SPECIFIC STATISTICS OF CZECH LEGISLATION

František Novák*

Abstract: As the title suggests the article deals with certain quantitative analysis of legislation, the backbone of any legal order, using methodological and theoretical approach, as well as investigative and analytical approach applied, in this case, on legislation, i.e. the legal order of the Czech Republic. It can be characterized as a specific statistical method based on the quantification of investigated phenomena of interest. However, this quantification cannot be done in a standard way – mainly because in legal theory any attempt to approach the investigated topics with quantitative exactness is a rare effort, there are no standards and sometimes such attempts may even be met with suspicion.

The introduction is therefore necessarily focusing on the question whether such legal phenomenon as legislation can be described quantitatively. The next part is dedicated to the methodology and clarification of author's approach, i.e. mainly definitions and interpretations of the introduced and monitored variables and their operationalization.

The third part of the study is an application of the introduced methodology on concrete research: quantitative description of Czech legislation over the last 12-month period, for which full data set has been collected. Thanks to regular quantitative monitoring of Czech legislation, and other similarly focused research efforts, in recent years we are able to compare the results of these analyses for different periods. The key variables and quantitative indicators were derived from the formal structure of legislative documents with emphasis on the relevance of the law, branch structure of legislation and also on the international factor in this context. Changes documenting the development of legislation are then highlighted within this framework. This procedure could be an inspiration for similar quantitatively and thematically oriented comparative research efforts in different countries, especially when it comes to the growing cooperation between Central European countries.

Keywords: Legislation, quantitative description of legislation, methodological basis of the legislation of the CR, structure and development of the legislation in the CR

1. PARAMETRIZATION OF THE LEGAL ORDER OF THE CZECH REPUBLIC

In the beginning of our analysis let us reflect upon the fact that the law is a complex and intricate collection or set of events and connections, ideas and relations that are hard to grasp for their great numbers and complicated relations. The phenomenon "law" is, as a whole, hard to define and not very open to rational organization and explication. We accept with humility this fact and, being fully aware of the scientific imperfections and incompleteness, we attempt to at least partially grasp certain parts or forms of the law as a phenomenon, represented in our opinion primarily by sources of law and, in modern legal orders, by individual legislative forms, i.e. legislative (written) documents. These documents can be seen as material carriers of legal standards[1], and, as such, are certainly a subject for empirical analysis.

The starting point for a quantitative description of the Czech legislation is a certain analogy with state statistics, which, as a method, have been used for a very long time in state gover-

---

[1] See KNAPP, V. *Teorie práva*. Praha, 1995, p. 131. Here the author literally talks about "material medium".

nance to influence social processes and impact many different areas. After all, statistical methods are quite common in the justice system and criminology. So the main point is to define, determine and select the basic characteristics (attributes) of legislative forms and establish their quantitative basis, their measures and dimensions. In other words, we need to define parameters as measurable and quantifiable variables that can be monitored regularly and thus provide comprehensive information about the system as a whole and about changes taking place in the structure of the system. These variables and their values can, in our opinion, in certain situations provide important information about hidden properties and manifestations of the system – in this case, the Czech legislation.

The basic element we monitor is a **legislative document**, by which we understand any independently existing published (printed) document in the official collections of laws (Collection of Laws and Collection of International Treaties of the Czech Republic). Based on an analysis of these documents, published throughout the existence of official collections (since 1918 in case of the Collection of Laws), it was possible to define basic quantitative characteristics as categories describing individual legislative documents. Using these categories we can capture each legislative document in a specific information database. The legislative part of the legal order is this way quantitatively described and continually parametrized.

Database on the legislation in the CR has been systematically built since the end of 1980s. Since 2007 analytical articles are published regularly in journal Právník. These articles monitor the status and development of Czech legislation following certain selected quantitative indicators and characteristics.[2]

2. METHODOLOGICAL BASIS – QUANTITATIVE VARIABLES

There are three types of variables that can be defined based on the structure of legislative documents and that are, in our opinion, suitable for fixing and displaying primary quantifiable and measurable properties of Czech legal order (Czech legislation) in a relevant way. These three types can be called:
   a) Primary (mainly descriptive, simple).
   b) Secondary (composite, derived from basic ones or built from basic variables, i.e. synthetic).
   c) Comparative.

2.1. Basic variables express simple properties that can be observed when looking at legislative documents in the CR or that can be quantitatively expressed as counts of certain defined units. They have a rudimentary, descriptive nature and they are simple, not complex. Basic variables are constructed to be potentially the building blocks for complex (synthetic) variables. They include in particular:

---

[2] See NOVÁK, F. Legislativa ČR v roce 2007 – kvantitativní přehled. *Právník*. 2009, Vol. 148, No. 2, pp. 159–177. NOVÁK, F. Legislativa ČR v roce 2008 – kvantitativní přehled. *Právník*. 2009, Vol. 148, No. 9, pp. 963–983. NOVÁK, F. Legislativa ČR v roce 2009 – kvantitativní přehled. *Právník*. 2010, Vol. 149, No. 12, pp. 1247–1262. NOVÁK, F. Legislativa ČR v roce 2010 – kvantitativní přehled, *Právník*. 2011, Vol. 150, No. 10, pp. 970-986 and other.

- the form of the document (determined basically from the formal name, i.e. "law", "government regulation", "public notice" etc.)
- the size of the document (determined from the number of printed pages in the collection, number of articles, sentences, words etc.)
- functional characteristics and contents (i.e. differentiate new legislation, amendment, derogatory clause, informative document etc.)
- legal branch characteristics (i.e. classification into traditional areas of law differentiated in Czech legal theory – constitutional law, administrative, criminal, civil, commercial, family, labour, financial etc.: in total 12 different legal branches)
- time coordinates (date the document was passed, came to force, was terminated etc.)
- scope of validity and force of the piece of legislation.

2.2. Secondary (compound, synthetic) variables are created "artificially" from primary variables and their structures. They are not immediately empirical (observable) and they cannot be directly identified in the objects of interest (legislative documents). They are important theoretically, expressing deeper structural properties of the system. We can also call them coefficients:

- **coefficient of legal relevance** expresses the quantitative **ratio** of documents carrying legislative information (legal standards) and accompanying documents that can be also found in official collections but have no general, i.e. legal, relevance (e.g. Parliament's resolution, measures taken by the National Bank).

- **Law weight coefficient**, i.e. weight coefficient of the primary legislative act expressed as the quantitative ratio between primary and secondary legislative documents (basically government regulation and public ordinances). This coefficient clearly reflects e.g. the principle of sovereignty of the law, especially from the comparative point of view (within the state and internationally).

