INTRODUCTION

1. On 17-18 June 2014, delegates to the Regulatory Policy Committee (RPC), OECD officials, member and non-member countries, as well as international experts met in The Hague, Netherlands. The workshop attracted around 60 participants from 19 member countries, the European Commission, Indonesia, South Africa, Russian Federation, Morocco, the Business and Industry Advisory Committee (BIAC), the Trade Union Advisory Committee (TUAC), as well as Academics and experts from the field of Regulatory Policy. It was chaired by Professor Gary Banks, Chair of the OECD Regulatory Policy Committee and Dean of the Australia New Zealand School of Government. This was the sixth in a series of expert meetings hosted by OECD countries that focuses on a substantive regulatory policy issue of concern to OECD countries.

2. According to the 2012 Recommendation of the Council on Regulatory Policy and Governance, OECD member countries have agreed to adhere to principles of open government, including transparency and participation in the regulatory process (Principle 2). OECD members have also committed to regularly publish reports on the performance of public consultation practices and to involve stakeholders in the review process (Principle 6). The aim of the workshop was to provide countries with support in meeting these commitments, by developing ideas and suggestions to help evaluate and improve their practices when engaging with stakeholders in the design, implementation and review of regulations.

3. The workshop started with a panel-discussion on “Evaluating stakeholder engagement in regulatory policy” which discussed the objectives of efficient stakeholder engagement. This was followed by a presentation on the recent research regarding the role of “Procedural Justice” and the resulting lessons countries can learn from its findings to improve their regulatory practices.

4. OECD delegates and experts then worked in parallel break-out sessions to allow for focused discussions on different aspects of evaluating stakeholder engagement in the regulatory policy cycle. Participants discussed the goals and challenges of evaluation and the pros and cons of different practices.

5. The OECD Secretariat presented an overview of the advice and findings of the new publication “Framework for Regulatory Policy Evaluation” which provides the tools for evaluating the design and implementation of regulatory policy, against the achievement of strategic regulatory objectives. Participants then took part in in-depth plenary discussions focusing on three key topics of stakeholder engagement practices: the different methods and practices of evaluating stakeholder engagement; the development of indicators and a database of regulatory practices; and the goals and methods of assessing the impact of stakeholder engagement. These discussions built upon the findings of panel discussions, presentations and the points of debate that had been raised in the break-out sessions. The conclusions of the workshop will provide an important contribution to the OECD’s work on the development of indicators on government’s practices of stakeholder engagement and the forthcoming publication Regulatory Policy Outlook. The conclusions will also contribute to the development of best practice principles of stakeholder-engagement.

6. The Secretariat is very grateful to the Dutch Government, Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations for hosting the workshop and to the Steering Group on Measuring Regulatory Performance for their invaluable support in the preparation of the workshop. The OECD Secretariat would especially like to
thank Ms. Lynn Van der Velden (Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations) and the Centre for International Legal Cooperation for the excellent co-operation in the organisation of the workshop.

Opening remarks by Gary Banks and Rolf Alter

7. The opening remarks reminded delegates that the Recommendation of the Council on Regulatory Policy and Governance states that governments should “Adhere to principles of open government, including transparency and participation in the regulatory process [...]”. The presenters highlighted the role of consultation and engagement practices at every stage of the regulatory policy cycle. The information received by governments can be used to better understand the regulatory problem and help devise the best solution. Communicating with the public can help promote public awareness of policy problems and be used to build support and trust for regulatory solutions.

Keynote speech

8. Michiel Scheltema, Royal Commissioner for the drafting of the General Administrative Law Act focused his address on how stakeholder engagement in regulatory policy has evolved to become a major concern of policy makers. Traditionally, constitutions do not leave much room for public consultations and the legitimacy of regulation derives from the democratic election of parliamentarians who pass laws. However, the interest in the regulation-making process that occurs ahead of parliamentary debate has increased steadily in the last decades. This is illustrated for example by the diffusion of Regulatory Impact Analysis (RIA) across OECD countries. Moreover, in an increasingly knowledge-driven, interconnected and fast-changing society, it has become virtually impossible to concentrate all relevant knowledge at one point in the public administration. Therefore, policy-makers depend today more than ever on the input and expertise of stakeholders.

