|  | OPINION |
| :---: | :---: |
| Impact Assessment (IA) | Amendment to healthcare regulatory bodies legislation to require registrants to hold professional liability cover as a condition of registration |
| Lead Department/Agency | Department for Health |
| Stage | Consultation |
| Origin | European |
| IA Number | 8037 |
| Date submitted to RPC | 15/01/2013 |
| RPC Opinion date and reference | 11/02//2013 |
| Overall Assessment | AMBER |
| The IA is fit for purpose. The IA provides a clear discussion of the relative merits of the options and the impact on business of the preferred option. However, the IA should explain how the proposed measure does not go beyond the minimum requirements of the EU directive. |  |
| Identification of costs and benefit third sector organisations, individ these in the choice of options <br> Cost and Benefits. The IA says that " to total costs (discounted) of $£ 8.6 \mathrm{~m}$ been made that the overall costs will giving a net present value of zero." justification for making this statement this assumption. <br> The IA would also benefit from a section costs and benefits including the add 70). | d the impacts on small firms, public and and community groups and reflection of <br> timated annual cost of $£ 1$ million will equate ten years. However, the assumption has balanced by benefits received by patients, graph 94). While the IA does give some nsultation responses should be used to test <br> providing a breakdown of the expected costs in monitoring compliance (paragraph |
| Have the necessary burden reduc identified and are they robust? <br> The IA says that the proposal is of Eur One-out. However, the IA should inc measure does not go beyond the minir | required by One-in, One-out been <br> ean origin, and it is out of scope of 'One-in, an explanation detailing how the proposed m requirements of the EU directive. |
| Signed | Michael Gibbons, Chairman |

