

# Appendix A Australian Government Office of Regulation Review: report on compliance with national standard setting

This appendix contains the Commonwealth Office of Regulation Review's *Report to the National Competition Council on the setting of national standards and regulatory action: 1 April 2003 – 31 March 2004*. The Office of Regulation Review provided this report to the Council on 28 June 2004.

The Office of Regulation Review works closely with Ministerial councils and other standard-setting bodies, advising them on applying COAG principles and guidelines for setting standards and regulations. The office advises these bodies on the adequacy of their regulatory impact statements before they are circulated to affected parties, and again before the final standard-setting decisions are made. The office's involvement with the Ministerial councils and standard-setting bodies informs the preparation of its report to the Council.

Prior to providing its report to the Council, the office circulated a draft report to Ministerial councils and other national standard setting bodies for comment. The office also provided the draft report to state and territory competition policy units and regulatory review units, and to the New Zealand Government (New Zealand is represented on several of the Ministerial councils and standard setting bodies). This consultation process assists the final report's accuracy and its appraisal of the regulatory impact analysis process undertaken before a decision is made on each new national standard or regulation.

The Office of Regulation Review's report to the Council is discussed in chapter 5.

# 1 Background to the Office of Regulation Review's report

## The requirements of the Council of Australian Governments

In April 1995, the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) agreed to apply a nationally consistent assessment process to proposals of a regulatory nature considered by all Ministerial Councils and national standard-setting bodies (NSSBs). The agreed assessment process is set out in the COAG *Principles and Guidelines for National Standard Setting and Regulatory Action by Ministerial Councils and Standard-Setting Bodies* (COAG 1997 as amended). The major element of the assessment process is the preparation of Regulatory Impact Statements (RISs).

A RIS documents the policy development process and considers alternative approaches to resolve identified problems, and assesses the impacts of each option on different groups and on the community as a whole. A COAG RIS needs to be prepared for proposals having a national dimension which, when implemented by jurisdictions, would result in regulatory impacts. The first stage RIS is used as part of community consultation and the second or final RIS, reflecting feedback from the community, assists in the decision-making process. The objective of these COAG *Principles and Guidelines* is to improve the quality of regulation, including through the adoption of good consultation processes as regulation is developed.

## The role of the Office of Regulation Review

The Office of Regulation Review (ORR) advises decision makers on the application of the COAG *Principles and Guidelines* and monitors and reports on compliance with these requirements. This includes advising whether a RIS should be prepared and assessing RISs prepared for Ministerial Councils and NSSBs. The ORR assesses the RISs at two stages: before they are released for consultation and again prior to a decision being made. At each stage it advises the decision-making body of its assessment. The ORR's assessment considers:

- whether the Guidelines have been followed;
- whether the type and level of analysis is adequate and commensurate with the potential economic and social impact of the proposal; and
- whether alternatives to regulation have been adequately considered.

The ORR makes its assessment of the application of the COAG *Principles and Guidelines* independently of the views of any particular jurisdiction. Further, the ORR does not comment on the merits of regulatory proposals being put to decision-making bodies — its prime focus is on the regulatory best practice processes as detailed in the Guidelines.

COAG's *Agreement to Implement the National Competition Policy and Related Reforms* (COAG 1995) also requires the ORR to advise the National Competition Council (NCC) on compliance with the COAG *Principles and Guidelines*. The NCC takes this advice into account when considering its recommendations to the Australian Government Treasurer regarding conditions and amounts of competition payments from the Australian Government to the states and territories. This ORR report addresses this obligation for the period 1 April 2003 – 31 March 2004, and is the fourth such report by the ORR to the NCC.

## 2 The focus and scope of the ORR's report

In its reports to the NCC, the ORR excludes from the COAG RIS requirements a number of categories of regulatory decisions made by Ministerial Councils or national standard-setting bodies. The first category involves decisions which have a low significance in terms of the scope and magnitude of community impacts. For such minor or machinery regulations, the RIS process may not add significant additional value to the policy development process in a cost-effective manner. The second category comprises decisions that are more of an administrative than of a regulatory nature. These decisions are essentially about the application of existing regulatory frameworks without consideration of other regulatory options.

Further, where a meeting of Ministers or a national standard-setting body considers a report that merely 'brainstorms' a regulatory subject matter rather than seeks a specific regulatory decision, a COAG RIS is not required beforehand for consideration by Ministers.

In most of the remaining cases, there is general consensus between the ORR and the relevant decision makers on the types of regulatory decisions and agreements covered — and not covered — by the COAG *Principles and Guidelines*. Also, there is usually agreement regarding how the COAG RIS requirements should be applied. However, the application of the COAG requirements is not always clear cut. Some explanation of these complex areas, and their relevance to the ORR's report, is provided below.