9. The speaker stressed that the effects of rule-making do not only depend on the rules themselves, but also on how they are implemented. The project “Pleasant Contact with the Government” (in Dutch: “Prettig Contact met de Overheid”) of the Dutch administration illustrates this in a powerful manner. Through the project, dispute resolution concerning administrative decisions was organised in a less formal manner, meaning that the public administration would informally contact citizens and try to resolve disputes before starting the official procedure. This informal approach resulted in a significant reduction of the number of complaints that led to a fully-fledged dispute settlement procedure. Additionally, citizens were more satisfied with their experience with the public administration and costs were reduced. Hence, policy makers should focus as much on the implementation of rules as on their design.

10. The speaker also addressed positive outcomes of stakeholder engagement. It was concluded that if stakeholders and their concern are taken seriously, trust in government increases and people are more willing to accept and comply with regulation.

Panel discussion: Better participation for better policies and better lives

Moderator: Rolf Alter, Director, Public Governance and Territorial Development Directorate, OECD

11. The panel discussion started with a debate on the importance of balance in the consultation process. The view was put forward that social partners were not always treated the same way during consultation. It was argued that in some instances, trade unions or other representatives of employees received privileged status compared to that of employers, but it was more often the case that employers and representatives of business are given greater attention; and that this is partly because the recent focus on regulation has been supportive of cutting regulation and meeting targets such as one-in-one-out and admin burden reduction targets, rather than developing smarter regulation.
12. Another point that was raised was the need to remember that efficient markets are not an important outcome in themselves but a means of servicing the economy and its people. It was also argued that while the business community was often opposed to increases in regulation, there was a good sense of common interest between those who worked for companies and those who managed them.

13. The issue of the importance of transparency in the rule making process was also highlighted. A panellist advised that policy making should not be too complex, and citizens should be able to understand the process. There should also be a balance between consulting on future regulation and consulting on existing regulation.

14. The example of the US 2012 Executive Order on Identifying and Reducing Regulatory Burdens was described. A panellist explained that the overarching goals of this Order were maximising social welfare and maintaining strong environmental protection whilst maintaining economic growth. The panellist explained that stakeholder engagement plays a prominent role in these aims, and by allowing the possibility of challenge from stakeholders the US can ensure the accountability of regulators.

15. It was suggested that stakeholder engagement should be seen as part of a broader regulatory policy package, including RIA and other tools to help address issues of balance and prevent a debate being skewed towards special interest groups. For a well-informed consultation and to ensure accountability and reduce the potential for unfair lobbying, it is necessary to formulate questions carefully and understand who the respondents are and what their particular interest is.

16. It was also suggested that countries should consider how to reach different areas of society, and consider how different groups are represented. One option is to consider weighting responses to help provide a more realistic comparison between views provided by individuals and views provided from a representative of a larger group of people. Examples of constructive stakeholder engagement methods include setting up expert groups with representatives from government and social partners (as advocated by the EU), having a series of structured bi-lateral discussions organised through a transparent policy process and using digital platforms to reach a wider audience.


17. The speaker presented on Procedural Justice, drawing on his draft paper “Perceived Fairness and Regulatory Policy” that was prepared for the expert meeting. The paper’s research focusses on stakeholder’s perceptions of whether they were fairly treated during the consultation process. The speaker stressed that, too often, the discussion of improving regulatory policy is focused on how governments engage with stakeholders in regulatory policy from a government perspective and not the stakeholder perspective. This failure to consider stakeholders’ point of view can undermine trust in regulatory processes and in government more broadly. The presentation – and supporting paper – drew upon literature on procedural justice and the field of social psychology.

18. “Procedural justice” – its name stemming from the history of the literature with law enforcement – focuses on how individuals consider how fairly they have been treated based on their direct experience. (Though what constitutes fairness may vary from country to country.) It is not concerned with abstract notions of fairness, abstract ratings of immediate satisfaction nor judgments about fairness of the outcome. The field of social psychology shows that fairness is closely related to process and not necessarily outcomes. In turn, fairness is closely associated with feelings of inclusion (or exclusion) and co-operation (or conflict). Moreover, magnetic resonance imaging shows that inclusion/co-operation stimulates the same part of the brain biologically as material reward; exclusion/conflict stimulates the same part of the brain as physical pain.
19. Extrapolating the lessons to regulatory policy, governments can benefit from paying attention to how stakeholders perceive their engagement in the regulatory processes. The speaker put forward three main reasons why, drawing upon empirical evidence from the use of procedural justice in various fields:

- Governments can build trust in government and legitimacy. For example, evidence from the implementation of drinking-and-driving regulations in Queensland, Australia showed that the use of procedural justice increased government legitimacy.

