



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

127744/EU XXVII.GP
Eingelangt am 20/01/23

Brussels, 18.3.2022
SEC(2023) 38 final

REGULATORY SCRUTINY BOARD OPINION

Proposal for a

REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL

on European statistics on population and housing, amending Regulation (EC) No 862/2007 and repealing Regulations (EC) No 763/2008 and (EU) No 1260/2013

{COM(2023) 31 final }

{SWD(2023) 11 final,
SWD(2023) 12 final,
SWD(2023) 13 final,
SWD(2023) 14 final,
SWD(2023) 15 final}



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
Regulatory Scrutiny Board

Brussels,
RSB

Opinion

Title: Impact assessment / European statistics on population

Overall opinion: POSITIVE WITH RESERVATIONS

(A) Policy context

Eurostat, the statistical office of the EU, ensures the production of high quality, comparable European statistics. The main objective of European statistics is to serve EU policy design, implementation and monitoring, and their main users are EU institutions. European statistics on population represent official European statistics on population, demographic events and migration, the statistics from the population and housing censuses, and the various indicators based on these statistics.

EU institutions need complete, timely, reliable, detailed, harmonised and comparable European statistics on population. The general goal of this initiative is to respond better to users' needs, and to modernise and enhance the relevance, efficiency and coherence of European population statistics.

(B) Summary of findings

The Board notes the additional information provided in advance of the meeting and commitments to make changes to the report.

However, the report still contains significant shortcomings. The Board gives a positive opinion with reservations because it expects the DG to rectify the following aspects:

- (1) The report is not sufficiently clear on the impacts on stakeholders. It does not show which Member States will be particularly affected by the proposed changes and how.**
- (2) The report does not present clearly enough the benefits and costs of the options. The comparison of the options in terms of effectiveness, efficiency and coherence is not robust enough.**
- (3) The choice of the preferred option is not adequately justified in terms of overall performance, proportionality and respect of the subsidiarity principle.**
- (4) The report does not reflect sufficiently the views of the different groups of stakeholders.**

This opinion concerns a draft impact assessment which may differ from the final version.

Commission européenne, B-1049 Bruxelles - Belgium. Office: BERL 08/010. E-mail: regulatory-scrutiny-board@ec.europa.eu

(C) What to improve

(1) The report should explain in detail the scope of the initiative and the scale of the problems, which should include a clearer narrative on the overall importance of population statistics. The problem definition should include issues associated with the burden faced by data providers such as National Statistical Institutes. The report should analyse in greater detail the administrative cost implications of the different methods used by Member States for the collection of data, in particular primary data collection versus extraction from administrative sources. It should improve the analysis of simplification potential.

(2) The baseline scenario should not be presented as a policy option and it should provide more information on the on-going activities of Member States to modernise their national statistical systems. The policy options should be assessed and compared against this dynamic baseline.

(3) The report should better explain the potential impacts of the options on Member States and whether the implementation will potentially be more problematic or costly for some of them. It should make sure that the analysis covers all relevant stakeholders and is clear on how different stakeholder types are impacted. This should include a clarification of the assessment of costs to businesses in the 'one in one out' approach. The report should also present the risks and uncertainties associated with the impacts of each option.

(4) The report should better explain the scoring methodology applied for the multi-criteria analysis and how the different performance levels and particular scores of each of the options were conceived. It should not only present the findings in a tabular form, but also provide more comprehensive explanation on the reasons and supporting evidence behind the particular scoring of options and measures. It should reflect whether the comparative assessment methodology used is the best way to bring out the differences between the options in terms of costs and benefits for decision-making.

(5) The report should better compare the options in terms of their effectiveness, efficiency and coherence dimension. It should fold the assessment of wider impacts into the effectiveness analysis. It should better justify the choice of the preferred option in terms of the available supporting evidence on the overall performance, proportionality and respect of the subsidiarity principle (in particular with respect to requiring interoperable national statistical population registers). It should also clarify against which benchmark the success of the initiative will be evaluated and within which period.

(6) The report should bring out more clearly the different views of stakeholders (including national statistical offices). It should systematically integrate their views and level of support on the need to act, policy options and measures as well implementation requirements.

The Board notes the estimated costs and benefits of the preferred option(s) in this initiative, as summarised in the attached quantification tables.

Some more technical comments have been sent directly to the author DG.

(D) Conclusion

The DG may proceed with the initiative.

The DG must revise the report in accordance with the Board's findings before launching the interservice consultation.

If there are any changes in the choice or design of the preferred option in the final version of the report, the DG may need to further adjust the attached quantification tables to reflect this.

