

Análisis de Impacto Normativo: experiencias internacionales

Andrea Renda


CEPS, Duke y Colegio de Europa

29 noviembre 2017

“Olas” de reforma regulatoria

- **1960s-1980s: reformas estructurales (“less is more”, Washington consensus)**
- **1980s-2000s: mejora regulatoria, ex ante AIR y consultas publicas**
- **2010-2015: ciclo de la regulación, evaluación ex post y de grupos de normas jurídicas**
- **2015-hoy: regulación experimental y nuevas tecnologías**


Ciclo de la regulación



Estructura del AIR

- **Definición del problema**
- **Objetivos de la propuesta**
- **Alternativas para solucionar el problema**
- **Recolección de informaciones y datos**
- **Aplicación de criterios decisionales**
- **Elección de la opción preferida**
- **Escogencia de los indicadores de monitoreo y evaluación (y cláusulas de revisión)**

Un éxito global?



Note: this represents the trend in the number of countries with a formal requirement for regulatory impact analysis (beyond a simple budget or fiscal impact).


Fuente: OECD

RIA en los EEUU

RIA en los EEUU (1)

- **1981: Reagan introduce el AIR (EO 12,291)**
 - No se aplica a las agencias independiente (e.g. FTC, FCC, SEC)
 - No se aplica al Congreso
- **1993: Clinton lanza la NPR (EO 12,866)**
 - AIR solo se aplica a las “medidas regulatorias significativas”
- **2002: RIA bajo la administración de GW Bush (EO 13,258)**
 - OIRA Prompt letters: de “consultor” a “adversario”
- **2009: RIA bajo la administración Obama (EO 13,653)**
 - Cass Sunstein y la era del “nudge”
 - Mas atención a los impactos distributivos y a la equidad
- **2017: RIA en la era de Trump (EO 13,771)**
 - Presupuestos regulatorios y “one in one out”


RIA en los EEUU (2)



Country	Years	Ratio (in:out) and Target	Measure	Evaluation	Economic Savings
Australia	2014-present	1:1	Administrative costs, substantive costs, delay costs	National Audit Office	2013-15: \$3.97B
Canada	2012-present	1:1	Administrative burden	Treasury Board	2013-14: \$21M 2014-15: \$2.7M
France	2015-present	1:1	Life events method plus methodology to measure delay costs	NA	NA
Germany	2015-present	1:1	Regulatory costs (includes compliance and enforcement); coupled with life events method	National Regulatory Control Council	2015-16: €1B
Netherlands	2003-present (with pilot projects since the 1990s)	25% reduction target; €2.5B reduction target	Compliance costs (includes administrative burdens, substantive costs and inspection/enforcement costs)	Ministry of Economic Affairs	2003-07: met target. 2007-11: met target 2012-17: on track for €2.5B reduction
Portugal	2014-present	1:1	Admin burdens (from 2014); Compliance costs (from 2017)	NA	NA
UK	2010-present	1:1 (2010); 1:2 (2013); 1:3 (2016), w/€10B reduction target by 2020	Direct costs to businesses	National Audit Office; House of Lords	2010-15: €10B reduction. 2016-present: €0.9B
US	2017-present	1:2	Opportunity cost to society	NA	NA

Source: Hahn and Renda 2017

The new US system: a sketch



Compliance with overall target and setting of new target for next fiscal year

From FY2019 agencies report related KPIs/goals/targets (see M-17-23)

Andrea Renda

One Step Forward, Two Steps Back? The New U.S. Regulatory Budgeting Rules in Light of the International Experience

Abstract: Executive Order (EO) 13771 on “Reducing Regulation and Controlling Regulatory Costs” introduces a new regulatory budgeting system in the U.S. federal rulemaking process. International experience suggests that the new rule, aimed both at reducing the number of regulations and the volume of regulatory costs, will focus on a subset of regulatory impacts, most certainly the direct costs imposed by regulation on businesses, or even a subset thereof. The paper discusses possible ways to make sense of the new rule, without undermining the soundness of benefit-cost analysis mandated by EO12866. The paper concludes that the new system, while potentially promoting more retrospective regulatory reviews, will risk fundamentally affecting the quality of regulation in the United States, generating frictions and inefficiencies throughout the administration, to the detriment of social welfare.


