

**EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM TO
THE END OF LIFE VEHICLES (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS 2010**

2010 No. 1094

AND

**THE END OF LIFE VEHICLES (PRODUCER RESPONSIBILITY) (AMENDMENT)
REGULATIONS 2010**

2010 No. 1095

1. This explanatory memorandum has been prepared by the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills and is laid before Parliament by Command of Her Majesty.

This memorandum contains information for the Joint Committee on Statutory Instruments.

2. **Purpose of the instruments**

2.1 These two sets of Regulations amend two earlier sets of Regulations that implemented the EC Directive on End of Life Vehicles 2000/53 EC (“the Directive”):

- The End of Life Vehicles Regulations 2003 (SI 2003 No. 2635) (“the 2003 Regulations”)
- The End of Life Vehicles (Producer Responsibility) Regulations 2005 (SI 2005 No.263) (“the 2005 Regulations”)

2.2 The 2003 Regulations contain restrictions on the use of certain heavy metals in materials and components of vehicles subject to exemptions set out in Schedule 1. The amendments change the transposition from copying out the list specifying the exemptions to an ambulatory reference to the list contained in Annex II of the Directive as amended from time to time. They also transpose certain amendments to the Directive which come into force on 1 December 2010 and provide powers of entry and inspection for enforcement authorities.

2.3 The amendments to the 2005 Regulations make changes to the requirements for reporting details of reuse, recycling and recovery rates. The opportunity has also been taken to correct errors raised by the JCSI in their Twelfth Report of Session 2004-5.

3. **Matters of special interest to the Joint Committee on Statutory Instruments**

3.1 Regulation 2(3) of the End of Life Vehicles (Amendment) Regulations takes advantage of provisions inserted into the European Communities Act 1972 by the Legislative and Regulatory Reform Act 2006 so as to refer to Annex II of the Directive as amended “from time to time”.

3.2 The End of Life Vehicles (Producer Responsibility)(Amendment) Regulations correct all the errors in the 2005 Regulations which were reported by the JCSI in their Twelfth Report of Session 2004-5.

4. Legislative Context

4.1 The Directive aims at minimising the negative environmental impacts of vehicles (cars, and goods vehicles up to 3.5 tonnes) when they are scrapped. The Directive establishes: (i) technical requirements affecting the design and composition of new vehicles and (ii) requirements for the collection, treatment, recycling and disposal of end-of-life vehicles (ELVs) in order to reduce the amount and hazardousness of the waste that arises from them.

4.2 The 2003 Regulations brought into effect:

- i) design requirements restricting the use of certain “heavy metals” in new vehicles;
- ii) information requirements requiring that, in order to aid recycling, vehicle producers make available dismantling manuals and mark certain plastic and rubber parts in their vehicles;
- iii) the introduction of a Certificate of Destruction (CoD) system for the UK;
- iv) new environmental standards for the authorised treatment facilities where vehicles are scrapped.

4.3 The 2005 Regulations brought into effect:

- i) producer responsibility requirements whereby vehicle producers must make available a network of facilities where ELVs will be accepted free of charge to the last owner;
- ii) re-use/recycling/recovery targets that apply to each vehicle producer and to treatment facilities operating outside the producers’ networks.

4.4 In respect of the 2003 Regulations, amendments are needed in order to a) include a reference to Annex II of the Directive as amended from time to time, b) make clearer to whom that annex applies c) transpose an amendment to the definition of “hazardous substance” in the Directive which comes into force on 1 December 2010 d) give the enforcement authority powers of entry and inspection, and e) amend certain disclosure requirements relating to some of the information obtained under the Regulations.

4.5 In respect of the 2005 Regulations, amendments are needed in order to a) make uniform the way ATFs and vehicle producers report their annual recycling/recovery achievement by requiring that it be submitted in a format published by the Secretary of State b) extend the deadline by which they have to do this by 3 months, and c) address all the points raised by the JCSI in their Twelfth Report for session 2004-5.

4.6 BIS (formerly the Department of Trade and Industry and the Department for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform) has previously submitted Explanatory Memoranda on the Directive (see Annex).

5. Territorial Extent and Application

5.1 These instruments apply to all of the United Kingdom.

6. European Convention on Human Rights

6.1 As both instruments are subject to negative resolution procedure and do not amend primary legislation, no statement is required.

