
AGENCY SURVEY RESPONSES

Section 1: Perceptions of RIA

Question	Number of responses						
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do not know	No response
Q2. Overall, the RIA process has been effective in:							
...improving quality of regulation	2	22	21	10	4	0	1
...reducing unnecessary impacts	1	22	22	10	5	0	0
Q3. The formal framework provided by RIA:							
...has led to a more thorough analysis of the nature of the problem than would otherwise have occurred	8	22	8	18	4	0	0
...helps ensure that government intervention is justified	2	24	13	19	2	0	0
...has led to a more systematic consideration of costs and benefits than would otherwise have occurred	10	24	11	10	4	1	0
...has led to consideration of a broader range of options than would otherwise have occurred	2	20	15	16	5	1	1
...is sufficiently flexible for most policy proposals	1	23	14	14	7	1	0
Q4(a) RIA written guidance material, developed for your jurisdiction, is:							
clear	4	33	11	7	5	0	0
concise	4	32	7	14	3	0	0
comprehensive	2	33	10	13	2	0	0
up to date	2	36	11	8	2	0	1
easily accessible (such as available on the internet)	13	36	7	2	2	0	0
(b) RIA written guidance material provides enough information to undertake the RIA process	4	28	12	12	3	0	1
(c) The regulatory oversight body is helpful in improving the quality of draft RISs (or equivalent)	10	24	13	4	6	3	0
(d) The regulatory oversight body is timely in its provision of advice and/or assessment	10	31	8	4	5	1	1

(Continued next page)

Section 1: Perceptions of RIA (cont)

Question	Number of responses						
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do not know	No response
Q5							
(a) Resources used in the RIA process are proportional to the likely impacts of the regulatory proposal	1	14	11	25	7	2	0
(b) RIA merely replaces policy development processes that would otherwise be undertaken	1	22	11	24	1	1	0
(c) The effect of the proposed regulatory options on national markets is considered during the RIA process	1	25	16	11	2	5	0
(d) Following a COAG RIS, a jurisdiction-specific analysis is often undertaken to have an understanding of the jurisdictional impacts	1	10	10	6	3	30	0
(e) The sanctions for non-compliance with RIA requirements are strong enough to encourage compliance	8	28	13	5	2	4	0
Q6. The RIA process is, or could be, more efficient and effective when:							
...a regulatory oversight body assesses the adequacy of RISs*	6	29	14	6	1	4	0
...the regulatory oversight body has statutory independence	5	22	18	9	1	5	0
...the decisions of the regulatory oversight body are subject to periodic auditing by an independent third party	7	31	11	2	1	8	0
...ministers are accountable for ensuring RIA compliance (e.g. by certifying that individual RISs* meet jurisdiction requirements)	3	22	13	14	2	6	0
...agency heads are accountable for ensuring RIA compliance (e.g. by certifying that individual RISs* meet jurisdiction requirements)	3	36	11	5	1	4	0
...the responsible minister is required to provide reasons for proposing regulations that are inconsistent with RIA principles	8	34	11	1	1	5	0
...the draft RIS* is published as a consultation document	8	24	15	8	2	3	0
...stakeholders can provide comments on draft legislation or regulation after RIA consultation	6	33	12	7	0	2	0

*or equivalent document(s) that may be referred to by another name in your jurisdiction

(Continued next page)

Section 1: Perceptions of RIA (cont)

Question	Number of responses						
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Do not know	No response
Q6. (cont) The RIA process is, or could be, more efficient and effective when:							
...the final RIS* is published	11	29	13	4	0	3	0
...compliance with RIA requirements for individual proposals is made public	6	27	18	6	0	3	0
...the reasons for the oversight body's assessment of a RIS* as adequate/inadequate are publicly reported	5	24	15	9	3	4	0
...the final RIS*, the adequacy assessment and the reasoning for the assessment are published at the time of the regulatory announcement	2	31	16	5	2	4	0
Q7. Sunsetting of regulation:							
...makes a substantial contribution to improving regulatory quality	3	12	21	14	2	6	2
...requires too much investment of resources for the benefits achieved	5	20	13	12	1	7	2
...is likely to yield greater benefits where related subordinate and primary legislation are reviewed as a package	5	32	11	3	0	7	2

*or equivalent document(s) that may be referred to by another name in your jurisdiction