- Governments can increase voluntary acceptance of, and compliance, with regulations and administrative decisions. For example, evidence from court-ordered arbitration showed that procedural justice increased acceptance of decisions.

- “Beneficence”: the government can reduce “physical pain” of feeling excluded by a system through procedural justice and directly improve the well-being of its citizens.

20. Drawing upon this empirical evidence, the speaker emphasized four requirements to integrate procedural justice into rule making processes:

- Voice: Stakeholders need to have the opportunity to present their views – but there must be evidence that the voice was taken into account by the decision makers. Perceptions of voice exert a very strong influence on perceived fairness.

- Respect and dignity: When citizens feel that they have been treated respectfully, perceived fairness increases. On the contrary, when citizens feel they have been treated disrespectfully, they tend to see the process as unfair. Stakeholders should not be treated as a number or a case.

- Explanations: Governments have to explain the procedure and decision as a basis for stakeholders to understand. Misunderstanding of the process and decision shape stakeholders’ perception of an experience.

- Public officials need to be trained to improve processes in the public administration. They have to know that the quality of these processes matter in their day to day interactions with the people.

21. Finally, the speaker focused on how to evaluate perceived fairness. Usually, perceived fairness is measured through questionnaires and/or interviews using randomised experiments in the design of data collection. Often the phased nature of training public officials provides opportunity to use randomised roll-out evaluation techniques – though continual monitoring and evaluation is very useful to support procedural justice.

Launch of the publication “OECD Framework for Regulatory Policy Evaluation”

22. The “OECD Framework for Regulatory Policy Evaluation” was officially launched for public use. The Framework is a diagnostic tool which assists countries in systematically evaluating the design and implementation of regulatory policy, against the achievement of strategic regulatory objectives. The Framework was developed in co-operation with the OECD Steering Group on Measuring Regulatory Performance and leading experts in the field.

23. The publication provides concrete guidance and examples on the application of the Framework to assess the functioning of ex ante and ex post evaluation systems, administrative burden reduction programmes and public consultation practices. It includes case studies of different methods of evaluation,
such as perception surveys, indicators for measuring compliance with formal requirements and in-depth reports.

24. Countries may find they are limited in the data and information available to evaluate the functioning and impact of regulatory policy, and it is extremely difficult to accurately demonstrate the 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, nevertheless there are a number of steps that every OECD country can take to improve the evaluation of regulatory policy. A good starting point can be to systematically collect data on the actual implementation of regulatory management tools and programmes to understand whether they are functioning in practice.

25. During the panel discussion, the panellists explained that the core objective was to "make the world a better place through regulation", and therefore the over-arching goal was to maximize social welfare. Countries needed to consider how indicators work together to achieve the expected regulatory outcomes and to consider what is the right mix of different tools/approaches needed to achieve the goals. Indicators can be a useful tool for self-evaluation or to allow external accountability of some actors, such as independent regulators. Indicators can be used to promote awareness and be a vehicle of debate or communication.

26. The information given in indicators, however, can be very vague, and can carry a risk that officials have the incentive to focus on how best to improve a score rather than how to improve the quality of regulation. It is easier to measure inputs, but it is possible even when successfully meeting targets for inputs to not successfully achieve the desired outcomes. It is therefore always necessary to make it clear how the desired outputs are related to the measured inputs.

Evaluating the benefits, challenges and impacts of stakeholder engagement in regulatory policy

27. The plenary discussions considered three key areas: Participants then took part in in-depth plenary discussions focusing on three key topics of stakeholder engagement practices: the different methods and practices of evaluating stakeholder engagement; the results of forthcoming 2014 survey and the development of indicators and a database of regulatory practices; and the goals and methods of assessing the impact of stakeholder engagement. These discussions built upon the findings of panel discussions, presentations and the points of debate that had been raised in the break-out sessions.

28. The Chair opened the plenary discussion with a review of the key aims of evaluation and assessment of impacts. He explained that evaluation can promote positive change, since ‘what is not measured does not get managed’. Measurement, however, is not straightforward, and governments should ensure they are collecting data on the right things. It may also be necessary to adapt the form of measurement to local circumstances.

