RegData U.S. 4.0 User's Guide

May 5, 2021

Patrick McLaughlin, Jonathan Nelson, Thurston Powers, and Hayden Warlick

Abstract

We describe RegData U.S. 4.0, the latest iteration of the United States Federal Regulation dataset in the RegData Project. The dataset was officially released on May 5, 2021, and created for the purpose of facilitating third-party usage and independent research. This User's Guide explains the major differences between the 3.x and 4.0 releases, general RegData methodology used to build data, and describes the recommended methods to download the data and to interact with the data.

Introduction

RegData is both a methodology and a database focused on the quantification of various dimensions of regulation. We use custom-made text analysis and machine-learning algorithms to create statistics designed to measure several features of regulation, including volume, restrictiveness, complexity, and relevance to different sectors and industries. The RegData Project was launched in 2012 with the express purpose of facilitating research that was previously infeasible. Regulations have been an important and widely used policy tool for decades, but empirical analysis of the actual effects of regulation has historically been hampered by a paucity of data.

RegData was designed to solve this data problem. RegData U.S. 4.0 maps United States federal regulations to the sectors and industries affected by them. This opens the way for new research about both the causes and effects of regulation and how it relates to specific sectors of the economy. RegData captures the restrictiveness of various regulations by counting words and phrases that indicate a specific prohibited or required activity; these words and phrases are called regulatory restrictions. RegData also reports the word count, complexity, agency, department, and an estimate of industry relevance for all regulations contained in the *Code of Federal Regulations*. RegData is produced with the open-source QuantGov policy analytics platform. Because of its open-source nature, QuantGov can be used to produce modified versions of the RegData dataset or datasets based on other documents, such as guidance documents or regulations from other jurisdictions. The technical details on using the QuantGov platform are available at http://docs.quantgov.org. Data from other jurisdictions (including national and subnational jurisdictions in the United States, Canada, and Australia) are also available at https://www.quantgov.org/download-data.

New Features Included in Version 4.0

New Restriction Count:

RegData U.S. 4.0 adds a new method of counting regulatory restrictions (which we call "restrictions 2.0" to differentiate the new counting method from the old one) to include obligations or prohibitions contained in lists or bullet points. If a regulatory restriction (one of the words *shall, must,*

may not, required, or *prohibited*) is contained in a paragraph that ends with a colon (:) or a dash (— or -) (we call this paragraph a "preamble") and the succeeding lines begin with "bullet points" (something like (1) or 1.), those lines are counting toward the restriction in the preamble. If another preamble is contained in one of the bulleted lines, we also count those additional restrictions. Any restrictions found within bulleted lines are also counted toward the total.

The following is an example (from 7 CFR § 1000.25) of how the new restriction count differs from the old one (regulatory restrictions have been bolded for convenience).

(c) Duties. The market administrator **shall** perform all the duties necessary to administer the terms and provisions of each order under his/her administration, including, but not limited to, the following:

(1) Employ and fix the compensation of persons necessary to enable him/her to exercise the powers and perform the duties of the office;

(2) Pay out of funds provided by the administrative assessment, except expenses associated with functions for which the order provides a separate charge, all expenses necessarily incurred in the maintenance and functioning of the office and in the performance of the duties of the office, including the market administrator's compensation;

(3) Keep records which will clearly reflect the transactions provided for in the order and upon request by the Secretary, surrender the records to a successor or such other person as the Secretary may designate;

(4) Furnish information and reports requested by the Secretary and submit office records for examination by the Secretary;

(5) Announce publicly at his/her discretion, unless otherwise directed by the Secretary, by such means as he/she deems appropriate, the name of any handler who, after the date upon which the handler is **required** to perform such act, has not:

- (i) Made reports **required** by the order;
- (ii) Made payments required by the order; or
- (iii) Made available records and facilities as required pursuant to § 1000.27;

(6) Prescribe reports **required** of each handler under the order. Verify such reports and the payments **required** by the order by examining records (including such papers as copies of income tax reports, fiscal and product accounts, correspondence, contracts, documents or memoranda of the handler, and the records of any other persons that are relevant to the handler's obligation under the order), by examining such handler's milk handling facilities, and by such other investigation as the market administrator deems necessary for the purpose of ascertaining the correctness of any report or any obligation under the order. Reclassify skim milk and butterfat received by any handler if such examination and investigation discloses that the original classification was incorrect;

(7) Furnish each regulated handler a written statement of such handler's accounts with the market administrator promptly each month. Furnish a corrected statement to such handler if verification discloses that the original statement was incorrect; and

(8) Prepare and disseminate publicly for the benefit of producers, handlers, and consumers such statistics and other information concerning operation of the order and facts relevant to the provisions thereof (or proposed provisions) as do not reveal confidential information.

