standards (IAS)

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>Overall state of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Evaluation published on 18.06.2015</i></p> <p><i>No follow-up planned currently</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The Commission evaluated Regulation 1606/2002 on the application of international accounting standards (IAS) and concluded that the Regulation was successful in creating a common accounting language for capital markets.</p> <p>Companies were mostly positive about their experience of using IFRS and in most cases, benefits outweighed costs. Investors also largely supported IFRS for improving the transparency and comparability of financial statements. Most stakeholders considered that the process through which IFRS become part of EU law works well.</p> <p>A modification of Regulation 1606/2002 is currently not planned. A codification of existing legislation may be considered to improve coherence and simplify the legislative framework once the major standards will have been agreed (IFRS 9 on financial instruments, IFRS 16 on leases, IFRS 17 on insurance contracts).</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The evidence showed that the benefits of the implementation of the IAS Regulation outweigh the costs.</p> <p>Given the data limitations, quantification of costs and benefits has not been possible.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Evaluation published on 18.06.2015</i> • <i>SWD(2015)301 and OM(2015)301</i> | <p>Evaluation</p> |
| <p><i>Scope:</i></p> | <p>Evaluation of Regulation 1606/2002 on the application of international accounting standards (IAS)</p> |
| <p><i>Evaluation findings:</i></p> | <p>The evaluation concluded that the objectives of the Regulation have been met.</p> <p>However, the evaluation identifies room for improvement in some areas. For instance, the collaboration between actors in the endorsement process could be enhanced to improve timeliness and to allow for a more holistic consideration of standards with other aspects of EU law.</p> <p>International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) issued by the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB) need to be endorsed by the Commission. An endorsement process remains necessary to ensure that the standards developed by a private body meet certain criteria and are fit for the European economy before becoming part of EU law.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Given the data limitations, quantification of costs and benefits has not been possible.</p> |

Company accounts

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>Overall state of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Proposal made in 2004 and adopted in 2006, transposition deadline September 2008</i></p> <p><i>Estimated savings confirmed and exceeded</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The initiative reduced financial reporting obligations (in particular, having to report off-balance-sheet arrangements) for SMEs by increasing the exemption thresholds that Member States can adopt for SMEs and parent undertakings.</p> <p>When Member States chose to apply the exemption, companies that meet the new eligibility requirements are dispensed from certain accounting obligations, should a Member State elect to pursue this policy.</p> <p>Implementation reports showed a reduction in the number of SMEs under the obligation to prepare, have audited and publish the same set of annual financial statements as the larger companies. Instead, these SMEs can prepare and publish a simpler set of information.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Initial estimations of savings of around 47% of total administrative costs associated with the implementation of Directive 2006/46/EC were increased by amendments in legislative procedure. Feedback on implementation showed savings in the range between 8% and 82% (CZ, LV, SK, SE, UK).</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Adopted by the Commission on 27/10/2004</i> • <i>Ref COM(2004)725</i> | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p><i>Which objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>The main benefit of the proposal was the increase by around 20% of the maximum size criteria ("thresholds") for balance sheet and net turnover that Member States may apply in determining which companies may be exempted from certain disclosure requirements.</p> <p>There was no obligation on Member States to make use of those increased thresholds, nor even to implement differentiated treatment of companies based on size. The Member States had also the flexibility, when implementing categories based on size, to apply lower thresholds than those provided for in the Directive.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>47% of total administrative costs associated with the implementation of Directive 2006/46/EC.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Adopted by the Legislator on 14/06/2006</i> • <i>Reference Directive 2006/46/EC</i> | <p>Legal Act</p> |
| <p><i>Outcome of Legislative Procedure</i></p> | <p>Parliament introduced an increased threshold for exemptions from certain disclosure requirements. Other main changes concern proportionality in transparency on related parties' transactions, clearer provisions on the collective responsibility of board members towards the company in respect of annual reports and financial statements, and improved corporate governance report.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Increased savings due to a higher threshold introduced by Parliament were calculated by the Centre for European Policy Studies in 2009 at €863 million.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date of effect: 05/09/2006; • <i>Transposition</i> 05/09/2008 • <i>Evaluation done in 2011 (Impact assessment accompanying the proposal for Accounting Directive 2013/34/EU)</i> | <p>Implementation</p> |
| <p><i>Implementation reported by Member States</i></p> | <p>The Directive contains flexibility for Member States in the implementation of the provisions for simplification of company accounts for SMEs. Member States have transposed the Directive between 2008 and 2014. Due to late transposition in the majority of Member States companies could not profit as early as expected from the savings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 Member States have fully implemented the simplification provision, (CZ, DK, DE, ES, NL, SK, SE, UK), while for 7 Member States the degree of implementation is not clear. (HR, CY, LU, MT, AT, PT, SL). • 6 Member States have only implemented certain provisions and not taken up the option to raise exemption thresholds. (BG, IE, EL, IT, LV, LT). • 3 Member States did not implement the provisions (EE, HU, FI). They either applied other simplification measures in the area of annual accounts or the permitted increase in exemption thresholds for SMEs was relatively small, thereby undermining potential or perceived benefits of the measure by Member States. • 2 Member States introduced additional requirements that can lead to an increase in administrative burden (CY, MT). |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>In the five Member States that provided assessments of the cost reduction it was estimated to range between 8% and 82% (CZ, LV, SK, SE, UK), while the initial estimation by the Commission predicted overall savings of administrative burdens of around 47%. Overall, available quantitative evidence was insufficient to provide a conclusive assessment of impacts of the measure on the ground.</p> |

Annual accounts of micro-enterprises

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Proposal made in 2009, adopted in 2012 and entered into force in 2013</i></p> <p><i>Estimated Savings were reduced by the legislator from 6.3 billion EUR to 3.5 billion EUR.</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The measure allowed micro entities to benefit from simplified accounting/auditing regimes. Micros are businesses that meet two of the following criteria: (1) a balance sheet total below €350,000; (2) a net turnover below €700,000; and/or (3) less than an average of 10 employees in a given financial year.</p> <p>Additionally, Member States may also allow micro entities to draw up an abridged profit and loss account and balance sheet.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Estimated savings were reduced by the legislator from EUR 6.3 billion to EUR 3.5 billion assuming each Member State adopts maximum simplification measures allowed by the Directive.</p> <p>Implementation feedback showed cost reductions between 42% and 70%, while the initial estimation by the Commission predicted overall savings of administrative burden of around 38%.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Adopted by the Commission on 26/02/2009</i> • <i>COM(2009)83</i> | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p><i>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>The Commission proposal provided for Member States to have the possibility to exempt micro-companies from certain accounting requirements in order to simplify their financial reporting.</p> <p>A key objective of the Directive was to create a simple financial reporting environment for micro entities. As such, Member States can exempt micro entities from one or more of the following obligations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the obligation to present “prepayments and accrued income” and “accruals and deferred income”; • the obligation to draw up notes on the accounts; • the obligation to prepare an annual report; and • the obligation to publish annual accounts. <p>Additionally, Member States may also allow micro entities to draw up an abridged profit and loss account and balance sheet.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>38% of total administrative burdens or EUR 6.3 billion assuming each Member State adopts maximum simplification measures allowed by the Directive.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Adopted by the Legislator on 14 March 2012</i> • <i>Reference Directive 2012/6/EU</i> • <i>Repealed and replaced by Directive 2013/34/EC</i> | <p>Legal Act</p> |
| <p><i>Outcome of Legislative</i></p> | <p>Despite significant limitations in the main administrative burden</p> |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Procedure | <p>reduction elements in the Commission proposal, the Council and the Parliament agreed in Directive 2012/6/EU on the principle of a significantly lighter regime for micro-enterprises.</p> <p>The amendments introduced by Directive 2012/06/EU reduced the scope of flexibility and the number of micro-enterprises to benefit from the simplification.</p> <p>The thresholds were reduced In order to be considered as a micro-enterprise, the latter should have not more than 10 employees, a balance sheet not exceeding EUR 350 000 and / or a net turnover not exceeding EUR 700 000.</p> <p>The Directive nevertheless makes a simpler accounting regime available to micro-entities compared to the EU provisions that had been in place so far, including a simplified balance sheet and profit and loss account, virtually no notes, no management report and simplified publication system.</p> <p>An obligation for companies Micro-enterprises will nevertheless continue to keep records showing the company's business transactions and financial situation with the obligation for micro entities to prepare a balance sheet and a profit & loss account, and the obligation to file at least the balance sheet with the business register were introduced in the final act.</p> <p>It is up to the Member States whether they want to use the option of implementing a simpler regime for their micro-entities. Member States shall bring into force the laws, regulations and administrative provisions necessary to comply with this directive if and when they decide to make use of any option provided in it.</p> <p>The legal provisions aiming for simplified financial reporting by micro-enterprises introduced by Directive 2012/6/EU were completely and faithfully taken over by Directive 2013/34/EU.</p> |
| Estimated savings and benefits | <p>Estimated savings reduced to EUR 3.5 billion assuming each Member State adopts maximum simplification measures allowed by the Directive.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| State of Play: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date of effect: 10/04/2012 | Implementation |
| Implementation reported by Member States | <p>Transposition of Directive 2012/6/EU as of 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7 Member States have partially implemented the measure |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>implementing between 1 and 3 of the provisions (DE, FR, LV, HU, AT, SK, UK). For 1 Member State the degree of implementation is unclear (PT).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 Member States have not implemented the measure the majority indicating their intention to implement together with another directive linked to accounting (Directive 2013/34/EU) with a transposition date of June 2015 (BE, BG, CZ, DK, EE, IE, EL, ES, IT, CY, LT, LU, MT, RO, SE). <p>Transposition of Directive 2013/34/EU:</p> <p>As of October 2016, Directive 2013/34/EU was implemented by all the Member States, except for Ireland where the adoption of the necessary legislation was impending before the Parliament.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>In the five Member States that provided information on their partial implementation of the provisions (FR, LV, AT, SK, UK), cost reductions were estimated to range between 42% and 70%, while the initial estimation by the Commission predicted overall savings of administrative burden of around 38%.</p> |

Regulation (EC) N°924/2009 on cross-border payments

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <i>Legislative Review Planned for 2017</i> | Summary |
| Summary: | Review of Regulation (EC) 924/2009 with a view to extend its scope to all non-Euro currencies in the Union would improve disclosure and reduce fees in cross-border transactions in particular with respect to and from non-euro Member States |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

Initiatives in the area of Statistics

Integrating business statistics (FRIBS)

| <p>State of Play:</p> <p><i>Proposal planned for Q1 2017</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
|---|---|
| <p>Summary:</p> | <p>Under the proposal planned for early 2017, the Framework Regulation Integrating Business statistics (FRIBS) would integrate the current 10 legislative acts governing the production of European business statistics into an overarching legal framework which enables better responsiveness to emerging user needs, provides new European statistics to serve the Commission policy priorities and gives better analytical value for users due to more harmonised and cross-cutting output for them.</p> <p>In addition, FRIBS would allow for the creation of a system which is more forward looking, with best potential for modernisation and collaborative approaches to statistical production. The National Statistical Authorities (NSAs) would have better access to administrative data and could use innovative and more cost-efficient methods of data production across the better integrated domains.</p> <p>The use of better integrated processes (e.g. due to the alignment of variable definitions), more innovative and alternative data sources, would create significant potential for reduction of burden on businesses acting as respondents.</p> <p>In summary, FRIBS would serve better the needs of users, facilitate the integration and modernisation of statistical production in the NSAs and allow for a reduction of burden on businesses.</p> <p><i>Input of the REFIT Platform:</i></p> <p>The REFIT Platform opinion on environmental protection investment statistics contains a recommendation of the majority of the Government group and some members of the Stakeholder group that the Commission examines the extent to which there are overlapping reporting requirements under different regulations linked to environmental protection investment and removes any duplication. The Commission attaches great importance to administrative burden being created by reporting obligations and has examined the legal basis for environmental accounts. The</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Commission plans to produce a legislative proposal on FRIBS which should ensure that there are no overlapping reporting requirements |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits:</i> | <p>Regarding administrative burden that data providers (businesses) are facing: FRIBS is expected to foster a reduction of administrative burden of at least 13.5 % (or EUR 93 million) compared to the current annual burden.</p> <p>Regarding the cost on data compilers (National Statistical Authorities): FRIBS could lead to a maximum net cost savings of EUR (–) 10 million and maximum net cost increase of EUR (+) 9 million - depending on the implementation modalities which may vary in different Member States.</p> <p>To sum up, FRIBS could bring about considerable benefits in reducing administrative burden and foster a potential reduction of costs to the NSAs.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Under preparation Proposal from COM planned for 4th quarter 2016</i></p> | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p><i>Which REFIT objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>FRIBS work targets the integration of existing individual basic acts in one framework Regulation. This would guarantee that all actions would be undertaken in a consistent and time-coordinated way. Furthermore, it would allow the definitions of a flexible frame for future developments of business statistics in the EU, since changes in statistical areas would always take place within the framework of one single Regulation, and thus, per definition, in a consistent way. Moreover, specific provisions for accessing administrative sources and notably the modernisation of Intra EU trade in goods statistics would reduce the administrative burden on respondents.</p> <p>The Proposal will also address the opinion by the REFIT Platform regarding overlapping reporting requirements under different regulations regarding environmental protection investment statistics.</p> |
| <p><i>Which other objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>Proposal for a Framework Regulation integrating Business Statistics (FRIBS)</p> <p>It would repeal Regulation (EC) No 295/2008; Regulation (EC) No 1165/1998; Regulation (EEC) No 3924/91 and Regulation (EC) No 912/2004; Regulation (EC) No 471/2009; Regulation (EC) No 638/2004; Regulation (EC) No 716/2007; Regulation (EC) No 177/2008; Regulation (EC) No 48/2004; Decision (EC) No 1608/2003 related to statistics; modifying Regulation (EC) No 184/2005; Regulation (EC) No 808/2004</p> <p>The initiative aims at integrating business statistics in a common legal framework to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • streamline and rationalise the reference framework for European business statistics, reduce the response burden on business • defining a new architecture for European business statistics instrumental to the compilation of quality and purpose-relevant European business statistics, including the provision on higher quality statistics on services, globalisation and entrepreneurship. |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and</i></p> | <p>Regarding administrative burden that data providers (businesses) are</p> |