7. Policy background

7.1 The Directive aims to reduce the environmental impact of vehicles when they are scrapped by stipulating certain vehicle design features. Use of lead, mercury, hexavalent chromium and cadmium is restricted in new vehicles placed on the market after 1 July 2003 and replacement parts for those vehicles. However, there is recognition that for some components/materials there is no suitable alternative material available, and so the Directive contains an Annex (Annex II) listing specific materials and components where the four restricted substances may still be used (in some cases adding specific numerical limits and/or end dates when the exemption will expire). This annex is reviewed periodically under the comitology procedure to take into account scientific and technical progress. The most recent review led to the Commission Decision 2008/689/EC. The amendments to the 2003 Regulations ensure that any amendment to Annex II of the Directive takes effect without the need for further amendments to those regulations. In addition to their publication in the Official Journal of the European Union details of any amendments to Annex II of the Directive will be communicated directly to stakeholder contacts and published on the BIS website.

7.2 In order to transpose the Directive, improved environmental standards for vehicle dismantlers have been introduced in the UK. These include new site standards, requirements to de-pollute vehicles at the start of the treatment process and recovery/recycling targets of 85% (by 2006) and 95% (by 2015). Each UK vehicle producer is required to put in place an accessible network of facilities where last owners of its vehicles are able to have their ELV treated free of any charge; at these facilities the obligation is with the vehicle producer to ensure that the recovery/recycling target is met. The overall approach adopted in the UK also allows ATFs to operate independently from the vehicle manufacturers networks; those doing so take on the obligation of meeting the recovery/recycling targets themselves.

7.3 The Directive also requires that member States have in place a Certificate of Destruction (CoD) system as part of the vehicle registration/de-registration process, with only permitted ATFs able to issue CoDs.

7.4 The proposed changes (which are not considered politically or legally important) are unlikely to lead to significant interest.

7.5 This is the first occasion that either set of ELV Regulations has been amended. There are currently no plans to consolidate the legislation.

8. Consultation outcome

8.1 Three written consultations were undertaken before implementation of the Directive into UK law. Subsequently DTI, BERR and now BIS have been running an ELV Consultation Group with regular meetings (3 times a year) of stakeholders from trade associations, the Environment Agencies and Devolved Administrations.

8.2 The European Commission carried out a written public consultation on the proposed amendments to Annex II of the Directive. BIS contributed to member States' discussions on the proposals, during Technical Adaptation Committee meetings.

8.3 No written consultation has been carried out in the UK on these particular amendments to either the 2003 or 2005 Regulations. On this occasion the Government needs to make information available to stakeholders, rather than seek views or evidence to influence policy. Forewarning of the process of introducing these changes to stakeholders has already started within the ELV Consultation Group and will continue.

9. Guidance

9.1 BIS already has guidance on the 2003 and 2005 Regulations and this will be updated to reflect changes to both sets of Regulations. Copies can be obtained at:

<http://www.berr.gov.uk/whatwedo/sectors/sustainability/elv/page30591.html>

10. Impact

10.1 The impact on business, charities or voluntary bodies is estimated to be of minimal cost. This is because the two sets of Regulations are principally concerned with making technical changes that are already common across Europe and simplifying certain reporting requirements.

10.2 The impact on the public sector is estimated to be a small annual saving of £7,000 because the Regulations now give effect to future changes to a technical annex of the Directive meaning that no time will need to be spent amending UK legislation when these changes are made.

10.3 Impact Assessments for both sets of regulation are attached to this memorandum.

11. Regulating small business

11.1 The legislation applies to small business.

11.2 To minimise the impact of the requirements on firms employing up to 20 people, the approach taken is to allow all obligated parties an additional 3 months to

report on their previous year's re-use recycling and recovery performance and to alter the requirement relating to who is able to sign this report.

11.3 The basis for the final decision on what action to take to assist small business is to minimise the burden of the reporting obligations as far as possible whilst still allowing the UK to report to the Commission on its performance. BIS has an enforcement role in respect of the 2005 Regulations and is in regular contact with treatment facilities (the majority of which employ less than 20 people) enabling the Department to gain a full understanding of the effects of this legislation on such businesses.