Restrictions 1.0 would count a total of 7 regulatory restrictions for this section of text (one instance of "shall" and six of "required"). Restrictions 2.0 increases that count to a total of 16 restrictions. The "shall"

in the first paragraph is counted 8 times, the "required" in paragraph (5) is counted 3 times, and the 5 additional instances of "required" are also included, totaling 16 restrictions.

Restrictions 2.0 has a higher total count than restrictions 1.0 by about 10 to 20 percent, depending on the year (the difference has increased over time). For example, in 1970, the restrictions 1.0 count is 409,520, while the restrictions 2.0 count is 442,602, and in 2020, the restrictions 1.0 count is 1,082,486, , while the restrictions 2.0 count is 1,305,358. Year to year, the increase in the difference is slight, meaning that the difference between restrictions 1.0 and restrictions 2.0 is broadly a level effect across years. However, this change will potentially impact comparative agency analysis because some agencies are more prone to use lists containing additional restrictions when writing regulations.

New Year of Data:

RegData U.S. 4.0 expends the date range of RegData, including analysis through the 2020 version of the CFR. The years 2017 through 2020 use text made available through the eCFR (the electronic version of the CFR), which is published daily. Later sections in this User Guide will go into the specifics of how this text is chosen and cleaned for RegData U.S. 4.0.

Improved Accuracy:

With the release of RegData U.S. 4.0, we have taken some additional steps in improving the accuracy of the collected text and associated metadata. For the years 1970–1995, some end-of-line hyphenation was corrected which led to a slight decrease in the word count but a slight increase in the restriction count for some documents for those years. In some cases, words such as "prohibited" or "required" were added to the restriction count if they were found at the end of a line, but this led to a decline in total words because, for example, the words "pro-" and "hibited" became "prohibited." This improvement has led to an increase in restrictions of about 1 percent for the years 1970–1995.

For the year 2020, agency data was improved by using the agency information available on the <u>eCFR website</u>. We were only able to correct the agencies for the most recent year because the information available is point-in-time, not historical. In a small number of cases, the time series data (pre-2020) for an agency may be slightly inconsistent with the 2020 data as the agency-part matching was improved, but this tradeoff is worth the improvement.

Primary Features of RegData

Unit of Analysis

The CFR is divided into fifty topical titles, each published across one or more volumes. Titles are subdivided, with varying levels of consistency, into chapters, subchapters, parts, sections, subsections, paragraphs, and subparagraphs. These subdivisions generally correspond to levels of topical specificity.

While the CFR is divided and subdivided into several different demarcated portions—such as title, chapter, part, subpart, section, and paragraph—all downloadable RegData U.S. 4.0 datasets use the CFR part as the unit of analysis. We analyze the CFR at the part level for several reasons. First, part-level division is present in every title of the CFR, and the parts in a title collectively contain all non-appendix

regulatory text. Second, parts tend to focus on a set of related issues that are likely to have similar relevance to industries throughout. Third, sources of regulatory authority are cited at the part level.

Primary Metrics of Regulation

While RegData U.S. 4.0 contains many metrics, the two primary metrics continue to be *restrictions* and *industry relevance* – which can be combined to create the *industry restrictions* metric.

Restrictions is a cardinal proxy of the number of regulatory restrictions contained in regulatory text, devised by counting select words and phrases that are typically used in legal language to create binding obligations or prohibitions. The current words used by RegData U.S. 4.0 are the same words used in all previous RegData versions: *shall, must, may not, required,* and *prohibited*. The database also includes a secondary measure of volume—the total word counts—as an alternative measure of the volume of regulation over time.

As of version 4.0, a new method of counting restrictions is released, which captures restrictions formerly hidden in lists or bullet points in the text. Please see the *New Features Included in Version 4.0* section above for more details on how restrictions 2.0 works and how it differs from the old count. Similar to the old restrictions count, the industry relevance metric can be multiplied by restrictions 2.0 to create the *industry restrictions 2.0* metric. Our expectation is that **most users will strongly prefer the restrictions 2.0** metric.