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| <i>benefits</i> | <p>facing: FRIBS is expected to foster a reduction of at least 13.5 % (or EUR 93 million) compared to the current annual burden.</p> <p>Regarding the cost on data compilers (National Statistical Authorities): Applying a cost model for calculating the net present value of the total FRIBS costs over a 10-year implementation period, there could be a maximum net cost savings of EUR (–) 10 million and maximum net cost increase of EUR (+) 9 million - depending on the implementation modalities which may vary in different Member States.</p> |
|------------------------|--|

Integrating Social statistics

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Proposal adopted on 24 August 2016 (COM(2016)551)</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The proposed framework Regulation will allow social data to be published faster, as it reduces the transmission deadlines in a number of areas. It will also increase the comparability and coherence of EU social statistics, by bringing together seven existing household surveys that are currently carried out in the EU and harmonising variables that are common to two or more surveys. This will, in addition, facilitate joint analysis of social phenomena, based on new survey methods. Finally, a richer and broader data set will be put at the users' disposal, thanks to the use of innovative approaches and methods by national statistical authorities and the combination of data from several sources.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Savings will depend on the concrete implementation of the production methods at national level (adoption of technological and methodological innovations, improved access to administrative registers). Therefore estimation of savings varied between a net present value of €-3.1 million under the more contained hypothesis and a net present value of -34 million under the less restrictive option.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p>Adopted on 24 August 2016; COM(2016)551.</p> | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p><i>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>The work concerns data collected from private households and individuals (persons), but not from enterprises. The objective is to make best possible use of the information provided by private households and individuals, and to meet current and future needs for European statistics while keeping the response burden at approximately the present level. This shall be achieved through the integration of European statistical data collections that are currently covered by different regulations.</p> |
| <p><i>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>The aim is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • consolidate and integrate statistical legislation on the production of European statistics relating to persons and households • enable progressive methodological and organisational integration of statistical surveys • increasing accountability, efficiency and responsiveness of statistical production and output <p>The framework regulation will possibly repeal the following acts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the EU Labour Force Survey (Council Regulation (EC) No 577/98 of 9 March 1998 on the organisation of a labour force sample survey in the Community), • the EU-SILC (EU Statistics on Income and Living Conditions, Regulation (EC) No 1177/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 June 2003 concerning Community statistics on income and living conditions), |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The REFIT objective of the proposal is to make best possible use of the information provided by private households and persons, and to meet the current and future needs for European statistics while limiting the response burden. This simplification should be achieved by bringing various European social statistical data collections, which are currently covered by separate regulations, under one framework. Details of the reduction of costs for data producers and providers, calculated based on model scenarios, can be found in the</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>impact assessment. The baseline hypothesis leads to an estimated increase in costs of €10.3 million in the design phase (at EU level), while leading to a decrease of €20.8 million in the data collection (net present value of €-10.4 million).</p> <p>Savings will depend on the concrete implementation of the production methods at national level (adoption of technological and methodological innovations, improved access to administrative registers). Therefore estimation of savings varied between a net present value of €-3.1 million under the more contained hypothesis and a net present value of -34 million under the less restrictive option</p> |
|--|--|

Framework Regulations in Agricultural Statistics to 2020 and beyond

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Proposal planned for Q4 2016</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>Two new framework regulations for agricultural statistics will be proposed. They will enable producing high-quality data that meet users' needs efficiently and effectively, increase the flexibility and reaction speed of the agricultural statistics system, improve the harmonisation and coherence of European agricultural statistics, and allow producing more statistics while lowering the burden on respondents by opening up alternative data sources and installing efficiency improvements.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The new framework is estimated to represent about 18% savings in agricultural census years (or 56 million of 320 million Euro total costs, if applied to the year 2010), and comparative proportions for sample survey years.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Under preparation and planned to be finalised/ proposed in Q4 2016.</i></p> | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p><i>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>The proposals will increase the availability of quality data needed for agricultural, environmental and climate change policies while simplifying the statistical system and keeping the burden moderate.</p> |
| <p><i>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>Two Proposals for Framework Regulation on agricultural statistics</p> <p>The aim is to repeal the current basic acts in the field of agricultural statistics, The scope of these two framework proposals is still being considered.</p> <p>As the current Farm Structure Survey Regulation will become obsolete in 2018, and as it is crucial that an agricultural census be organised in 2020, the Commission will propose a two-phased approach with the objective of integrating the existing basic acts and new statistical data needs under two Framework Regulations and related delegated/implemented acts. The aim is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • permit collection of existing and new data requested by users for new needs by having most data collection covered by legislation; • increase the efficiency of the statistical system and quality of collected data by keeping the burden on respondents and National Statistical Institutes moderate; • increase the coherence and comparability of agricultural statistics by ensuring that common essential elements such as scope, precision and quality requirements are the same. |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The main direct costs for stakeholders relate to the adaptation to new statistical, organisational and technical systems. In the mid to long term, these costs and burdens are expected to pay for themselves by establishing a slightly lower burden, and more effective and efficient data production leading to cost savings by having to survey almost a fifth fewer farms. This is estimated to represent about 18% savings in agricultural census years (or 56 million of 320 million Euro total costs, if applied to the year 2010), and comparative proportions for sample survey years. Short-term adaptation costs are estimated at</p> |

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| | around 8% of total costs. |
|--|---------------------------|

Priority 6: A Reasonable and Balanced Free Trade Agreement with the U.S.

Overview

Overview of REFIT Initiatives in the area of Trade

| | Evaluation | Commission Proposal | Legal Act | Implementation |
|---|--|---|---------------------------------|----------------|
| Trade diversion into the EU of certain key medicines | Evaluation (published 7 April 2016) | | | |
| Reform of Trade Defence Instruments | | Commission Proposal (adopted on 10 April 2013) | Legal Act (pending) | |
| Common rules for imports of textile products | | Commission proposal 12 June 2014 | Legal Act 25 June 2015 | Implementation |
| Export control for dual-use items | Evaluation (adopted 24 April 2014) | Commission Proposal (adopted on 28 September 2016) | <i>In legislative procedure</i> | |

Initiatives in the area of Trade Policy

Trade diversion into the EU of certain key medicines

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Overall state of play</p> <p><i>Evaluation published 7 April 2016</i></p> <p><i>No legislative follow-up foreseen</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p>Summary:</p> | <p>The Commission has carried-out an evaluation of legislation on trade diversion into the EU of certain key medicines. The evaluation concludes that tiered pricing is still important and that Regulation (EC) No 953/2003 represents an important sign of EU support for it. Legislative follow-up to the evaluation of Regulation 953/2003 is therefore not foreseen.</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>Indicative cost measurement by pharmaceutical companies delivered data on registration costs of €200 000, registration costs of €100 000 and overall costs associated with the logo for the whole application period of the Regulation.</p> <p>The benefits of the Regulation include an offsetting of costs, as it reduces the need to use other, more costly anti-diversion processes for some products in some areas. It is thus concluded that the benefits can be assumed to have offset the administrative costs.</p> <p>Given data limitations, further quantification of regulatory benefits has not been possible.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p>Finalised -7 April 2016.</p> <p>SWD (2016) 124 final</p> | <p>Evaluation</p> |
| <p><i>Scope:</i></p> | <p>Evaluation of Council Regulation (EC) No 953/2003 to avoid trade diversion into the European Union of certain key medicines.</p> |
| <p><i>Evaluation findings:</i></p> | <p>The evaluation considers that the objective of improving access to medicines in the poorest developing countries remains relevant, that tiered pricing still has value and that the Regulation is a signal of EU support for it.</p> <p>The objective of the Regulation is to ensure that customs authorities prevent the re-importation into the EU of HIV/AIDS, TB and malaria medicines sold to the poorest developing countries at discounted prices. The Regulation empowers the customs authorities to detain, or suspend the release of, products registered under the Regulation.</p> <p>The Regulation also adds value to the EU commitment in the context of the WHO global strategy and plan of action; one aspect of encouraging differential pricing is to take action against product diversion. The Regulation is seen as a signal of support for tiered pricing which private initiatives cannot send.</p> <p>The evaluation concludes that the benefits of the Regulation outweigh the costs and that the Regulation plays a relevant role in the context of the <i>Trade for all</i> Communication to promote an ambitious global health agenda and better access to medicines in poor countries.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The following regulatory costs were measured by pharmaceutical companies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One company incurred costs in registering products with the Commission and adding a logo on its packs. These costs were estimated at around €200 000 for the whole period. There were also one-off costs of getting regulatory authorities to amend/extend marketing authorisations for the medicines due to a change of packaging. As the fee for such amendments in several countries is estimated at more than €100 000, the overall costs associated with the logo were estimated at several hundred thousand euros. • Other companies choosing to use the Regulation would face similar administrative and authorisation costs. <p>The benefits of the Regulation include an offsetting of costs, as it</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>reduced the company's need to use other, more costly anti-diversion processes for some products in some areas. It is thus concluded that the benefits can be assumed to have offset the administrative costs. Also, the Regulation improved transparency on the prices at which HIV, TB and malaria medicines were sold to developing countries.</p> <p>Companies that do not use the optional scheme are under no legal obligation to take measures and so face no additional administrative burden.</p> <p>Given data limitations, further quantification of regulatory benefits has not been possible.</p> |
|--|--|

Reform of the Trade Defence Instruments – Anti-dumping regulation and Anti-subsidy regulation

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>Overall state of play</i></p> <p><i>Pending</i></p> <p><i>COM proposal in 2013 pending in legislative procedure</i></p> <p><i>Benefits likely to be improved in legislative procedure</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The Commission proposed a reform of trade defence instruments in 2013 to increase its efficiency and effectiveness and improve transparency and predictability. SMEs are likely to benefit in dealing with Trade Defence cases, both in their capacity as European producers as well as importers liable to payment of duties imposed.</p> <p>The proposal is pending in legislative procedure, amendments may further reduce the burden for SMEs when initiating and cooperating in trade defence investigations.</p> <p>The proposal focuses on different challenges to the EU trade defence policy, which has not undergone any major reform since 1994. The principal goal of the Commission is to find solutions to streamline the system, to ensure utmost efficiency and effectiveness of the instruments without altering the existing balance among the different interests of stakeholders.</p> <p>In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a trading environment in which EU industries (and by implication their workers) are able to compete on the basis of their genuine competitive advantages and make sure that they can make full use of the instruments legally at their disposal to restore a level playing field • Allow users and consumers to benefit from imports based on the genuine competitive advantages of foreign suppliers • Increase confidence and awareness in the EU's TDI system among all stakeholders, including among small and medium enterprises • Improve the level of cooperation of all stakeholders concerned in TDI proceedings • Preserve the existing balance of interests between producing and importing interests |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and</i></p> | <p>Due to the limited availability of data, the savings could not be</p> |

| | |
|-----------------|-------------|
| <i>benefits</i> | quantified. |
|-----------------|-------------|

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Adopted 10 April 2013</i></p> <p><i>COM(2013)192</i></p> | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p><i>Which REFIT objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>Assist SMEs in dealing with Trade Defence cases, both in their capacity as European producers as well as importers liable to payment of duties imposed.</p> <p>Improve transparency and predictability of the two instruments by adopting and publishing guidelines in due course.</p> |
| <p><i>Which other objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>Improvement and update of the two key trade defence instruments with a view of notably:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing transparency and predictability. Interested parties will be informed 2 weeks in advance of decision to impose (or not) provisional or definitive measures and will be allowed to comment; • Preventing retaliation. Special circumstances to initiate ex officio investigation will include threat of retaliation; • Ensuring effectiveness and enforcement by removing the lesser duty rule in case of raw material distortions or subsidisation; • Facilitating cooperation; • Optimising review practice by reimbursing duties collected during the investigation to importers where measures are not extended after a review; • Increasing legal certainty through the codification of practices stemming from ECJ and WTO rulings. |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Due to the limited availability of data, the savings could not be quantified.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Pending</i></p> | <p>Legal Act</p> |
| <p><i>Debate in Legislative Procedure</i></p> | <p>Several amendments aim at further reducing the burden for SMEs when initiating and cooperating in trade defence investigations, these include standard forms or questionnaires in all EU languages. Suggested web-access to information aims at simplifying procedures for all interested parties.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The EP voted a legislative resolution in April 2014 and closed its first reading. It has thus been ready to start trilogues ever since. • So far, the Council has not reached a compromise. The main stumbling block is the proposal regarding the partial non-application of the lesser duty rule ('LDR') in cases of structural raw material distortions. In the steel communication of March 2016, the Commission asked the Council to move the file forward. To help the Council reach a common position, the Commission has proposed to focus the non-application of the LDR on situations of massive overcapacities. It also presented a paper on the ways to shorten investigations to be able to impose provisional measures faster. |
| <i>Outcome of Legislative Procedure</i> | Information not yet available. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

