

---

---

## Regulatory Governance

**ecpr**

standing group

# Newsletter

The Newsletter of the ECPR Standing Group on Regulatory Governance  
July 2008, Volume 1(2).

Group website <http://regulation.upf.edu/>

---

---

## Contents

Editor's introduction	2
The Standing Group's 2nd biennial conference, June 5 <sup>th</sup> -7 <sup>th</sup> 2008, Utrecht University	3
Feature Article: Quality of Regulation: Meaning, Determinants and Assessment	6
Rethinking Regulation: Project News from Sussex University	9
Workshop on the Politics of Climate Change, ECPR Joint Sessions, Rennes, April 2008	11
First Giandomenico Majone Prize awarded	13
Research Centres on Regulation	15
Willamette Center for Governance and Public Policy Research, Oregon, US	15
Groningen Centre of Energy Law (GCEL), University of Groningen, Netherlands	16
Centre for European Governance, University of Exeter, UK	17
Management of Network Industries, Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, Switzerland	18
Centre for Regulatory Impact Assessment, New Delhi, India	19
Centre for Competition Promotion, New Delhi, India	21
Millstein Center for Corporate Governance and Performance, Yale, US	22
List of Research Centres on Regulation	24
Call for papers: Regulation & Governance	25

# Editor's introduction

**Ian Bartle**

This second issue of the newsletter includes some short feature articles and summaries of a number of research centres. We think short summaries of research centres is a more useful and informative exercise than a list of centre names and in keeping with the ethos of the network it can better facilitate closer cross national collaborations, knowledge transfer and understandings. This can be developed in any way suitable to network members but one possibility is to build up a database of centre summaries made available as a separate document on the website.

I would like to draw your attention to the feature articles in this issue for themselves but also as examples of the kind of content we would like to include (eg short feature articles, project news and reports on conferences, seminars and workshops, and book reviews). Accordingly we again call for content along these lines for future issues. I received numerous book and conference announcements but have not included them in this issue. There is likely to be a high number of these and I'm not sure in the long run whether the newsletter is the best place for them. This is of course open for debate but I would now recommend

that those who would like to make book and conference announcements do so via the standing groups email list which can be accessed via the website.

The comments I have received about the newsletter, both via email and at the Group's recent second biennial conference in Utrecht (June 5-7, 2008) have been positive. In particular, there is a clear benefit in having communication medium which is less ephemeral than email. Despite this, a conventional newsletter format is rather static and does not facilitate easy and wide interaction among members. The idea of having a Group blog (either in addition to or in place of the newsletter) was floated at Utrecht and could be more interactive and dynamic. Anyone who has ideas on this or who would be willing to initiate it is encouraged to contact the group's co-chairs.

Finally, in the foreseeable future (at least well into next year) I will not be able continue with the editorship of the newsletter. Anyone who is willing to take over the role is encouraged to contact the group's co-chairs, David Levi Faur and Jacint Jordana.

# The Standing Group's 2nd biennial conference, June 5<sup>th</sup>-7<sup>th</sup> 2008, Utrecht University

**Prof Frans van Waarden, chair local organizer team**

From June 5<sup>th</sup> to 7<sup>th</sup> 2008 the Standing Group organised its second biennial conference, this time at University College, Utrecht University, in the Netherlands. The Standing Group organises these conferences in the year when there is no general ECPR conference. The first was organised in 2006 at the University of Bath in England by Ian Bartle and his team. In 2007 the Standing Group was present at the general conference in Pisa with 12 sessions. Next year we will do so again at the general conference in Potsdam. And in 2010 our third biennial conference is planned at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem.

The Utrecht conference was, like the earlier one in Bath, well attended. About 140 scholars from many countries and disciplines presented papers more or less linked to the conference theme. This theme was '(Re)Regulation in the Wake of Neoliberalism'. The aim was to take stock of three decades of neoliberalism as to its intended as well as unintended consequences regarding changes in economic governance arrangements. What did privatisation, market creation, market liberalisation, and attempts to bring market principles and incentives, by trying to deregulate and to reduce administrative burdens, bring? As we know by now, liberalisation and deregulation produced in a few years their very opposites: new regulation, and new constraints on both economic and

political freedom of choice. But by regulating markets new freedoms were also created.

Neoliberalism was originally motivated by rather naïve neoclassical economic ideas about markets being spontaneous self-organising social orders. However, it soon turned out that social reality did not fit the neoclassical theoretical models. Markets had to be protected from disappearing through mergers and acquisitions; freer markets led to more opportunistic behaviour in the market place, created more room for calculating competitive strategies, and legitimised these more; information asymmetries persisted or even increased, and with it the transaction costs to be made to reduce these. Notwithstanding attempts to narrow gaps in information, transaction partners got cheated. The reputation mechanism proved insufficient to prevent these. Scandals and crises happened, and brought home an old truth: that markets need regulation and market masters to reduce risks, uncertainties, and opportunism. Economic governance institutions are needed to bring order and to allow for trust relations to develop. These institutions have come in many forms and from many sources: commercial information providers and certifiers, self-regulating associations, public-private partnerships, state regulation, and courts.

Papers at the conference discussed these consequences in various sectors, which have been prone to liberalisation attempts: telecom services, other utilities and infrastructure markets, nano-technology, food production, financial markets, gambling, health care, social security. What issues were (re)regulated on these markets, why, how, and by whom? Among the new governance institutions discussed were public and private standard setting, litigation and adjudication, and not in the last place the newly founded independent regulatory state agencies.