## Scope of decisions covered by the COAG requirements

The COAG *Principles and Guidelines* cover regulatory decisions that:

*... would encourage or force businesses or individuals to pursue their interests in ways they would not otherwise have done ... . (COAG Principles and Guidelines, p.4)*

While noting that Ministerial Councils and national standard-setting bodies commonly reach agreement on the main elements of a regulatory approach or standards which are then given force in Australian jurisdictions through principal or subordinate legislation, COAG went further by defining regulation to include:

*... the broad range of legally enforceable instruments which impose mandatory requirements upon business and the community as well as those voluntary codes and advisory instruments ... for which there is a reasonable expectation of widespread compliance. (COAG Principles and Guidelines, p.4)*

As such, the scope of regulatory decisions covered by COAG's requirements is wide, and includes agreements on standards and measures of a quasi-regulatory nature — such as endorsement of industry codes of conduct — as well as on national regulatory approaches implemented by legislation.

## Decision-making groups covered by the COAG requirements

The COAG *Principles and Guidelines*:

*... apply to decisions of Ministerial Councils and inter-governmental standard-setting bodies, however they are constituted, and include bodies established statutorily or administratively by government to deal with national regulatory problems. (COAG Principles and Guidelines, p.4)*

While Councils of Ministers are usually standing bodies — and some are established by statute — there are from time to time ad hoc bodies of Australian Government, state and territory Ministers (and sometimes delegated senior officials) established to address and resolve regulatory issues considered to have a national dimension. These ad hoc bodies can be required to consider proposals that will result in significant regulatory impacts. (At any one time there are typically about 40 COAG decision-making forums.)

In view of COAG's broad definition of what constitutes an inter-governmental body for the purposes of the COAG requirements, the ORR advises such

bodies of the need to comply with the COAG Principles and Guidelines when reviewing and considering regulatory issues.

Further, from time to time COAG itself makes decisions dealing with national regulatory problems. While COAG is not considered to be bound by the COAG Principles and Guidelines, the ORR's advice has been that the responsibility for compliance with the COAG requirements rests with the body preparing or transmitting regulatory proposals for consideration by COAG.

## **Multi-stage decision making and the RIS requirements**

In some cases, a Ministerial Council or national standard setting body, in addressing a national regulatory problem, may make decisions in several sequential stages. This is more likely to occur for highly complex and significant regulatory issues. For example, a Ministerial Council may consider a range of regulatory options to deal with an identified problem. Having made an initial decision on whether and how it wishes to intervene, the Council or standard-setting body then separately considers implementation options.

This situation has led to concern that two or more RISs may be required, one for the key decision and follow-up RISs for the subsequent implementation decisions to accord with the COAG *Principles and Guidelines*. The ORR's approach in such situations is that, where an adequate RIS has been prepared for a regulatory decision made by a Ministerial Council or national standard-setting body, a follow-up or subsequent RIS is not required when only the detail of the regulation is to be put in place to implement the decision. However, a subsequent RIS would be required where follow-up regulatory decisions require further significant new regulation, and if the likely impacts of feasible regulatory options are significant and can be assessed. Whether the implementing regulation for a particular matter requires a RIS should be determined in consultation with the ORR on a case by case basis.

## **Decisions requiring implementation in states and territories**

For decisions requiring further regulatory decision by the states and territories, including the development of implementing legislation, each jurisdiction may require the development of state or territory specific RISs to meet their individual RIS requirements. In the past, this has raised the question as to whether the preparation of a COAG RIS is duplicative and therefore unwarranted.

COAG's RIS requirements apply to the initial decision by the Ministerial Council or national standard-setting body. Not only does the COAG RIS guide the overarching decision taken by the inter-governmental body, it can also guide further decisions taken in each jurisdiction from a carefully analysed starting point. It is also the case that states and territories can, where applicable, forgo their own RIS requirements if an adequate COAG RIS has been prepared.

### **3 Matters for which COAG's requirements were met**

Table A.1 documents the 28 decisions made during the period 1 April 2003 – 31 March 2004 where the COAG RIS requirements applied and were fully met. The table includes a brief description of the regulatory measure, the decision-making body and the date of the final decision.

**Table A.1:** Cases where COAG RIS requirements were met

Measure	Body responsible	Date of decision
1. Livestock Identification and Tracing Systems	Primary Industries Ministerial Council (PIMC)	11 April 2003
2. National Ban on Routine Tail Docking of Dogs	PIMC	11 April 2003
3. Amendments to the National Exposure Standard for Benzene	National Occupational Health and Safety Commission (NOHSC)	24 April 2003
4. Amendments to the Approved Criteria for Classifying Hazardous Substances	NOHSC	24 April 2003
5. Amendments to the National Exposure Standards for Atmospheric Contaminants in the Occupational Environment	NOHSC	24 April 2003
6. National Code of Practice for the Preparation of Material Safety Sheets	NOHSC	24 April 2003
7. Australian Builder's Plate (compliance plates for recreational vessels)	Australian Transport Council (ATC)	1 May 2003
8. Australian Road Rules Amendment Package 2003	ATC	30 June 2003
9. Building Code of Australia Amendment 13 Volume 1	Australian Building Codes Board	1 July 2003
10. Review of Processing Requirements of Uncooked Comminuted Fermented Meat	Food Standards Australia New Zealand	2 July 2003
11. Gene Technology (Recognition of Designated Areas) Principle 2003	Gene Technology Ministerial Council	3 July 2003
12. Amendments to the chrysotile asbestos exposure standard	NOHSC	23 July 2003
13. Dangerous Goods – Transport Emergency Response Plan Guidelines	ATC	1 August 2003
14. 50 km/hour National Default Urban Speed Limit	ATC	1 September 2003
15. TTMRA – ADR Review – ADR 12 – Glare Reduction in the Field of View	ATC	1 September 2003
16. TTMRA – ADR Review – ADR 15 – Demisting of Windscreens	ATC	1 September 2003
17. TTMRA – ADR Review – ADR 71 – Temporary Use Spare Tyres	ATC	1 September 2003
18. Deletion of Australian Design Rule (ADR) 24/02 – Tyre and Rim Selection	ATC	1 September 2003
19. Deletion of ADR 20/00 – Safety Rims	ATC	1 September 2003

