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Why?

Evaluation of regulatory policy helps to:

• Target scarce resources for reform efforts
• Communicate progress
• Generate the political support needed for implementing regulatory policy reforms
How?

• Identify a framework that countries can take and apply in their own country as a diagnostic tool for regulatory policy evaluation

• Develop options for a set of indicators for the domestic evaluation of the performance of regulatory policy

• Provide consolidated information on how regulatory policy performance is currently evaluated across OECD countries
Process

- Engagement of Steering Group
- Expert papers (2011-2012)
- Approval of Framework at the RPC meeting (2012)
- Testing the Framework in Canada and the Netherlands (2012-2013)
- Survey on Regulatory Policy Evaluation in OECD countries (2012-2013)
- Launch of publication (June 2014)
1. There is no “holy grail” to simply demonstrate a causal link between the design and implementation of regulatory policy measures on the one hand and the achievement of strategic outcomes in the economy on the other hand.

2. There is great value in *systematically* evaluating the design and implementation of regulatory policy, against the achievement of strategic regulatory objectives.

3. There is not enough data and information available to evaluate the functioning and impact of regulatory policy in most OECD countries.

4. Every OECD country can take steps to improve the evaluation of regulatory policy.
OECD Framework for Regulatory Policy Evaluation

**Design**

- **I. Input**
  - What resources are committed?
  - E.g. budget, staffing, expertise

- **II. Process**
  - Are requirements for good regulatory practices in place?
  - E.g. requirements for objective-setting, consultation, evidence-based analysis, simplification, risk assessments (e.g. indicators of regulatory management type), aligning regulatory changes internationally

**Implementation**

- **III. Output**
  - Have the good practices been implemented?
  - E.g. percentage of RIAs that comply with formal requirements, e.g. quality of post-implementation reviews

- **IV. Intermediate Outcome**
  - Have good practices helped to get quality regulation?
  - E.g. % of those involved in the regulatory process that think RIA has improved the quality of regulation as opposed to being a tick-the-box-exercise; comparison of costs/benefits of initial regulatory proposal to those of actual regulation that was passed

**Strategic outcome**

- **V. Regulatory quality**
  - Have strategic objectives for regulatory policy in general been achieved?
    - Economic: Net benefits (possibly in comparison with counterfactual and alternatives)
    - Efficient and streamlined: Compliance costs and burdens (possibly integrated into net benefits; Reduced enforcement costs)
    - Perception of regulatory quality in general
    - Improved compliance rate
    - Transparent and easy to access

**Regulatory outcomes**

- Have strategic objectives for regulatory policy in a specific sector been achieved?
  - Effectiveness – market failure/problem/risk was solved or mitigated
  - Protection and benefits of the public, responsive and accountable

Facts-based and perception based sector-specific indicators:

- **ENVIRONMENT**
  - E.g. SOx and NOx emissions, concentration of air pollutants in urban areas
- **SAFETY**
- **HEALTH**

**Feedback loop**

- Regulatory system
- Regulatory impacts
- Other factors that influence outcome
Current country practices

Performance reports published online

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Number of Jurisdictions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>on RIA on draft regulations</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on consultation practices on draft regulations</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on ex-post analysis (reviews) of existing regulations</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on administrative simplification and burden reduction programmes</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OECD survey on Regulatory Policy Evaluation (2012)
Performance indicators published online on:

- RIA: 14 jurisdictions
- Consultation: 6 jurisdictions
- Ex-post analysis: 2 jurisdictions
- Administrative simplification and burden reduction programmes: 20 jurisdictions

Source: OECD survey on Regulatory Policy Evaluation (2012)
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