RIA en la Unión Europea

AI(N) en la Unión Europea: historia

- **2002: Communication on Impact Assessment**
- **2003: Inter-institutional agreement on better lawmaking**
- **2005: Re-launch of the IA system (“growth and jobs”)**
- **2007: Impact Assessment Board**
- **2010: Communication on smart regulation**
- **2012: European Parliament creates an IMPA Directorate**
- **2012: REFIT strategy**
- **2014: Commission Vice President for better regulation**
- **2015: New Better regulation Package and new RSB**

Problemas iniciales

- **Metodología: dilema entre análisis costo beneficio y análisis multicriterial**
- **Talento humano y cultura administrativa**
- **Ciclo de la regulación muy incompleto, que causa un AIN incompleto**
- **Falta de transparencia y supervisión**
- **Expectativas excesivas**



ACB: problemas principales

- Hipótesis principales

~~– Utilidad – Dinero~~

Falso!!

~~– El dinero tiene utilidad marginal constante~~

Falso!!

~~– Los individuos se comportan de una manera razonable y perfectamente informada~~

Falso!!

~~– La utilidad no depende del contexto (individualismo metodológico)~~


Falso!!

Impactos de la regulación


Costos de la regulación

Beneficios de la regulación

Impactos directos




Impactos indirectos



Nuevo programa de mejora regulatoria

- **Adopted on May 19, 2015**
 - Nuevas lineas guias de mejora regulatoria + herramienta
 - Nueva propuesta de acuerdo inter-institucional
 - Regulatory Scrutiny Board – con miembros independientes
 - REFIT stakeholder platform
 - Nuevos procedimientos y plataformas de consulta publica
- **“Too good to be true?”**

Cambios desde 2015



* For "major" initiatives

Conclusiones

- **Un proceso muy largo para integrar el AI en el proceso regulatorio**
 - De adolescente a adulto: como debe evolucionar el AI?
 - De la eficiencia a la coherencia con las metas de largo plazo
- **Precondiciones esenciales**
 - Ex ante y ex post: “aprendizaje” es el verdadero enfoque
 - Transparencia y dialogo con los stakeholder
 - Gestionar expectativas
 - Tener todos los impactos en el radar
- **La metodología depende del enfoque: ACB no siempre el método mas correcto**
 - Para Chile: desarrollo sostenible y productividad como marco jurídico y institucional?

Análisis de Impacto Normativo: experiencias internacionales

Andrea Renda

CEPS, Duke y Colegio de Europa

29 noviembre 2017

Example 1: vulnerable road users

Financial Benefit (€ million)						
	Existing Direct	Commission Proposal				
		Without BAS	With BAS I	With BAS II		
Benefit Value (m€)	4855 ¹ (100%)	3107 (64%)	8438 ¹ (174%)	3398 (70%)	8849 ¹ (182%)	11,509 ² (237%)
Ratio to Industry Cost of 711m€ ³	6.8:1	4.4:1	11.8:1	4.8:1	12.4:1	16.1:1
Ratio to Consumer Cost of 995m€ ⁴	4.9:1	3.1:1	8.5:1	3.4:1	8.9:1	11.5:1

How can costs remain constant across options?

140% pass-on rate?

Example 2: roadworthiness tests

Option	Benefit (€ mn)	Monetized benefit/cost ratio	Additional jobs (compared to previous option)
Option 1	184	656:1	0
Option 2a	459.5	3.53:1	1,450
Option 2b	5807	1.68:1	13,450
Option 2c	7027	0.76:1	46,260
Option 3a	460	3.93:1	1,450
Option 3b	5807	1.73:1	13,450
Option 3c	7211	0.78:1	46,260

If CEA is chosen, then option 1 wins

Option 1 is not enough: then, Option 3a wins

CEA is not correct: Option 3b should win!

But with more reasonable VSL, 3c would win!