Common rules for imports of textile products

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>Overall state of play</i></p> <p><i>Adopted</i></p> <p><i>Commission proposal on 12 June 2014</i></p> <p><i>Legal Act 25 June 2015</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p>Summary:</p> | <p>The Commission proposed a recast of the common rules for imports of textile products in 2014, the proposal was adopted by the legislator and entered into force in 2015.</p> <p>Following to 29 amendments to Council Regulation (EC) No 517/94 on common rules for imports of textile products, the recast version provides a clearer and updated Regulation for all users. In particular, the possibility to extend the validity of wholly or partly unused import authorisations has simplified procedures for importers.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Due to the limited availability of data, savings could not be quantified.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Adopted 12/06/2014</i> • <i>COM(2014)345</i> | Commission Proposal |
| <i>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i> | This recast clarified the legal text and facilitated procedures for importers who may now benefit from extensions of wholly or partly unused import authorisations if enough quantities are available. |
| <i>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</i> | <p>Council Regulation (EC) No 517/94 on common rules for imports of textile products from certain third countries not covered by bilateral agreements, protocols or other arrangements, or by other specific Community import rules was submitted to a recast to take into account slight substantive amendments in Articles 4(2), 6(4) and 23, align it with the TFEU and to enhance clarity for Member States, companies and European citizens.</p> <p>The following substantive amendments were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In order to facilitate procedures for importers, wholly or partly unused import authorisations may be extended, if enough quantities are available, in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 25(3) (Article 23). |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Due to the limited availability of data, savings could not be quantified |

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Adopted on 25 June 2015</i> • <i>Regulation (EU)2015/936</i> | Legal Act |
| <i>Outcome of Legislative Procedure</i> | The European Parliament adopted its position at first reading in accordance with Article 294, paragraph 3 of the Treaty. The Council approved the Parliament's position in line with Article 294 paragraph 4 of the Treaty. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Due to the limited availability of data of data, the savings could not be quantified |

| | |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Date of effect:</i> <i>15/07/2015;</i> <i>Entry into force</i> <i>Date pub. +20</i> <i>See Art 37</i> | <p>Implementation</p> |
| <p><i>Implementation reported by MemberStates</i></p> | <p>Information not yet available.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Information not yet available.</p> |

Recast of Export control for dual-use items

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>Overall state of play:</i></p> <p><i>Pending</i></p> <p><i>EU legislation on export control for dual-use items evaluated in several steps</i></p> <p><i>Proposal adopted Sept 2016</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary</i></p> | <p>The Commission evaluated the rules for Export control for dual-use items in 2014 and proposed to recast rules in 2016.</p> <p>The objectives of the evaluation of Regulation (EC) N° 428/2009 establishing the EU regime for the control of exports, transfer, brokering and transit of dual-use items include ensuring that EU export control system is fully capable of responding to today's evolving and new security risks, rapid technological and scientific developments as well as transformations in trade and economic processes.</p> <p>The Commission assigned a clear goal to the legislative review of export control policy, to "ensure security and competitiveness in a changing world", in an effort to strike the right balance between security and trade.</p> <p>Among the main benefits, the Commission expectations were that the EU dual-use export control policy review contributes to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) improving of the human rights situation in third countries; 2) strengthening international and EU security and, consequently, the security of EU citizens; and 3) improving the export environment for EU exporters by enhancing the legal clarity of the current Dual-Use Regulation (Regulation (EC) No 428/2009). |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The review of the EU export control system is likely to reduce administrative burdens for economic operators and competent authorities, allowing for cost savings as well as focusing controls on high risk transactions.</p> <p>Due to the limited availability of data, these estimated savings could not be quantified and are mainly qualitative.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Communication on the review of export control policy – 24 April 2014</i> • <i>COM(2014)244</i> | <p>Evaluation</p> |
| <p><i>Scope:</i></p> | <p>Evaluation of Regulation (EC) No 428/2009 setting up a Community regime for the control of exports, transfer, brokering and transit of dual-use items.</p> <p>The process was conducted as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Paper – "the dual-use export control system of the European Union: ensuring security and competitiveness in a changing world" (COM(2011) 393 final, 30 June 2011); • Staff Working Document - reporting on the conclusions of a public consultation launched under the Green Paper COM(2011) 393 (SWD (2013)7, 17 January 2013); • Report to the Council and the European Parliament on the implementation of Regulation (EC) N° 428/2009 (COM (2013)710, 16 October 2013); • Communication on the review of export control policy (COM/2014/244, 24 April 2014). |
| <p><i>Evaluation findings:</i></p> | <p>The Staff Working Document SWD (2013)7 and the report to the Council and Parliament (COM (2013)710) conclude that the EU export control regime is generally considered robust and provides solid legal and institutional foundations, but cannot remain static and must be re-evaluated and upgraded in order to face new challenges and generate the modern control capabilities the EU needs for the coming period.</p> <p>The findings have fed into a Communication outlining a long-term vision for EU strategic export controls and to update the EU's export control regime to rapidly changing technological, economic and political circumstances (COM(2014)244).</p> <p>The Communication maps the direction for EU export controls, and identifies concrete policy options for their modernisation and their adaptation to rapidly changing technological, economic and political circumstances, including a number of options with potential impact on regulatory burden and simplification of procedures.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Due to the limited availability of data, potential savings could not be quantified and are essentially qualitative. |
|--|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Adopted 28 September 2016</i> • <i>COM(2016)616</i> | Commission Proposal |
| <i>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i> | The initiative aimed to clarify the implications of any change to the control parameters in terms of, on the one hand, ensuring an appropriate level of security and, on the other hand, maintaining EU competitiveness, including any regulatory simplification and reduction of the administrative burden, e.g. in relation to the simplification of licensing procedures for certain exports. |
| <i>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjusting the EU dual-use export control system to evolving security risks and threats and adapting it to rapid technological and scientific developments; • Preventing the export of cyber-surveillance technology in violation of human rights; • Reducing competitive distortions and administrative costs within the Single Market; • Levelling the global playing field; • Ensuring the effective and consistent application of controls in the EU. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>Due to the availability of data, potential savings could not be quantified and are essentially qualitative.</p> <p>Thanks to the introduction of new EU General Export Authorisations (EUGEAs), controls would become four times less costly for companies, and up to 11 times less costly for licensing authorities. The proposal is also expected to enable a reduction of administrative burden within the Single Market, in particular as the number of products subject to control on transfers within the EU would be reduced by approximately 40%.</p> <p>Other expected benefits are mainly in terms of improving human rights in third countries, improved international and EU security (and subsequently security for EU citizens) and improved legal clarity of the Regulation. These benefits by their very nature cannot be quantified.</p> |

Priority 7: Upholding the rule of law and linking up Europe's justice systems

Overview

Overview of REFIT initiatives in the area of Justice, Consumers and Gender Equality

Evaluation

Commission Proposal

Legal Act

Implementation

| | | | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--|
| Brussels IIA Regulation | Evaluation May 2015 | Commission proposal 14 June 2016 | Pending in legislative procedure | |
| Personal data protection | | Commission proposal 25 January 2012 | Legal act 27 April 2016 | Implementation Date of effect: 24 May 2016; Entry into force Date of publication +20 days (See Art 99) |
| Package travel | | Commission proposal | Legal act | Implementation |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| | | 09 July 2013 | 11 December 2015 | Date of effect: 01 July 2018; Application See Art 28.2 |
| Small claims | | Commission proposal 19 November 2013 | Legal act 06 December 2015 | Implementation Date of effect: 13 January 2016 |
| Consumer Law | Fitness Check results expected end 2016 | Commission proposal planned for 2017 | | |
| Consumer Protection Cooperation | Evaluation 25 May 2016 | Commission Proposal 25 May 2016 | | |
| Consumer product safety | | Commission proposal 13 February 2013 | Legal act Pending in legislative procedure | |
| Company Law | | Commission proposal 03 December 2015 | Legal act Pending in legislative procedure | |
| Identity and Residence Documents | | Commission proposal Planned for 2017 | | |
| Emergency Travel | Evaluation | Commission proposal | | |

| | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Documents | Planned to be finalised in 2017 | Planned for 2018 | | |
| Equal Treatment in Social Security | Evaluation Planned Q4 2016 | | | |
| Timeshare, long-term holiday products, resale and exchange contracts | Evaluation finalised December 2015 | | | |
| Women on company boards | | Commission proposal 14 January 2012 | Legal Act Pending in legislative procedure | |
| Counter Terrorism Instruments | Fitness Check | | | |

1. Overview of REFIT Initiatives in the area of Communications Networks, Content and Technology



| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| Directive on ePrivacy and Electronic Communications | Evaluation Ongoing planned to be finalised Q4 2016 | Commission Proposal Adoption foreseen January 2017 | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|

Initiatives in the area of Justice, Consumers and Gender Equality

Jurisdiction and recognition and enforcement of judgements in matrimonial matters and the matters of parental responsibility (Brussels IIa Regulation)

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Overall state of play:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Evaluation published 2014</i> • <i>Proposal made in 2016 - pending in legislative procedure</i> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p>Summary</p> | <p>The Commission has evaluated Regulation (EC) No 2201/2003 in 2014 and presented a proposal for modification in 2016 which is pending in legislative procedure.</p> <p>Building on the results of the evaluation, the proposal foresees that procedures for the return of abducted children, on custody and access, on the cross-border placement of children and on child protection measures in cross-border cases will be shorter and more efficient.</p> <p>It will be ensured that children are given the opportunity to be heard in these proceedings.</p> <p>The free circulation of judgments in these areas will be enhanced by abolishing the requirement of exequatur (specific authorisation of enforcement of a judgement).</p> <p>The rules on cross-border cooperation of competent authorities in this area are rendered more explicit and clearer, thereby enabling these authorities to fulfil incoming requests more quickly and easily.</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>It is expected that the new rules will reduce the amount of working time that Central Authorities and child protection authorities need to fulfil a request under the Regulation in cases such as e.g. obtaining consent in the placement procedures reduced to 8 weeks instead of the current 6 months or more.</p> <p>Similarly, clarifying rules on cross-border cooperation for obtaining social reports and introducing a time limit of max. eight weeks to provide the report will shorten the procedures in the same way.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>Moreover, it is expected that citizens will need fewer billable hours of specialised legal advice in those proceedings. E.g. with the proposed abolition of <i>exequatur</i>, delays (taking up to several months) and costs (up to € 4,000) relating to obtaining it would be eliminated.</p> <p>The proposed amended procedure for the return of the child in case of abduction would reduce the costs of specialised legal advice for parents (between € 1,000 and 4,000).</p> <p>In international child abduction cases, the proposed concentration of jurisdiction on a limited number of specialised courts and the limitation of the number of ordinary appeals to one will reduce the length of the proceedings in those Member States which have not yet taken those measures under national law from several months, sometimes more than a year to less than 20 weeks max.</p> |
|--|---|

| | |
|---|---|
| State of Play: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>COM(2014) 225 of 15 April 2014</i> | Evaluation |
| Scope: | Evaluation of Regulation (EC) No 2201/2003 |
| Evaluation findings: | <p>While the Regulation is considered to be functioning well overall and to be delivering value to EU citizens, the operational functioning of the instrument is at times hampered by a series of legal issues. The current legal text is insufficiently clear or is incomplete on some points (e.g. child return procedure; cooperation between the Central Authorities on parental responsibility matters). The evaluation showed that between the two major areas covered by the Regulation, the matrimonial and parental responsibility matters, the latter were identified to have caused acute problems.</p> |
| Estimated savings and benefits | <p>The overall efficiency of certain aspects of the child-related proceedings has been called into question. In matters concerning parental child abduction, cross-border placement of children, recognition and enforcement of decisions and cooperation between (central and other) national authorities there are excessive and undue delays arising from the way the existing procedures are formulated or applied. This has had a negative impact on parent-child relationships and the best interests of children. In addition, the requirement of <i>exequatur</i> generated average delays per case of several months and costs reaching up to 4,000 Euro for citizens, including between € 1,000 and 4,000 per case for the work of specialised lawyers. Decisions given in another Member State are often not enforced or only with significant delays. The vague description of the cooperation between Central Authorities has often led to delays of several months or even to the non-fulfilment of requests – which is detrimental to children's welfare. For the Member States, on the other hand, the Regulation itself has generated very limited costs; these mainly relate to the operation of the Central Authorities.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| State of Play: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Date of adoption: 14 June 2016</i> • <i>COM(2016)411</i> | Commission Proposal |
| Which REFIT objective(s) does the | The proposal includes a number of measures aimed at clarifying the current system, simplifying and making more efficient the |

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>Commission pursue?</i> | procedures for the return of abducted children, on custody and access, on the cross-border placement of children and on child protection measures in cross-border cases. It provides legal certainty, clarity and consistency for children affected by cross-border proceedings concerning them and for their parents. |
| <i>Which other objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To enhance the operation of the 1980 Hague Child Abduction Convention among Member States by implementation measures at supranational level. • To strengthen children's rights in procedures concerning them by approximating the Regulation to the rules of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child and the European Charter of Fundamental Rights, which provide for binding guidelines for the implementation and application of the Regulation. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>The proposal would lead to cost savings for European citizens engaged in cross-border litigation.</p> <p>The abolition of <i>exequatur</i> would allow them to save the major part of the current average costs of € 2,200 for the procedure. In addition, it would contribute to saving costs by parents seeking enforcement as they would not necessarily need to look for highly specialised lawyers with knowledge of the foreign enforcement system.</p> <p>Even though it is not possible to estimate in how many cases such savings could be achieved, every 10 hours of work of a specialised lawyer generate costs between € 1,000 and 4,000.</p> <p>There could be a small reduction of costs for Central Authorities; if procedures contain unified rules or are shorter at the enforcement stage, there should be fewer requests for assistance, and/or assistance would be required for a shorter period. However, given the different organisation of work and remuneration of the Central Authorities' staff it is not possible to quantify such savings.</p> <p>Similarly, the reformulation of the cooperation rule is likely to save costs. Detailed description of the cooperation of the Central Authorities allows for a one-stop-shop and contains a time limit for responding to requests for assistance, in particular for social reports. The obligations can thus be fulfilled more quickly in a single, streamlined procedure under this Regulation, thereby shortening the proceedings for which the assistance is needed and reducing the amount of human resources necessary to process a request.</p> |

| | |
|--|------------------|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Pending in legislative procedure</i> | Legal Act |
|--|------------------|

| | |
|--|--------------------------------|
| <i>Outcome of Legislative Procedure</i> | ongoing |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