- **External influence coefficient** explicates the quantitative ratio between the national legislative documents and published international treaties that were accepted and ratified by the Czech Republic and thus became a part of the legal order of the CR. One specifically monitored parameter is an indicator quantifying the transformation of the EU law into the legal order of the CR.

- **Amendment (change) rate coefficient** reflects the ratio of the number of legislative documents bringing changes to the current legislation (actively changing) and all legislative documents passed, i.e. their share in all legislative documents. This variable characterizes the dynamics or development of legislation and, as such, is always very closely followed, not only from the perspective of the given state, but also in comparative sense in different periods and internationally.

2.3. Comparative variables are constructed for comparative purposes and to solve comparative questions in legislation. They are based on the comparison of the rate or size of certain properties, on temporal and also on branch segmentation differentiation.

2.3.1. Temporal point of view

– **Temporal development characteristics of legislation's formal structure**. Here we look at e.g. ratios (shares) of individual legislative forms as they were used in the monitored periods or phases (1 year, 5 years, 20 years etc.). The important thing here is, again, the ratio of legal (primary) and sub-legal legislative forms.

– **Temporal development characteristics of external influence in legislation:** Similarly to the previous case, we obtain comparative information about the intensity of external foreign political influence and factors as they are exhibited in the area of legislation in the periods or stages of interest.

– **Developmental stability and variability of law** provides information about the development in legislation during the periods or phases of interest. This type of information indicates time periods (e.g. individual years) characterized by increased or minimal intensity of innovative efforts and tendencies in legislation and through legislation. It clearly implies other historical and political connections.

– **Temporal characteristics of the development of the branch structure** of legislation in the CR reveals specific features in the development of legislation and law as such at the level of **individual legal branches**. We can also compare larger categories of **private and public law** in the periods of phases of interest.

All these comparative variables and their results can be further compared with each other. We can thus follow e.g. the application of formal legislative structure from temporal (developmental) point of view, but also from the point of view of international influence and breakdown into the individual legal branches.

2.3.2. Branch-based viewpoint offers comparative information about branch structure applied in legislation. We may apply it on the formal structure of legislation, i.e. analyse the representation of the individual areas of law in different legislative forms; the branch-based viewpoint can be used to analyse the stability of legislation and certainly interesting is also comparative analysis of foreign influence on the structure of legislation.

It is clear that synthetic (compound) and comparative variables we present here are not just descriptive. We believe that they reflect deeper and latent characteristics and aspects of the structure of legislation and in this sense exceed the framework of this declared quantitative description. They become **qualitative indicators** of a kind. At the same time we see here the potential to detect new relations and connections – not just for legal science, but also for other fields, such as sociology, political science, history.

It would be certainly interesting and scientifically very beneficial to carry out international legislative comparative also on this quantitative basis. The presented article aspires to be an invitation and motivation for such activities. For better illustration we include in the following section a brief overview or excerpt from the results of monitoring of Czech legislation for the year 2013.

3. CZECH LEGISLATION IN 2013 – QUANTITATIVE OVERVIEW AND SELECTED COMPARISONS

Quantitative description is the capturing of the status in the given timeframe. Then standardized approach is used that allows comparing these statuses and thus recombine the changes in the system of Czech legislation, capture its development, which is primarily influenced politically. The presented information has therefore also specific relevance for sociology and political science. However, we must not forget the intrinsic dynamics of the structure of legislation that is determined by traditional legal and cultural influences.

Because the available time series is sufficiently long we can distinguish and assess relatively short-term and, on the other hand, also long-term tendencies and trends, but also breaks in development, seasonality etc.

As a part of this statistics we specifically follow amendments, i.e. factor representing changes in legislation, as well as factor representing international influences. All this with respect to the basic typological structure of legislative documents and their classification into legal branches.

Czech legislation is regularly monitored since 2007, when the results were first captured and later collected in a standardized way and published.[3] This specific statistic (quantitative description) is based on analysing official collections of legislative documents – Collection of Laws and Collection of International Treaties of the Czech Republic and from LexGalaxy – database of legislative documents, which is the only one, as far as the author of this study is aware, that describes the status and development of Czech legislation, its changes year-to-year and in longer timeframes, and can be therefore one of the cornerstones for the evaluation of this very important topic.

3. 1. Quantitative overview of documents from official Czech collections

Tab. No. 1 – Summary of documents published and notified in the Collection of Laws and Collection of International Treaties of the Czech Republic in 2013 by their basic types – basic summary quantification

Type	UZ	ZO	Z	NV	V	UZZ	NUS	UP	RP	MS	S	RS	RV	Total
Count	1	4	92	53	211	1	16	4	6	105	84	0	4	581

Tab. No. 2 – Summary categories of legislative documents recognized as "legal" and "other"

Category	All documents	Total coll.	Total MS	Legal	Other
Count	581	476	105	482	99
Share in total	1	0.82	0.18	0.83	0.17
Percentage of total	100	8.93	18.07	82.96	17.04

---

[3] For this see NOVÁK, F. Legislativa v ČR v roce 2007 – kvantitativní přehled. *Právník*. 2009, Vol. 148, No. 2, pp. 159–177 and other studies with similar titles published in the following years (2009–2012) in journal Právník.

Tab. No. 3 – Summary categories of documents published in Col., recognized as "legal" and "other"

Category	Collection total	Legal	Other
Count	476	377	99
Share in total	1	0.71	0.21
Percentage of total	100	79.2	20.8

Tab. No. 4 - Typology of „other" documents, published of notified in the Col.

	Type of document	Commu-nication	UZZ	Parliament's resolution	RP	R V	Total
Count	84	1	4	6	4	99	
Share in total	0.85	0.01	0.04	0.06	0.04	1	
Share in total in %	84.85	1.01	4.04	6.06	4.04	100	

Standard notation in the tables: UZ – constitutional laws, Z – laws, ZO – statutory measures of the Senate of the CR, NV – government acts, V – public ordinances of central administrative bodies, MS – international agreements, UZZ – full versions of the act, NUS – findings of the Constitutional Court, UP – resolutions of the Parliament of the CR, RP – decision of the president of the Republic, RPS – decision of the Chairman of the Senate of the Parliament of the CR, RV – decision of the government, S – communication, RS – editorial communication on a corrigendum, Sb – Collection of Laws of the CR, Sb.m.s. - Collection of International Treaties of the CR. Documents labelled as "legal" are those that the Constitution deems suitable to contain generally binding, i.e. **legal** norms – UZ, ZO, Z, NV, V, NUS and MS. Documents of types UZZ, UP, RP, RV and S are in this context classified as "other".