Section 2: Influence on decision making/outcomes

Question	Number of responses
Q8(a) Has the RIA process in your agency been effective in influencing regulatory decisions and/or the quality of regulation in the following ways? <i>(respondents were able to select multiple answers)</i>	
...by improving decision maker understanding of impacts	32
...by building stakeholder awareness and support for the decision made	25
...through oversight body involvement which improved information available to decision makers	14
...deciding not to proceed with a regulatory action because the RIA demonstrated either the status quo or a non-regulatory option was preferable	10
...influencing the design of a regulation by demonstrating that a particular option was more effective or efficient	16
...other	10
no answers selected	16
Q8(b) Please provide specific examples of such changes to decisions or outcomes that can be attributed to RIA.	27
Q9. In your agency, approximately what percentage of regulatory proposals were modified in a significant way or withdrawn (such as those described above) because of RIA processes?	
less than 10 per cent	49
10 to 30 per cent	2
31 to 50 per cent	1
greater than 50 per cent	1
no response	7
Q10. How could the RIA process be changed to improve regulatory decision making and/or regulatory outcomes?	38

Section 3: Integrating RIA into policy development

Question	Number of responses
Q11. Do you have a centralised unit within your agency that assists in undertaking the RIA process?	
yes	29
no	29
no response	2
Q12. In general, at what stage of the RIA process do you first engage with your regulatory oversight body?	
start of policy development	23
before regulatory proposal determined	8
after regulatory proposal determined	14
after a draft RIS has been prepared	4
other	9
no response	2
Q13. What are the main barriers to using RIA processes to better inform policy development in your agency? (<i>respondents were able to select multiple answers</i>)	
no barriers	4
policy is already decided by minister	35
lack of support from minister	6
minister needs to respond quickly	21
lack of support from senior management	8
RIA process is not flexible	26
RIA process is administratively burdensome	33
RIA process is viewed as irrelevant	14
lack of in-house skills	18
lack of data to undertake cost-benefit analysis	37
other barriers	11
no response	4
Q14. How could the RIA process be modified to ensure the requirements are still met when there are pressing timeframes?	36

Section 4: Consultants and RIA

Question	Number of responses
Q15. Have you used consultants for any aspect of the RIA process?	
yes	23
no	36
no response	1
Q16. Why have consultants been employed in the RIA process? <i>(this question was only available to respondents who had selected 'yes' for Q15. Respondents were able to select multiple answers)</i>	
lack of in-house skills in cost benefit analysis	17
lack of in-house skills in other areas	7
time constraints	15
technical complexity of regulatory area	10
cost effectiveness	4
improve public perception of objectivity	11
transfer knowledge to agency staff	2
to improve the quality of the RIS (or equivalent)	11
other	3
no response	0
Q17. For what part of the RIA process did you use consultants? <i>(this question was only available to respondents who had selected 'yes' for Q15. Respondents were able to select multiple answers)</i>	
to determine if a RIS was needed	1
development of regulatory and non-regulatory options	4
public consultation	4
cost-benefit analysis	18
preparation of the complete RIS document	13
entire RIA process	4
other	1
no response	0

Section 5: RIA activity and costs

<i>Question</i>	<i>Aggregated number undertaken</i>	
	<i>July 2010 to June 2011 (12 months)</i>	<i>July to December 2011 (6 months)</i>
Q18. How many of the following has your agency undertaken in each of the time periods specified?		
preliminary impact statements (where relevant)	354	237
formal applications for exemptions	122	118
RISs*	92	60
RISs* undertaken by other agencies (e.g. COAG RISs) where you have provided significant input	15	7
RISs* prepared after the regulation is implemented (e.g post implementation reviews)	7	2
<i>Question</i>	<i>Number of responses</i>	
Q19. In the 2010-11 financial year, what do you estimate was the cost of the RIA process to your agency above 'business as usual' costs?	35	
Q20. Approximately, what percentage of RIA costs (if any) do the following functions account for. (available options: consultation with stakeholders; preparation of preliminary impact assessments (or equivalent); preparation of RISs (or equivalent); staff training; quality control and internal coordination; other)	36	
Q21. Approximately, what percentage of RIA costs do the following account for. (available options: internal staff costs (including overheads); external consultants)	41	
Q22. Please state reasons (if any) why cost data for 2010-11 is likely to be atypical.	19	
Q23. If available, please provide information on the costs incurred by your agency for a particular RIS (or equivalent) undertaken in recent years. And, if possible, indicate how this compares with typical RIS costs	15	
Q24. How could the RIA process be made more cost effective for your agency?	28	
Q25. Please outline internal processes (if any) that your agency has which are similar to RIA requirements or which enhance the policy development process but are not formally included in the RIA process.	29	

*or equivalent document(s) that may be referred to by another name in your jurisdiction