Evaluating stakeholder engagement: practices in OECD countries

29. While all participants agreed that effective stakeholder engagement is essential for regulatory quality and that without evaluating stakeholder engagement activities it is impossible to achieve the desired outcomes, only a small number of countries are currently evaluating how their approaches to engage with stakeholders are functioning in practice. The few evaluation reports and performance indicators published by countries mostly assess outputs and processes (e.g. whether requirements for stakeholder engagement, such as minimum periods for public consultation, have been adhered to) and not outcomes (e.g. evaluation of whether stakeholder engagement has helped to achieve its goals, such as better quality of regulation, higher compliance rates or increased trust in government).
30. Participants stressed the need to clearly define the objectives of stakeholder engagement before evaluating it. Whether these objectives have been achieved will then serve as evaluation criteria against which the performance of stakeholder engagement practices can be assessed.

31. While the evaluation of stakeholder engagement is desirable, participants highlighted that it must be proportionate and feasible. The budget allocated for evaluation should reflect the resources spent on stakeholder engagement. Countries that are just starting to evaluate their practices should begin simply and on a small scale, without losing sight of more ambitious goals. A starting point could be for example to evaluate stakeholder engagement concerning one specific regulation, or to start with continuous monitoring whether basic process requirements (e.g. time limits, publishing consultation results online) have been respected. Participants also suggested following the example of how evaluations of Regulatory Impact Analysis (RIA) have evolved – from focusing on the process and evaluating single RIAs to more continuous evaluation mechanisms taking into account also the outcomes of the RIA process.

32. Such evaluations will provide a first indication on the actual functioning of countries’ systems. However, even more value lies in evaluating how good practices in stakeholder engagement have contributed to achieve desired outcomes. This task is methodologically challenging as in the realm of regulation causes and effects cannot be as easily observed as in a medical experiment. Though there are some statistical techniques, such as difference-in-difference estimations, that can be used to account for factors other than stakeholder engagement that might have an effect on outcomes. However, countries have made little use of these evaluation techniques due to the complexity and amount of resources required to implement such advanced research designs.

33. Participants also discussed the pros and cons of perception surveys in evaluation. On the one side, surveying stakeholders on their experience and views on the process and impact of stakeholder engagement can help highlight very concrete problems and point to ways to overcome these. On the other hand, policy makers using the results of such surveys should be aware of the fact that perception can be influenced by many factors and that it does not necessarily reflect the actual quality of stakeholder engagement processes. Therefore, in general, it is better to use perception surveys to evaluate the engagement process. When assessing the performance of stakeholder engagement, other techniques might serve better.

34. Participants found it very challenging to make concrete suggestions on how countries can assess the inclusiveness, transparency and adequate consideration of stakeholders’ views. The following suggestions for possible performance indicators were mentioned as examples. However, there was no general agreement on the usefulness of some of these indicators:

- Percentage of draft regulations that were changed as a result of public consultations – it is not clear what this indicator actually shows. A high percentage could indicate that stakeholder engagement during the development of the draft regulation was poor because many changes had to be made, but it could also indicate that consultation was good since many comments were actually incorporated. Another limitation is that many laws are changed extensively in parliament even if views of stakeholders were adequately considered and included in the draft regulation that was sent to parliament;

- Number of complaints on regulation after it was adopted;

- Number of participants in public consultation;
• Percentage of people/groups covered by consultation on which the regulation is expected to have a significant impact. For example it could be examined if all groups that are likely to bear costs/benefits as identified in the RIA were actually consulted.

35. Notwithstanding the methodological and practical difficulties in evaluating stakeholder engagement, participants agreed that it is better to have an imperfect or incomplete evaluation than no evaluation at all.

**The 2014 OECD survey on stakeholder engagement**

36. The purpose of this session was to brief delegates on the section on “stakeholder engagement and open government” in the 2014 OECD Regulatory Indicators Survey of government officials, to clarify questions and to discuss methodological issues including the construction of indicators and a good practice database. A number of issues were raised to improve the clarity of the questions, particularly explanations regarding definitions of terms and the scope of the questions. For example, some countries follow different practices and procedures for regulations that originate in parliament to those that originate in the Executive branch of government. The questionnaire focuses on practices regarding the regulations that originate in the Executive branch of government. It was agreed that an additional question would be added regarding the percentage of laws that originate in the Executive to help provide context for the answers.