3.1.1. Basic commentary

3.1.1.1. The total number

of legislative documents from official collections adds up to 581, of which 476 are in Collections and 105 in Collections of International Treaties. This is a slight decline in comparison with the previous year's 611 total; 508 in Collections, 103 in Collections of International Treaties. More pronounced is clearly the overall decline in the number of national legislative documents, i.e. documents published or notified in the Collection of Laws of the CR. This decline in relative numbers means that in 2013 was published only 93.7 % of the previous year's total published documents. The decline in the number of MS is in comparison with 2012 marginal.

When we look at the total numbers of legislative documents considering the „legal" and „other" classification, we see that this indicator is relevant only for national documents. Here the decline when compared to 2012 is 133 documents, which in relative terms means that „legal" documents from 2013 represent less than 83 % of all documents, however, for the Collection it is only 79 %. The **coefficient of „legal relevance"** calculated for the Collection of Laws of the CR is 0.792, while in 2012 it was 0.801. This coefficient therefore continues to decline, as was concluded also in monitoring for 2012.

„Other" documents make up 17 %; in the Collection of Laws less than 21 %. Dominant in their segmentation, as in previous years, is document type „Communication" that makes up almost 85 % of all „other" documents. In comparison with 2012 we see no significant changes in this context.

3.1.1.2. The ratio of national

legislative documents and **international** documents can be found in Table No. 5. Their quantitative comparison is given by the ratio 476/105 and 377/105, if we consider only documents legally relevant. In comparison with 2012 we clearly see the increase in the share of international agreements. While in 2012 MS made up less than 17 % of all documents and 20 % of all „legal" documents, in 2013 it is 18 % and almost 22 % of „legal" documents, which is a relative increase of 10 %. So the importance of the international factor in Czech legislation in 2013 again increased when compared to 2012.

Important is also the comparison of laws, or primary documents, and international treaties, which can be from the perspective of legal relevance for the most part considered equally important. This ratio in 2013 reached 92/105 and 97/105, i.e. 0.876 and 0.924. In the longer term (at least 5 years), this indicator fluctuates (mainly in 2011 – 128/106), however, in comparison with 2012 we see a mild decline (0.980).

Tab. No. 5 – Ratio of national and international legislative documents, international treaties

Type of document	National document	International document	National legal	Total	Total legal
Number	476	105	377	581	482
Share of total	0.82	0.18	0.782* (0.649)	1	0.83
Share of total in %	81.93	18.07	78.22 (64.89)	100	82.96

3.1.1.3. Basic classification

based on individual **types of documents**, as they were officially established in 2013 in official collections used to communicate legislative information, including their quantitative proportions and relative weight, expressed also as a share in all documents from these collections can be found in the below Tables No. 6 through 9.

Tables No. 8 and 9 reveal the ratios of documents classified as „legal", i.e. legally relevant. In Table No. 9 we add aggregate categories of primary and secondary legislative documents, whose ratio is also a relevant statistic in for the construction of legal order of each country.

Tab. No. 6 – Types of documents included in the Collection of Laws and Collection of International Treaties and their ratios with respect to all documents

Type	Number	Share in total	Share in total in %
UZ	1	0.002	0.17
ZO	4	0.007	0.69
Z	92	0.158	15.83
NV	53	0.091	9.12

---

* In brackets you see the shares of national legal documents in all documents, including MS.

Type	Number	Share in total	Share in total in %
V	211	0.363	36.32
UZZ	1	0.002	0.17
NUS	16	0.028	2.75
UP	4	0.007	0.69
RP	6	0.010	1.03
MS	105	0.181	18.07
RV	4	0.007	0.69
S	84	0.145	14.46
RS	0	0	0
Total	581	1	100

Tab. No. 7 – Types of documents contained only in the Collection and their shares in total of all documents in the Collection

Type	Number	Share in total	Share in total in %
UZ	1	0.002	0.21
ZO	4	0.008	0.84
Z	92	0.193	19.33
NV	53	0.111	11.13
V	211	0.443	44.33
UZZ	1	0.002	0.21
NUS	16	0.034	3.36
UP	4	0.008	0.84
RP	6	0.013	1.26
RV	4	0.008	0.84
S	84	0.176	17.65
Total	476	1	100

Compared with 2012, in 2013 we see the rarely used category of statutory measures and also government decisions, which we, however, do not consider being documents carrying legislative, i.e. legal-normative legislative information. When comparing the overall ratios of all documents with 2012 the number of UZ stands out (one against two in 2012) and so does the decline in the number of full wordings of Acts (from 4 to 1), which is clearly not a positive thing for the readability of Czech laws. There is also a clear differences in the number of resolutions of the Parliament of the CR (9 in 2012 compared to 4 in 2013), which, however, in 2013 all deal with the approval of statutory measures of the Senate and not Parliament's re-confirmation of laws returned by the President or Senate. Significantly higher is the number of President's decisions (6 to 1).

Proportional shifts in other types of documents are small in the compared years (about 1 percent), with the exception of public ordinances, whose total share decline in 2013 by a whole 3 percent (from 39.61 to 36.32 percent). We also see almost 1-percent decline in laws in 2013 and growth in International Treaties.

Table No. 7 shows the distribution of **national documents only**. The proportions change slightly here, the ratio differences are more pronounced. We see higher share of government regulations (11.13 % compared to 9. 65 %), relatively by 15 %, but probably at the

expense of a decline in the share of public ordinances (44 % compared to 47 %). The share of laws has remained practically unchanged.

The other two tables, No. 8 and 9, focus only on the proportional distribution of documents classified as "legal". In Table 9 we see only collections with primary and secondary categories of legislative documents.