Political scientists focused understandably on the *politics* of regulation: how did it come about, got shaped, whose interests were best served? In doing so, attention was paid to contradictory demands in policy formulation. For example the fate of attempts to mediate in policies between the often contradictory requirements of protecting public services, public interests and consumer and worker interests, and making sufficient room for private enterprise to realise the expected efficiency benefits of market liberalisation.

Political scientists and organisation sociologists focused on the organisation and autonomy of these agencies, their specialisation, jurisdictional conflicts, coordination, and collaboration; their degrees of autonomy vis-à-vis politics and industry, and the consequences of various degrees of autonomy for regulatory performance. Attention was of course also paid to the problems their autonomy creates for accountability and control, standard concerns of political

and legal scholars of political institutions and constitutional law.

Next to policy formation, policy implementation also found a place in the programme. Sociologists, economists, political scientists, and criminologists discussed and compared regulation and compliance regimes in different countries. What incentives and policy instruments can best be used to solve enforcement problems? What is the place for the carrot, the stick, or the sermon? Should one punish or persuade? How useful can naming and shaming be, also as a way to strengthen the related reputation mechanism, which already works, albeit imperfectly, on markets.

By drawing on experiences with regulation in different societal, national, and sectoral settings, papers came up with proposals for improvement. If regulation is necessary, can we at least 'better regulate', meaning being less costly, less bureaucratic, or otherwise burdensome to industry, consumers, and/or the state?

Considering the internationalisation of markets and political institutions, the European and international dimensions of markets also got attention. Risk and uncertainties that call for regulation after all come increasingly from abroad. Thus sessions were devoted to European integration as a driving force behind regulation, the role of European regulatory agencies, and the necessity for and/or the possibilities and problems of private international regulation as alternatives to state regulation.

The two plenary speakers, John Braithwaite from Canberra and Giandomenico Majone from Florence, placed the conference theme in different perspectives. John opened the conference and framed the conference theme, borrowing from his recently published book 'Regulatory Capitalism: How it works, ideas for making it better'. Majone added the European dimension. Both were also the subjects in 'Author meets critic sessions' in which several scholars commented on a book of each of them.

The conference offered also plenty of opportunities for socialising with like-minded or like-interested scholars, not only during the sessions, but also during coffee and tea breaks and a rather successful dinner at the conference venue, the dining hall of University College.

In this place I would once again like to thank all those who contributed to the success of the conference. In the first place of course the participants and paper presenters. Furthermore, the local organisers Markus Haverland, Kutsal Yesilkagit, Youri Hildebrand, Moritz Knapp, Anne Poorta, Jen Boutylkova, and Berend Snijders; the University College student-staff members Floortje Beemsterboer, Teodora Dimitrova, Marcin Pawlowski, and Eelke van Well, and the catering management and staff.

Further information, such as a detailed program, the papers presented, and some photographic memories, can be found on the conference website <http://regulation.upf.edu> Thanks go therefore also to its webmaster: Xavier Fernandez from the Universitat Pompeu Fabra in Barcelona.



**Utrecht Conference Local Organizers:**

Markus Haverland, Kutsal Yesilkagit, Youri Hildebrand  
and Frans Van Waarden

## Feature Article: Quality of Regulation: Meaning, Determinants and Assessment.

Siddhartha Mitra, Director, Research, CUTS International

The quality of regulation of economic activity is judged by the desirability of underlying regulatory laws/rules and effectiveness in enforcing such laws/rules. The objective of regulation should be to produce desirable outcomes in the present or future which might not otherwise occur or prevent undesirable outcomes which might otherwise occur. In other words, the purpose of regulation is to rein in the free exercise of market forces and consumer and producer impulses in cases where such a display can act as an obstacle to the maximisation of societal well being or to remove externally applied obstacles to market forces when their play is desirable. Undesirable regulatory laws (regulation that is not required) therefore automatically give rise to poor quality regulation irrespective of how such laws are implemented.

For the sake of illustration consider a law asking for an excessive fee for registration/licensing of business. It is clearly undesirable as it prevents many firms from entering the industry and hinders competition. Such a law will give rise to poor quality regulation irrespective of how efficiently it is implemented. Contrast this law with another that imposes heavy penalties on cartels. The latter is obviously an example of a desirable regulatory law. However, it constitutes only a necessary condition for good quality regulation. The quality of regulation might still be

poor in this case if this desirable regulatory law cannot be enforced because of investigative incompetence or the incidence of corruption. Success in enforcement often depends on the institutional structure i.e. the composition of the regulatory body and the ties/obligations that bind it to government, producers and consumers.

Regulation is undertaken by various sectoral agencies with different immediate objectives. The literature on regulation highlights the following determinants of regulatory quality - the degree of independence of the regulator with respect to the government and sectional lobbies, consistency and timeliness in pronouncements, well qualified staff, accountability etc. Empirical studies have shown that these qualities are positively linked to the desirability and effectiveness of regulation. Common sense also leads to the same conclusion; unless a regulator has a fair degree of independence it will not be able to formulate and implement regulation in a manner that is fair to all groups and consistent with the maximisation of social welfare. If it is not prompt in its pronouncements it will not be able to curb dangerous excesses before they result in damage to the economy. Without well qualified staff it will have difficulty in formulating regulation and also in implementing it. Accountability ensures that regulations are formulated and implemented with care after

assigning due importance to the welfare of all stakeholders.