37. It was agreed that respondents should provide explanations and methodologies for the statistical data they provide, as these differences may mean the information provided cannot be directly comparable across countries. It was also agreed that the sections of the questionnaire regarding consultations taking place at different stages of developing a regulation should be revised, with more questions being placed in the ‘general’ part of the questionnaire.

38. The OECD Secretariat also presented on the different options for developing indicators on consultation practices and the potential for using a database of country practices to complement the indicators and share good practices. Workshop participants stressed that indicators are a useful way of presenting information, making it easy to track progress over time and to identify areas of improvement. Indicators can also be an extremely effective way of gaining attention from political leaders on particular topics. They can also be used in conjunction with other complementary sources of information.

39. A number of different methods of weighting were discussed including: simple weights, expert, statistical or self-selection. The group concluded that when aggregating the data from the survey, a methodology should be designed that is simple to understand and would allow for comparability over time. The methodology should also try and prevent the possibility of ‘gaming’ by countries, i.e. providing selective information which would artificially inflate individual scores. Participants expressed a preference for using simple equal weights. Participants asked the Secretariat to develop a composite indicator for stakeholder engagement, with potentially some sub-composite indicators. The methodology will be discussed in the next meeting of the Steering Group on Measuring Regulatory Performance in November.

40. The Secretariat explained that the questionnaire asks for specific examples of regulatory policies and practices, including a section in each area on ‘innovative practices’. These specific examples will be a key source of information for one of the longer-term ambitions of the project; a database of examples of regulatory practices in key areas which will be developed to allow officials to study examples from across a wide range of OECD countries. Delegates were invited to brainstorm how such a database could be made most useful for them.
41. Participants identified ways to make the database user-friendly, including the use of an easy-to-read format and a search function. They suggested that Secretariat develops a standardised form to be sent to countries for retrieving information on specific practices.

40. It was also suggested that the practices described should include a certain level of background information so that readers could understand the context in which they were implemented. This background information could potentially also include the level of resources needed to implement a practice, so officials can have a realistic idea of which practices may be suitable/feasible for their own governments. If designing a standardised form the OECD could therefore consider what kind of background information/details should be asked for.

41. There were debates about what kind of examples the database should include. For example should the database only include practices which clearly reflect the principles of the OECD Recommendation; or could there also be examples which may be useful for countries under particular circumstances; or even examples of practices which have not been successful in achieving the desired outcome, to allow for ‘learning from mistakes’.

42. A question was put forward of whether it was possible for the database to potentially include contact details of the experts who provided the examples, building a network of expertise. A decision will also need to be made if the database should be a one-off exercise or whether there should be regular updating of the database.

43. It was suggested that the existing Observatory of Public Sector Innovation (OPSI) Database could serve as an example or potentially the new database could be incorporated into the existing structure.

44. The scope and scale of the database will depend on the amount of resources available. Thanks to the voluntary contributions from Denmark and the Netherlands, the OECD is able to begin work on the development a database, starting with developing examples of stakeholder engagement practices. Funding from other countries is welcome and be will used to create a user-friendly interface and extend the scope of the database to include practices reflecting other principles in the Recommendation.

Assessing the impact of stakeholder engagement

45. The focus of this discussion was to examine the impact of stakeholder engagement on outcomes, including trust in government, inclusive growth, compliance with regulations and better regulatory quality. It also sought to show how outcomes depend on specific engagement practices and to identify the actors in this process. Participants sought to answer the questions: ‘How to define the desirable (and undesirable) outcomes that stakeholder engagement seek to achieve?;’ ‘What proxies exist to measure whether these outcomes are achieved?’; and ‘How these outcomes may be shared by certain preconditions?’.

46. A starting point for the discussion was the presentation of the results of a 2009 OECD survey on citizen engagement in service delivery (not explicitly regulatory policy) completed by governments in 23 OECD member countries and 2 then observer countries (Chile and Slovenia). The survey found that, with respect to government itself, governments considered the “important” and “very important” goals for citizen engagement to be “improving transparency and accountability” (52 percent), “improving effectiveness and efficiency” (39 percent, respectively), with “improving legitimacy” as lower priority (17 percent). Moreover, the survey found that governments consider “increase citizens’ trust” (61 percent), “strengthening social cohesion” (35 percent) and raising knowledge/awareness (35 percent) as “important” and “very important” goals for citizen engagement, with improving compliance as a lower priority (13 percent).
47. The results of this survey highlighted two main points. First, that it is difficult to define what final goals/outcomes are, and what the intermediate goals/outcomes are. For example, are transparency and accountability outcomes in themselves or intermediate outcomes – and are they equivalent with one another? Second, these groupings of country responses may be very context specific. For example, could the financial crisis – and its economic and social impact – influence governments’ emphasis on social cohesion as important and very important goals?

