

Title: Remake of North Western Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority Byelaw 5 Lead department or agency: NWIFCA Other departments or agencies: MMO, Natural England	Impact Assessment (IA)
	IA No:
	Date: 01/01/2010
	Stage: Development/Options
	Source of intervention: Domestic
	Type of measure: Primary legislation
Contact for enquiries:	

Summary: Intervention and Options

What is the problem under consideration? Why is government intervention necessary?

Cockle and mussel fisheries in North Western England are regulated under IFCA byelaws. Byelaw 5 provides for all fishers to hold a permit issued upon production of evidence of identity and track record or allocation by place on a waiting list. This byelaw expires on 31 August 2011 and must be remade to come into force in time for the end of the seasonal cockle closure on 1 September 2011. The byelaw provides for a limit on numbers of fishers and for all fishers to have completed a short training course on safe working on the shores of NW England.

What are the policy objectives and the intended effects?

1. To limit the numbers of cockle and mussel fishers in NW England. 2. To improve safety and reduce risk for cockle and mussel fishers. 3. To provide a list with identity evidence of all cockle and mussel fishers operating commercially. 4. To gather evidence of catch. 5. To establish track record of fishing and eligibility for future cockle and mussel permits.

What policy options have been considered, including any alternatives to regulation? Please justify preferred option (further details in Evidence Base)

1. No regulation. It would be unacceptable to return to the position where this fishery was unregulated.
 2. A permit scheme without restriction on numbers or a requirement for a safety training course or a requirement to submit catch returns. There is not time to make the changes without risk of delay caused by objections to the changes.
 3. Remaking byelaw 5 which has been in force for 4 years. This is preferred option. Only this option delivers all the policy objectives.

Will the policy be reviewed? It will be reviewed. **If applicable, set review date:** 03/2013

What is the basis for this review? Sunset clause. **If applicable, set sunset clause date:** 08/2013

Are there arrangements in place that will allow a systematic collection of monitoring information for future policy review?

Yes

SELECT SIGNATORY Sign-off For consultation stage Impact Assessments:

I have read the Impact Assessment and I am satisfied that, given the available evidence, it represents a reasonable view of the likely costs, benefits and impact of the leading options.

Signed by the responsible Minister: _____

Date: _____

Summary: Analysis and Evidence

Policy Option 1

Description:

Price Base Year	PV Base Year	Time Period Years	Net Benefit (Present Value (PV)) (£m)		
			Low: Optional	High: Optional	Best Estimate:

COSTS (£m)	Total Transition (Constant Price) Years	Average Annual (excl. Transition) (Constant Price)	Total Cost (Present Value)
Low	Optional	Optional	Optional
High	Optional	Optional	Optional
Best Estimate			

Description and scale of key monetised costs by 'main affected groups'

There are no monetised costs to the fishing industry. The current position will continue for a further 2 years with no change.
 The only costs are to the NWIFCA which runs the permit scheme, enforces the fishery and co-ordinates the interagency management committees that contribute to the management and enforcement.

Other key non-monetised costs by 'main affected groups'

There are no non-monetised costs to the fishing industry or the NWIFCA.

BENEFITS (£m)	Total Transition (Constant Price) Years	Average Annual (excl. Transition) (Constant Price)	Total Benefit (Present Value)
Low	Optional	Optional	Optional
High	Optional	Optional	Optional
Best Estimate			

Description and scale of key monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'

There are no monetised benefits to the fishing industry or the NWIFCA.

Other key non-monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'

The industry and the NWIFCA benefits from a more structured legally run industry

Key assumptions/sensitivities/risks

Maximum of 8 lines

Discount rate (%)

Direct impact on business (Equivalent Annual) £m):			In scope of OIOO?	Measure qualifies as
Costs:	Benefits:	Net:	Yes/No	IN/OUT

Enforcement, Implementation and Wider Impacts

What is the geographic coverage of the policy/option?	Other				
From what date will the policy be implemented?	01/09/2011				
Which organisation(s) will enforce the policy?	NWIFCA and many other bodies				
What is the annual change in enforcement cost (£m)?	£0m				
Does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?	Yes/No				
Does implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?	Yes				
What is the CO ₂ equivalent change in greenhouse gas emissions? (Million tonnes CO ₂ equivalent)	Traded: 0		Non-traded: 0		
Does the proposal have an impact on competition?	No				
What proportion (%) of Total PV costs/benefits is directly attributable to primary legislation, if applicable?	Costs: n/a		Benefits: n/a		
Distribution of annual cost (%) by organisation size (excl. Transition) (Constant Price)	Micro 5	< 20	Small	Medium	Large
Are any of these organisations exempt?	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No	Yes/No

Specific Impact Tests: Checklist

Set out in the table below where information on any SITs undertaken as part of the analysis of the policy options can be found in the evidence base. For guidance on how to complete each test, double-click on the link for the guidance provided by the relevant department.