Personal data protection

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Overall state of play:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Commission Proposal 2012</i> • <i>Legal Act 2018</i> • <i>Application 2018</i> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p>Summary:</p> | <p>The data protection reform package includes the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the Data Protection Directive for the police and criminal justice sector (Police Directive).</p> <p>The GDPR updates and modernises the principles enshrined in the 1995 Data Protection Directive to guarantee privacy rights. It focuses on: reinforcing individuals' rights, strengthening the EU internal market, ensuring stronger enforcement of the rules, streamlining international transfers of personal data and setting global data protection standards.</p> <p>The GDPR will help the Digital Single Market realise its full potential through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One continent, one law: a single, pan-European law for data protection, replacing the current inconsistent patchwork of national laws. Companies will deal with one law, not 28. The benefits are estimated at €2.3 billion per year; • One-stop-shop: with a 'one-stop-shop' for businesses companies will only have to deal with one single supervisory authority, not 28, making it simpler and cheaper for companies to do business in the EU; • The same rules for all companies – regardless of where they are established: today European companies have to adhere to stricter standards than companies established outside the EU but also doing business in our Single Market. With the reform, companies based outside of Europe will have to apply the same rules when they offer goods or services on the EU market. This creates a level playing field; |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technological neutrality: the GDPR enables innovation to continue to thrive under the new rules. <p>The Police Directive ensures the protection of personal data of individuals involved in criminal proceedings, be it as witnesses, victims, or suspects. It will also facilitate a smoother exchange of information between Member States' police and judicial authorities, improving cooperation in the fight against terrorism and other serious crime in Europe. It establishes a comprehensive framework to ensure a high level of data protection whilst taking into account the specific nature of the police and criminal justice field.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>The GDPR will establish a single, pan-European law for data protection meaning that companies can simply deal with one law, not 28. The new rules are expected to bring benefits of an estimated €2.3 billion per year. This is due not only to the removal of prior authorisations and notifications to data protection authorities but also to the reduction of costs linked to activities of companies across different Member States.</p> <p>The Police Directive cuts the red tape for authorities. It means that police and criminal justice authorities will no longer have to apply different sets of data protection rules according to the origin of the personal data, saving time and money. The new rules will apply to both domestic processing and cross-border transfers of personal data. Having more harmonised laws in all EU Member States will make it easier for our police forces to work together.</p> <p>Given data limitations, further quantification has not been possible.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25 January 2012 – COM(2012)11 | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p>Which REFIT objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</p> | <p>The proposal provides legal certainty, clarity and consistency, both for individuals and business, and strengthens the internal market dimension of the data protection rules through the adoption of a single law for Europe to replace the current patchwork of 28 different national laws. The proposal also created a regulatory one-stop-shop for business allowing companies to deal with a single supervisory authority. It removed a number of existing requirements in terms of notifications and prior authorisation.</p> <p>To ensure minimal regulatory burden for SMEs, the proposal included the following specific provisions and exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An exemption for SMEs from the obligation to appoint a Data Protection Officer; • A risk-based approach within the obligation to conduct a Data Protection Impact Assessment; • Provisions included for Subject Access Request Fees that businesses can request in case of abuse. |
| <p>Which other objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</p> | <p>The proposed legal instruments strengthened personal data protection rights and boost Europe's digital economy. This involves promoting growth and innovation and strengthening the free flow of personal data within the digital market while at the same time ensuring the protection of data.</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>The proposal was estimated to reduce overall administrative burden by about 2.3 billion euro per year, coming from the important reduction of fragmentation in national data protection rules and from the removal of prior authorisations and notifications that were imposing significant compliance costs on economic operators and affecting the free flow of personal data in the EU.</p> <p>For example, the provision on the information of individuals was expected to save approx. 180 million euros per year to data controllers. The provision on notification is expected to save approx. 80 million euro per year to data controllers.</p> |

| | |
|--|-------------------------|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopted 27/04/2016: | <p>Legal Act</p> |
|--|-------------------------|

| | |
|--|---|
| Regulation (EU) 2016/679 | |
| <i>Outcome of Legislative Procedure</i> | <p>Some exemptions and specific provisions for SMEs proposed by the Commission were changed in first reading by the co-legislators to a general risk-based approach, differentiating not between the size of companies but connected to the risks the processing in question has for the rights and freedoms of individuals. This was explained by the argument that a small organization with just a few employees can control a huge amount of sensitive personal data and vice versa.</p> <p>However, the fundamentals of the proposal have not been changed in the legislative proposal: the key benefits of the GDPR remain unchanged compared with the initial commission proposal.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Estimations on savings were not updated following amendments in legislative procedure. |

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>Overall state of play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Date of effect:</i> 24/05/2016; <i>Entry into force</i> <i>Date pub. +20</i> <i>days See Art 99</i> • <i>Date of effect:</i> 25/05/2018; <i>Application See</i> <i>Art 99</i> • <i>Deadline:</i> 25/05/2020; <i>At</i> <i>the latest See Art</i> <i>97</i> • <i>First evaluation</i> <i>Planned for May</i> <i>2020</i> | Implementation |
| <i>Implementation reported by Member States</i> | The GDPR provides for a two-year transition period and will enter into application on 25 May 2018. |
| <i>Estimated savings and</i> | Not yet available. |

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| <i>benefits</i> | |
|-----------------|--|

Package travel

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Overall state of play:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Proposal 2013</i> • <i>Legal Act 2015</i> • <i>Application 2018</i> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p>Summary</p> | <p>The Commission proposed a revision of the Package Travel Directive in 2013 which was adopted by the legislator in 2015 without effects to savings estimated.</p> <p>The new Directive is expected to reduce compliance costs for businesses and detriment to consumers.</p> <p>It includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New information requirements for travellers: they must include understandable information on the package and the protection they benefit from under package holiday rules; • More predictable prices: establishment of a 8% cap for possible price increases by the trader, beyond which the traveller has the right to cancel their holiday free of charge; • Stronger cancellation rights: free cancellation before departure in case of natural disasters, war, or other serious situations at the destination. Package travellers will also be able to cancel their holiday for any reason by paying a reasonable cancellation fee (in addition to the right to transfer the package to another traveller); • Clear identification of the liable party: the organiser of the package in all EU Member States has to deal with the problem if something goes wrong. In addition Member States may decide that also the retailer (travel agent) is fully liable. • Clear liability for booking errors: traders will be made explicitly liable for booking errors in relation to packages and linked travel arrangements; • Clarification on essential consumer rights: the organiser is required to assist travellers in difficulty, for example where |

| | |
|--|--|
| | health assistance is needed. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>The new Directive is expected to reduce detriment to consumers by about €430 million a year.</p> <p>While increasing business costs for some companies the new Directive is expected to reduce overall costs for businesses by €475 million per year through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abolishing outdated requirements to reprint brochures, thereby saving tour operators and travel agents an estimated €390 million per year; • Excluding managed business travel from the Directive, which is expected to lead to savings of up to € 76 million per year; • Furthermore, harmonised information requirements are expected to lead to one-off cost savings of € 21 millions and to annual cost-savings of € 5.1 million. |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>State of Play:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 09/07/2013 • COM(2013)0512 | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</p> | <p>Reduction of compliance costs for businesses by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creating a level playing field between different operators; • Abolishing outdated requirements to reprint brochures, excluding managed business travel from the Directive and providing EU-wide rules on information, liability and mutual recognition of national insolvency protection schemes, thus facilitating cross-border trade. |
| <p>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</p> | <p>The proposal sought to establish a level playing field between operators, remove legal obstacles to cross-border trade and reduce compliance costs for businesses as well as to reduce consumer detriment through unclear rules on the kind of combined travel arrangements included in the scope of the Directive.</p> <p>The proposal is complementary to existing EU law, in particular the Unfair Contract Terms Directive, the Unfair Commercial Practices Directive, the Consumer Rights Directive, the Regulations in the area of passenger rights as well as Directives on electronic commerce and on services in the internal market.</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>Reduction of compliance costs for businesses by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creating a level playing field between different operators; • Abolishing outdated requirements to reprint brochures, thereby saving tour operators and travel agents an estimated €390 million per year; • Excluding managed business travel from the Directive, which is expected to lead to savings of up to € 76 million per year; • Providing EU-wide rules on information, liability and mutual recognition of national insolvency protection schemes, thus facilitating cross-border trade. <p>Overall cost savings for businesses can be estimated at € 475 mio annually, not including one-off costs.</p> |

| | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------|
| <p>State of Play:</p> | <p>Legal Act</p> |
|------------------------------|-------------------------|

| | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Adopted</i> <i>11/12/2015,</i> • <i>Directive (EU)</i> <i>2015/2302</i> | |
| <i>Outcome of Legislative Procedure</i> | Despite certain changes in the legislative text (including increased transparency and further details in some respects), the adopted text maintains the key features of the initial proposal, including the extended scope, the distinction between packages and linked travel arrangements, full harmonisation, including in relation to information requirements, and mutual recognition of insolvency protection requirements |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | The changes brought about by the co-legislator are not expected to cause any significant changes in the estimated costs and savings compared to the initial Commission proposal. |

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Application on</i> <i>Date of effect:</i> <i>01/07/2018;</i> <i>Application See</i> <i>Art 28.2</i> • <i>Transposition</i> <i>Deadline :</i> <i>01/01/2018;</i> <i>Review See Art</i> <i>26</i> • <i>Deadline:</i> <i>01/01/2021;</i> <i>Review See Art</i> <i>26</i> • <i>Evaluation</i> <i>Planned for</i> <i>January 2021</i> | Implementation |
| <i>Implementation reported by Member States</i> | <p>Transposition work ongoing, no measures notified so far.</p> <p>January 2019, report on the provisions of this Directive applying to</p> |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| | online bookings made at different points of sale and the qualification of such bookings as packages, linked travel arrangements or stand-alone travel services, and in particular on the definition of package set out in point (b)(v) of point 2 of Article 3 and whether an adjustment or broadening of that definition is appropriate. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Not yet available. |

Small claims

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>Overall state of play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Proposal in 2013</i> • <i>Legal in 2015</i> • <i>Application in 2017</i> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The European Small Claims Procedure is a simplified and accelerated civil procedure applicable to cross-border claims of a value of up to EUR 2,000. It is mainly a written procedure, though in some circumstances hearings can be organised. Representation by a lawyer is not required. Judgments given are enforceable in all MS without the need to obtain a declaration of enforceability. These features make the procedure less expensive than ordinary civil proceedings.</p> <p>The revision extends the scope of application of the European Small Claims Procedure by increasing the maximum value of claims that can be pursued through the procedure and by extending the definition of a cross-border case. The revision should result in a reduction of litigation costs in which cases which before could not be pursued through the European Small Claims Procedure.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The initiative could result in a reduction of court proceeding costs by €1,250 per case in cases which would otherwise have to be dealt with under national ordinary civil proceedings.</p> <p>The initiative provides for further simplifications of the procedure, making it lighter and cheaper for the parties. It enhances the use of modern communication technologies, in particular for the service of documents and oral hearings, thereby reducing the costs of proceedings by between €300 and €700 per case.</p> <p>The use of electronic service of documents will shorten court proceedings for at least 9 days.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 19/11/2013 • COM(2013)0794 | Commission Proposal |
| <i>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i> | <p>The proposal aims at a reduction of costs of cross-border litigation and at cutting red tape, in particular for SMEs. The proposal increases the existing threshold of €2,000 to €10,000, which should allow a considerable increase of its use by SMEs.</p> <p>Moving the number of court cases from ordinary civil proceedings to simplified proceedings will reduce also the workload of courts.</p> |
| <i>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</i> | <p>The proposal aims to correct shortcomings in the original Regulations regarding legal certainty, language barriers and transparency of proceedings and increase the utilisation of the European Small Claims Procedure.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>The proposal could result in a reduction of court proceeding costs by €1,250 per case in cases which would otherwise have to be dealt with under national ordinary civil proceedings.</p> <p>The proposal provides for further simplifications of the procedure, making it lighter and cheaper for the parties. It enhances the use of modern communication technologies, in particular for the service of documents and oral hearings, thereby reducing the costs of proceedings by between €300 and €700 per case.</p> <p>The use of electronic service of documents will shorten court proceedings for at least 9 days.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopted 24/12/2015, • Regulation (EU) 2015/2421 | Legal Act |
| <i>Outcome of Legislative Procedure</i> | <p>The Regulation was adopted on 16 December 2015. While still representing an improvement as compared to the current situation, the scope of the REFIT objectives has been reduced due to the</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | amendments introduced by Council. The threshold was increased to EUR 5,000, the cross-border case definition remained unchanged, court fees should not be disproportionate and the use of electronic means of communication is made subject to the availability of technical means. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>Due to the increase of the threshold of the claim amount, a category of cross-border cases where the value of the claim is between EUR 2,000 and EUR 5,000 will be dealt with under this simplified and accelerated procedure, which is in principle cheaper than ordinary civil proceedings. Further savings and benefits lie mainly in the extended use of electronic means of communication, both for service of documents and taking of evidence. These savings will depend on the availability of technical means in each Member State.</p> <p>No specific update of the initial estimated savings has been performed.</p> |

| | |
|--|--------------------------------|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Date of effect:</i> 13/01/2016; <i>Entry into force</i> <i>Date pub. +20</i> <i>See Art 3</i> • <i>Date of effect:</i> 14/01/2017; <i>Application</i> <i>Partial</i> <i>application See</i> <i>Art 3</i> • <i>Date of effect:</i> 14/07/2017; <i>Application See</i> <i>Art 3</i> • <i>Evaluation</i> <i>Planned for July</i> <i>2022</i> | Implementation |
| <i>Implementation reported by Member States</i> | Information not yet available. |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|