The factors mentioned so far are proximate determinants of regulation. Delving further into the sources of regulatory laws and activity enables us to determine the root/ultimate determinants which drive these proximate determinants. For example, no overlap in functions of regulatory agencies and clear delineation of powers lead to timeliness of regulation. If the regulatory agency has its own training facilities for generating man power then it results in independence from the government and a steady flow of well qualified staff and consequently quality formulation and implementation of regulation. Own training facilities and sanction for generating financial resources through taxes, fees and publications result in both functional and financial autonomy from the government. The existence of an option for regulated entities to appeal against regulators in a tribunal ensures the accountability of regulators.

As different sectors have different objectives in adopting regulations it is very difficult to develop an integrated and holistic framework for assessing the quality of regulation. However any assessment of the quality of regulation involves three processes: (a) determining whether regulation is needed; (b) if it is needed determining its deviation from the optimal level of regulation; (c) determining the effectiveness of regulation in achieving its objectives.

With regard to (a) regulation is usually needed when (i) there is a natural

monopoly (economies of scale exist so that competition is not desirable); (ii) externalities exist so that agents are often not charged by the market for the costs they impose on others; (iii) there are information asymmetries among buyers and sellers implying that the market does not constitute a level playing field. If any of these characteristics are not found in a market to a significant extent regulation is deemed to be unnecessary and therefore of poor quality. With regard to (b) a technique called regulatory impact assessment (RIA) is used for determining the sub-optimality of regulation. This technique involves determination of the extent of regulation at which net benefits (benefits minus cost) are maximised. Note that a regulation involves both administrative costs (salaries of staff, equipment costs etc) for the regulator and compliance costs for the regulated parties (documentation costs and associated costs of staff etc.). The net benefit from regulation is therefore the welfare gains from regulation less the costs mentioned above and is a function of the stringency of regulation. When a regulation is less stringent than that required to maximise net benefit it is deemed as sub-optimal and the relevant sector is said to be under-regulated. On the other hand overregulation is said to occur if the stringency of existing regulation is more than the level which maximises net benefits.

While RIA is a good technique for determining the quality of regulatory laws it might be inadequate for judging their enforcement. The quality of regulatory enforcement can be judged by reviewing the status of its proximate or

ultimate determinants mentioned above. While one or both classes of determinants might be used the actual use might not be a matter of choice. In certain cases, especially in developing countries, the history of a regulatory body is so short at the time of assessment that it is often not possible to have adequately voluminous data on proximate determinants which are usually performance indicators. In such cases information on ultimate causes, such as the availability of own training facilities and own sources of funds, which are input indicators might have to be used.

of modern regulation. There is great scope for multilateral intervention in this regard so that economies of scale in training and development of skills can be exploited and rewarding interaction among countries on regulatory issues can be facilitated. Only then can we raise the quality of regulation in the developing world.

In general, it has been found that regulation is a task that requires specialised skills and training. Regulatory regimes in most developing countries are in an early stage of their evolution and many of them suffer from a lack of funds and training facilities for their staff. These are therefore unable to meet the demands

**Summary table**

<b>Need for regulation (1)</b>	<b>When is regulation desirable? (2)</b>	<b>Determinants of regulation (3)</b>	<b>Assessment Methods (4)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To check free play of market forces when that is not consistent with welfare maximisation</li> <li>• To facilitate its free play, when it is consistent with such maximisation, through removal of external obstacles.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natural monopolies</li> <li>• Asymmetries of information</li> <li>• Externalities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proximate determinants (independence accountability, timeliness, staff quality etc)</li> <li>• Ultimate determinants (own training facilities, own sources of funds etc)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desirability assessment: check for three properties mentioned in (2)</li> <li>• Regulatory Impact Assessment: check whether regulatory law maximises social benefit</li> <li>• Assess quality by reviewing status of determinants mentioned in (3)</li> </ul>

# Rethinking Regulation: Project News from Sussex University

**Adrian Smith**

The Rethinking Regulation project is part of a portfolio of work at the STEPS Centre, University of Sussex, UK which seeks to understand the dynamics, governance and design of pathways to sustainability ([www.steps-centre.org](http://www.steps-centre.org)). The project compares the regulation of two technologies - transgenic cotton seeds and antibiotics - with the way those technologies are experienced amongst poorer communities in rural Argentina and rural China. We will use the findings from these case studies to explore the implementation challenges facing regulators; and to understand the kinds of inclusive regulatory designs that can incorporate issues relevant to poorer communities. As such, we wish to understand how to improve regulatory capacity, and identify fruitful ways of rethinking regulation. We intend this project to provide insights of help to policy-makers and other stakeholders involved in regulatory capacity-building efforts.

Rapid scientific and economic change is extending the availability of modern technologies around the world, and fuelling aspirations to use them. Sources of innovation, modes of production, and routes of access proliferate. The variety of dynamic social and environmental contexts in which these technologies are used also increases, and the consequences of use become more uncertain. With technology access becoming an important development concern, so understanding

user contexts within poorer communities becomes important, including networks of supply and distribution. Regulations remain important instruments of (technology) governance. Technologies are subject to multiple procedures for setting norms and standards in relation to quality, safety, effectiveness, intellectual property, environmental protection and so on. Indeed, in fields like agricultural biotechnology and pharmaceuticals, the formulation of regulatory assurances is an important aspect of the technology development process.

