

BETTER  
REGULATION  
AIMED AT  
VALORISING EMAS

## Summary

Project BRAVE's objective is to favour the full integration of EMAS (as well as other means of voluntary certification) into the environmental legislation of the UE and its member countries as a means to facilitate implementation by all organizations ("better regulation") and to eliminate, reduce and simplify the administrative costs for all EMAS registered organizations – as well as for companies that adopt Ecolabel or other certification means permitted under Article 5 of EC regulation # 1221/09 – in order to encourage the adoption and usage of voluntary environmental certification ("regulatory relief").

The objective of Action 6 is the efficient implementation of the most relevant measures of "better regulation" and of "regulatory relief" among those identified and tested by stakeholders participating in the project.

Activities identified as the final step in the project's testing phase (Action 5) will be carried on as sub-actions. Specifically:

- 6.1 Selection of proposals (June 2013-Feb 2014)
- 6.2 Drafting of amendments (Aug 2013 – Mar 2014)
- 6.3 Approval of amendments and development of legislative proposals (Nov 2013 – July 2014)

The purpose of this Deliverable is explaining the methodology that could be adopted to select simplification proposals (sub-action 6.1) at both regional and national level.

Confindustria Liguria e Confindustria Genova are responsible for Action 6. They coordinate all the anticipated activities. The methodology will be shared with all Spanish and Italian working groups, both regional and national.

## Methodology

The methodology was built on the basis of the ideas included in the project proposal sent to the EC in 2010 as well as the development of the project in its first year of activity.

In order to identify and select proposals for regional and national better regulation and regulatory relief to be more fully developed in the sub-action item, the methodology will be based on:

- Analysis of legislation and opportunities to develop measures pertaining to better regulation and regulatory relief (see Action 3);
- Evaluation of timing to implement;
- Evaluation criteria identified in sub-action 5.1;
- Evidence emerging from Action 5 field testing;
- Financial and organizational implementation costs;
- Alignment with European indications and recommendations;
- Potential impact on use of EMAS and on exceeding results as reported in literature.

Through the analysis of the above criteria all partners, according to their responsibility, will have to fill a form for each simplification measure and provide their assessment for the following parameters:

1. Time span for implementation of the measure
2. Economic cost for P. A.
3. Organizational cost for P. A.
4. Level of support by the companies.

The required assessments within these parameters will derive from the work done to date in the project. Given that all proposals are aligned with European guidelines, all partners in Action 3 have carried out a thorough analysis of regional and national legislation to identify opportunities to include amendments offering simplifications, facilitations or incentives for EMAS registered/ISO 14001 certified organizations.

The partners have organized their work on the basis of environmental matrices and themes. Thereafter they have completed extensive consultations in order to draft different amendment proposals for the Italian legislation. Such proposals were developed to insert in the Italian legislation relevant incentives, facilitations and simplifications for EMAS registered and ISO 14001 certified organizations.

Within Action 5, criteria were defined for partners to use in evaluating regional and national proposals by means of questionnaires. In Action 5.3 evidence emerge re suitable measures which will have to be assessed as part of the current action plan.

### Explanatory note

Partners are asked to fill a form for each simplification proposal using the explanatory note which follows in order to ensure homogeneity and indicating at the margin how the note criteria were applied.

- 1) Timing for implementation of each measure: in selecting a measure the shortest implementation time should be privileged; the suggested scale is: short (1 year), medium (2-5 years), long (more than 5 years). Suggested points: 5 for short, 3 for medium and 1 for long.

CRITERIA	ASSESSMENT	SCORE
Timing for implementation of measure	short ( about 1 year)	5
	medium (2-5 years)	3
	long (more than 5 years)	1

- 2) Financial implementation costs for the P.A.: low implementation costs should be privileged; such costs pertain to incurred implementation costs excluding existing manpower (eg training costs for inspectors). Suggested scale is: unimportant (5 points), important (3 points), very important (1 point)

CRITERIA	ASSESSMENT	SCORE
Financial implementation costs for the P.A	Unimportant	5
	Important	3
	Very important	1

- 3) Organizational implementation costs for the P.A.: Low organizational costs should be privileged; such costs include internal P.A. manpower costs for the work related to implementing the suggested measure. Suggested scale is: unimportant (5 points), important (3 points), very important (1 point).

CRITERIA	ASSESSMENT	SCORE
Organizational implementation costs for the P.A	Unimportant	5
	Important	3
	Very important	1

- 4) Level of appreciation by affected organizations: for this purpose reference is made to the survey developed for EMAS registered organizations. This could be combined with other forms of consultation used with companies, if it's possible should be useful the consultation of the Italian or European Report Survey. Suggested scale is: very important (5 points), important (3 points), unimportant (1 point).

CRITERIA	ASSESSMENT	SCORE
Level of appreciation by affected organizations	Very important	5
	Important	3
	Unimportant	1

Assessments and related scoring will have to be reviewed with RCB and/or RWG in order to achieve maximum integration in the selection of the regional proposals.