Consumer Law

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Overall state of play:</p> <p><i>Evaluation / Fitness Check expected in 2016</i></p> <p><i>Proposal planned for 2017</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p>Summary:</p> | <p>The Commission carries out a Fitness Check and an evaluation on legal acts related to consumer rights and advertising which is due for completion end 2016.</p> <p>A legislative proposal is planned for 2017.</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>According to earlier estimations, action in this area could eliminate to a great extent the problem of cross-border misleading marketing practices and reduce by more than €500 million damages incurred by companies.</p> <p>A strengthened protection would also significantly reduce the number of fraudulent domestic practices.</p> <p>These estimations will have to be reviewed in the light of the results of the ongoing Fitness Check and preparations for a proposal in 2017.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <i>Ongoing and planned to be finalised in Q4 2016</i> | Fitness Check and Evaluation |
| <i>Scope:</i> | <p>Fitness Check on legal acts related to consumer rights and advertising:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directive 2005/29/EC on unfair business to consumer commercial practices; • Directive 1999/44/EC on certain aspects of the sale of consumer goods and associated guarantees; • Directive 93/13/EEC on unfair terms in consumer contracts; • Directive 2006/114/EC concerning misleading and comparative advertising. • Directive 98/6/EC Price Indication Directive; • Directive 2009/22/EC Injunctions Directive. <p>Evaluation of the Consumer Rights Directive 2011/83/EU.</p> |
| <i>Evaluation findings:</i> | Information not yet available. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>State of play:</i> <i>Proposal Planned for 2017</i> | Commission Proposal |
| <i>Which REFIT objective(s) will the Commission pursue?</i> | <p>Follow up to the Fitness Check on Consumer law (covering six horizontal Directives) and to the evaluation of the Consumer Rights Directive 2011/83/EU.</p> <p>Pending the results of the Fitness Check, and building on the results of a dedicated study, and depending upon policy decisions, the proposal could have the following benefits: making possible EU wide cooperation between Member States when enforcing against misleading advertising and widening the scope of applicability to all entities which are not consumers (such as NGOs, schools etc).</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | Modernisation of the rules in force is necessary also to make clear that certain new and emerging misleading practices are banned upfront (e.g. misleading directory scams). |
| <i>Which other objectives will the Commission pursue?</i> | Information not yet available. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

Consumer Protection Cooperation

| Overall state of play: Pending | Summary |
|---|---|
| Summary: | <p>The Commission evaluated Regulation (EC) N° 2006/2004 on the cooperation between national authorities responsible for the enforcement of consumer protection laws, the results of the evaluation were published in May 2016.</p> <p>The evaluation showed that the CPC Regulation had been beneficial for the competent authorities, consumers and traders and confirmed the appropriateness and relevance of its objectives. It also pointed out that these objectives had not been fully achieved and that the Regulation had not been exploited to its full potential.</p> <p>In follow-up to the findings of the evaluation, the Commission adopted a proposal for a review of Regulation 2006/2004.</p> <p>The proposal aims to improve the effectiveness of public action and the governance of EU retail cross-border markets. Costs for public action and transaction costs for economic actors are expected to decrease.</p> |
| Estimated savings and benefits | <p>The following benefits and savings were calculated in respect of the Commission proposal to review the CPC Regulation:</p> <p>Consumers will benefit from better and safer market conditions when purchasing cross-border. It was estimated for the subset of five online markets that a decrease of 10 points in the non-compliance rate of 37% could reduce consumer detriment from an estimated EUR 770 million per year to about EUR 539 million, i.e. by 30%.</p> <p>Any new single CPC action against a widespread practice could also reduce consumer detriment across the EU (e.g. by an estimated EUR 68 million in the case of the coordinated action against the misleading marketing of in-app offers in online games).</p> <p>Savings for authorities will be achieved thanks to the possibility to reuse evidence, avoid duplication and ensure maximum consistency of enforcement actions. Pooling of resources to address widespread infringements would save resources as one coordinated action would replace 28 national actions, resulting in net savings varying from ca. EUR 180,000 (in case of successful coordinated action) to ca. EUR 815,000 (in case of failed action).</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| State of Play: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalised on 25 May 2016 • COM(2016) 284 final | Evaluation |
| Scope: | Evaluation of Regulation (EC) N° 2006/2004 on the cooperation between national authorities responsible for the enforcement of consumer protection laws |
| Evaluation findings: | <p>The evaluation concluded that the CPC Regulation has strengthened the enforcement of consumer laws across the EU. However, it also showed that the CPC regulation is not adapted to respond to the challenges of the digital economy and the development of cross-border retail trade in the EU.</p> <p>The main problems linked to the CPC cooperation as an enforcement instrument for the EU consumer acquis cross-border are: the insufficient mutual assistance mechanisms, no efficient response to widespread infringements across the EU, especially those occurring in the digital environment, as well as difficult detection of infringements and the lack of prioritisation of enforcement action.</p> <p>The current rate of business non-compliance with EU consumer acquis shows that enforcement is suboptimal: 37% of e-commerce would breach consumer law. This generates a detriment for consumers estimated to be about EUR 770 million per year for consumers shopping online cross-border in travel, entertainment, clothing, electronic goods and financial services alone.</p> |
| Estimated savings and benefits | Due to the limited availability of data, regulatory costs and benefits of Regulation (EC) N° 2006/2004 could not be further quantified. |

| | |
|---|--|
| State of Play: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • COM(2016)283 of 25 May 2016 | Commission Proposal |
| Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue? | <p>The Commission proposal is expected to generate efficiency gains, such as reduction of administrative burden and costs for national authorities in cross-border enforcement of Union consumer law.</p> <p>Businesses operating in all or a large majority of Member States will</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>benefit from a one-stop-shop approach. A possibility to negotiate commitments at EU-level will make it simpler, faster and cheaper for the businesses to resolve consumer issues. More consistent enforcement of consumer legislation across Europe will increase legal certainty and reduce legal expertise costs when doing marketing cross-border.</p> <p>The proposal does not impose any legal obligations on businesses. It streamlines administrative systems for the enforcement of existing consumer laws and simplifies the business environment, especially in the EU's Digital Single Market.</p> |
| <i>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</i> | <p>The general objectives are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure further a high level of consumer protection in the EU through reduction of financial consumer detriment caused by cross-border and widespread infringements; • Improve further the legal consistency of enforcement of EU consumer protection legislation across the EU and thus legal certainty for traders and consumers; • Increase further the deterrence effect of the CPC cooperation. <p>The specific objectives are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce the situations where important cross-border or widespread infringements are not addressed via the CPC framework; • Reduce duplication of enforcement efforts of national authorities; • Increase the detection rate of widespread infringements; • Reduce delays in the CPC cooperation. <p>The proposal also aims at ensuring a strengthened and more efficient enforcement cooperation framework by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring that authorities act faster and save costs especially to jointly stop widespread online infringements thanks to additional cooperation powers (e.g. interim measures to block infringing websites); • Providing for a single coordinated procedure where the Commission could play a strengthened assistance role; • Offering businesses a one stop shop approach for the enforcement of EU consumer law. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>Consumers will benefit from better and safer market conditions when purchasing cross-border. It was estimated for the subset of five online markets that a decrease of 10 points in the non-compliance rate of 37% could reduce consumer detriment from an estimated</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>EUR 770 million per year to about EUR 539 million, i.e. by 30%.</p> <p>Any new single CPC action against a widespread practice could also reduce consumer detriment across the EU (e.g. by an estimated EUR 68 million in the case of the coordinated action against the misleading marketing of in-app offers in online games).</p> <p>Savings for authorities will be achieved thanks to the possibility to reuse evidence, avoid duplication and ensure maximum consistency of enforcement actions. Pooling of resources to address widespread infringements would save resources as one coordinated action would replace 28 national actions, resulting in net savings varying from ca. EUR 180,000 (in case of successful coordinated action) to ca. EUR 815,000 (in case of failed action).</p> |
|--|--|

Consumer product safety

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>Overall state of play:</i></p> <p><i>Commission proposal 2013 pending in legislative procedure</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The Commission proposal for a Regulation on Consumer Product Safety aimed to modernise the product safety rules applicable to (non-food) consumer products currently laid down in the General Product Safety Directive 2001/95/EC which would have been repealed together with the Council Directive 87/587/EEC on food-imitating products.</p> <p>Together with the proposal for a Regulation on Market Surveillance of Products, the proposal aims to overcome fragmentation and inconsistency of rules in the field of product safety and market surveillance.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Due to the limited availability of reliable data or estimates regarding the number of unsafe and non-harmonised consumer products, and the number of non-compliant harmonised products data, savings could not be quantified.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 13/02/2013 • COM(2013)78 | <p>Commission Proposal</p> |
| <p><i>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simpler set of more common requirements for economic operators in terms of labelling, traceability and information obligations applicable across all product sectors; • Reduction of administrative burden (mostly to the benefit of small retailers) due to exemption from certain notification obligations in cases where the risk has already been fully controlled by the economic operators so that information of authorities would not provide added value; • Commitment of the Commission to provide guidance and assistance for SMEs before the new regulation is applied. • The revision would repeal the General Product Safety Directive 2001/95/EC considered by SMEs to be one of the most burdensome pieces of EU legislation according to the 2013 "Top Ten" consultation of SMEs on EU regulation. |
| <p><i>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Choice of Regulation as legal instrument to ensure more uniform application of general product safety rules and to avoid divergences between Member States (level playing field for businesses); • Alignment of the general obligations of economic operators to ensure safety of all consumer products with clearer responsibilities for manufacturers, importers and distributors; • Improved traceability of consumer products throughout the supply chain – enabling a swift and effective response to safety problems (e.g. recalls); • Streamlined procedures to obtain standards in support of the general safety requirement; • More trust of consumers that products on offer in the EU, including online, are safe. Faster and streamlined procedures to obtain standards in support of the general safety requirement |

| | |
|--|---|
| | serving a double purpose: market access and consumer safety. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Due to the limited availability of reliable data or estimates regarding the number of unsafe and non-harmonised consumer products, and the number of non-compliant harmonised products data, savings could not be quantified. |

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Pending in legislative procedure</i> | Legal Act |
| <i>Debate in Legislative Procedure</i> | <p>Several amendments would add additional obligations on economic operators in addition to the currently applicable provisions of Decision 768/2008 (e.g. procedural requirements for sample testing, drawing up of product model lists). They would negatively impact the objectives on simplification and administrative burden reduction.</p> <p>On 9 July 2014, the Commission issued its opinion on the individual amendments proposed by the European Parliament, accepting 36 amendments in their entirety and 31 amendments partially or in principle subject to modifications whilst rejecting 22 amendments.</p> |
| <i>Outcome of Legislative Procedure</i> | The negotiations are blocked in Council due to divergent opinions of Member States regarding the proposed mandatory labelling of the product's country of origin (Article 7). |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Not applicable |

Company law

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Overall state of play:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Proposal in 2015 pending in legislative procedure</i> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p>Summary</p> | <p>The proposed company law codification brings together 6 company law directives and all related amendments in a single new directive with out introducing any substantive changes.</p> <p>It includes Directive 82/891/EEC (domestic divisions), Directive 89/666/EEC (requirements for branches opened in other Member States), Directive 2005/56/EC (cross-border mergers), Directive 2009/101/EC (disclosure, validity of obligations, nullity), Directive 2011/35/EU (domestic mergers) and Directive 2012/30/EU (capital maintenance).</p> <p>The purpose of codifying several company law directives into a single instrument is to increase transparency and readability. The codification will simplify the <i>acquis</i> and make EU Company law more reader-friendly. It will make it easier to have a clear overview of EU law in this policy area.</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>Not applicable (codification)</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 03/12/2015 COM(2015)0616 | Commission Proposal |
| <i>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i> | To codify into one instrument various company law directives to increase transparency and readability |
| <i>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</i> | Bringing together six directives in the area of EU company law and all related amendments in a single new act without introducing any substantive changes. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Not applicable (codification) |

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>State of Play:</i> pending in legislative procedure | Legal Act |
| <i>Debate in Legislative Procedure</i> | The Commission proposal is being examined in the Council and the European Parliament according to an accelerated procedure applicable to codification proposals. |
| <i>Outcome of Legislative Procedure</i> | Not available yet |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Not applicable (codification) |