Tab. No. 8 – Only legally relevant types of legislative documents from the Collection of Laws and Collection of International Treaties and their proportions with respect to the total of all "legal" documents

Type	UZ	ZO	Z	NV	V	MS	NUS	Total
Number	1	4	92	53	211	105	16	482
Share in total	0.002	0.008	0.191	0.110	0.438	0.218	0.033	1
Share in total in %	0.21	0.83	19.09	11.00	43.78	21.78	3.32	100

Tab. No. 9 – Legally relevant types of legislative documents from the Collection of Laws and their proportions to the total of all documents, split into primary and secondary, together with NUS, and without it

Type	UZ	Z	ZO	PRI	NV	V	SEK	NUS	Total	Total without NUS,
Number	1	12	4	97	53	211	264	16	377	361
Share in total in %	0.265	24.40	1.06	25.73	14.06	55.97	70.03	4.24	100	
Share in total without NUS	0.28	25.48	1.11	26.87	14.68	58.45	73.13		100	

The biggest differences when compared with 2012 can be found, again, in government regulations (9.61 % to 11 %), public ordinances (43.78 % to 47.45 % in 2012) and international treaties (20.20 % to 21.78 % in 2013). In relative terms, the number of government regulation increased to almost 115 % from 2012, public ordinances declined to 92 % and international treaties increased to almost 108 % of the value from 2012.

The ratio of primary and secondary legislative documents stayed practically unchanged since 2012. Primary regulations made up in 2013 about 25.73 % (26.87 % when deducting NUS), secondary made up 70 % (73 %). In the previous year this ratio was 25.77 % to 74.23 %. The coefficient of force of the law stays therefore in 2013 unchanged.

3.1.1.4. Tables No. 10 and 11

show the distribution of the types of legislative documents, i.e. **typological structure of the Czech legislation in the last 5 years** with aggregate categories of primary and secondary regulations. The ratios are calculated from all documents, as well as from all documents minus MS and NUS, i.e. specifically for national legislative documents, always in "legal" categories. This allows comparing the structure of legislation of the CR and its shifts in recent time, i.e. in the five-year period between 2009 and 2013.

Tab. No. 10 – Distribution of legislative "legal" documents by types in the last 5 years

Type-year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
UZ	2	0	1	2	1
ZO	0	0	0	0	4
Z	112	66	128	99	92
PŘI	114	66	129	101	97
NV	79	62	52	49	53
V	188	199	189	242	211
SEK	267	261	241	291	264
NUS	20	30	16	15	16
MS	124	91	164	103	105
Total	525	448	490	510	482
Total without MS and NUS	381	327	370	392	361

Tab. No. 11 – Share of the individual types of legislative documents in total of all legislative documents and also without NUS and MS in % over the last 5 years

Type-year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
UZ	0.38	0.52	0	0	0.20
	0.27	0.39	0.51	0.21	0.28
ZO	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0.83	1.08
Z	21.33	29.40	14.73	20.18	26.12
	34.59	19.41	25.26	19.09	25.48
PŘI	21.71	29.92	14.73	20.18	26.33
	34.86	19.80	25.77	20.12	26.87
NV	15.05	20.73	13.84	18.96	10.61
	14.05	9.61	12.50	11.00	14.68
V	35.81	49.34	44.42	60.86	38.57
	51.08	47.46	61.73	43.78	58.45
SEK	50.86	70.08	58.26	79.82	49.18
	65.14	57.06	74.23	54.77	73.13
NUS	-	-	-	-	3.32
					4.24
MS	23.62	20.31	21.22	20.20	21.78
Total	525	448	490	510	482
Total without MS and NUS	381	327	370	392	361

In terms of the total number of legislative documents the year 2013 seems to be below-average, which is not necessarily a bad thing.

When comparing the individual types of legislative documents and their proportions in the monitored years, the year 2013 stands out in the category of measures of the Senate, which appears in this year only (4 in total). In the category of constitutional law we see the years 2009 and 2012 standing out (2 and 0.5 %), in the category "laws" we see extreme results in 2011 (almost 35 %) and 2010 (only 20 %), the year 2013 is in both cases average. In these years we see extreme values also in the aggregate value of primary regulations.

As for government regulations; we saw the biggest share (20.73 %) in 2009, the lowest in 2012 (12.5 %). The year 2013 was below-average when comparing with the other years of the monitored period. Public ordinances have the biggest share in 2012 (61.73 %), the lowest in 2009 (49.34 %), and the year 2013 is slightly above-average. Secondary regulations saw the highest share in 2010 (79.82 %), the lowest in 2011 (65.14 %), the year 2013 is slightly above average. International treaties were slightly above 20 (21) %, except for the year 2009 (23.62 %), with the absolute number 124!

In absolute terms the year 2009 stands out overall (525), but also when looking at the number of laws (112) and international treaties (124) and government regulations (79), which have generally a declining trend – unlike regulations, which peak (242) in 2012. International treaties oscillate around 100. The ratio of primary and secondary regulations approaches 1:3, i.e. around 25 % of primary regulations and 75 % secondary. When counting in also MS, which represent around 20 %, the proportional part of primary regulations declines to around 20 %, the secondary regulations make up about 60-55 %.

3.2. Amendment and derogation – factor of change in legislation

3.2.1. In this part of the study

we will in detail analyse the dynamic development, clearly visible in Czech Republic in 2013. The factor, indicator, **change** in legislation is described quantitatively using the number of legislative documents that implement changes in the legislative system or derogate some stipulations. Derogation can be seen as an extreme change. A derogation of a single legislative document is, when looking at the system as a whole, only a partial correction or change.

In terms of amending and derogating activities we only consider those documents that carry legislative information, leaving out decisions of the Constitutional Court and, in this case, also international treaties. We therefore focus on the comparison of legal (primary) and sub-legal legislation, also by looking at aggregate categories of primary and secondary regulations. The outcomes of the amending legislative activity can be seen in Tables No. 12 and 13 as an overview and also as the proportions of actively amending regulations with respect to the whole in the corresponding categories or legislative types (Table No. 12) and also in overview (Table No. 13).

Tab. No. 12 – Active amending in 2013 by type of legislative documents

Type	UZ	ZO	Z	PRI	NV	V	SEK	Total
Number of amendments / all	1/1	4/4	81/92	85/97	21/53	114/211	135/264	220/361
Number of amendments / all	1	1	0.880	0.876	0.396	0.540	0.511	0.609
Share of amendments / all in %	100	100	88.04	87.63	39.62	54.03	51.14	60.94

Tab. No. 13 – Total numbers of amended documents for individual types of legislative documents in 2013 (absolute amendment)

Type	UZ	ZO	Z	PRI	NV	V	SEK	Total
Number of amendments / all	1/1	125/4	348/92	474/97	40/53	125/211	165/264	639/361
Number of amendments / all	1	31.25	3.78	4.89	0.755	0.592	0.625	1.770
Share of amendments / all in %	100	3125	378.26	488.66	75.47	59.24	62.50	177.01

3.2.2. Total share of active amendments

reached in 2013 the value of 0.609, which means that the share of regulations that contain any express amendment is almost 61 % (60.94) of all legislative documents. In comparison with the previous year (2012) this is a slight increase in amendment activity (58.67 % in 2012). For laws and primary regulations the value of this coefficient remained practically stable since 2012 (around 88 %) and in public ordinances we saw and increase (54 compared to 48.5 %), while government regulations declined significantly in 2013 in comparison with the previous year (39.6 % v. 53 %).