(continued)

**Table A.1** continued

20.	Review of the 1994 Load Restraint Guide (for vehicles)	ATC	1 October 2003
21.	National Compliance and Enforcement Provisions for the National Road Transport Law: Road Transport Reform (Compliance and Enforcement ) Bill	ATC	3 October 2003
22.	National Code of Practice for the Control of Work Related Exposure to Hepatitis and HIV (blood borne ) Viruses	NOHSC	15 October 2003
23.	National Standard for Commercial Vessels – Sub section 7A: safety equipment	ATC	1 November 2003
24.	Mandatory Food Safety Programs for High Risk Sectors, and Policy Guidelines to Improve Food Safety Management in Australia	Australia New Zealand Food Regulation Ministerial Council (ANZFRMC)	12 December 2003
25.	Minimum Energy Performance Standards for Electricity Distribution Transformers	Ministerial Council on Energy	4 February 2004
26.	Heavy Vehicle Driver Fatigue	ATC	1 March 2004
27.	Heavy Vehicle NHVAS Advanced Fatigue Management Module	ATC	1 March 2004
28.	National Safety and Infrastructure Protection Performance Standards (for heavy vehicles)	ATC	1 March 2004

Source: ORR estimates

## 4 Matters for which COAG's requirements were partially met

Table A.2 documents the two decisions made during the period 1 April 2003 – 31 March 2004 where the COAG RIS requirements applied and were partially met; that is, there has been qualified compliance with the requirements. Commentary on the individual decisions, including the reasons why the decisions were considered to have partially met the requirements, is provided below the table.

**Table A.2:** Cases of qualified compliance with the COAG RIS requirements

Measure	Body responsible	Date of decision
1. New National Regulatory Framework for In Vitro Diagnostic Devices	Australian Health Ministers' Conference	1 July 2003
2. Professional standards legislation	Ministerial Meeting on Insurance Issues	6 August 2003

Source: ORR estimates

## Commentary on partially compliant decisions

### New national regulatory framework for in vitro diagnostic devices

On 1 July 2003, the Australian Health Ministers' Conference agreed to a new national regulatory framework for in vitro diagnostic devices. While the proposal was the subject of consultation, the ORR had advised that a consultation RIS was required. The discussion paper prepared, whilst detailed, did not substitute for an adequate RIS. However, a final RIS assessed by the ORR as adequate was available to support the decision to adopt the proposed framework.

### Implementation of a national system of professional standards legislation

The Ministerial Meeting on Insurance Issues considered a model for implementing a national system of professional standards legislation (PSL) on 6 August 2003 and confirmed the commitment of all jurisdictions to implementing PSL on a nationally consistent basis. The ORR was not provided with forward notice and a consultation RIS was not prepared. However, broad consultation with professional groups and the insurance industry had taken place and it is relevant that professional standards legislation was already in place in at least one jurisdiction. A final RIS assessed by the ORR as adequate was prepared and available to support the decision to endorse a national model.

## 5 Matters for which COAG's requirements were not met

Table A.3 indicates that, during the period 1 April 2003 – 31 March 2004, the COAG RIS requirements were not met at either the consultation stage or at the decision stage in four cases. Commentary on the individual decisions, including the reasons why the decisions were considered to be non-compliant, is provided below the table.

**Table A.3:** Cases where COAG RIS requirements were not met

Measure	Body responsible	Date of decision
1. Policy Guideline for the Regulation of Caffeine in Food	Australia New Zealand Food Regulation Ministerial Council	4 April 2003
2. Proportionate liability	Ministerial Meeting on Insurance Issues	6 August 2003
3. Endorsement of model provisions for the regulation of the legal profession	Standing Committee of Attorneys-General	7 August 2003
4. Endorsement of the Australian Retailers Association Code of Practice for the Management of Plastic Bags	Environment Protection and Heritage Council	2 October 2003

Source: ORR estimates

### Commentary on non-compliant decisions

#### Policy guideline for the regulation of caffeine in food

On 4 April 2003, the Australia New Zealand Food Regulation Ministerial Council considered controls over the addition of caffeine to food, and agreed to maintain the current additive permissions for caffeine, while restricting the use of new food products containing non-traditional caffeine rich ingredients to boost their caffeine content beyond the current provisions.