11.4 The terms of the Directive mean that the vehicle design standards apply to all vehicle producers. However, the UK approach is to take into account the potential burden on producers during negotiations and then apply a flexible and helpful enforcement approach, assisting all producers with advice on how best to meet the requirements.

12. Monitoring & review

12.1 The Vehicle Certification Agency (VCA) enforces the technical requirements that restrict the use of heavy metals in new vehicles. BIS officials participate in EU Technical Adaptation Committee meetings where the periodic reviews of these requirements are discussed between member States. The Environment Agency for England and Wales, Northern Ireland Environment Agency and Scottish Environment Protection Agency monitor and enforce the environmental standards at treatment facilities. Vehicle manufacturers' producer responsibility requirements are enforced by BIS who monitor the effectiveness of the producers' networks and the performance of all treatment facilities with regard recycling/recovery targets.

13. Contact

Peter Cottrell at the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills - Tel: 020 7215 1330 or email: peter.cottrell@bis.gsi.gov.uk can answer any queries regarding the instrument.

Scrutiny History

1. The Department for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform has previously submitted Explanatory Memoranda on the ELV Directive.
2. EM 11034/97 on a Proposal for a Council Directive on End of Life Vehicles was submitted on 28 October 1997; the House of Commons European Scrutiny Committee considered it to be politically important (Report 9, item 18434, Session 98/99), and the House of Lords Select Committee on the European Communities referred it to Sub Committee C (Progress of Scrutiny 18 December 1998, Session 98/99). A Supplementary EM 11034/97 was submitted on 11 December 1998; the House of Commons European Scrutiny Committee considered it politically important for debate (Report 11, item 18434, session 98/99). The House of Lords Select Committee on the European Communities referred it to Sub Committee C, (Progress of Scrutiny 19 February 1999) and cleared it after further correspondence with the Minister (Progress of Scrutiny, 5/3/99, Session 98/99). The proposal was debated by the European Standing Committee C on 9 March 1999, when the Committee agreed the Government motion.
3. A further EM (8000/99) on an amended Proposal for a Council Directive on ELVs was submitted by the DTI on 24th May 1999 and a supplementary EM on 21 June 1999. The Commons European Scrutiny Committee considered them politically important and cleared them (Report 11, Item 20117, Session 99/00). The Lords Select Committee on the European Union cleared them by letter to the Minister (Progress of Scrutiny, 25th June 1999, Session 98/99).
4. The DTI wrote to both Committees on 29th February 2000 to inform them of the 33 amendments to the Common Position text that had been passed by the European Parliament's Plenary Session on 3 February 2000. The letter explained that there was strong opposition to many of the amendments from a number of member States and that conciliation was likely to begin in March 2000. The Commons European Scrutiny Committee considered it politically important but cleared (Report 11, Session 99/00).
5. The Department then submitted an EM (7214/00) on 17 April 2000 relating to an Opinion of the Commission on the European Parliament's amendments to the Council's Common Position regarding a proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and the Council on End of Life Vehicles. The Commons European Scrutiny Committee considered it not legally or politically important, and cleared (Report 18, Session 03/04). The Lords Select Committee on the EU did not report on it (Progress of Scrutiny, 21 April 2000, Session 99/00).
6. EM 7532/04 was submitted by the Department of Trade and Industry on 29th April 2004 on a Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the type approval of motor vehicles with regard to their re-usability, recyclability and recoverability, and amending Council Directive 70/156/EEC. The House of Commons European Scrutiny Committee considered it politically important and cleared it by letter to the Minister on 23rd May 2005 (Report1, Item 25471, Session

05/06). The Lords Select Committee on the European Union cleared it by letter to the Minister dated 13 June 2005 (Progress of Scrutiny, 27th June 2005, Session 05/06). EM 10894/05 was submitted by the Department of Trade and Industry on 3rd October 2005 on a Council Decision to amend Annex II to the ELV Directive to take into account scientific and technical progress since the Directive was agreed.

7. EM 5249/07 was submitted by the Department for Trade and Industry on 2 February 2007 on a Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Directive 2000/53/EC on end of life Vehicles, as regards the implementing powers conferred to the Commission. The House of Commons European Scrutiny Committee considered it politically and legally important and cleared it (Report 15, Session 06/07). The Lords Select Committee on the European Union did not report on it (Progress of Scrutiny, 16 March 2007, Session 06/07).