Please note this checklist is not intended to list each and every statutory consideration that departments should take into account when deciding which policy option to follow. It is the responsibility of departments to make sure that their duties are complied with.

Does your policy option/proposal have an impact on...?	Impact	Page ref within IA
Statutory equality duties¹ Statutory Equality Duties Impact Test guidance	No	
Economic impacts		
Competition Competition Assessment Impact Test guidance	No	
Small firms Small Firms Impact Test guidance	No	
Environmental impacts		
Greenhouse gas assessment Greenhouse Gas Assessment Impact Test guidance	No	
Wider environmental issues Wider Environmental Issues Impact Test guidance	No	
Social impacts		
Health and well-being Health and Well-being Impact Test guidance	No	
Human rights Human Rights Impact Test guidance	No	
Justice system Justice Impact Test guidance	No	
Rural proofing Rural Proofing Impact Test guidance	No	
Sustainable development Sustainable Development Impact Test guidance	No	

¹ Public bodies including Whitehall departments are required to consider the impact of their policies and measures on race, disability and gender. It is intended to extend this consideration requirement under the Equality Act 2010 to cover age, sexual orientation, religion or belief and gender reassignment from April 2011 (to Great Britain only). The Toolkit provides advice on statutory equality duties for public authorities with a remit in Northern Ireland.

Evidence Base (for summary sheets) – Notes

Use this space to set out the relevant references, evidence, analysis and detailed narrative from which you have generated your policy options or proposal. Please fill in **References** section.

References

Include the links to relevant legislation and publications, such as public impact assessments of earlier stages (e.g. Consultation, Final, Enactment) and those of the matching IN or OUTs measures.

No.	Legislation or publication
1	
2	
3	
4	

+ Add another row

Evidence Base

Ensure that the information in this section provides clear evidence of the information provided in the summary pages of this form (recommended maximum of 30 pages). Complete the **Annual profile of monetised costs and benefits** (transition and recurring) below over the life of the preferred policy (use the spreadsheet attached if the period is longer than 10 years).

The spreadsheet also contains an emission changes table that you will need to fill in if your measure has an impact on greenhouse gas emissions.

Annual profile of monetised costs and benefits* - (£m) constant prices

	Y ₀	Y ₁	Y ₂	Y ₃	Y ₄	Y ₅	Y ₆	Y ₇	Y ₈	Y ₉
Transition costs										
Annual recurring cost										
Total annual costs										
Transition benefits										
Annual recurring benefits										
Total annual benefits										

* For non-monetised benefits please see summary pages and main evidence base section



Microsoft Office
Excel Worksheet

Evidence Base (for summary sheets)

There is discretion for departments and regulators as to how to set out the evidence base. However, it is desirable that the following points are covered:

- Problem under consideration;
- Rationale for intervention;
- Policy objective;
- Description of options considered (including do nothing);
- Costs and benefits of each option (including administrative burden);
- Risks and assumptions;
- Direct costs and benefits to business calculations (following OIOO methodology);
- Wider impacts;
- Summary and preferred option with description of implementation plan.

Inserting text for this section:

Replace the notes on this page with the text for the evidence base.

To maintain consistent formatting, apply Styles from the toolbar. The **Paste Without Format** toolbar button can be used to paste text from other documents in the current style here.

Annexes

Annex 1 should be used to set out the Post Implementation Review Plan as detailed below. Further annexes may be added where the Specific Impact Tests yield information relevant to an overall understanding of policy options.

Annex 1: Post Implementation Review (PIR) Plan

A PIR should be undertaken, usually three to five years after implementation of the policy, but exceptionally a longer period may be more appropriate. If the policy is subject to a sunset clause, the review should be carried out sufficiently early that any renewal or amendment to legislation can be enacted before the expiry date. A PIR should examine the extent to which the implemented regulations have achieved their objectives, assess their costs and benefits and identify whether they are having any unintended consequences. Please set out the PIR Plan as detailed below. If there is no plan to do a PIR please provide reasons below.

Basis of the review: [The basis of the review could be statutory (forming part of the legislation), i.e. a sunset clause or a duty to review , or there could be a political commitment to review (PIR)];
Review objective: [Is it intended as a proportionate check that regulation is operating as expected to tackle the problem of concern?; or as a wider exploration of the policy approach taken?; or as a link from policy objective to outcome?]
Review approach and rationale: [e.g. describe here the review approach (in-depth evaluation, scope review of monitoring data, scan of stakeholder views, etc.) and the rationale that made choosing such an approach]
Baseline: [The current (baseline) position against which the change introduced by the legislation can be measured]
Success criteria: [Criteria showing achievement of the policy objectives as set out in the final impact assessment; criteria for modifying or replacing the policy if it does not achieve its objectives]
Monitoring information arrangements: [Provide further details of the planned/existing arrangements in place that will allow a systematic collection systematic collection of monitoring information for future policy review]
Reasons for not planning a review: [If there is no plan to do a PIR please provide reasons here]

Add annexes here.