A RIS was not prepared for community consultation on the proposal as required by the COAG requirements. Although a final RIS was drafted for the decision makers, the ORR assessed the RIS as not having an adequate level of analysis. This was chiefly due to inadequacies in the specification of the problem and in the analysis of individual options.

#### Proportionate liability

On 6 August 2003, the Ministerial Meeting on Insurance Issues agreed to a national model for proportionate liability where economic loss or property

damage occurs through professional negligence. This will replace, throughout all Australian jurisdictions, the established legal principle of joint and several liability, and impacts on businesses throughout Australia in dealing with the risk of, and losses from, the negligent provision of services. The decision was informed by the work done by the Heads of Treasuries Insurance Issues Working Group in developing the proposal.

A COAG RIS was not prepared for consultation or at the decision-making stage. The ORR was not given forward notice of the proposal.

## National legal profession model bill

On 7 August 2003, the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General (SCAG) endorsed model provisions for nationally consistent laws for the regulation of Australia's legal profession. A COAG RIS was not prepared for either consultation on the proposed core model provisions or the decision by SCAG to endorse them. In addition, the ORR was not given forward notice of the proposal.

The National Legal Profession Model Bill has since been circulated. The ORR notes that it is intended that a COAG RIS be prepared to examine the impacts of the model provisions. A joint working party, comprising the legal profession, state, territory and Australian Government officers, is to advise SCAG on the operation and implementation of the Bill and on proposed amendments to its core provisions.

## Code of practice for the management of plastic bags

On 2 October 2003, the Environment Protection and Heritage Council (EPHC) decided to endorse the Australian Retailers' Association Code of Practice for the Management of Plastic Bags. The Code aims to improve recycling rates for, and reduce the number of, high density polyethylene plastic bags used in Australia.

A COAG RIS was not prepared in relation to the proposal, for consultation or for the final decision.

The ORR examined documents provided to the Council for its final decision and found that, while a preliminary impact analysis of several legislative options was prepared, this did not extend to analysis of the preferred option.

## **6 Trends in compliance with COAG RIS requirements**

### **At consultation**

The COAG *Principles and Guidelines* state that “public consultation is an important part of any regulatory development process” and an adequate COAG RIS is required for consultation. These requirements, however, make it clear that the depth of analysis in the consultation RIS need not be as great as in the RIS for decision makers. In many cases, the focus of the consultation RIS will be on identification of the problem and objectives and a preliminary assessment of feasible options. The RIS for the decision-making stage should reflect the additional information and views collected from those consulted, and provide a more complete impact analysis.

While COAG requires a RIS for consultation and for the final decision, the ORR’s practice has been that an adequate consultation RIS is only one consideration in whether a matter is compliant overall. In the absence of an adequate consultation RIS, the ORR has in determining overall compliance taken into account the extent of community consultation that took place on the proposal and the level of analysis in the final RIS (relative to the impacts of the proposal). The ORR has applied this approach as a transitional measure to assist in the implementation by Ministerial Councils and NSSBs of the COAG *Principles and Guidelines*.

In relation to decisions covered by this report, compliance at consultation was less than at the decision-making stage. This is notwithstanding the lighter RIS requirements for adequacy at the consultation stage.

Eighty-two per cent of matters had an adequate consultation RIS — this compares to 88 per cent compliance at final decision (see below).

This is the first time that the ORR has reported compliance with COAG’s requirement for a consultation RIS. It is proposed to include such compliance information in the ORR’s next report to the NCC covering decisions made in the year to 31 March 2005.

### **At the decision-making stage**

Of the 34 decisions by Ministerial Councils and national standard-setting bodies reported during the year to 31 March 2004 (the ORR’s fourth report to the NCC), compliance with COAG’s requirements was 88 per cent. This is comparable to the compliance rate of 89 per cent for 27 decisions made during the previous reporting period (the ORR’s third report to the NCC).

(For consistency with the reporting of cases in previous reporting periods, the cases listed in Table A.2, where RIS requirements were partially met, are treated as compliant for the purposes of this assessment.)

## For significant regulatory matters

As discussed in earlier ORR reports to the NCC, an important consideration in measuring compliance — and changes in compliance over time — is the degree of significance of the decisions made in each period. The ORR has classified each regulatory proposal that requires a RIS as of greater or lesser significance. The criteria for this classification is based on:

- the nature and magnitude of the problem and the regulatory proposals for addressing it; and
- the scope and intensity of the proposal's impact on affected parties and the community.

Classifying regulatory proposals in this way provides a better basis on which to apply the 'proportionality rule' that the extent of RIS analysis should be commensurate with the magnitude of the problem and the likely impacts of any regulatory response.