8. EM 5413/07 + ADD 1.2 was submitted by the Department of Trade and Industry on 13 February 2007 on a Commission report to the Council and the European Parliament concerning the Directive's 2015 recovery target. The House of Commons European Scrutiny Committee considered it not legally or politically important and cleared it (Report 11, Session 06-07). The Lords Select Committee on the European Union referred it to Sub-Committee B (Progress of Scrutiny, 30 October 2007, Session 06-07) and cleared it at their meeting of 2nd March 2009.

9. EM 14087/07 was submitted by the Department for Business Enterprise and Regulatory Reform on 9th November 2007 on a report from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on the implementation of Directive 2000/53/EC on End of Life Vehicles for the period 2002-2005. The Commons European Scrutiny Committee cleared it (Report 2 Session 07/08) The Lords Select Committee on the EU cleared it (P.O.S. 23 November 2007 Session 07/08).

10. EM 16459/09 was submitted by the Department for Business Enterprise and Regulatory Reform on 7th December 2009 on a report from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on the implementation of Directive 2000/53/EC on End of Life Vehicles for the period 2005-2008. The House of Commons European Scrutiny Committee considered it not legally or politically important and cleared it (Report 4, Session 09/10). The Lords Select Committee on the European Union cleared it (P.O.S. 15 December 2009 Session 09/10).

Summary: Intervention & Options

Department /Agency:	Title: Impact Assessment of ELV Amending Regulations 2010 amending ELV Regulations 2005	
Stage: Final	Version: 1	Date:
Related Publications: End of Live Vehicles 2005 Regulatory Impact Assessment		

Available to view or download at:

<http://www.>

Contact for enquiries: Peter Cottrell

Telephone: 020 7215 1330

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

The UK's End-of Life Vehicle (ELV) Regulations 2005 transpose certain elements of the ELV Directive in the UK. The ELV Directive aims to reduce the environmental impact of certain types of vehicles placed on the European market by requiring the controlled de-pollution of ELVs and increased recycling/recovery of de-polluted ELVs. It also places a number of restrictions on the use of certain heavy metals in new vehicles and components to reduce the risk of harm from the use of such heavy metals. The rationale for the ELV Directive is to correct negative externalities resulting from new vehicles and ELVs.

What are the policy objectives and the intended effects?

The policy objectives are to up-date and simplify the UK's 2005 ELV Regulations in line with the reporting requirements of the ELV Directive with respect to the treatment and recovery and recycling of ELVs.

The Amendment Regulations provide for three main changes to the 2005 ELV Regulations. These changes and their implications in terms of costs, benefits and risks are detailed on page 3 of the Impact Assessment.

What policy options have been considered? Please justify any preferred option.

The Regulations need to be up-dated to reflect the reporting requirements inherent in the ELV Directive to ensure the UK achieves and maintains the recovery and recycling targets for ELVs. This is the preferred option that is being taken forward incorporating amendments made necessary because of developments at EU level. It provides a simple method for obligated parties to meet existing requirements and extends the time available for them to do so.

It is compared with a 'do nothing' option, which serves as a baseline against which to measure the impact of the preferred option.

When will the policy be reviewed to establish the actual costs and benefits and the achievement of the desired effects? UK policy in relation to ELVs is continually monitored and reviewed by BIS with particular help from its ELV Consultation Group, other Government Departments, the Driver and Vehicle Licensing Agency, the Vehicle Certification Agency, and the Environment Agencies.

Ministerial Sign-off For final proposal/implementation 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:

Ian Lucas

.....Date: 29 March 2010

Summary: Analysis & Evidence

Policy Option: Amend ELV Regulations

Description: Up-date Regulations to reflect ELV Directive, and make some minor administrative and other changes.

COSTS	ANNUAL COSTS		Description and scale of key monetised costs by 'main affected groups' No measurable additional costs are expected for vehicle producers or Authorised Treatment Facilities (ATFs) over and above those estimated in the Regulatory Impact Assessment for the 2005 Regulations.	
	One-off (Transition)	Yrs		
	£ 0			
	Average Annual Cost (excluding one-off)			
	£ 0		Total Cost (PV)	£ 0
Other key non-monetised costs by 'main affected groups' While the vast majority of obligated vehicle producers and ATFs are already using the standard reporting form, those that are not might need some one-off familiarisation time and might incur minor additional ongoing costs where the format is different from that previously used.				

