

Title: The Bathing Water Regulations 2013 (S.I. No. 1675) PIR No: 2013/1675 Original IA/RPC No: DEFRA1223 Lead department or agency: Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Contact for enquiries: Tracy Westell	Post Implementation Review
	Date: 31/08/2018
	Type of regulation: Domestic
	Type of review: Statutory
	Date measure came into force: 31/07/2013
	Recommendation: Keep
	RPC Opinion: Not applicable

1. What were the policy objectives of the measure?

The policy objectives were to ensure that the required information, including symbols indicating the quality of the bathing water, is provided at all bathing waters in England to enable bathers to make an informed decision about the water quality, and that this is done in the most cost effective manner (by local authorities).

2. What evidence has informed the PIR?

An annual signage audit is undertaken by the Environment Agency, checking the correct information is available on the signs. A telephone/e-mail questionnaire (see Annex 1) was also undertaken for this PIR by 18 stakeholders, including local authorities, private beach owners, NGOs, tourism organisation and the water industry, to seek their views. The local authorities and private beach owners interviewed covered in total 172 bathing waters in England.

3. To what extent have the policy objectives been achieved?

The EA's signage audit for the 2017 bathing season showed out of 413 bathing waters, 242 had signs displaying the required information, 126 didn't have the correct information and 45 had no bathing water signage. This year, the EA introduced a signage generator to help improve compliance. The 2018 audit shows 320 bathing waters displaying the required information, 96 have incomplete signage and only 6 appear to have no relevant signage. The classification symbols are considered clear and easy to understand.

Sign-off for Post Implementation Review: Chief economist/Head of Analysis and Minister

I have read the PIR and I am satisfied that it represents a fair and proportionate assessment of the impact of the measure.

T. Coffey

Signed:

Date: 26/11/2018

4. What were the original assumptions?

The changes would address the risk of non-compliance by transferring the burden to provide signage to local authorities. There was a small risk that local authorities would be unwilling to take on responsibility for the provision of information at privately owned bathing waters and a possible unwillingness of some private owners to allow local authorities to erect signs on their property. It was also assumed that local authority staff costs were the same.

5. Were there any unintended consequences?

For some local authorities with bathing waters covered by the Short Term Pollution system additional time, and therefore cost, is involved in travelling to beaches to put up daily notices when pollution is predicted. Some private beach owners are also spending extra time putting up pollution warning notices, though this is not a requirement of the Regulations and is something they are choosing to do.

6. Has the evidence identified any opportunities for reducing the burden on business?

There is no burden to business or the voluntary sector.

7. For EU measures, how does the UK's implementation compare with that in other EU member states in terms of costs to business?

We do not have information on this aspect as none of the Member States (MS) have carried out a review of the implementation of the Bathing Water Directive 2006/7/EC in their country. The Commission will be undertaking a full review of implementation across the EU by 2020.