48. The debates distilled the desired outcomes of stakeholder engagement in regulatory policy as twofold: more effective and efficient regulation (i.e. good regulatory outcomes) and procedural legitimacy (i.e. feeling of good outcomes). Assessing progress in achieving these outcomes is, however, very challenging; and cross country evaluation is very difficult because of different starting points. It is much easier to measure the attributes of stakeholder engagement processes and inputs. It is therefore more realistic to attempt examine trends over time in specific outcomes e.g. whether there is higher compliance, or better health/safety outcomes within a single country.

49. Moreover, the experts agreed that measuring the outcomes of stakeholder engagement requires consideration of a number of issues, especially if comparisons of cross-country trends are to be made. Experts need to look at the ways in which different instruments (and not single tools) impact one another. As such, it is not sufficient to look at consultation procedures alone; it may be necessary to examine the existence of both consultation procedures, freedom of information and other administrative procedures. Quantitative surveys may fall short in capturing the cause-effect relationship. A qualitative ex-post evaluation of regulations in relation to their respective expectations and a collection of cases that included and excluded consultation procedures may be a good starting point to create a learning model for good consultation and to distil outcome indicators.

Key conclusions

50. The workshop discussions have reconfirmed the importance of stakeholder engagement throughout OECD countries. There is a dual reason to invest in stakeholder engagement. Firstly, it improves the technical quality of regulation, as policy makers gain access to information and expertise that is often not available in the public administration. Secondly, engaging stakeholders at every step of the regulatory cycle enhances the legitimacy of and trust in government action. If all stakeholders/contributors feel that they can make their voice heard, that they are treated respectfully throughout the whole process and that regulators actually take their inputs into account, they are more likely to accept and to comply with the regulation. Moreover, the perceived fairness of consultation processes will also influence how open and receptive citizens are towards future regulatory initiatives.

51. However, it has also become clear that a blueprint for effective stakeholder engagement does not exist. The degree and method of engaging stakeholders will depend on the type of initiative and the country-specific context. Therefore, it might be necessary to use a mixture of different tools, of which formal consultation is only one.

52. Evaluating the functioning of stakeholder engagement is essential for policy makers to understand whether their efforts to engage really help to achieve desired objectives. Measuring how stakeholder engagement improved outcomes (e.g. regulatory quality) is challenging. More systematic monitoring on how regulations are implemented can help to assess whether desired outcomes have actually been achieved. A starting point for process evaluations could be to assess whether minimum requirements, such as time limits or the publication of consultation documents, have been respected. Gathering feedback of those who were consulted can provide another important signal on whether the engagement process works well in practice.
53. It is important that countries have a sense of whether they are improving over time. The upcoming 2014 OECD Regulatory Indicators Survey, which addresses stakeholder engagement as one of three key focus areas, will provide countries with an up-to-date overview of their progress in implementing effective stakeholder engagement and highlight good practice examples that will help countries to improve. Moreover, policy makers will be able to use the resulting indicators to attract the attention of their political leaders.

54. The policy conclusions of the workshop will be an important contribution to future OECD work, such as the forthcoming Regulatory Policy Outlook (2015) and the development of indicators of stakeholder engagement. Looking forward towards 2015/2016, the OECD will be working on best practice principles of stakeholder-engagement, building on the RPC’s work on enforcement and inspections and on the governance of regulators. This will require more in-depth discussions.

55. Finally it was noted that the findings of the meeting are not only applicable to the development of regulation, but should be implemented throughout the whole regulatory cycle. Moreover, it was stressed that countries should not lose sight of their ultimate goal; that is making a difference to peoples’ lives.

Closing remarks

56. The Chair and Secretariat thanked the Dutch government for their excellent organization of the meeting and their hospitality. The workshop proved to be extremely useful with a good mix of concrete and academic discussions and the OECD Secretariat is very thankful to all those who presented or took part in the panel discussions.

57. The OECD would like to thank the government of Iceland for agreeing to host the 7th Expert Meeting on Measuring Regulatory Performance which will take place Reykjavik in the summer of 2015.
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