Identity and Residence Documents

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>Overall state of play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Proposal planned for 2017</i> | Summary |
| <i>Summary:</i> | <p>The Commission is planning a legislative proposal to facilitate acceptance by public authorities and businesses of residence and identity documents by enhancing their security and common features, and therefore on the one hand facilitating the exercise of free movement and on the other hand contributing to an increased internal security.</p> <p>In the 2013 EU Citizenship report, the Commission committed to work on solutions to remove obstacles faced in daily life by mobile EU citizens and their family members in relation to identity and residence documents. Their identity cards are not always accepted in essential daily commercial activities (e.g. opening a bank account; signing a contract with utilities or telephony providers etc) or for administrative purposes (e.g. as travel document at a border control). In addition, ID cards and residence cards do not have common (or even low) security features which increases the risk of falsification.</p> <p>Enhancing the security of these documents to prevent fraud and address security concerns will increase acceptance by Member States and private operators. EU citizens will benefit when crossing borders or when using these documents in other cross-border situations (eg prove that they are actually residing in a specific country). It will also be of benefit for internal security and border control; national authorities can rely on secured documents and will be able to fight against crime and fraud more effectively and to prevent travel of so called foreign fighters or other persons presenting a risk to the internal security.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>A first analysis of the benefits including costs saving will be available in January 2017 (study launched in 2016).</p> |

Emergency travel document

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>Overall state of play:</i></p> <p><i>Evaluation results expected in 2017</i></p> <p><i>Proposal planned for 2018</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>Under certain conditions, Union citizens enjoy the right of consular protection by other Member States than their own. Issuing Emergency Travel Documents (ETDs) constitutes the most frequent type of assistance provided in this context.</p> <p>The currently applicable Decision 96/409/CFSP establishing an Emergency Travel Document (ETD) is not sufficient.</p> <p>The Commission proposal under consideration aims to bring the following benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) simplifying for unrepresented EU citizens the necessary formalities to obtain an ETD from any Member State; (b) enhancing the coordination and cooperation among the MS when issuing ETDs; (c) reducing the costs both for citizens and the MS as a result of the synergies created; (d) modernising security features of ETDs and therefore addresses security gaps as follow-up to the EU agenda on security (workstream on enhancing identity management and strengthening the fight against documents fraud), see also COM (2016) 602 from 14.9.2016 on enhancing security in the world of mobility: improved information exchange in the fight against terrorism and stronger external borders); (e) ensuring consistency with the recently adopted Directive (EU) 2015/637 on the coordination and cooperation measures to facilitate consular protection for unrepresented citizens of the Union in third countries and repealing Decision 95/553/EC. |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Information not yet available.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <i>Evaluation results expected in 2017</i> | Evaluation |
| <i>Scope:</i> | Evaluation of the Decision of the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States (96/409/CSFP) meeting within the Council of 25 June 1996 on the establishment of an emergency travel document |
| <i>Evaluation findings:</i> | <i>To be updated once SWD is adopted</i> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <i>To be updated once SWD is adopted</i> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Proposal planned for 2018</i> | Commission Proposal |
| <i>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i> | Simplification (proposal not yet adopted) Revision of Decision of the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States (96/409/CSFP) meeting within the Council of 25 June 1996 on the establishment of an emergency travel document. |
| <i>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</i> | Legislative proposal for the communitarisation of the <i>sui generis</i> decision on emergency travel documents aiming at simplifying formalities for unrepresented EU citizens in third countries, whose passport or travel document has been lost, stolen or destroyed, and ensuring that they can be issued an Emergency Travel Document by any other Member State to travel back home. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | An economic analysis, including costs saving will be carried out in a study which is currently being prepared (the results will be available in the second semester 2017) |

Equal Treatment in Social Security

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>Overall state of play:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>Evaluation results expected end 2016</i> | Summary |
| <i>Summary:</i> | The Commission is evaluating legislation regarding equal treatment in social security covering Council Directive 79/7/EEC on the progressive implementation of the principle of equal treatment for men and women in matters of social security. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

Timeshare, long-term holiday products, resale and exchange contracts

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>Overall state of play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Evaluation published December 2015</i> <i>Communication: COM(2015) 644</i> <i>No legislative follow-up planned</i> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The Commission carried out an evaluation of Directive 2008/122/EC on the protection of consumers in respect of certain aspects of timeshare, long-term holiday product, resale and exchange contracts which was concluded in December 2015.</p> <p>Overall, the evaluation concluded that the Directive constitutes a useful tool for consumers and does not require legislative modification.</p> <p>The Commission is committed to continuing its efforts to ensure full implementation by Member States of the provisions of EU consumer law which are relevant to the timeshare sector.</p> <p>Specific evaluation findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Right to pre-contractual information and the right of withdrawal: The Directive appears overall to be a useful tool for consumer protection in this specific holiday sector; Regarding aspects falling outside the scope of Directive 2008/122/EC such as the presence of ‘in perpetuity clauses’, which deprive the consumer of his right to terminate the timeshare contract, and the unilateral increases of maintenance fees, the analysis carried out by the Commission shows that these aspects can be successfully addressed through targeted interventions at national level, efficient self-regulatory measures and a stepped up enforcement of other relevant EU consumer law instruments, most notably Directive 93/13/EEC (the Unfair Contract Terms Directive). |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Whilst the Directive has facilitated cross-border trade by harmonising pre-contract information requirements, businesses find</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>that its provisions have resulted in increased operational costs.</p> <p>This is mainly due to the ban on advance payments, increased paperwork and increased translation costs. These effects on businesses' operational costs were anticipated in the Commission's 2007 impact assessment and the benefits to the sector from greater consumer confidence outweigh the disadvantages associated with the costs of compliance with Directive 2008/122/EC.</p> <p>The impact assessment indicated that these adjustment costs would eventually become a minimal part of ongoing marketing efforts over time. Given that in most EU Member States, the Directive was only implemented 2-3 years ago, this evidence suggests that timeshare businesses are still going through an 'adjustment period' in relation to their operational costs.</p> <p>Given data limitations, further quantification of regulatory costs and benefits could not be carried out.</p> |
|--|---|

Women on company boards

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Overall state of play:</p> <p><i>Commission proposal in 2012 – pending in legislative procedure</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p>Summary and benefits:</p> | <p>The Commission proposal set objectives for the percentage of representation of women in company boards and included an exception for SMEs. The proposal is pending in legislative procedure.</p> <p>In the absence of sufficient progress and commitment to improve the presence of women in business leadership, in 2012 the Commission took steps to improve gender balance on boards of listed companies and proposed legislation with the aim of attaining a 40% objective of the under-represented sex in non-executive board-member positions in publicly listed companies. Alternatively Member States may set a lower objective (33%) provided it would cover both executive and non-executive directors.</p> <p>The proposal does not apply to SMEs (companies with less than 250 employees) or non-listed companies and is designed as a temporary solution which will expire on 31 December 2031.</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>The implementation of the proposed directive would have a significant positive spill-over effect on the wider economy in terms of the reducing the gender employment gap and the gender pay gap and increasing the average return on education. Corporate governance indicators would score significantly better under this option. Company performance would also significantly improve. The corresponding net benefits are estimated to increase further, generating an additional net income for listed companies of about €23.7 billion under a conservative estimate, as the average ROE is projected to increase by 2.92% compared to the baseline.</p> <p>Savings for SMEs following the SME exemption were not quantified due to data limitations.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <i>14 January 2012 - COM(2012) 614</i> | Commission proposal |
| <i>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i> | SME are exempted from the requirement for companies with less than 40% of non-executive directors to apply transparent selection procedures based on neutral selection criteria in order to attain 40 % by 1 January 2020. |
| <i>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</i> | This proposed Directive sets a 40% objective for the percentage of members of the under-represented gender on non-executive boards of publically listed companies by 2020. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>Overall benefits of the proposal are estimated to generate an additional net income for listed companies of about €23.7 billion under a conservative estimate, as the average ROE is projected to increase by 2.92% compared to the baseline.</p> <p>Savings for SMEs following the SME exemption were not quantified due to data limitations.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <i>Pending in legislative procedure</i> | Legal Act |
| <i>Debate in Legislative Procedure</i> | <p>First reading report and legislative resolution: amendments by Parliament do not increase administrative burden for companies. SMEs remain excluded from the scope of the directive. However, the Parliament introduced that Member States should put in place policies to support and incentivise SMEs to significantly improve gender balance on their boards and management. Moreover, the Parliament added references in recitals that the Commission should assess whether non-listed public undertakings and non-listed large undertakings should be included in the scope in the future.</p> <p>Although the draft Directive is supported by the majority of Member States in the Council, there is a blocking minority, which was confirmed at the EPSCO Council in December 2015. Opposing Member States continue to prefer national measures (or non-binding measures at EU level). The proposal remains a priority file for the Commission as included in its Work Programme for 2016.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>Outcome of Legislative Procedure</i> | (pending) |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | There are no changes to quantification. The modifications to the proposal that have been discussed in Council simply provide clarity on the operation of the flexibility already offered to Member States under the original proposal, under which they may choose not to apply the procedural obligations of the Directive where they have substantially similar procedural requirements in operation under legislation at national level. |

Counter Terrorism Instruments

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>Overall state of play:</i> <i>Fitness Check Planned for 2017</i> | Summary |
| <i>Summary and benefits:</i> | The Commisison intends to carry-out a Fitness Checks of counter-terrorism instruments. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

Initiatives in the area of Communications Networks, Content and Technology

Directive on ePrivacy and Electronic Communications

| Overall State of Play <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Evaluation results Q4 2016</i> • <i>Proposal planned for end 2016/beginning 2017</i> | Summary |
|---|--|
| Summary: | <p>The Commission is evaluating the ePrivacy Directive and is planning a revision of Directive 2002/58/EC concerning the processing of personal data and the protection of privacy in the electronic communications sector (Directive on privacy and electronic communications) to update it in the light of latest technological developments and taking into account the opinion of the REFIT Platform.</p> <p>Preliminary results of the evaluation have shown that there is a need to simplify the current framework by repealing outdated or unnecessary provisions, removing overlaps and ensuring consistency with other pieces of legislation, in particular the GDPR as well as clarifying provisions to avoid differing interpretation and thus improving their effectiveness. The need to broaden the scope of application of the ePD to include communication services not provided by ECS but that are functionally equivalent to those provided by ECS has also been identified.</p> <p>The Commission is therefore preparing a new privacy instrument, planned to be adopted by the end of 2016, with the view to take into account the consequences of the data protection reform, in particular, to ensure consistency with the General Data Protection Regulation 2016/679/EU ("GDPR") and of the Law Enforcement Directive 2016/680. The Commission has paid particular attention to the Platform recommendations in the preparation of the proposal.</p> <p>Input of the REFIT Platform:</p> <p>The REFIT Platform opinion on the ePrivacy directive recommends that the Directive on ePrivacy is aligned with the General Data Protection Regulation, that additional exceptions to the 'consent' rule for cookies are considered and that implementation</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | problems are addressed. |
| Estimated savings and benefits | <p>Savings are expected from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – the harmonisation of the legal framework; – the free movement of data processed in the electronic communications sector; – increase of users trust on ICT and more particularly on communication services, as an enabler of a digital economy. <p>Data on costs and benefits of the current Directive and savings from the Commission proposam will be provided when the supportive documents have been adopted.</p> |
| State of Play: Ongoing, planned to be finalised Q4 2016 | Evaluation |
| Scope: | <p>Evaluation of Directive 2002/58/EC concerning the processing of personal data and the protection of privacy in the electronic communications sector (ePrivacy Directive) as amended by Directive 2009/136/EC.</p> <p>Preliminary results of the evaluation have shown that there is a need to simplify the current framework by repealing outdated or unnecessary provisions, removing overlaps and ensuring consistency with other pieces of legislation, in particular the GDPR as well as clarifying provisions to avoid differing interpretation and thus improving their effectiveness. It is also needed to broaden the scope of application of the ePD to include communication services not provided by ECS but that are functionally equivalent to those provided by ECS.</p> |
| Evaluation findings: | Expected Q4 2016. |
| Estimated savings and benefits | Expected Q4 2016. |

| | |
|--|--|
| State of Play: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adoption planned for 2017 | Commission Proposal |
| Which REFIT objective(s) does the Commission pursue? | Revision of Directive 2002/58/EC concerning the processing of personal data and the protection of privacy in the electronic communications sector (Directive on privacy and electronic communications) to update it in the light of latest technological developments and taking into account the opinion of the REFIT |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>Platform.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) To simplify the framework by repealing outdated or unnecessary provisions; 2) Streamlining the framework by removing overlaps and ensuring consistency with other pieces of legislation, in particular the GDPR. 3) Clarifying provisions to avoid differing interpretation and thus improving their effectiveness. 4) Broadening the scope of application of the ePD to include communication services not provided by ECS but that are functionally equivalent to those provided by ECS. |
| <i>Which other objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Removing unnecessary burdens and making the rules operate in a more efficient way. In particular, streamlining the rules that apply to the placement of cookies enabling user control of cookies through browsers and similar applications. 2) The administration of websites would be simplified based on the possibility for citizens to refuse or allow tracking by default. Additional costs would ensue for the limited number of providers of browsers, operating systems and app stores as these would need to ensure privacy-friendly settings |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>The measures envisaged, according to a study commissioned to external contractors would reduce costs on businesses essentially thanks to the measures streamlining and simplifying the consent rules and greater harmonisation.</p> <p>As an example, it has been reported that on average the implementation of some of the envisaged measures (the simplification regarding the administration of cookies), would entail savings of EUR 1 000 per website. Lifting these costs would constitute a significant saving for SMEs: micro-companies.</p> |