BENEFITS	ANNUAL BENEFITS		Description and scale of key monetised benefits by 'main affected groups' None	
	One-off	Yrs		
	£ 0			
	Average Annual Benefit (excluding one-off)			
	£ 0		Total Benefit (PV)	£ 0
Other key non-monetised benefits by 'main affected groups' Obligated vehicle producers and ATFs benefit in management time by having 3 additional months to report re-use/recovery performance. The standard reporting form means they are less likely to have their returns queried by BIS officials, leading to potential time savings for both stakeholders and officials.				

Key Assumptions/Sensitivities/Risks Effective compliance of the new requirements of the regulation by stakeholders.

Price Base Year 2009	Time Period Years 10	Net Benefit Range (NPV) £ 0	NET BENEFIT (NPV Best estimate) £ 0
-------------------------	-------------------------	--	--

What is the geographic coverage of the policy/option?		UK		
On what date will the policy be implemented?		2010		
Which organisation(s) will enforce the policy?		BIS		
What is the total annual cost of enforcement for these organisations?		£ 0 - None additional		
Does enforcement comply with Hampton principles?		Yes		
Will implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?		No		
What is the value of the proposed offsetting measure per year?		£ 0		
What is the value of changes in greenhouse gas emissions?		£ 0		
Will the proposal have a significant impact on competition?		No		
Annual cost (£-£) per organisation (excluding one-off)	Micro 0	Small 0	Medium 0	Large 0
Are any of these organisations exempt?	No	No	N/A	N/A

Impact on Admin Burdens Baseline (2005 Prices)		(Increase - Decrease)	
Increase of £ 0	Decrease of £ 0	Net Impact	£ 0

Key:

Annual costs and benefits: Constant Prices

(Net) Present Value

[Use this space (with a recommended maximum of 30 pages) to set out the evidence, analysis and detailed narrative from which you have generated your policy options or proposal. Ensure that the information is organised in such a way as to explain clearly the summary information on the preceding pages of this form.]

Strategic Overview, Issue and Objectives

1. The UK's End-of Life Vehicles (ELV) Regulations of 2005 (along with the UK's ELV Regulations 2003) transpose the European End-of Life Vehicle (ELV) Directive in the UK. The ELV Directive is European environmental legislation which aims to reduce the environmental impact of certain vehicles when they are produced as new vehicles, and when they reach the end-of their life and are subsequently discarded by their owners.

2. To this end the ELV Directive places certain restrictions on the use of certain heavy metals in the production of certain new vehicles (i.e. Category M1 and N1 vehicles). The Directive also requires the proper de-pollution of vehicles at the end-of their life and requires the recycling and recovery of ELVs to certain levels (currently this is set at 85 per cent overall recovery by weight of ELVs).

3. The UK's 2005 ELV Regulations completed transposition of the ELV Directive into UK, following the introduction of the 2003 ELV Regulations. The 2005 Regulations introduced the following main provisions of the ELV Directive in the UK: the entitlement to the free take-back of ELVs for their last holders/owners; the establishment of an adequate network of take-back points by vehicle manufacturers for last holders/owners of ELVs; requirements on those accepting ELVs from last holders to achieve certain recovery and recycling targets of ELVs.

4. The ELV Amending Regulations to which this IA relates update the UK's ELV Regulations of 2005 to ensure that the reporting requirements of the ELV Directive are achieved and maintained in the UK and to provide simplified arrangements for obligated parties to use to enable them to meet existing reporting requirements.

Options, Analysis and Risks

5. The UK is required to maintain its own domestic ELV Regulations so as they are in line with the text (and any revisions to this text) of the ELV Directive. The ELV Directive requires member States to report on the achievement of the recycling and recovery targets of the Directive. This is currently 85 per cent recovery, of which 80 per cent needs to be recycling, for the ELVs covered by the Directive, i.e. M1 and N1 vehicles (these being passenger cars and light goods vehicles).

6. The Amendment Regulations which amend the 2005 ELV Regulations provide for three main changes to the Regulations. These changes and their implications in terms of costs, benefits and risks are discussed in turn below.