Of the 34 regulatory decisions reported here, seven were assessed by the ORR as of greater significance according to the above criteria. They are as follows:

The Gene Technology Ministerial Council's decision to issue a policy principle which would recognise state/territory rights to designate under state/territory law special areas that are either for genetically modified (GM) or non-GM crops for marketing purposes — the Gene Technology Regulator must then act consistently with the policy principle;

The agreement by the Ministerial Meeting on Insurance Issues to implement professional standards legislation on a nationally consistent basis, by which an upper limit (cap) is placed on liability payouts to plaintiffs for economic loss where professional groups meet legislated standards;

The decision by the Australia New Zealand Food Regulation Ministerial Council (ANZFRMC) that food safety programs be mandatory for the highest risk sectors in Australia, and that policy guidelines to improve food safety management be adopted in Australia;

The Australian Transport Council's decision to adopt performance based standards for heavy vehicles — this involved the adoption of twenty new standards, sixteen relating to vehicle safety, and four to protection of infrastructure;

The endorsement by the Environment Protection and Heritage Council (EPHC) of the Australian Retailers' Association Code of Practice for the

Management of Plastic Bags, which aims to improve recycling rates for, and reduce the number of, high density polyethylene plastic bags used in Australia;

The agreement by the Ministerial Meeting on Insurance Issues to a national model for proportionate liability, where economic loss or property damage occurs through professional negligence, which replaced throughout all Australian jurisdictions the established legal principle of joint and several liability. This decision will impact on the ability of victims of professional negligence to achieve full compensation in certain instances and may impact on the risks for business in dealing with service providers; and

The endorsement by the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General of model provisions which are to form the basis for consistent laws for the regulation of Australia's legal profession.

The RISs for the first four of these decisions were compliant with COAG's requirements (one of these had qualified compliance), and contained a level of analysis commensurate with the significance and impact of the proposal. For the last three decisions, the COAG *Principles and Guidelines* were not complied with either at the consultation stage or at the decision-making stage.

In summary, the compliance result for the seven matters of 'greater significance' for the year to 31 March 2004 is 57 per cent. While comparisons from year to year are only indicative given the small number of significant matters in each reporting period, the ORR notes that compliance for the current period is less than that for the ORR's second and third reports to the NCC.

Table A.4 summarises compliance results for all proposals and significant proposals over the periods covered by the four ORR reports to the NCC.

**Table A.4:** COAG RIS compliance for regulatory decisions made by Ministerial Councils and NSSBs, 2000-01 to 2003-04<sup>1</sup>

	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04
Overall compliance (qualified and full)	15/21 (71%)	23/24 (96%)	24/27 (89%)	30/34 (88%)
Compliance (qualified and full) for significant regulatory proposals	5/9 (56%)	6/6 (100%)	4/6 (67%)	4/7 (57%)

Source: ORR estimates

<sup>1</sup> Data for 2000-01 relate to the period 1 July 2000 - 31 May 2001. Data for 2001-02 relate to the period 1 April 2001- 31 March 2002. While there is therefore some overlap between these two reports, only four decisions (including one on a significant matter) are covered by both reports. All decisions covered in both reports were compliant with COAG's requirements.

## 7 Compliance issues

The lack of full compliance with COAG's RIS requirements, particularly for the more significant regulatory proposals, continues to be an issue.

Non-compliance appears to be due to several factors. The first is that there has not been a good appreciation by some Ministerial Councils and national standard-setting bodies of the analytical requirements of a COAG RIS. This includes adequate identification of the problem and potential case for government regulation, and a balanced and thorough assessment of feasible options.

It would also appear that, as for the third report, the allocation of decision-making power to ad hoc groups or committees involves a risk that these processes may not follow best practice, in large part because such groups are not fully aware of COAG's requirements.

These factors played a role in the first two non-compliant decisions listed in Table 5.1. It should be noted, however, that each of the relevant decision-making bodies made one other decision during the same period that did meet COAG's RIS requirements. This suggests that these factors, while responsible for poor compliance outcomes for some decisions, may not be systemic with respect to these bodies.

In relation to the third non-compliant decision listed in Table 5.1, the key factor facilitating non-compliance was the decision being made in several stages. In this case, the initial decision to regulate was not subjected to the COAG RIS process. Operational and implementation issues are to be considered in the second and subsequent stages.

The fourth non-compliant decision noted above was made by a Ministerial Council that, with respect to all other reports by the ORR to the NCC, has been fully compliant with COAG's requirements. Further, the secretariat had consulted early with the ORR on other regulatory proposals being developed during the current reporting period.

Taking a longer term view of compliance over the period covered by the four reports by the ORR, it would appear that, with some exceptions, non-compliance is usually associated with decision-making bodies that make infrequent regulatory decisions, and for which the regulatory best practice approach required by COAG has not become incorporated into their operating protocols. The majority of these decisions have been on regulatory matters of significance.

The lack of compliance at the community consultation stage is also an issue. While it is due in part to a continued lack of awareness of COAG's RIS requirements, it would also appear to be due to a lack of awareness of COAG's specific requirement for a consultation RIS.

## 8 Improving compliance

There is clearly a need for improved awareness of the scope of the COAG RIS requirements, the required level of analysis and the role of the ORR.

In the twelve months to 31 March 2004, the ORR provided training on COAG's RIS requirements to over 90 government officials. Further training will continue, with particular emphasis on officials supporting decision-making groups that make regulatory decisions less often, but potentially on significant issues.