Priority 8: Towards a New Policy on Migration

Overview

Overview of REFIT Initiatives in the area of Migration and Home Affairs

| | Evaluation | Commission Proposal | Legal Act | Implementation |
|--|--|--|----------------------------------|----------------|
| Visa Information System | Evaluation Staff Working Document and Report adopted on 14 October 2016 | Proposal Planned for 2017 (CWP 2017) | | |
| Visa lists | | Commission proposal Preparation ongoing | | |
| Revision of Visa Code | | Commission proposal 1 April 2014 | Pending in legislative procedure | |
| Schengen Information system in the field of border | | Proposal | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---------------------------|--|
| management and law enforcement | | Planned for 2017 (CWP 2017) | | |
| Codification of Schengen borders Code | | Commission proposal 20 January 2015 | Legal act 9 March 2016 | Implementation Entry into force 23 March 2016 |
| Legal migration | Fitness Check to start in Q4 2016 | | | |
| Entry and stay in the EU for third-country nationals students, researchers and other groups | | Commission proposal 25 March 2013 | Legal act 11 May 2016 | Implementation Date of effect: 22/05/2016 |
| Residence permits for victims of trafficking in human beings | Evaluation Finalised on 17 October 2014 | | | |
| Facilitation of unauthorised entry, transit and residence | Evaluation Ongoing and expected to be finalised in Q4 2016 | | | |
| Asylum Package | | Commission proposals Adopted on 13 July 2016 | | |

Initiatives in the area of Migration and Home Affairs

Visa Information System (VIS)

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>Overall state of play:</i></p> <p><i>Staff Working Document and Report adopted on 14 October 2016</i></p> <p><i>Proposal planned for 2017 (CWP 2017)</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary</i></p> | <p>The Commission has evaluated Regulation (EC) No 767/2008 concerning the Visa Information System (VIS) and the exchange of data between Member States on short-stay visas (VIS Regulation) and Council Decision 2004/512/EC establishing the Visa Information System (VIS). Results of the evaluation are presented in a Staff Working Document adopted on 14 October 2016 together with a Report to the European Parliament and the Council.</p> <p>A legislative proposal following-up on the results of the evaluation is planned for 2017 (CWP 2017).</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The efficiency analysis shows that the costs of setting up the system have already been largely amortised by the Member States and that the limited administrative burden it triggers is outweighed by the gains brought by the system in terms of simplifying the visa procedure.</p> <p>While set-up costs have been quantified, quantification of benefits has not been possible due to data limitations.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>SWD(2016)327, SWD(2016)328 and COM(2016)655</i></p> <p><i>Adopted 14 October 2016</i></p> | <p>Evaluation</p> |
| <p><i>Scope:</i></p> | <p>Evaluation of Regulation (EC) No 767/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the Visa Information System (VIS) and the exchange of data between Member States on short-stay visas (VIS Regulation) and Council Decision 2004/512/EC establishing the Visa Information System (VIS).</p> |
| <p><i>Evaluation findings:</i></p> | <p>The evaluation found that the VIS has been effective in facilitating the visa application procedure. The costs of setting up the VIS were reasonable and in certain cases the VIS contributed to enforcing synergies at European level, hence limiting costs at national level. Limited administrative burden was outweighed by the gains brought by the system in terms of simplifying the visa procedure. At the same time, the VIS creates benefits in operational terms by facilitating checks at external borders, combating visa fraud and enabling the rapid identification of people who may not or no longer fulfil the conditions for entry or stay in the EU territory. It also supports asylum authorities by providing relevant information for determining the Member State responsible and for examining asylum applications.</p> <p>However, the evaluation also showed that Member States need to do more to implement the VIS in order to reap its full benefits. The use of the VIS for the purpose of checks at external borders or within the territory, and for asylum, return or law enforcement purposes, needs to be enhanced and/or intensified. Member States should also improve practical implementation of the decision related to the law enforcement access to the VIS.</p> <p>Given the general political objective of increased cooperation between Member States in the field of migration and borders and in stepping up controls at external borders, including through increased interoperability between the systems, the VIS added value is consolidating.</p> <p>Finally the evaluation leads to recommendations as regards the development of the VIS regulatory framework to respond to new</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | challenges in visa, border and security policies. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>The cost of setting up the VIS amounted to EUR 151 million over six years (2005 to 2011).</p> <p>Additionally, Member States incurred costs ranging from EUR 1-2 million to EUR 30 million to set up their national systems, giving a total of approximately EUR 600 million , including maintenance costs for the first years. Member States' costs depended on their consular network and the level of equipment used.</p> <p>On the other hand, with nearly 23 million applications currently stored in the system, over EUR 1.320 million were collected by Member States to process these applications. Given the massive initial cost of the investment, the relatively low cost of subsequent maintenance, and even considering all other administrative costs incurred by the Member States when processing visas, the initial cost of setting up the system appears to have been largely amortised.</p> <p>The main benefits of the system include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it contributes to the enforcement of a common visa policy and consular cooperation and provides an easily available and secure means of consultation between central visa authorities; • it makes it possible to identify any person who may not, or may no longer, fulfil the conditions for entry to, stay or residence on the territory of the Member States; • it facilitates the application of criteria and mechanisms to determine which Member State is responsible for examining an asylum application and when examining the application for asylum itself; • it contributes to preventing, detecting and investigating serious criminal offences. <p>Given data limitations, quantification of these benefits has not been possible.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <i>Planned for 2017</i> | Commission proposal |
| <i>Which REFIT objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i> | Revision of Regulation 767/2008 concerning the Visa Information System (VIS) and the exchange of data between Member States on short-stay visas and Regulation 810/2009 establishing a Community Code on visas (the Visa Code) |

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>Which other objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i> | Information not yet available. Revision of Council Decision 2004/512/EC of 8 June 2004 establishing the Visa Information System. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

Visa lists

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>State of play:</i> • <i>Codification Planned</i> | Summary |
| <i>Summary</i> | <p>The Commission is planning codification of Council Regulation (EC) No 539/2001 listing the third countries whose nationals must be in possession of visas when crossing the external borders and those whose nationals are exempt from this requirement.</p> <p>The codification of the Regulation will improve its legibility and transparency, ensuring that provisions are clear and readily understandable and offering better certainty as to the law applicable.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | not applicable (codification) |

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <i>Planned</i> | Commission Proposal (Codification) |
| <i>Which REFIT objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i> | Improvements of the legibility and transparency of the Regulation |
| <i>Which other objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i> | All existing amending acts to Council Regulation (EC) No 539/2001 listing the third countries whose nationals must be in possession of visas when crossing the external borders and those whose nationals are exempt from this requirement will be codified into one single new act without introducing any additional amendments. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | not applicable (codification) |

Revision of the Visa code

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>State of play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Proposal in 2014, pending in legislative procedure</i> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The revision of the Visa Code aims at shortening and simplifying the procedures for those wanting to come to the EU for short stays, inducing cost savings and less bureaucracy, whilst maintaining the level of security.</p> <p>As a result, the common visa policy will become more user-friendly and efficient for both the visa applicants and the visa issuing authorities.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The modifications proposed in relation with the issuance of multiple entry visas will produce savings for both the Member States/consulates and visa applicants. Due to the absence of data, the savings could not be quantified further.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Adopted on 1 April 2014 – COM(2014)164</i> | <p>Commission Proposal (recast)</p> |
| <p><i>Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>This proposal recasts and amends Regulation (EC) No 810/2009 establishing a Community Code on Visas (Visa Code).</p> <p>The proposal will make travel easier for legitimate travellers and simplify the legal framework in the interest of Member States, e.g. by allowing more flexible rules on consular cooperation.</p> <p>Considering the overall length and costs (direct and indirect) and the cumbersome nature of the existing procedures, the proposal aims at introducing a distinction between first-time travellers and regular travellers whereby the latter will benefit from a number of procedural facilitations, including having to submit less supporting documents and, when conditions are met, receiving automatically a multiple entry visa (MEV) with a long period of validity.</p> <p>By issuing more MEVs with a long period of validity (up to 5 years), the administrative burden for both applicants and issuing authorities will be greatly diminished.</p> <p>The proposal also clarifies the respective procedural facilitations of free circulation applying to family members of EU citizens under Directive 2004/38/EC in relation to the Visa Code.</p> |
| <p><i>Which other objectives did the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>The proposed revision will contribute to maintaining security at the external borders and ensuring the good functioning of the Schengen area and will make travel easier for legitimate travellers.</p> <p>The proposal takes into account the increased political emphasis given to the economic impact of visa policy on the wider European Union economy, and in particular on tourism, to ensure greater consistency with the growth objectives of the Europe 2020 strategy, in line with the Commission's communication "Implementation and development of the common visa policy to spur growth in the European Union".</p> <p>Making the access to the Schengen area easier for legitimate travellers will facilitate visiting friends and relatives and doing business. It should support economic activity and job creation in, for</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | instance, the tourism sector as well as in related activities such as restaurant and transport industries. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>The proposal is expected to produce savings for both the Member States/consulates and visa applicants with the issuance of MEVs. The issuing of MEVs with a long validity accompanied by certain procedural facilitations has the potential to lessen the administrative burden on consulates and, at the same time, it is considered a very important facilitation for certain groups of travellers. In practice it would be equivalent to a visa waiver for the period of validity of the MEV, resulting in significant savings and efficiency gains both for visa applicants (in terms of time and cost) and consulates (time). Due to the absence of data, the savings could not be quantified.</p> <p>On the other hand, the declining number of visa applications under the MEV-system, is expected to reduce Member States' visa revenues. However, the issuing of MEVs will also reduce costs, as fewer visa applications need to be processed. In addition, the economic benefits should considerably exceed the costs. The Impact Assessment estimated that there could be up to 3 million additional trips to the Schengen area. These additional trips would generate additional income, up to EUR 2 billion, turning into up to 50 000 supported FTE jobs.</p> |

| | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <i>Pending in legislative procedure</i> | Legal Act |
| <i>Debate in Legislative Procedure</i> | Still in legislative procedure. |
| <i>Outcome of Legislative Procedure</i> | Not applicable yet |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Not applicable yet |

Schengen Information System in the field of border management and law enforcement

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>Overall state of play:</i></p> <p><i>Proposal planned for 2017(CWP 2017)</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>Revision of Regulation 1987/2006 and Council Decision 2007/533/JHA on the establishment, operation and use of the second generation Schengen Information System (SIS II) (Art. 77 (2) (b) and (d), 82 and 87 TFEU; Q4/2016).</p> <p>The initiative represents a follow up to the evaluation of the implementation of SIS II, as requested by the legal bases (Regulation (EC) No 1987/2006, Council Decision 2007/533/JHA.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Information not yet available.</p> |

Codification of Schengen borders Code

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>State of play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Commission proposal in 2015</i> • <i>Legal Act in 2016</i> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The codification of Regulation (EC) No 562/2006 establishing a Community Code on the rules governing the movement of persons across borders compiles several amendments to the Schengen Borders Code, such as the use of the Visa Information System (Regulation (EC) No 81/2009) and 2013 amendments, into one legal text.</p> <p>This codification ensures that provisions are clearer and readily understandable and offers better certainty as to the law applicable.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>not applicable (codification)</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| State of Play: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adopted on 20 January 2015 – COM(2015) 8 final | Commission Proposal (codification) |
| Which REFIT objective(s) did the Commission pursue? | The codification of the Schengen Borders Code brings together several amendments to the Schengen Borders Code, such as the use of the Visa Information System (Regulation (EC) No 81/2009) and 2013 amendments, into one legal text, thereby making the provisions clearer, readily understandable and offering more certainty as to the law applicable. |
| Which other objectives did the Commission pursue? | The new Regulation supersedes the various acts incorporated in it; the proposal fully preserves the content of the acts being codified and hence does no more than bring them together with only such formal amendments as required by the codification exercise itself. |
| Estimated savings and benefits | not applicable (codification) |

| | |
|---|---|
| State of Play: Adopted 9 March 2016 Regulation (EU) 2016/399 | Legal Act (Codification) [Union Code on the rules governing the movement of persons across borders] |
| Outcome of Legislative Procedure | Adopted without changes. |
| Estimated savings and benefits | Not applicable (codification) |

| | |
|--|---|
| State of Play: Entry into force: 23.03.2016 Evaluation: at least every 5 years (at least 2021) | Implementation [Union Code on the rules governing the movement of persons across borders] |
|--|---|

| | |
|---|--------------------------------|
| <i>Implementation reported by MemberStates</i> | Information not yet available. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