(i) Regulation 2(4)

7. This Regulation deals with the way in which obligated parties (both vehicle producers and individual Authorised Treatment Facilities) are required to report their annual performance against numerical re-use/recovery targets for the ELVs that they treat. The new requirement will be for parties to complete a straightforward form to show the calculations that will have been necessary in order to arrive at the final figure. A form of this type has already been provided by BIS to all obligated parties for them to use on a voluntary basis and the vast majority of them use it and find it a helpful aid to carrying out the necessary calculation. Additionally, this information will assist BIS in providing the Commission with the full details necessary to meet the requirements for member States reporting. At the time the original legislation was drafted, the detailed rules on reporting had not been agreed in Europe. Furthermore, the existing obligation is for parties to report by 1 April for the preceding year's performance. The new requirement will move this date to 1 July each year. This amendment provides a benefit for stakeholders, especially small businesses that do not have staff dedicated to administrative tasks.

(ii) Regulation 2(6)

8. This Regulation sets a date by which obligated parties who attain the targets for re-use, recovery and recycling need to send in their certificate of compliance to BIS. The existing obligation is for parties to do so by 1 April for the preceding year's performance. The new requirement will move this date to 1 July each year, in line with the new date in Regulation 2(4) above. This amendment provides a benefit for stakeholders, especially small businesses that do not have staff dedicated to administrative tasks.

(iii) Regulation 2(7)

9. This Regulation deals with the status of the person or persons that have authority to sign the aforementioned certificate of compliance. The new regulation neither tightens nor relaxes the requirements, but merely clarifies the way it is set out in law.

“Do nothing” Option

10. Not amending the existing Regulations to obligate parties to complete a form reporting their annual re-use/recovery performance would hinder the UK in meeting its own obligation to report its overall performance to the European Commission, and in the worst case scenario, could lead to infringement proceedings against the UK.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. The Regulations that amend the 2005 End of Life Vehicle (Producer Responsibility) Regulations are not expected to have any measurable additional impact on the current costs and benefits of the 2005 Regulations. Savings are minimal and are not quantified. Simplification aspects are the new reporting format that provides obligated parties (around 40

vehicle producers and 1,700 ATFs) with a helpful method of meeting an existing obligation and a further amendment that allows additional time for them to report.

12. There will be a saving in Government administrative resources because of the standardisation in the information received and because it will now be tailored to enable the UK more easily to report performance to the European Commission.

Specific Impact Tests: Checklist

Use the table below to demonstrate how broadly you have considered the potential impacts of your policy options.

Ensure that the results of any tests that impact on the cost-benefit analysis are contained within the main evidence base; other results may be annexed.

Type of testing undertaken	<i>Results in Evidence Base?</i>	<i>Results annexed?</i>
Competition Assessment	No	Yes
Small Firms Impact Test	No	Yes
Legal Aid	No	Yes
Sustainable Development	No	Yes
Carbon Assessment	No	Yes
Other Environment	No	Yes
Health Impact Assessment	No	Yes
Race Equality	No	Yes
Disability Equality	No	Yes
Gender Equality	No	Yes
Human Rights	No	Yes
Rural Proofing	No	Yes

Annexes

SPECIFIC IMPACT TESTS

Competition Assessment

The Amending Regulations are not expected to have any significant impact on competition in the UK.

Small Firms Impact Test

The Amending Regulations are expected to have some small time saving benefits for small firms because of the introduction of the reporting table which gives a simple method for reporting re-use/recycling performance, and because of the additional time allowed to do this.

Legal Aid

The Amending Regulations are not expected to have any material effect on the criminal or civil liability of those who it affects, and so should not have any impact on legal aid in the UK.

Sustainable Development/Other Environment

The Amending Regulations are not expected to have any significant impact on sustainable development.

Carbon Impact Assessment

The Amending Regulations are not expected to have any significant carbon impact.

Health Impact Assessment

The Amending Regulations are not expected to have any significant health impacts.

Race, Disability and Gender Impact Assessments

After initial screening as to the potential impact of this regulation on race, disability and gender equality it has been decided that there will not be a major impact upon minority groups in terms of numbers affected or the seriousness of the likely impact, or both.

Human Rights

The Amending Regulations are not expected to impact on the rights and freedoms of individuals as set out in the Human Rights Act 1998.

Rural Proofing

The Amending Regulations are not expected to have significant impacts on rural areas or circumstances.