There is also a need for a better understanding of COAG's RIS requirements at the consultation stage. The ORR aims to address this in briefing and training officials. It is also intended that, for the fifth report to the NCC, covering the period 1 April 2004 – 31 March 2005, the ORR will continue to report (as here) on compliance at the consultation stage for individual decisions made during the reporting period. This increased transparency may assist in raising compliance with COAG's RIS requirements.

It is also worthy of note that, while COAG does not require that the final RIS for the decision-making stage be made public, a number of standard-setting bodies and secretariats of Ministerial Councils have made public the final RIS for decisions made during the reporting period. They include the Australian Building Codes Board, the National Occupational Health and Safety Commission, and the secretariat for the Gene Technology Ministerial Council. This practice further promotes the transparency of the policy development process, and as such is consistent with regulatory best practice.

# Appendix B National Competition Policy contacts

For further information about National Competition Policy, please contact the National Competition Council or the relevant Commonwealth, State or Territory competition policy unit.

## National

National Competition Council  
Level 9  
128 Exhibition Street  
MELBOURNE VIC 3000  
Telephone: (03) 9285 7474  
Facsimile: (03) 9285 7477  
[www.ncc.gov.au](http://www.ncc.gov.au)

## Australian Government

Competition Policy Framework Unit  
Competition & Consumer Policy  
Division  
The Treasury  
Langton Crescent  
PARKES ACT 2600  
Telephone: (02) 6263 3997  
Facsimile: (02) 6263 2937  
[www.treasury.gov.au](http://www.treasury.gov.au)

## New South Wales

Inter-governmental &  
Regulatory Reform Branch  
The Cabinet Office  
Level 37  
Governor Macquarie Tower  
1 Farrer Place  
SYDNEY NSW 2000  
Telephone: (02) 9228 5414  
Facsimile: (02) 9228 4408  
[www.nsw.gov.au](http://www.nsw.gov.au)

## Victoria

Economic, Social and Environmental  
Group  
Dept. of Treasury and Finance  
10th Floor, 1 Macarthur Street  
MELBOURNE VIC 3002  
Telephone: (03) 9651 1239  
Facsimile: (03) 9651 2048  
[www.vic.gov.au](http://www.vic.gov.au)

### **Queensland**

Regulatory and Inter-Governmental  
Relations Branch  
Queensland Treasury  
100 George Street  
BRISBANE QLD 4000  
Telephone: (07) 3224 4996  
Facsimile: (07) 3221 4071  
[www.treasury.qld.gov.au](http://www.treasury.qld.gov.au)

### **Western Australia**

Competition Policy Unit  
WA Treasury  
Level 12, 197 St George's Terrace  
PERTH WA 6000  
Telephone: (08) 9222 9805  
Facsimile: (08) 9222 9914  
[www.treasury.wa.gov.au](http://www.treasury.wa.gov.au)

### **South Australia**

National Competition Policy  
Implementation Unit  
Cabinet Office  
Department of Premier & Cabinet  
Level 14,  
State Administration Centre  
200 Victoria Square  
ADELAIDE SA 5000  
Telephone: (08) 8226 1931  
Facsimile: (08) 8226 1111  
[www.premcab.sa.gov.au](http://www.premcab.sa.gov.au)

### **Tasmania**

Economic Policy Branch  
Department of Treasury and Finance  
Franklin Square Offices  
21 Murray Street  
HOBART TAS 7000  
Telephone: (03) 6233 3100  
Facsimile: (03) 6233 5690  
[www.tres.tas.gov.au](http://www.tres.tas.gov.au)

### **Australian Capital Territory**

Micro Economic Reform Section  
Dept. of Treasury  
Level 1, Canberra-Nara Centre  
1 Constitution Avenue  
CANBERRA CITY ACT 2600  
Telephone: (02) 6207 0290  
Facsimile: (02) 6207 0267  
[www.treasury.act.gov.au/competition](http://www.treasury.act.gov.au/competition)

### **Northern Territory**

Policy & Coordination Division  
Dept. of Chief Minister  
4th Floor, NT House  
22 Mitchell Street  
DARWIN NT 0800  
Telephone: (08) 8999 7712  
Facsimile: (08) 8999 7402  
[www.nt.gov.au/ntt/](http://www.nt.gov.au/ntt/)