The overall indicator of active amendments (coefficient of absolute amending activity) decreased in 2013 to 1.77, i.e. 177 %, compared to 1.98 (198 %) in 2012. **One new legislative document therefore on average amends almost two others**. On the level of laws there are almost 4 amendments (3.78) per law, for primary laws it is almost 5 (4.89), while for government regulations less than 1 (0.75) and for public regulations (0.59). Extreme values were observed in regulatory measures of the Senate, especially in two cases. However, the overall numbers are not important enough to have an impact on the overall situation. In 2012 the value of this indicator for laws and primary regulations was significantly higher (6.22 for laws, which means that the year 2013 is only 60.7 % of the 2012 basis for laws and 79.9 % for primary regulations). For secondary documents the differences are not significant.

The decrease of the indicator of absolute amending activity also confirms the overall decrease in the number of amended documents in 2013 compared to 2012 (639 compared to 777) to 82.24 %.

3.2.3. The change in the Czech legislation

in 2013, in terms of **abrogated and derogated legislation**, can be found in Tables No. 14, 15 and 16. Table No. 14 brings the ratios of the number of regulations actively abrogating, Table No. 15 ratios of all active derogations of new regulations, always within specific legislative types. Table No. 16 combines amendments and derogations and thus offers **absolute indicated of legislative change.**

Tab. No. 14 – Active derogation in 2013 by the type of legislative documents

Type	UZ	ZO	Z	PRI	NV	V	SEK	Total
Number of derog. / all	0/1	2/4	21/92	23/97	16/53	35/211	51/264	74/361
Ratio derog. / all	0	0.50	0.228	0.237	0.302	0.166	0.193	0.205
Ratio derog. / all in %	0	50.00	22.83	23.71	30.19	16.59	19.32	20.50

Tab. No. 15 – All active derogations in 2013 by the type of legislative documents (absolute derogation)

Type	UZ	ZO	Z	PRI	NV	V	SEK	Total
Number of derogations	0/1	19/4	57/92	76/97	21/53	65/211	86/264	162/361
Ratio derog. / all	0	4.75	0.620	0.784	0.396	0.308	0.326	0.449
Ratio derog. / all in %	0	475	61.96	78.35	39.62	30.81	32.58	44.88

Tab. No. 16 – Active derogation and active amendments in total for individual types of legislative documents in 2013 (absolute indicator of change in legislation)

Type	UZ	ZO	Z	PRI	NV	V	SEK	Total
Number of derogations plus amendments / all	1/1	144/4	405/92	550/97	61/53	190/211	251/264	801/361
Ratio of derog. plus amendments / all	1	36	4.40	5.67	1.151	0.900	0.951	2.219
Ratio of derog. plus amendments / all in %	100	3600	440.22	567.01	115.09	90.05	95.08	221.88

Overall derogation coefficient increased in comparison with the previous year by around 3 % (20.5 % compared to 17 % in 2012), which is a relative increase of around 120 % compared to 2012! This increase is reflected quite evenly across all types of legislative documents, albeit more in laws (increase to 133 %) and primary regulations, less in public ordinances. However, government regulations saw the biggest increase (30 % compared to 8 % in 2012, which means almost 370 % compared to the previous year). The total number of actively derogating regulations increased in 2013 slightly (from 67 to 74 %, which means an increase to almost 115 %).

When we look at the total numbers of derogated regulations, we see that years 2012 and 2013 are quite different. In 2012 the indicator of **absolute derogation activity** reached 0.66, while in 2013 it was only 0.45. In absolute numbers the ratio in these years is 257/162, which means in 2012 it was more than 158 % of 2013. A significant value is reached by the difference in laws (1.54 in 2012 compared to 0.62 in 2013), for which in 2013 we see only 40 % of the value from the year before. Obviously, this is reflected in the category of primary regulations, although not strongly (52 % of 2012). In other types of secondary legislative documents the differences in this indicator are not so significant. The results show that derogation activity in total, as well as the level of laws and primary regulations, was significantly higher in 2012 – also when compared with 2011. Clearly then, year 2013 saw this indicator dropping significantly.

3.2.4. For the first time we include

the **indicator of absolute change** in legislative (Tab. No. 16), which takes into account **all amending and derogating documents**. It is the ratio of the sum of all amended and all derogated regulations with respect to the newly published documents. This coefficient reached in 2013 the value of 2.21. This means that **every new document brings a change into the legislative system that touches more than two other legislative documents** in the form of amendment or derogation.

At the level of laws and primary regulations these values are much higher (4.40 and 5.67), while for secondary regulations it is around 1. **Change is therefore more often and to a larger extent realized via primary legal regulations, laws in particular.**

3.2.5. In this study we also for the first time

include **indicator of explicit amendments**. It can be used as a corrective of the indicator of active amendments. Amendments are in this case defined as legislative documents that **explicitly in their title declare** to be amendments by using the word "amend". This is a very reliable way of identifying regulations that are really amendments – either exclusively or at least partially.

Tab. No. 17 – Regulations whose functional content implements change in legislation – explicit amendment

Type	UZ	ZO	Z	PRI	NV	V	SEK	Total
Number of amendments / all	1/1	2/4	67/92	70/97	20/53	110/211	130/264	200/361
Ratio amendments / all	1	0.50	0.728	0.722	0.377	0.521	0.492	0.554
Ratio amendments / all in %	1	50	72.83	72.16	37.74	52.13	49.24	55.40

When comparing Tables No. 17 and 12 (active amendments) we see a slight decrease in the amendment coefficient for explicit amendments (0.55, i.e. 55.40 % compared to 0.609, i.e. 60.94 %). These values are slightly lower in secondary regulations, however, in laws and primary regulations we see significant differences (72.83 % compared with 88.04 % in laws and 72.16 % compared with 87.63 % in primary regulations). We also see a significant difference in legal measures of the Senate (50 % compared with 100 % for active amendments coefficient). Results summarizing absolute amendment activities in legislation are much higher for laws and primary legal regulations.

3.2.6. Overall level of the amendment factor

is in 2013 clearly **lower** – considering the presented results and comparison with 2012. This could be either due to the fact that 2013 was an election year, which always means less new legislation that is waiting for the construction of a new government. It is worth to mention that in this case there was for a relatively long time non-standard "presidential" government.