In this project we examine the harmonising regulation of two widely available technologies - transgenic cotton seeds and antibiotic medicines - in rural China and rural Argentina. We wish to explore how their regulation - in terms of intellectual property, availability, authenticity, trade, quality, effectiveness and safety - overlaps, compares and contrasts with the way poorer users experience these properties. How do regulators' understandings of efficacious and safe use of antibiotics, for example, compare with poorer user experiences? How complete is the formal regulatory reach in poorer rural communities, and, where absent, what informal 'regulatory' strategies do the users themselves deploy in order to assure themselves of technological benefits and guard against risks? In sum, how inclusive are the regulatory framings of medicines and

seeds towards actual concerns amongst poorer communities?

Regulatory harmonisation and capacity building initiatives frequently understand their task to mean the transfer, scaling up and rolling out of dominant models. We wish to address how these models are reinterpreted, domesticated and acquire new meanings in particular contexts. At the same time, we wish to contrast this domestication with the realities of use of these technologies amongst poorer communities. Regulatory capacity building efforts, whether multilateral, bilateral or domestic, presume stable, certain worlds and widely shared goals. They reinforce classical regulatory efforts to fix and impose ideal patterns of use. Meanwhile, regulators struggle with diverse and dynamic contexts, shifting uncertainties, and privilege some classes of producer/user over others, whether deliberately or through insufficiently reflexive framings of the problem.

With these issues in mind, the STEPS project poses the following questions:

1. How do regulators understand the world they are regulating; how do they try to bring actual technological practices, and their consequences, into line with their regulatory framings?
2. How and why do these regulatory worlds contrast with the ways technologies are experienced amongst poorer users; how do poorer users

develop informal strategies for assuring themselves of benefits and guarding against risks?

3. How far do regulatory reforms and capacity building efforts bridge these divergent socio-technical worlds; which initiatives improve the reach of regulation for the poor in diverse and uncertain contexts?
4. How does the global political economy of technology development, coupled with unequal access to regulatory negotiations, shape the space for regulatory alternatives at different scales?

The challenge, from the STEPS Centre's point of view, is to research the evolution of regulatory systems in a way that acknowledges dynamics, complexity and the diverse framings and goals of different groups, with a view to developing alternatives that better meet the needs of the poor in ways that avoid political paralysis and remain alert to surprises.

Fieldwork in China and Argentina has just begun. Research partners include Fundación Cenit in Buenos Aires, Zhongnan University of Economics and Law in Wuhan, and Beijing Normal University. Information about the project is available from the STEPS Centre website. We expect preliminary results towards the end of this year (2008). For further details please contact Adrian Smith, the project co-ordinator, at [a.g.smith@sussex.ac.uk](mailto:a.g.smith@sussex.ac.uk).

# Workshop on the Politics of Climate Change, ECPR Joint Sessions, Rennes, April 2008

**Ian Bartle**

The aim of this workshop was to bring together political scientists to discuss research on the political obstacles to effective action on climate change and how they might be overcome. The workshop was part of a wider network of activities on the politics of climate change initiated by Dr Hugh Compston of Cardiff University. There remain significant obstacles to determined action despite the wide consensus on the science of climate change and established policy instruments to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

The workshop focused mainly on the national level and below as this is where most substantive policies are formulated and implemented. At present the main strategy employed by national governments that wish to reduce emissions is to move on a broad range of fronts while avoiding or diluting actions that may be resisted by business groups or the electorate. The workshop aimed to evaluate the political efficacy of these strategies as well as identify and evaluate other ways in which political obstacles to more vigorous action on climate change may be overcome.

Papers presented at the workshop included:

- cross-national comparative analyses to investigate the influence of key political variables on emissions reductions including parties and party systems, membership of international

- organisations such as the EU, corporatism and consociationalism;
- media presentations of climate change and policy influences;
- policy network theory;
- how emissions trading arose as the dominant policy mechanism in the EU;
- climate policy drivers in Germany and Finland;
- east-west divides in climate policy in Europe;
- strategies learned from sub-national experience in the US; dilemmas of EU climate policy;
- better regulation and transparency and its scope for improving climate policy.

Some key issues discussed at the workshop were:

- how climate policies are affected by policy congestion;
- how political strategies are influenced by perceptions of interests and by national institutions and political opportunity structures. Relevant variables include electoral systems; number of parties; degree of consensus, corporatism and/or consociationalism; election finance laws; and media structure;
- how agenda-setting is heavily influenced by issue framing. Rightly or wrongly weather-related natural disasters tend to be attributed to climate change;
- how issue linkage with issues such as energy security and employment helps to increase public support, especially in

countries where climate policy is not (yet) well developed;

- how greater transparency in the policy process may help to bolster public support for climate policies that are popular or substantial enough to attract significant media attention, although this may be counterproductive;
- how issues of equity are relevant at the national as well as international level, as policy instruments such as carbon taxes are often regressive in nature. Western norms of equity are in large part culturally specific and not universally shared at international level, complicating the task of persuading developing countries to push ahead faster with climate policies;
- how the development of climate policies can create a growing political constituency of support, for example among firms investing in renewable energy production;
- how consensus strategies help to get climate policy moving by reducing opposition. However, once the easy options have been implemented, such strategies may give those involved an effective veto over policy and impede further progress. This means that radical policies may require confrontation, imposition and/or compensation.