# References

- ACCC (Australian Competition and Consumer Commission) 2001, *Reducing fuel price variability*, Canberra.
- 2002, *Terminal gate pricing arrangements in Australia and other fuel pricing arrangements in Western Australia*, Canberra.
- ACG (The Allen Consulting Group) 2004, *Regulated towing operations in Victoria: public interest assessment*, Final report, Melbourne.
- Australian Government 2004, *Commonwealth–State financial relations, Budget paper no. 3*, Canberra, 11 May.
- Baker, J 1996, *Conveyancing fees in a competitive market*, Justice Research Centre, Sydney.
- Batchelor, the Hon. P (Minister for Transport) 2003, Second reading: Port Services (Port of Melbourne Reform) Bill, *Hansard*, 9 April, Melbourne.
- Beattie, the Hon. P (Premier) 2003, ‘Economic rationalists take a back seat for Queensland cabbies’, Media statement, 31 August.
- Chance, the Hon. K (Minister for Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries) 2004, ‘Consumers and growers benefit from new potato plan’, Media release, July 1.
- CoAG (Council of Australian Governments) 1997, *Principles and guidelines for national standard setting and regulatory action by Ministerial councils and standard-setting bodies*, Canberra.
- 2000, *Communiqué*, Canberra, 3 November.
- 2002, *CoAG senior officials working group commentary on the National Competition Policy review of pharmacy*, Canberra.
- CoAG Energy Market Review 2002, *Towards a truly national and efficient energy market*, Canberra.
- DCITA (Department of Communications, Information Technology and the Arts) 2002, *Report on review of the operation of schedule 6 of the Broadcasting Services Act 1992 (datacasting services)*, Canberra.
- Department of Health and Ageing (Australian Government) 2000, *Third Community Pharmacy Agreement between the Commonwealth of Australia and the Pharmacy Guild of Australia, 1 July 2000 to 30 June 2005*, Canberra.
- Department of Premier and Cabinet (South Australia) 2001, *Reviewing restrictions on competition in proposed new legislation*, Adelaide.
- 2003, *Preparing Cabinet submissions*, Circular 19, Adelaide.
- Department of the Chief Minister (Northern Territory) 2003, *Competition impact analysis principles and guidelines*, Darwin.

DTF (Department of Treasury and Finance, Tasmania) 2004a, *National Competition Policy: applying the principles to local government in Tasmania*, Hobart.

— 2004b, *Significant business activities and local government in Tasmania*, Hobart.

— 2004c, *Changes to casino and gaming licence arrangements and the introduction of a state-wide cap on gaming machine numbers*, Regulatory impact statement, Hobart.

DPIF (Department of Primary Industries Forestry) (Queensland) 2003, *DPI Forestry Yearbook 2002-03*, Brisbane.

Forestry Tasmania 2003, *Annual Report 2002-03*, Hobart.

GLA (Grain Licensing Authority) 2004, *Report to the Minister on Operation and Effectiveness for the 2003/04 season*, Perth, June.

Government of New South Wales 1995, *From red tape to results — government regulation: a guide to best practice*, Regulatory Review Unit, The Cabinet Office, New South Wales Government, Sydney.

— 2000, *Manual for the preparation of legislation (8<sup>th</sup> edition)*, Parliamentary Counsel's Office, New South Wales Government, Sydney.

— 2004, *Supplementary report on the application of National Competition Policy in New South Wales*, Sydney.

Government of Queensland 1999, *Public benefit test guidelines, Approach to undertaking public benefit test assessments for legislation reviews under National Competition Policy*, Queensland Government Treasury, Brisbane.

— 2003, *National Competition Policy review: legal practice legislation: competition impact statement*, Brisbane.

— 2004, *Eighth annual report to the National Competition Council*, Brisbane.

Government of Tasmania 2003, *Legislation review program, Procedures and guidelines manual*, Department of Treasury and Finance, Hobart.

Government of the ACT 1999, *National Competition Policy review of ACT health professional regulation*, Department of Health and Community Care, Canberra.

— 2002, *Third tranche progress report to the National Competition Council on implementing National Competition Policy and related reforms*, Canberra.

— 2003a, *Best practice guide for preparing regulatory impact statements, ACT Treasury*, Canberra.

— 2003b, *Follow-up to 2003 annual report*, Correspondence, 18 June.

— 2004a, *Follow-up to 2004 annual reports: ACT response to NCC request for supplementary information*, Correspondence, 1 July.

— 2004b, *Explanatory statement to the Pharmacy Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2004*, 14 May 2004, Canberra.

- 
- Government of Victoria 1999, *Second tranche assessment report: volume 1*, Melbourne.
- 2003, *Regulation of the health professions in Victoria, A discussion paper*, Department of Human Services, Melbourne.
- 2004, *Victorian Government submission: inquiry into National Competition Policy arrangements*, Melbourne.
- Government of Western Australia 2001a, *Public interest guidelines for legislation review*, Competition Policy Unit, Department of Treasury and Finance, Perth.
- 2001b, *Key Directions, Review of Western Australian health practitioner legislation*, Legal and Legislative Services Branch, Health Department of Western Australia.
- 2002, *National Competition Policy Legislation Review — Marketing of Potatoes Act 1946, Marketing of Potatoes Regulations 1987*, Department of Agriculture, Perth.
- 2004, *Final progress report: implementing National Competition Policy in Western Australia — Report to the National Competition Council*, Perth.
- Howard, the Hon J (Prime Minister) 2002, 'Publication of the CoAG Working Group's response to the National Competition Policy review of pharmacy', Media release, 2 August.
- 2004a, 'Pharmacy and National Competition Policy', Media release, 5 May.
- 2004b, *Correspondence to Mr Jon Stanhope MLA*, Chief Minister of the ACT, 16 July.
- IPART (Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal, New South Wales) 1999, *Review of the taxi cab and hire car industries*, Final report, Sydney.
- Irving, M, Arney, J and Lindner, B 2000, *National Competition Policy review of the Wheat Marketing Act 1989*, NCP-WMA Review Committee, Canberra.
- Jebb Holland Dimasi 2000, *Sunday trading in Australia: implications for consumers, retailers and the economy*, Melbourne.
- MacTiernan, the Hon. A (Minister for Planning and Infrastructure) 2003, 'Taxi drivers to get fare rise', Media release, 5 December.
- 2004a, 'Strong demand for extra taxi plates', Media release, 20 January.
- 2004b, 'New taxi plates a benefit to drivers and the public', Media release, 1 April.
- McKinsey & Company 2003, *Partnerships for recovery: caring for injured workers and restoring financial stability to workers compensation in NSW. A review of the NSW WorkCover Scheme prepared for the Honourable J.J. Della Bosca*, Sydney.
- MMA (McLennan Magasanik Associates) 2003a, *Gas FRC Cost Benefit Assessment Attachment 6 - Report to Queensland Office of Energy*, Queensland Treasury.
-