3.3. Legislation in the CR in 2013 by areas of laws

3.3.1. As a part of the annual monitoring

of Czech legislation we present also a criterion based on contents that classifies legislative documents (of course "legal") by area of law. It is a traditionally and theoretically well-grounded classification for Czech and also continental law. For the individual areas of law within the Czech legal order we use the following abbreviations: UP – constitutional law, SP – administrative law, FP – financial law, THP – substantive criminal law, TPP – criminal procedure, OPP – civil procedural law (all these branches belong to structural sub-category of the **public law** that includes also PSZ – social security law), OPH – civil law, OP – commercial law, PP – labour law, RP – family law and MPSP – international private and procedural law that is included in the sub-structure of private law.

3.3.2. Table No. 18 shows the distribution

of the individual legislative types by these areas of law and their totals. As we can see, the number of area classifications in the database declined slightly, which corresponds to the total decline in the number of legislative documents monitored in 2013.

Tab. No. 18 – Distribution of basic types of legislative documents ("legal") by areas of law in 2013

Type / area of law	UZ	ZO	Z	NV	V	NUS	Total
UP	1(50)	0(0)	15(6.22)	1(0.88)	13(2.77)	5(17.24)	35
SP	0(0)	2(16.67)	59(24.48)	37(32.74)	167(35.53)	9(31.03)	274
FP	0(0)	4(33.33)	42(17.43)	17(15.04)	62(13.19)	4(13.79)	129
TPH	0(0)	0(0)	5(2.07)	0(0)	4(0.85)	2(6.90)	11
TPP	1(50)	0(0)	5(2.07)	0(0)	5(1.06)	0(0)	11
OPP	0(0)	0(0)	9(3.73)	1(0.88)	10(2.13)	4(13.79)	24
OPH	0(0)	2(16.67)	39(16.18)	19(16.81)	66(14.04)	2(6.90)	128
OP	0(0)	3(25)	46(49.09)	21(18.58)	97(20.64)	1(3.45)	168
PP	0(0)	0(0)	11(4.56)	11(9.73)	34(7.23)	1(3.45)	57
PSZ	0(0)	1(8.33)	9(3.73)	6(5.31)	11(2.34)	1(3.45)	28
RP	0(0)	0(0)	1(0.41)	0(0)	1(0.21)	0(0)	2
PSP	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0
Total	2(100 %)	12(100 %)	241(100 %)	113(100 %)	470(100 %)	29(100 %)	867
Percent of the total of all classifications	0.23	1.38	27.80	13.03	54.21	3.34	100

The total numbers of documents classified within the individual areas of law indicate a significant decline compared with 2012. It is clear especially in SP and OP. On the other hand, in 2013 we saw an increase in the areas of criminal law (substantive and procedural) by almost 100 %.

The area of criminal law was also much more present in public ordinances, although in 2012 it was not present at all. Overall proportions of the individual types of legislative

documents changed only slightly (laws declined only by 0.5 %, public ordinances by 1.5 %, which is in relative terms 1.5 % and 3 %).

3.3.3. Table No. 19 shows the representation

and proportions of the individual types of legislative documents within the individual areas of law, i.e. the **internal structure of the areas of law by the type of legislative document**. We also included aggregate categories of primary and secondary regulations.

Tab. No. 19 – Distribution of the types of legislative documents within the individual areas of law (2013)

Type / area of law	UZ	ZO	Z	NV	V	PRI	SEK	NUS	Total
UP	1 (2.86)	0 (0)	15 (42.86)	1 (2.86)	13 (37.14)	16 (45.71)	14 (40.00)	5 (14.29)	35 (100%)
SP	0 (0)	2 (0.73)	59 (21.53)	37 (13.50)	167 (60.95)	61 (22.26)	204 (74.45)	9 (3.28)	274 (100%)
TP	0 (0)	4 (3.10)	42 (32.56)	17 (13.18)	62 (48.06)	46 (35.66)	79 (61.24)	4 (3.10)	129 (100%)
TPH	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (45.45)	0 (0)	4 (36.36)	5 (45.45)	4 (36.36)	2 (18.18)	11 (100%)
TPP	1 (10.00)	0 (0)	5 (50.00)	0 (0)	5 (50.00)	6 (60.00)	4 (40.00)	0 (0)	10 (100%)
OPP	0 (0)	0 (0)	9 (37.50)	1 (4.17)	10 (41.67)	9 (37.50)	11 (45.83)	4 (16.67)	24 (100%)
OPH	0 (0)	2 (1.56)	39 (30.47)	19 (14.84)	66 (51.56)	41 (32.03)	85 (66.41)	2 (1.56)	128 (100%)
OP	0 (0)	3 (1.79)	46 (27.38)	21 (12.50)	97 (57.74)	49 (29.17)	118 (70.24)	1 (0.60)	168 (100%)
PP	0 (0)	0 (0)	11 (19.30)	11 (19.30)	34 (59.65)	11 (19.30)	45 (78.95)	1 (1.75)	57 (100%)
PSZ	0 (0)	1 (3.57)	9 (32.14)	6 (21.43)	11 (39.29)	10 (35.71)	17 (60.71)	1 (3.57)	28 (100%)
RP	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (50.00)	0 (0)	1 (50.00)	1 (50.00)	1 (50.00)	0 (0)	2 (100%)
PSP	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (100%)
Total % of all classified	2 0.23	12 1.38	241 27.80	113 13.03	470 54.21	255 29.41	583 67.24	29 3.34	867 100

Even here we do not see large changes compared to the previous year. Exceptions are the areas of the criminal law that were in 2012 realized 100 % by means of laws.

In the ratios of primary and secondary regulations we saw shifts in UP (45 to 40 against 53 to 28 % in 2012), TP and TPP (45 and 60 to 36 and 40 % in 2013 against 100 % in both cases on the side of primary regulations in 2012), OP (30 to 70 against 23 to 76), PP (increase in SEK from 70 to almost 79). In total ratios however, these shifts between primary

and secondary regulations were not so pronounced (29.4 to 67 against 28 to 68.9 %, i.e. 0.437 against 0.413), we saw a slight increase in the number of included documents in total of primary regulations by almost 5 % in relative terms.