Action to mitigate climate change encompasses many of the key themes and principles in modern regulatory governance. It is a significant example of modern risk based regulation: notions of risk, uncertainty, and whether to adopt the precautionary principle play key roles in policy debates between mitigation and adaptation in climate change. Many established regulatory instruments are deployed including mandatory 'command and control' regulations; market based mechanisms (using financial incentives); and voluntary approaches ('moral suasion'). There are institutions at multiple levels from the local and national to the international and global. Arguments for (and against) the adoption of independent agencies (a 'carbon authority') for the control of carbon emissions (similar to the independent utility regulators or central banks) have also been made.

The workshop was directed by Dr Hugh Compston, Reader in the Department of Politics, Cardiff School of European Studies, at Cardiff University, UK. He has also set up a network of scholars interested in the politics of climate change, for further information contact him at [compston@Cardiff.ac.uk](mailto:compston@Cardiff.ac.uk).

## First Giandomenico Majone Prize awarded

The Standing Group on Regulatory Governance of the European Consortium for Political Research awarded its first Giandomenico Majone Prize to Dr John Mikler (University of Sydney) during its second biennial Conference held at University Utrecht in June 5-7, 2008 for his paper entitled "Domestic Liberalisation as Global Regulation: the Cases of Fuel Economy and Online Gambling Regulations".

The Prize is in honour of Giandomenico Majone for his outstanding contribution for the study of regulatory governance in the European Union and well beyond it. This award recognises outstanding research by scholars in early stages of her or his career in the field of regulatory governance from all relevant disciplinary backgrounds. The Prize is limited to scholars having completed their PhD no more than seven years before the deadline for submission.

The Prize committee, composed of Prof. Claudio Radaelli (University of Exeter), Chair, Prof. Markus Haverland (Erasmus University) and Prof. Jarle Trondal (University of Oslo) decided to award the first prize to the paper presented by Dr. John Mikler considering that the paper "proposes a fresh and original approach to the theme of the conference, criticising some blunt statements made by political scientists on the advent of 'neo-liberalism' and 'globalisation'. Blending different theoretical inspirations, Dr John Mikler provides evidence from two great case studies to support his arguments". The prize committee found that this paper makes the most ambitious

claims and is by far the most exciting among those submitted for the Majone prize in terms of blending theory and empirical evidence.

Dr. John Mikler is lecturer in the Department of Government and International Relations at the University of Sydney since February 2006. Although an early career researcher, John has around 10 years experience in policy development and implementation through several positions with the Australian Commonwealth Public Service.

His research interests are primarily focused on the role of transnational economic actors, particularly multinational corporations, and the interaction between them and states, international organisations and civil society. He is currently researching the global regulation of online gambling. He has presented his findings at national and international conferences, and has had his research published as a working paper, book chapter, and as journal articles in "Global Society", "Business and Politics", and "Policy and Society".

Paper abstract:

Globalisation is sometimes taken as a synonym for market liberalisation, and it is said that power has flowed from states to markets. Whether happening as a result of undeniable 'forces' or some hegemonic consensus, there is agreement on the left and right of politics that this is a reality. This paper examines how market liberalisation actually produces two countervailing forces in respect of

regulation. On the one hand, domestic deregulation enhances market power and the discretion of market actors. Yet on the other hand, states with effective market-friendly regulations are able to influence outcomes beyond their borders. The cases of fuel economy and online gambling regulations are used to illustrate these points. In the former case, Japanese and European industry-driven regulations are being 'exported' in the attributes of the products of their car industries, producing pressures for

harmonisation in other markets. In the case of online gambling, UK market-friendly regulations are likely to be 'exported' to the European region and beyond because of market liberalisation principles embodied in European Union institutions. While seemingly unrelated cases, what they thus have in common is that domestic liberalisation coupled with globalisation is creating opportunities for global regulation.



**Claudio Radaelli, Giandomenico Majone  
and Prize Winner John Mikler**

# Research Centres on Regulation

## Willamette Center for Governance and Public Policy Research, US

April 4, 2008 – Willamette University President Lee Pelton announced the opening of the Willamette Center for Governance and Public Policy Research located at the Atkinson Graduate School of Management. Fred Thompson, the Grace and Elmer Goudy Professor of Public Management and Policy at the Atkinson Graduate School of Management at Willamette University, has been named director of the center.

The new center brings to five the number of centers of academic excellence that already include the Center for Ancient Studies and Archeology, Center for Asian Studies, Center for the Study of Democracy, Religion, and Law and Center for Sustainable Communities.

The policy research center will be a collaborative effort with participating faculty drawn from Willamette's College of Liberal Arts, Atkinson Graduate School of Management, College of Law and from campuses throughout the Pacific Northwest. The mission of the center is the conduct of high-quality, policy-relevant research focusing primarily on transformational and

governance problems, especially those with a financial component. "Excellence in public policy research is judged by its scholarship and its influence," said Thompson. "Our work aims to satisfy both criteria."