- 2003b, *Gas Further Contestability Cost Benefit Assessment – Report to Queensland Office of Energy*, Queensland Treasury.
- NCC (National Competition Council) 1998a, *Compendium of National Competition Policy agreements*, 2nd edn, Melbourne.
- 1998b, *Review of the Australian Postal Corporation Act: final report. Volume 1*, Melbourne.
- 1999, *National Competition Policy and related reforms first tranche assessment. Volume 1: assessment of Commonwealth, state and territory progress*, Melbourne.
- 2002, *Assessment of governments' progress in implementing the National Competition Policy and related reforms*, Volume 1, Melbourne.
- 2003a, *Assessment of governments' progress in implementing National Competition Policy and related reforms*, Volume 1, Melbourne.
- 2003b, *Assessment of governments' progress in implementing the National Competition Policy and related reforms: Volume two — Legislation review and reform*, Melbourne.
- New South Wales Department of Racing and Gaming 2002, *Discussion paper, National Competition Policy review of the New South Wales Liquor Act 1982 and Registered Clubs Act 1976*, Sydney.
- 2003, *Final report National Competition Policy review, New South Wales Liquor Act 1982 and Registered Clubs Act 1976*, Sydney.
- New South Wales Treasury 2004, *Performance of NSW Government Businesses 2002-03*, Office of Financial Management, Research and Information Paper, Sydney.
- NFF (National Farmers Federation) 2004, *National Competition Policy — Submission to Productivity Commission*, Canberra, June.
- ORR (Office of Regulation Review) 1998, *A Guide to Regulation (second edition)*, Canberra.
- PC (Productivity Commission) 1999a, *Submission to the national review of pharmacy*, Canberra.
- 1999b, *Australia's gambling Industries*, Report no. 10, Canberra.
- 2000, *Broadcasting*, Report no. 11, Canberra.
- 2001, *Regulation and its review 2000-01*, Canberra.
- 2002a, *Trends in Australian infrastructure prices 1990-91 to 2000-01*, Canberra.
- 2002b, *Radiocommunications*, Report no. 22, Canberra.
- 2003, *Annual Report 2002-03*, Annual Report Series, Canberra.
- 2004a, *Financial performance of government trading enterprises, 1998-99 to 2002-03*, Commission research paper, Canberra.
- 2004b, *National workers' compensation and occupational health and safety frameworks*, Report no. 27, Canberra.

- 
- Premier of Victoria 1995, *Guidelines for the application of the competition test to new legislative proposals*, Competition Policy Taskforce (Victoria), Melbourne.
- SCAG (Standing Committee of Attorneys-General) 2004, *Legal profession — model laws project: model provisions*, Canberra, 23 April.
- Short, C, Swan, A, Graham, B and Mackay-Smith, W 2001, 'Electricity reform: the benefits and costs to Australia', *ABARE Paper presented at Outlook 2001 Conference*, Canberra, 27 February – 1 March.
- Standing Committee on Forests 1996, *National principles for forest practices related to wood production in plantations*, Canberra.
- Standing Committee on Planning and Environment (Legislative Assembly for the ACT) 2003, *Inquiry into the Road Transport (Public Passenger Services) Amendment Bill 2003*, Canberra.
- Townsend, J and Renouf G 2004, *Drawing a line in the sand*, Paper presented at the third Australasian Drug Strategy Conference, Alice Springs.
- Transport SA 2000, *Competition policy review of the accident towing legislation under the Motor Vehicles Act 1959 and accident towing roster scheme Regulations, 1984*, Final report, Adelaide.
- Trembath, A 2002, *Competitive neutrality: scope for enhancement*, National Competition Council staff discussion paper, Melbourne.
- Truss, the Hon. W (Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry) 2003, 'Truss announces wheat marketing review panel members', Media release, 24 December.
- 2004, 'Truss announces Wheat Marketing Review Panel members', Media release, 24 December.
- VORR (Victorian Office of Regulation Reform) 1995, *Regulatory impact statement handbook*, Melbourne.
- Wilkinson, W (2000), *Final report of the National Competition Policy review of pharmacy*, Canberra.