3.3.4. Table No. 20 shows the order

of areas of law, as given by the number of included documents and percentile share. When compared with 2012 OPH and FP exchanged places, the numbers of documents included in either category, as well as the corresponding ratios, remained almost the same. Slight shift can be seen in the area of social security law and family law (2 included against 7 in 2012 and share 0.23 % compared with 0.74 %). The share of PSZ remained slightly above 3 %. This table gives quite **instructive overview of the total weight** of individual areas of law within legislation of the monitored year.

Tab. No. 20 – Order of areas of law by the number of included legislative documents ("legal") in 2013

Order	Area of law	Number of included documents	Share in all included documents in %
1.	SP	274	31.60
2.	OP	168	19.38
3.	FP	129	14.88
4.	OPH	128	14.76
5.	PP	57	6.57
6.	UP	35	4.04
7.	PSZ	28	3.23
8.	OPP	24	2.77
9.	TPH	11	1.27
10.	TPP	10	1.15
11.	RP	2	0.23
12.	PSP	0	0
Total		867	100

Via the following Table No. 21 we offer an overview of the results of an analysis of the structure of Czech legislation in 2013, subdivided into private and public law. The results show a slight increase in the share of public law when compared with 2012, of course at the expense of private law (59 to 41 against 57.5 to 42.5 in 2012). In relative terms the difference of 1.5 % means an increase of the public law to 102.6 % of the 2012 level.

Slightly changed are also the ratios of primary and secondary regulations – more so in case of private law (28.73 to 70.14 against 27 to 72 in 2012, which in relative terms gives a difference of more than 6 %). In case of the public law this ratio is 29.41 to 67.24 against 29.52 to 66.61 in 2012. Within the category of primary regulations this ratio is expressed in 2013 by percentage ratios 40 to 60, more being in the public law, and in secondary regulations 42.71 to 57.29, more again in the public law (in 2012 this ratio in primary regulations was 40.3 to 59.7 and in secondary it was 44.38 to 55.62).

Inside the substructure of the private law the shares of primary and secondary regulations are 28.73 % to 70.14 %, for public law it is 29.88 to 65.23 %.

Tab. No. 21 – Private and public law by legislative types in 2013

Legisl. types (number. %)	UZ	ZO	Z	NV	V	PRI	SEK	NUS	Total
Private law	(0)	(1.41)	(27.32)	(14.37)	(55.77)	(28.73)	(70.14)	(1.13)	(100)
	0	5	97	51	198	102	249	4	355
	(0)	(41.67)	(40.25)	(45.13)	(42.13)	(40)	(42.71)	(13.79)	(40.95)
Public law	(0.23)	(1.37)	(28.125)	(12.11)	(53.125)	(29.88)	(65.23)	(4.88)	(100)
	2	7	144	62	272	153	334	25	512
	(100)	(58.33)	(59.75)	(54.87)	(57.87)	(60)	(57.29)	(86.21)	(59.05)
Total	(0.23)	(1.38)	(27.80)	(13.03)	(54.21)	(29.41)	(67.24)	(3.34)	(100)
	2	12	241	113	470	255	583	29	867
	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)	(100)

Note: Data in brackets above the number in each cell of the table represent the share of the legislative type in total for the given row (e.g. for private or public law). The figures in brackets under the numbers are the shares of the total number of included documents within the corresponding legislative type, i.e. inside the given column of the table.

3.4. International treaties

3.4.1. International treaties published

in a special Collection of International Treaties of the Czech Republic are clearly an important part of the Czech legislation. They reflect the external political factor influencing the existence and functioning of the Czech Republic. The legislative significance of treaties is comparable to laws as a sovereign expression of national legislation. The relationship of Czech law and Czech legislation to **Community and European law** has a specific position.

The following analysis includes first an overall perspective on the position of internationally oriented legislation in 2013 and, second, an analysis of the factor of transposition of EU law into Czech legislation.

Tab. No. 22 – Quantification of international treaties in relation to Czech legislation in 2013

International treaties-overall summary	Share of MS in all legislative documents	Relationship of MS to laws	Share of MS in legislative legal documents
Number	105/581	105/97	105/482
Share of MS in legislation overall	0.181	0.520	0.218
Share of MS in %	18.072	51.98	21.78

3.4.2. Table No. 22 quantifies the basic production

of international treaties in 2013 and their most significant relations in general to all legislative documents, to laws and to all legally relevant legislative documents.

The comparison of the overall number of international treaties registered in the Collection of International Treaties with 2012, as well as the preceding years, demonstrates a

relatively sustained level of production of international treaties, only slightly exceeding 100 (the number was 104 in 2011, 103 in 2012 and 105 in 2013).

From the perspective of overall proportions, a slight increase occurred in 2013 (approximately by 1 %) in comparison with 2012, which means a return to the level of the year before, i.e. 2011.

This shift was even more remarkable in relation to the share of MS in all the legislative "legal" documents. The proportions shifted the most remarkably as regards the relationship of MS and laws - MS form a share of 51.98 %, however, in 2012, they only counted for 50.99 %. In relative comparison the proportion of international treaties in 2013 thus amounted to 101.94 % of the proportion in 2012.

3.4.3. The following two tables address

the issue of transposition of EU law into Czech law which has been continuously ongoing since the accession of the Czech Republic to the EU, i.e. since 2004. They analyse the shares of individual legislative types in the transposition of EU law into Czech legislation both from the perspective of an overall summarization of documents transposing EU law as well as from the perspective of quantification of EU documents that have been transposed by the Czech legislation in 2013 (the numbers stated in brackets in relevant of the table no. 23). Further, we also include an overview of shares of transposing documents since 2004 until 2013 classified by individual legislative types.

Tab. No. 23 – Numbers and shares of documents transposing EU law (Community law) into Czech law and classified by the type pf legislative documents

Type	Overall number	Number of transposing documents	Share of transposing documents	Share of transposing documents in %
Z	92	24 (190)	0.261 (2.065)	26.09 (206.52)
ZO	4	1 (6)	0.25 (1.50)	25 (150)
UZ	1	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
V	211	43 (151)	0.204 (0.716)	20.38 (71.56)
NV	53	12 (42)	0.226 (0,792)	22.64 (79.25)
Total	361	80 (389)	0.222 (1.078)	22.16 (107.76)

Overall, the intensity of transposition activity decreased in 2013 by approximately 1 %, (22.16 % in comparison to 23.21 % in 2012), which is 95.48 % of the value in the previous year. From the perspective of typological structure, the lowest decrease has been recorded for laws (over 3 %, i.e. 89.07 % of the value in 2012) and government regulations (22.64 compared to 32.65 in 2012, i.e. only 69.34 % of the value in 2012!). The overall number of transposing documents dropped in 2013 from 91 to 80. However, the recorded absolute number of EU documents transposed into Czech legislation in 2013 amounts to 389, with the majority of laws (190) and public ordinances (151).