Serving on the center's board of directors are Professors Patrick Emerson, Oregon State University; Tony Rufolo, Portland State University; Vincent F. Chiappetta, Willamette College of Law; Richard Ellis and Joe Bowersox, Willamette College of Liberal Arts; Manohar Singh and Ken Smith, Atkinson Graduate School of Management, and Laura Lockwood-McCall, director of the Debt Management Division, Office of the Oregon State Treasurer.

[www.willamette.edu/centers/publicpolicy/](http://www.willamette.edu/centers/publicpolicy/)

[http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/cf\\_dev/AbsByAuth.cfm?per\\_id=249171](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/cf_dev/AbsByAuth.cfm?per_id=249171)

Contact: Russell Yost  
Director of Marketing – Willamette University MBA [ryost@willamette.edu](mailto:ryost@willamette.edu)  
(503) 428-4913

## Groningen Centre of Energy Law (GCEL), University of Groningen, Netherlands

The Faculty of Law of the University of Groningen in the Netherlands has established a research centre which focuses on legal questions involving the energy sector, called the Groningen Centre of Energy Law (GCEL). This is a unique research centre concentrating on energy law. Some 25 researchers aim at examining a wide range of legal issues affecting the energy sector.

The Groningen Centre of Energy Law coordinates all research involving the energy sector, 'from well head to burner pit'. It includes all legislation and regulation applying to the production, transmission and supply of energy, the promotion of renewable energy sources, the need to secure energy supply, as well as issues concerning climate change and environmental protection.

Major project on carbon capture and storage:  
Recently the Groningen Centre of Energy Law started a research programme on the

legal aspects of Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS). Research topics include: liability for damages, third party access, the impact planning law and safety norms, and the relation with emissions trading. A book on CCS will be published by the end of this year.

Contacts:

Prof. dr. Martha M. Roggenkamp (initiator), +31 (0)50-3633388, [m.m.roggenkamp@rug.nl](mailto:m.m.roggenkamp@rug.nl) Dr. Edwin Woerdman (co-initiator), +31 (0)50-3635736, [e.woerdman@rug.nl](mailto:e.woerdman@rug.nl)

Address:

Groningen Centre of Energy Law  
University of Groningen  
Faculty of Law  
PO Box 716  
9700 AS Groningen  
The Netherlands

Internet:

[www.rug.nl/crbs/onderzoek/gcel/index](http://www.rug.nl/crbs/onderzoek/gcel/index)

## Centre for European Governance, University of Exeter, UK

The Centre for European Governance was established in May 2008 at the University of Exeter under the Directorship of Professor Claudio Radaelli.

The Centre results from a merger of the existing Centres for Regulatory Governance and European Studies ([www.centres.ex.ac.uk/ces/](http://www.centres.ex.ac.uk/ces/)). Exeter is a research leader in the study of Europe and European integration. The Centre for European Governance is a university Centre the aim of which is to promote and coordinate international excellence in research across the University. It has a particular strength in politics and law and business. CEG staff are integrated into wider national and international

research networks. The Centre runs regular workshops and seminars ([www.centres.ex.ac.uk/ces/further.shtml](http://www.centres.ex.ac.uk/ces/further.shtml)), hosts visiting scholars and coordinates 4 MA programmes. CEG has close ties with the Centre for European Legal Studies based in the School of Law. It provides a focal point across the University and beyond for interdisciplinary research and post-graduate specialised training. The Centre is also a platform for high-profile discussion fora on regulation involving different stake holders within government, the business community, and the civil society. The Centre is unique in the UK in that it brings together European governance and policy analysis.

## Management of Network Industries, Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, Switzerland

The Chair MIR studies, the de- and re-regulation, as well as the governance and the management of the network industries, postal services, telecommunications, electricity, water distribution and sanitation, air transport and railways with a special focus on the role the ICTs play in both transforming and governing these industries. MIR has also extended its research activities into areas of innovation and risk in these industries, as their transformation makes them simultaneously more innovative and more vulnerable.

MIR also teaches Minor/Master courses on Corporate Governance and Industry Analysis, as well as PhD courses on de-

/re-Regulation of Network Industries, and on Qualitative Research Methods.

MIR edits a quarterly Newsletter the section Economics of Infrastructures at TU Delft. In addition, MIR co-edits the Journal of Competition and Regulation in Network Industries (CRNI).

### CONTACTS

Address:

EPFL - CDM - MIR

Bassenges Station 5

CH - 1015 Lausanne

Tel.: +41 21 693 00 02

Fax: +41 21 693 00 00

[mir@epfl.ch](mailto:mir@epfl.ch)

## Centre for Regulatory Impact Assessment, New Delhi, India

*The name of the Centre, CRIA, is derived from the Sanskrit word 'kriya', which means a practice with the goal of attaining higher knowledge*

TERI set up CRIA (Centre for Regulatory Impact Assessment) in its Regulatory Studies and Governance Division in 2007. CRIA has been set up to undertake theoretical and empirical research on the process and impact of regulation, and encourage policy-makers and regulators to regulate better. The Centre focuses on the following activities:

- To design appropriate Regulatory Impact Assessment processes and methodologies for appraising regulatory options
- To increase awareness among policy-makers and practitioners on how policy design and implementation of regulation can be improved through Regulatory Impact Assessment to meet development objectives and reduce regulatory failure
- To undertake ex-ante and ex-post impact assessment of economic regulation and policy decisions, using both qualitative and quantitative techniques (putting Regulatory Impact Assessment in practice)
- To increase awareness on principles of good regulation in decision-making
- To undertake capacity building of various stakeholders

Our experience includes studies on impact of reforms in the power and telecom sectors in India; impact of usage of electricity on poverty reduction in the

Indian state of Madhya Pradesh; designing, demonstrating, and assessing impact of time-of-day pricing in Delhi amongst others. TERI was also a partner of CRC (Centre on Regulation and Competition), IDPM (Institute for Development Policy and Management) at the University of Manchester, UK from 2003 to 2007. In this capacity, TERI undertook research on Regulatory Impact Assessment in the electricity and telecom sectors in India. It also participated actively in the conferences organised by the CRC in the UK, Philippines, and South Africa, and presented its work to a wider audience.

