



# Hungary

Indicators of Regulatory Policy and Governance 2021





## Overview and recent developments

All primary and subordinate legislations are required to undergo a RIA. However, RIAs are not consulted on nor made publicly available. In March 2019, Hungary updated an act from 2010 on law-making to establish new obligations for law-makers. It requires law-makers to consider the results of impact assessments when developing new laws so that they only propose laws that are necessary for achieving regulatory objectives. In addition, it requires that where possible, legislations are drafted in a way that result in simpler, faster and less costly procedures, reduce the number of legal obligations and administrative burdens, and prevent over-regulation and regulatory overlap.

Draft legislation with its statement of purpose is required to be made accessible to the public with the possibility to provide comments by email. However, consultation is not required in the early phases of the design of legislation. The general public can express their recommendations to modify or provide feedback on existing regulations by sending an email to the corresponding ministry. While *ex post* evaluation is required, the OECD has received no evidence that this is done in practice.

The Government Office is responsible for co-ordinating the different phases of preparation of a regulatory proposal, from the consultation with

other administrations once a ministry has prepared a regulatory proposal and RIA to the meeting of the State Secretaries to the final government meeting. The Government Office can also propose reforms or modifications related to the RIA and *ex post* evaluation framework. It prepares an annual report on RIA based on feedback from each ministry, which is not publicly available. Within the Prime Minister's Office, the State Secretary in charge of the territorial administration makes proposals for simplifying regulatory burdens on citizens and businesses. There is no oversight body in charge of quality improvements on RIAs or *ex post* reviews. Hungary would benefit from technical quality support for RIAs, *ex post* evaluations and consultations.

Overall Hungary would gain from improving transparency throughout the policy cycle. Stakeholders should be consulted at different stages of the policy cycle and relevant supporting legislative documents and impact assessments should be made available online to a wider public. Furthermore, the public should be informed in advance when consultations, RIA and *ex post* evaluations will take place. This would allow to further improve the efficiency and effectiveness of public policies and promote the accountability of the system.

# Indicators of Regulatory Policy and Governance (iREG): Hungary, 2021

● Methodology 
 ● Systematic adoption 
 ● Transparency 
 ● Oversight and quality control 
 ■ Country total, 2018 
 — OECD average, 2021



Notes: The more regulatory practices as advocated in the [OECD Recommendation on Regulatory Policy and Governance](#) a country has implemented, the higher its iREG score. The indicators on stakeholder engagement and RIA for primary laws only cover those initiated by the executive (74% of all primary laws in Hungary).

Source: Indicators of Regulatory Policy and Governance Surveys 2017 and 2021, <http://oe.cd/ireg>.

## Hungary: Transparency throughout the policy cycle



### Inform the public in advance that:

A public consultation is planned to take place	<b>Never</b>
Regulatory impact assessment (RIA) is due to take place	<b>No</b>
Ex post evaluations are planned to take place	<b>Never</b>



### Consult with stakeholders on:

Draft regulations	<b>All</b>
Evaluations of existing regulations	<b>Never</b>



### Publish online:

Ongoing consultations*	<b>All</b>
Views of participants in the consultation process	<b>No</b>
RIAs	<b>Never</b>
Evaluations of existing regulations	<b>No</b>



### Policy makers use:

Interactive website(s) to consult with stakeholders	<b>No</b>
Website(s) for the public to make recommendations on existing regulations	<b>No</b>



### Policy makers provide a public response to:

Consultation comments	<b>No</b>
Recommendations made in ex post evaluations	<b>Never</b>

\* Publish on a single central government website.

Note: The data reflects Hungary's practices regarding primary laws initiated by the executive.

Source: Indicators of Regulatory Policy and Governance Survey 2021, <http://oe.cd/ireg>.



## THE OECD REGULATORY INDICATORS SURVEY AND THE IREG COMPOSITE INDICATORS

The data presented in the 2021 Regulatory Policy Outlook are the results of the 2014, 2017 and 2021 Indicators of Regulatory Policy and Governance (iREG) surveys.

The iREG survey investigates in detail three principles of the 2012 OECD Recommendation of the Council on Regulatory Policy and Governance: stakeholder engagement, regulatory impact assessment (RIA) and *ex post* evaluation. Three composite indicators were developed based on information collected through the surveys for these areas. Each composite indicator is composed of four equally weighted categories:

- **Systematic adoption** comprises formal requirements and how often these requirements are conducted in practice;
- **Methodology** presents information on the methods used in each area, e.g. the type of impacts assessed or how frequently different forms of consultation are used;
- **Oversight and quality control** reflects the role of oversight bodies and publicly available evaluations; and
- **Transparency** comprises information which relates to the principles of open government e.g. whether government decisions are made publicly available.

The data underlying the composite indicators reflect practices and requirements in place at the national level of government, as of 1 January 2021. The indicators for stakeholder engagement

and RIA relate to regulations initiated by the executive, while the indicator on *ex post* evaluation relates to all regulations. Whilst the indicators provide an overview of a country's regulatory policy system, they cannot fully capture the complex realities of its quality, use and impact. In-depth country reviews are therefore required to complement the indicators and to provide specific recommendations for reform. A full score on the composite indicators does not imply full implementation of the Recommendation. To ensure full transparency, the methodology for constructing the composite indicators and underlying data as well as the results of sensitivity analysis are available publicly on the OECD website (<http://oe.cd/ireg>).

Related links:

- [Regulatory Policy Outlook 2021](#)
- [Indicators and underlying data and methodology](#)
- [2012 Recommendation of the Council on Regulatory Policy and Governance](#)
- [OECD Measuring Regulatory Performance Programme](#)
- [OECD work on regulatory policy](#)

**Contact:**

Measuring Regulatory Performance programme  
[mrp@oecd.org](mailto:mrp@oecd.org)