Legal migration

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>Overall state of play:</i> <i>Fitness Check to start in Q4 2016, results expected Q1 2018</i> | Summary |
| <i>Summary</i> | <p>The Commission will carry out a fitness check of the body of legislation related to legal migration. Its results are expected early 2018.</p> <p>The fitness check will evaluate how the existing acquis on legal migration has contributed to the attainment of legal migration policy objectives, and identify possible overlaps, gaps or inconsistencies as well as possible obsolete measures. It will provide a basis for simplifying and streamlining the current EU framework in this area as necessary.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>Information not yet available.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Results expected Q1 2018</i></p> | <p>Fitness Check</p> |
| <p>Scope:</p> | <p>The fitness check will evaluate how the existing acquis on legal migration has contributed to the attainment of legal migration policy objectives, and identify possible overlaps, gaps or inconsistencies as well as possible obsolete measures. It will provide a basis for simplifying and streamlining the current EU framework in this area as necessary.</p> <p>The fitness check will therefore cover the following Directives related to migration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council Directive 2003/86/EC of 22 September 2003 on the right to family reunification. • Council Directive 2003/109/EC of 25 November 2003 concerning the status of third-country nationals who are long-term residents ("Long Term Residents"); • Council Directive 2009/50/EC of 25 May 2009 on the conditions of entry and residence of third-country nationals for the purposes of highly qualified employment ("Blue Card"); proposal for review adopted 7.6.2016 (COM(2016)378 final • Directive 2011/98/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 December 2011 on a single application procedure for a single permit for third-country nationals to reside and work in the territory of a Member State and on a common set of rights for third-country workers legally residing in a Member State ("Single Permit"); • Directive 2014/36/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 February 2014 on the conditions of entry and stay of third-country nationals for the purpose of employment as seasonal workers; • Directive 2014/66/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 May 2014 on the conditions of entry and residence of third-country nationals in the framework of an intra-corporate transfer ("ICTs"); • Directive (EU) 2016/801 of 11 May 2016 on the conditions of entry and residence of third-country nationals for the purposes of research, studies, training, voluntary service, pupil exchange schemes or educational projects and au |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>pairing, which recasts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council Directive 2004/114/EC of 13 December 2004 on the conditions of admission of third-country nationals for the purposes of studies, pupil exchange, unremunerated training or voluntary service; • Council Directive 2005/71/EC of 12 October 2005 on a specific procedure for admitting third-country nationals for the purposes of scientific research; <p>It will build upon recent reviews and recast and will also take into account that some of the Directives are still too recent for their impact to be fully evaluated.</p> |
| <i>Evaluation findings:</i> | Information not yet available. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

Entry and residence in the EU for third-country nationals students, researchers and other groups (recast)

| | |
|---|--|
| <p><i>Overall state of play:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Proposal adopted 2013</i> • <i>Legal act adopted 2016</i> • <i>Date of Transposition: May 2018</i> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary and benefits:</i></p> | <p>The new recast Directive adopted on 11 May 2016 aims at aligning, simplifying and improving existing provisions for entry and residence of third-country nationals for the purposes of research, studies, pupil exchange, remunerated and unremunerated training, voluntary service and au pairing.</p> <p>The new Directive will support social, cultural and economic relationships, foster the transfer of skills and know-how and promote competitiveness while, at the same time, ensuring fair treatment. It is also expected to enable more intra-EU mobility of third-country researchers and students and facilitate job-seeking and business creation for students and researchers after graduation/finalisation of research, thus contributing to economic growth.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Although the main benefits of the new legislation are economic and social, Member States can expect to make savings in a medium to long-term perspective through the harmonisation of criteria of admission and the facilitation of intra EU mobility which will reduce the administrative burden on Member States' administration.</p> <p>Due to the very limited availability of data on administrative costs, the savings could not be quantified further.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Proposal adopted on 25 March 2013 – COM(2013) 151</i></p> | <p>Commission proposal</p> |
| <p><i>Which REFIT objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>The Commission proposal is recasting Directives 2004/114/EC and 2005/71/EC, thereby streamlining and simplifying the legislative framework in a single instrument.</p> <p>It aims to remedy the weaknesses identified in the implementation reports on those Directives, ensure increased transparency and legal certainty and offer a coherent legal framework for different categories of third-country nationals coming to the Union, thereby rendering EU more attractive as a destination.</p> <p>Despite differences between the categories covered, they also share a number of characteristics which makes it possible to address them through a common legal framework at Union level.</p> |
| <p><i>Which other objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>More exchange students and international scholars will lead to economic growth, spur innovation and lead to more jobs in the long run. The EU should become more attractive for foreign students and researchers and increase its appeal as a world centre for excellence.</p> <p>The overall objective of the Commission proposal was therefore to align, simplify and improve the provisions for entry and residence of third-country national researchers, students, school pupils, unremunerated trainees and volunteers, and create rules for remunerated trainees and au pairs, to support social, cultural and economic relationships, foster the transfer of skills and know-how and promote competitiveness while, at the same time, providing for appropriate safeguards to ensure fair treatment .</p> <p>The proposal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • streamlines admission procedures and makes them more transparent for applicants (clearer deadlines, information to be provided to applicants); • provides for fast track and easier procedures in cases where applicants are beneficiaries of EU mobility programme; • facilitates mobility across Member States, based on a single |

| | |
|--|--|
| | authorisation. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <p>Although the main benefits of the new legislation are economic and social, Member States can expect to make savings in a medium to long-term perspective through the harmonisation of criteria of admission and the facilitation of intra EU mobility which will reduce the administrative burden on Member States' administration.</p> <p>Due to the very limited availability of data on administrative costs, the savings could not be quantified further.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <i>Directive (EU) 2016/801,</i> <i>adopted on 11 May 2016</i> | Legal act |
| <i>Outcome of legislative procedure</i> | <p>The major issues of the negotiations were notably the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the scope of the Directive - intra-EU mobility - equal treatment - access to the labour market for students - stay after graduation / finalisation of research to look for a job or set up a business <p>The Directive provides for mandatory rules for researchers, students, trainees and volunteers under EVS, while rule for other volunteers, school pupils and au pairs will be optional. Students will be allowed to work for at least 15 hours a week, so as to make it easier for them to support themselves during studies. The substance of the final text remains however in line with the initial proposal.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | There was no update following the legislative debate. |

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <i>Date of effect: 22/05/2016;</i> <i>Entry into force : date</i> <i>pub. +1 (Art 42)</i> <i>Date of transposition:</i> <i>23/05/2018 at the latest</i> <i>(Art 40.1)</i> <i>Deadline for reporting on</i> | Implementation |
|---|-----------------------|

| | |
|---|--------------------------------|
| <i>application: 23/05/2023 (Art 39)</i> | |
| <i>Implementation reported by MemberStates</i> | Information not yet available. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

Residence permits for victims of trafficking in human beings

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>Overall State of play:</i></p> <p><i>Evaluation finalised on 17 October 2014 – COM(2014) 635</i></p> <p><i>No legislative follow-up planned</i></p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>The Commission evaluated Council Directive 2004/81/EC on the residence permit issued to third-country nationals who are victims of trafficking in human beings.</p> <p>The evaluation showed that the possibility of issuing permits to third-country nationals in exchange for cooperation with the authorities is under-utilised, leading the Commission to engage in bilateral exchanges with Member States to achieve full and correct implementation of the Directive as well as facilitate further exchange of information and good practices through existing structures.</p> <p>As announced in the Action Plan against migrant smuggling adopted in 2015, in 2016 the Commission will launch a consultation process on Directive 2004/81/EC. The findings of these consultations will inform future decision on a possible review of this instrument, which will also take into account the on going assessment of the implementation of Directive 2011/36/EU on preventing and combating trafficking in human beings and protecting its victims.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Due to the limited availability of data, the costs and benefits could not be quantified further.</p> |

Facilitation of unauthorised entry, transit and residence

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>Overall State of play: Evaluation results expected end 2016</i> | Summary |
| <i>Summary</i> | The Commission is evaluating the existing EU legal framework to fight against migrant smuggling. The results of the evaluation are expected end 2016. |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | Information not yet available. |

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>State of Play:</i> <i>Evaluation results expected end 2016</i> | Evaluation |
| Scope: | Evaluation of the existing EU legal framework to fight against migrant smuggling: Council Directive 2002/90/EC defining the facilitation of unauthorised entry, transit and residence and of Council Framework Decision 2002/946/JHA on the strengthening of the penal framework to prevent the facilitation of unauthorised entry, transit and residence (known as "the Facilitators Package", which aim at countering the aiding of irregular migration and cracking down on criminal networks of migrant smugglers). |
| Evaluation findings: | Information not yet available. |
| Estimated savings and benefits | Information not yet available. |

Asylum Package

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Overall state of play:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Proposals adopted on 13 July 2016</i> • <i>Pending in legislative procedure</i> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p>Summary</p> | <p>In order to complete the reform of the Common European Asylum System, the Commission made three proposals on 13 July 2016:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and the Council establishing a common procedure in the Union and repealing Directive 2013/32/EU – 2016/0224 (COD) • Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and Council on standards for the qualification of third-country nationals or stateless persons as beneficiaries of international protection, for a uniform status for refugees or for persons eligible for subsidiary protection and for the content of the protection granted and amending Council Directive 2003/109/EC of 25 November 2003 concerning the status of third-country nationals who are long-term residents - 2016/0223 (COD) • Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down standards for the reception of applicants for international protection (recast) - 2016/0222 (COD) |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>Given data limitations, quantification has not been possible.</p> |

Priority 10: A Union of Democratic Change

Overview

Overview of REFIT Initiatives in the area of Environment

Evaluation

Commission Proposal

Legal Act

Implementation



| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| Environmental Reporting Initiative | <p>Fitness check</p> <p>1st part completed on 27/5/2016</p> <p>2nd part expected completion Q1 2017</p> | <p>Commission proposal</p> <p>Repeal in Preparation</p> <p>Communication Planned for 2017</p> | | |
| Environmental Compliance Assurance | | <p>Initiative planned for 2017</p> | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| Access to Justice in the area of environment | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

Initiatives in the area of Environment

Environmental Reporting Initiative

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Overall state of play</p> <p><i>ongoing</i></p> <p>- Fitness Check ongoing,</p> <p>- Repeal under preparation,</p> <p>- Initiative planned for 2017 (CWP 2017)</p> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p>Summary</p> | <p>To ensure that the EU's legal instruments have the intended effect, the Commission intends to step up its efforts in 2017 on the application, implementation and enforcement of EU law. This includes a proposal to simplify environmental reporting following the recent Fitness Check.</p> <p>The initiative will allow for the development of more modern, effective and efficient monitoring and reporting for EU environment policy as a necessary step towards delivering a better environment. This will reduce pressure on the public and private sector contributing to reporting, whilst also filling information gaps and make environmental information more visible and accessible to citizens, so achieving higher standards of transparency and accountability.</p> |
| <p>Estimated savings and benefits</p> | <p>To be updated when the SWD is finalised.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>ongoing</i></p> <p><i>1st part completed on 27/5/2016 (SWD(2016)188</i></p> <p><i>2nd part expected completion 2nd quarter 2017</i></p> | <p>Fitness Check</p> |
| <p><i>Scope:</i></p> | <p>This Fitness Check assesses regulatory reporting and monitoring obligations across the entire regulatory acquis in the area of environment. This includes almost 60 pieces of legislation and approximately 170 reporting obligations. The Fitness Check assesses the obligations to report directly or indirectly to the EU level, it excludes Member States' monitoring to ensure implementation and environmental monitoring in a wider sense.</p> |
| <p><i>Evaluation findings:</i></p> | <p>Findings will be available in Q1 2017.</p> <p>As a first outcome of the work on the Fitness Check, the Commission services have prepared a Staff Working Document "Towards a Fitness Check of EU environmental monitoring and reporting: to ensure effective monitoring, more transparency and focused reporting of EU environment policy SWD(2016)188" set out the ambition level and the approach. It also presents the key findings of the public consultation.</p> <p>The Fitness Check findings will be reflected in a Communication setting out an action plan to accelerate the transition to a more modern, efficient and effective monitoring and reporting.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>The Fitness Check will result in an evaluation of the effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, relevance and EU value-added of environmental reporting obligations and deliver some quantification of regulatory costs of reporting from Member States to the Environment Agency or the Commission for the different reporting obligations, as well as some more qualitative assessment of benefits.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Under preparation</i></p> | <p>Repeal</p> |
| <p><i>What purpose does the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>Repeal of Council Directive of 23 December 1991 standardizing and rationalizing reports on the implementation of certain Directives relating to the environment (91/692/EEC).</p> <p>More than 90% of the original obligations have become obsolete. For the remaining legal acts only a few still provide an added value. As a result, the proposal for a repeal will ensure legal certainty, improve transparency, reduce administrative burden and ensure that EU legislation is "fit for purpose".</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>State of Play:</i></p> <p><i>Planned for 2017 (CWP 2017)</i></p> | <p>Initiative on Monitoring/ Transparency/ Focused Reporting</p> |
| <p><i>Which objective(s) does the Commission pursue?</i></p> | <p>To ensure that the EU's legal instruments have the intended effect, the Commission intends to step up its efforts in 2017 on the application, implementation and enforcement of EU law. This includes a proposal to simplify environmental reporting following the recent Fitness Check.</p> <p>Follow-Up to Fitness Check of Reporting Requirements in the area of Environment.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p>Information not yet available.</p> |

Environmental Compliance Assurance

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>State of play</i> <i>Initiative planned for 2017 (CWP 2017)</i> | Summary |
| <i>Summary:</i> | <p>To ensure that the EU's legal instruments have the intended effect, the Commission intends to step up its efforts in 2017 on the application, implementation and enforcement of EU law. This includes a proposal to support environmental compliance assurance in Member States.</p> <p>Initiative on implementation and enforcement.</p> |
| <i>Estimated savings and benefits</i> | <i>Expected 2017</i> |

Access to Justice in the area of environment

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>State of play</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Initiative planned for 2017 (CWP 2017)</i> | <p>Summary</p> |
| <p><i>Summary:</i></p> | <p>To ensure that the EU's legal instruments have the intended effect, the Commission intends to step up its efforts in 2017 on the application, implementation and enforcement of EU law. This includes a proposal to facilitate access to justice.</p> <p>The initiative responds to the 7th Environment Action Programme's objective to improve the implementation of EU environmental law. Fostering an effective judicial protection at national level in environmental matters when implementing EU law while ensuring that national provisions on access to justice reflect the case-law of the CJEU.</p> |
| <p><i>Estimated savings and benefits</i></p> | <p><i>Expected 2017</i></p> |