In 2007, the Centre undertook a study on 'Analysis of distribution tariff orders issued by the State Electricity Regulatory Commissions, India' (Ministry of Power, Government of India), 2006, analysed the distribution tariff orders issued by nine SERCs (State Electricity Regulatory Commissions) in India during FY 2003/04, FY 2004/05, and FY 2005/06. It assessed the impact of these tariff orders on parameters, such as consumption and access, efficiency, investment, financial performance, tariffs, and competition. It also looked at parameters of regulatory governance, such as regulations issued, public participation in tariff determination process, timeliness of orders, staffing and compliance of directives. The findings of the study have also been published in the form of a book

titled "Regulation in practice: impact of tariff orders on the Indian Electricity sector". The findings of this study have found acceptance in the regulatory community in India and some of the issues highlighted have been taken up by the Ministry for further research and understanding.

The Division has also been involved in capacity building activities in the area of impact assessment. It organised the 'National Conference on Reforms in Infrastructure Sectors: impact assessment and governance' in 2003 and 'National Conference on Regulatory Performance in India: achievements, constraints and future action' in 2006. These conferences focused on the assessment of the performance of regulatory reforms in India's infrastructure sector, identifying

the implementation constraints, and drawing a roadmap for future action. The conference covered key infrastructure sectors, such as electricity, oil and gas, water, transport, and telecom.

Contact:

Anjali Garg

Fellow and Area Convener

Centre for Regulatory Impact Assessment  
Regulatory Studies and Governance  
Division

Darbari Seth Block, IHC Complex, Lodhi  
Road

New Delhi - 110 003, India

Fax: +91 11 2468 2144/2468 2145

Tel.: +91 11 2468 2100/4150 4900 (Extn  
2239)

E-mail: [agarg@teri.res.in](mailto:agarg@teri.res.in)

Website: [www.teriin.org](http://www.teriin.org)

## Centre for Competition Promotion, New Delhi, India

The Centre for Competition Promotion was set up in 2007, building on the work that the Institute has been undertaking in the past in the field of competition and regulation. At the heart of the Centre's agenda are the goals of conducting responsible research in the field of competition policy and subsequent dissemination of the research. The Centre endeavours to provide assistance to various stakeholders, such as governments at both central and state level, regulatory authorities, and public and private sector utilities on policy, structural, institutional, and legislative changes that are required to promote competition and reduce barriers to entry of a player. To begin with, the focus of the Centre will be on physical infrastructure sectors like energy, transport, water etc followed by social infrastructure sectors like health and education.

The Centre will focus on:

- Identifying the impact of government policies and regulations on encouraging healthy competition in the identified sectors;
- Compiling and analysing international best practices for competition promotion and their applicability to the Indian situation;
- Suggesting structural, legislative, policy and regulatory changes that need to be introduced so as to make the sectors more competitive while balancing developmental concerns;
- Increasing awareness on competition issues and undertaking capacity building activities.

In 2007, TERI had carried a detailed study looking at the competition issues in the Indian energy sector, findings of which were well received by all concerned stakeholders. Presently, the Centre is undertaking a study on 'Competition issues in regulated industries: Case of Indian transport sector' for the CCI (Competition Commission of India), Foreign Investment Advisory Service (a joint service of the World Bank and International Finance Corporation), and the DFID (Department for International Development). The study specifically focuses on the Indian Railways and the Indian Ports sector. The aim of the study is to assess the level of competition in these sectors, to identify barriers to entry and then through light on any anti-competitive practices that might be prevalent in the sectors. The scope of work includes extensive critical review of relevant international experience so as to suggest alternative regulatory and legal frameworks for establishing a more competitive environment.

Contact:

Ruchika Chawla

Associate Fellow and Area Convener

Centre for Competition Promotion

Regulatory Studies and Governance  
Division

Darbari Seth Block, IHC Complex, Lodhi  
Road

New Delhi - 110 003, India

Fax: +91 11 2468 2144/2468 2145

Tel.: +91 11 2468 2100/4150 4900 (Extn  
2249)

E-mail: [ruchikac@teri.res.in](mailto:ruchikac@teri.res.in)

Website: [www.teriin.org](http://www.teriin.org)

# Millstein Center for Corporate Governance and Performance, Yale

## Call for Research Proposals

The Millstein Center for Corporate Governance and Performance at Yale sponsors empirical and analytical research relating to corporate governance and performance. Unlike a traditional call for papers, this Call for Research Proposals is intended to support scholars at relatively early stages of research. The Faculty Advisory Board of the Center twice annually considers outstanding proposals for award stipends. Scholars at Yale and other institutions are eligible. Projects should reflect the Center's mission. Efforts are currently focused on the following subject areas, though topics not mentioned here are welcome:

- firm governance (impact of firm structure; interactions among owners, board, and management);
- market institutions (role of institutions that are vital to transactions);
- regulation (role of regulation, transparency, and international standards);
- role of the corporation (rationale for the corporation, corporate obligation and responsibility, expectations of stakeholders);
- shareholders (the extent of ownership rights, obligations of retail and institutional investors, private pools of capital, and governments).