The overview since 2004 shows an increase in the years 2006–2011, followed by a decrease back to the level around 22–23 %. The year 2013 then marks another decrease compared to the previous year (22 %) under the average value of this indicator for the entire period which amounts to 23.28 %.

Tab. No 24 – Relationship of legislative documents transposing EU law into Czech law by type of legislative documents in individual years from 2004

Year	UZ	ZO	Z	NV	V	Total	Share	Share in %
2004	0/2	0/0	17/150	14/139	33/292	64/583	0.110	10.98
2005	0/0	0/0	27/101	25/81	36/255	88/437	0.201	20.14
2006	0/0	0/0	54/134	29/78	47/275	130/487	0.267	26.69
2007	0/0	0/0	23/64	18/58	29/158	70/280	0.250	25.00
2008	0/0	0/0	35/113	18/57	40/194	93/364	0.255	25.55
2009	0/2	0/0	37/112	24/79	44/188	105/381	0.276	27.56
2010	0/0	0/0	26/66	20/62	53/199	99/327	0.303	30.28
2011	0/1	0/0	49/128	16/52	42/189	107/370	0.289	28.92
2012	0/2	0/0	29/99	16/49	46/242	91/392	0.232	23.21
2013	0/1	1/4	24/92	12/53	43/211	80/361	0.222	22.16
Total	0/8	1/4	321/1059	192/708	413/2203	927/3982	0.233	23.280

Tab. No. 25 – Share of legislative documents transposing EU law into Czech law by type of legislative documents in % from 2004

Year	UZ	ZO	Z	NV	V	Total
2004	0	0	11.330	10.072	11.301	10.978
2005	0	0	26.733	30.864	14.118	20.137
2006	0	0	40.299	28.814	17.091	26.694
2007	0	0	35.938	31.034	18.354	25.000
2008	0	0	30.973	31.579	20.619	25.549
2009	0	0	33.036	30.380	23.404	27.559
2010	0	0	39.394	32.258	26.633	30.275
2011	0	0	38.281	30.769	22.222	28.919
2012	0	0	29.292	32.653	19.008	23.214
2013	1	25	26.087	22.642	20.379	22.161
Total	1	25	31.136	28.107	19.313	23.280

3.5. Summary

Monitoring of the Czech legislation carried out since 2007 aims to provide a standardized quantitative description of this **fundamental and default structure of the Czech Republic's** legal order. Its most important and most general part are quantitative indicators – ratios, which we refer to as **coefficients**. These are first, **the coefficient of the relevance or the role of law** which reflects the principle of the sovereignty of the law as the guiding principle of democratic legislation, second, **the coefficient of change** depicting the development dynamics of legislation and finally, **the coefficient of international influence** on the Czech legislation arising from the Czech Republic's international position and its activity in international or inter-state relations.

The substantial influence of this monitoring is based *inter alia* precisely on **the ability to compare** the chosen variables and their quantified values as recorded in individual monitored years. The final section of this study therefore presents a table summarizing the outcome of the foregoing quantitative description of Czech legislation in the last seven years, i.e. from 2007 to 2013.

The **coefficient of relevance** is perceived in a more complex manner and expresses the relationship of all primary regulations, including constitutional laws and regulatory measures while respecting that laws, as a corner stone of the Czech legislative system, clearly dominate all legislative ("legal") documents issued in a given year. It also expresses the relationship, mutual ratio and share of primary and secondary legislation which, as we believe, is the clearest **expression of the significance, role and position of laws (primary regulations) in relation to secondary legislation.** In 2013 this indicator reached the highest value so far (the share of primary legislation in the entire national legislative production amounted to 36.74 % in that year). The position and role of law is thus enhanced, if only from the formal and quantitative perspective.

The **coefficient of change** has been attentively monitored in the last years (see, e.g. last important international conferences in the field of theory of law held in Znojmo in 2012 and in Tatranská Štrba, which have featured theoreticians from the Visegrad Group, the latter of which was directly entitled "Change of Law"). It is recorded in individual years for both, primary regulations and secondary regulations and thus gives information **on the strength and location of innovation activities in the Czech legislation**. From the perspective of the development of the last seven years, the year 2013 may be characterized as a year with a below-average activity as regards the production of amendments (the average value of the coefficient of change for both primary and secondary regulations is 63.5 % overall, for primary regulations it is 88.89 %).

The **coefficient of international influence** on the Czech legislation is expressed as a ratio of international treaties and the legislation as a whole, but also as the share of international treaties and primary legislative documents only. Its values in 2013 may be interpreted as average with respect to the entire monitored period of seven years.

Tab. No. 26 – Overview of basic indicators (coefficients) of the structure and development of legislation of the Czech Republic in the last monitored 7 years (2007–2013)

Year	Coefficient of relevance of the law	Coefficient of international influence	Coefficient of change
	PRI/all (in %) PRI/SEK (in %)	MS/all (in %) MS/PRI+MS (in %)	PRI (in %) SEK (in %) PRI+SEK (in %)
2007	(64/369) 17.34 (64/280) 22.86	(89/369) 24.12 (89/153) 58.17	(60/64) 93.75 (123/216) 56.94 (183/280) 65.36
2008	(113/452) 25 (113/364) 31.04	(88/452) 19.47 (88/201) 43.78	(102/113) 90.27 (136/251) 54.18 (238/364) 65.38
2009	(114/505) 22.57 (114/381) 29.92	(124/505) 24.55 (124/238) 52.10	(93/114) 81.58 (139/267) 52.06 (232/381) 60.89

Year	Coefficient of relevance of the law	Coefficient of international influence	Coefficient of change
2010	(66/418) 13.72 (66/327) 20.18	(91/418) 21.77 (91/157) 57.96	(59/66) 89.39 (155/261) 59.39 (214/327) 65.44
2011	(129/474) 27.22 (129/370) 34.86	(104/474) 21.94 (104/233) 44.64	(118/129) 91.47 (133/241) 55.19 (251/370) 67.84
2012	(101/495) 20.40 (101/291) 34.71	(103/510) 20.20 (103/204) 50.49	(89/101) 88.12 (141/291) 48.45 (230/392) 58.67
2013	(97/466) 20.82 (97/264) 36.74	(105/466) 22.53 (105/202) 51.98	(85/97) 87.63 (135/264) 51.14 (220/361) 60.94