Full title	Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on European statistics on population
Reference number	PLAN/2021/10584
Submitted to RSB on	16 February 2022
Date of RSB meeting	16 March 2022

ANNEX: Quantification tables extracted from the draft impact assessment report

The following tables contain information on the costs and benefits of the initiative on which the Board has given its opinion, as presented above.

If the draft report has been revised in line with the Board's recommendations, the content of these tables may be different from those in the final version of the impact assessment report, as published by the Commission.

I. Overview of Benefits (total for all provisions) – Preferred Option		
<i>Description</i>	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Direct benefits		
Better information on own local/regional environment	Not quantified	People (citizens and migrants)
Reduced response burden	Not quantified	
Better EU level timeliness and completeness of statistics across all Member States	Not quantified	EU level institutional users
Better EU level comparability and coherence of statistics across all Member States	Not quantified	
More accurate and comparable total population counts for Council voting	Not quantified	
Improved inputs to demographic change monitoring and projecting the long-term budget sustainability in relation to population ageing	Not quantified	
Better data evidence for monitoring and policy-making	Not quantified	
Better comparability with other Member States and EU regions	Not quantified	Other institutional users (national and sub-national levels)
Better data evidence (through grids) for policy-making in border regions and local crisis response	Not quantified	
Better research/analysis incl. improved comparability across the EU	Not quantified	Other professional users
Reduced administrative burden (through ability to find all needed statistics on Eurostat website)	Not quantified	
Economic benefits from better European statistics available	Not quantified	
Improved comparability of statistics with other Member States	Not quantified	Statistics producers (NSIs)
Improved accuracy and coverage of statistics due to interoperability with other Member States	Not quantified	
Reduced administrative burden (through simplified statistics transmission processes)	Not quantified	
Reduced administrative burden (through integrated statistics production process)	e.g. up to EUR 575m per EU census round	
Reduced administrative burden (through improved use of administrative and/or other data sources)	Not quantified	
Reduced administrative burden (relating to regulatory changes to adapt to evolving policy needs)	Not quantified	
Reduced administrative burden through streamlined	Not quantified	Administrative data providers

data exchange with NSIs		Eurostat
Increased value added from own data through improved reuse	Not quantified	
Improved legal base of statistical cooperation through clear mandate	Not quantified	
Better data evidence for other European statistics (e.g. sample surveys, national accounts)	Not quantified	
Improved collaboration with ESS partners due to EU wide interoperability	Not quantified	
Reduced administrative burden (relating to regulatory changes to adapt to evolving policy needs)	Not quantified	
Reduced administrative burden (related to coordination/ quality assurance for voluntary data)	Not quantified	
Indirect benefits		
Benefits from improved policy-making	Not quantified	People
Reputational gains from improved policy-making and EU decision-making in general	Not quantified	EU level institutional users
Reputational gains from improved visibility and transparency in a European context	Not quantified	Other institutional users (national and sub-national levels)
Increased ability to meet legal requirements	Not quantified	Statistics producers (NSIs)
Increased staff skills	Not quantified	
Improvements in administrative registers thanks to closer collaboration with NSI	Not quantified	Administrative data providers
Reputational gains from improved reuse of administrative registers	Not quantified	
Advancement of Eurostat mission ‘to provide high quality statistics and data on Europe’	Not quantified	Eurostat
Improved collaboration with EU level policy users	Not quantified	
Reputational gains from enhanced international standing of European statistics free for all	Not quantified	

- (1) Estimates are gross values relative to the baseline for the preferred option as a whole (i.e. the impact of individual actions/obligations of the preferred option are aggregated together); (2) Please indicate which stakeholder group is the main recipient of the benefit in the comment section; (3) For reductions in regulatory costs, please describe details as to how the saving arises (e.g. reductions in adjustment costs, administrative costs, regulatory charges, enforcement costs, etc.); (4) Cost savings related to the 'one in, one out' approach are detailed in Tool #58 and #59 of the 'better regulation' toolbox. * if relevant

II. Overview of costs – Preferred option (in thousands of 2021 EUR)							
		Citizens/Consumers		Businesses		Administrations	
		One-off	Recurrent	One-off	Recurrent	One-off	Recurrent
Policy Option D.2	Direct adjustment costs	-	-	-	-	25,237 – 27,894	N/A
	Direct administrative costs	-	-	-	-	N/A	33,770 – 37,325
	IT costs	-	-	-	-	24,778 – 27,387	17,586 – 19,467

	Direct regulatory fees and charges	-	-	-	-	Not estimated	Not estimated
	Direct enforcement costs	-	-	-	-	N/A	73,699 – 81,430
	Indirect costs	-	-	-	-	Not estimated	Not estimated