The program's goals are: (1) to support and foster young, exceptional talent in corporate governance (2) to stimulate research on issues related to corporate governance, corporate performance, and

any linkages or correlations (3) to improve the educational research community's firsthand knowledge of corporate governance. The program supports research projects that are quantitative or qualitative in nature, including the analysis of existing data and the development of new data sets. Collection and organisation of new data sets that can serve as a resource in corporate governance research is a particularly important activity that the Center is actively interested in supporting.

Research awards are up to \$20,000 for a 1 year projects and may be renewed. Applications are encouraged from multiple disciplines and open to applicants of any nationality. Awards are available for post-doctoral researchers, faculty, and PhD-level researchers. Successful candidates will also be expected to submit a progress report and a final report of publication quality.

Application Requirements: for consideration by the committee, all applications must include:

Research proposal (limited to 5 pages) that includes: a brief abstract; description of issue and its importance; short review of relevant research/policy literature; model/framework of the study; description of methodology and research design; estimated budget; author(s) current resume or CV; list of any other grants received or applied for.

Evaluation criteria: evaluation will be based on importance of the proposed issue, the strength of methodology mode, and relevant experience and research record of the applicant.

Application Submission: proposals for Research Grants will be reviewed twice a

year, with funding decisions made within a month of the review date. Upcoming deadlines for proposals are: October 1, 2008 to be reviewed in late October; June 1, 2009 to be reviewed in late June; the submission process will be electronic for the 2008-2009 review cycles.

## List of research centres on regulation

- American Bar Foundation
- Centre for Analysis of Risk and Regulation
- Centre for Business Relationships, Accountability, Sustainability and Society (BRASS)
- Centre for Competition Policy (CCP) – University of East Anglia
- Centre for Environmental Risk - UEA
- Centre for Regulatory Governance (CRG), University of Exeter
- Centre for Risk and Insurance Studies
- The King's Centre for Risk Management, King's College London
- Centre for the Study of Environmental Change (CSEC) - University of Lancaster
- Centre for the Study of Regulated Industries (CRI) - University of Bath
- Center for the Study and Improvement of Regulation
- Center for Research in Regulated Industries at Rutgers University
- Centre on Regulation and Competition (CRC) - University of Manchester
- Centre for Research in Economics and Finance, Cranfield School of Management, Cranfield University, UK.
- European Corporate Governance Institute
- Harvard Center for Risk Analysis
- Hugo Sinzheimer Institute on Labour and Law
- Institute for the Study of Genetics, Biorisks and Society - University of Nottingham
- Judge Institute of Management, University of Cambridge
- Max-Planck-Institut für Gesellschaftsforschung
- Monash Centre for Regulatory Studies
- PRAXIS Center for Policy Studies
- Public Utility Research Center, University of Florida
- Regulation Initiative - London Business School
- Regulatory Institutions Network (REGNET) - Australian National University
- Risk Management and Decision Process Center - Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania
- Risk, Science and Health Media Research Group
- STEPS - Social, Technological and Environmental Pathways to Sustainability
- The Center for the Study of Law and Society - University of California, Berkeley
- Warwick Business School - Centre for Management Under Regulation
- Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin - Institute for Advanced Study Berlin



## Call for papers

We are pleased to invite you to submit your papers to our new peer-reviewed, international, and interdisciplinary journal - *Regulation & Governance* - edited by John Braithwaite (Australian National University), Cary Coglianese (University of Pennsylvania) and David Levi-Faur (Corresponding editor) (Hebrew University).

*Regulation & Governance* aims to serve as a leading platform for the study of regulation and governance by political scientists, lawyers, sociologists, historians, criminologists, psychologists, anthropologists, economists, and others. Published quarterly, *Regulation & Governance* provides a forum for open and critical scholarly dialogue for those working in a range of disciplines, using diverse methodologies, and concerning any aspect of regulation and governance. Through *Regulation & Governance*, we aim to advance discussions between various disciplines about regulation and governance, promote the development of new theoretical and empirical understanding, and serve the growing needs of practitioners for a useful academic reference.

*Regulation & Governance* is an excellent choice of outlet for your research, providing authors with:

- Referee reports from highly prestigious experts in the field, providing valuable insight and feedback to authors;
- Rapid speed to publication: the average time from submission to decision is just 48 days! Articles are published 'OnlineEarly' to ensure journal content is available to readers as quickly as possible;
- Exposure to researchers around the world: In 2007 *Regulation & Governance* had the fifth highest rate of downloads-per-article among all of Wiley-Blackwell's 1,400 scholarly journals;
- The prestige of publishing in a leading international journal. The journal is led by internationally renowned experts in the field, and supported by an Editorial Board of outstanding scholars from a range of disciplines.

**Be a part of this exciting new journal and submit to *Regulation & Governance*.** For further information about the journal, including submission instructions, please visit our website at:

<http://www.blackwellpublishing.com/rego>.

Manuscripts can be submitted online at: <http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/reggov>