Industry relevance is the second key variable in RegData, representing estimates of the relevance of a CFR part to the different sectors and industries in the economy.

RegData utilizes the industry definitions in NAICS, which categorizes all economic activity into different industries. For example, in one version of NAICS (the two-digit version), the US economy is divided into approximately 20 industries, whereas in the most granular version of NAICS (the six-digit version), the economy is divided into over 1,000 industries. To illustrate, NAICS code 51 signifies the "Information" industry, while NAICS code 511191 signifies a much more granular subsector of the information industry, the "Greeting Card Publishers" industry. RegData uses NAICS because it allows researchers to easily merge RegData with other datasets that contain information about the United States economy. In the United States, the Bureau of Economic Analysis and Bureau of Labor Statistics are just two examples of organizations that publish several datasets designed around NAICS.

To create the estimates of the relevance of a CFR part to a specific industry, RegData U.S. 4.0 uses custom trained machine-learning algorithms. These algorithms "learn" what words, phrases, and other features can best identify when a unit of text is relevant to a specific industry by analyzing our compilation of training documents. Training documents are documents that are known to be relevant to one or more explicitly named industries. Over the course of the RegData project, we have gathered tens of thousands of training documents from publications in the Federal Register that name the NAICS codes affected by rulemakings.

Combining the probabilistic output of *industry relevance* metric and the *restrictions* metric allows the researcher to create the *industry restrictions* metric. This metric is an estimate of the number of restrictions that are relevant to a particular industry or set of industries in one or more CFR parts—see Al-Ubaydli and McLaughlin (2015) for a discussion and examples. The advent of an industry-specific metric of regulation that is comprehensive (i.e., inclusive of all federal regulations that are in effect in each year),

replicable, and transparent has created paths to performing economic research on regulation in ways that were previously infeasible.

Summary of Data

RegData U.S. 4.0 provides the following for each part-level segment of the CFR dating from 1970 to 2020:

- The CFR publication year, title number, and part number.
- A count of regulatory restrictions, denoted by the individual phrases counted: *shall, must, may not, required,* and *prohibited* (restrictions 1.0).
- A new method of counting these restrictions to include those hidden in lists or bullet points (restrictions 2.0).
- A count of words.
- The authoring agency and department.
- A probability that the part is relevant to industries included in the 2007 NAICS at the 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6-digit levels.
- Complexity metrics (including Shannon Entropy, conditional counts, and sentence length). (Note that the discrete drop off in complexity between 2016 and 2017 is due to a change in document formatting, rather than a change in the actual content of regulatory text. Contact us for more details.)
- The last date the text was updated (for the year 2020 only).

These data elements can be combined to produce the following metrics that have been commonly used by other researchers:

- Regulatory restrictions by agency and department.
- Estimates of regulatory restrictions by industry at any NAICS level.
- Estimates of regulatory restrictions by industry for each agency and department.
- Relative complexity of regulations for each industry, agency, and department.

Modifying RegData U.S. 4.0

Utilizing the open-source QuantGov framework, it is possible to both reproduce RegData and extend it. Modifications could include the following:

- A different definition of regulatory restrictions.
- A different unit of analysis than the CFR part.
- A different set of training documents to train the industry classifier.
- Classification into a different set of categories besides the 2007 NAICS.

The QuantGov framework also allows for analysis of bodies of text unrelated to regulation. Any modification would require some amount of technical effort (specifically in Python) that would not be required to use any of the official RegData datasets. For more information on how to modify RegData U.S. 4.0 see our <u>technical documentation</u>.

Methodology

Sources of Regulatory Text

We use three sources of data to construct a plain-text historical series of the Code of Federal Regulations. For the years 1970–1995, we use scans of book pages that have been processed with Optical Character Recognition (OCR) using the Tesseract-OCR engine. For 1996–2016, we use the HTML versions of the historical CFR made available by the Government Publishing Office (GPO). While GPO does make an XML version of the historical CFR available, this version is produced automatically from the language used to typeset the CFR and is not reliable for our purposes. Finally, the XML version of the Electronic CFR, a current version of the CFR produced by the Office of the Federal Register and GPO, is annualized and used for 2017-2020.

The CFR is divided into titles, which are subdivided into chapters, subchapters, parts, and so forth. We analyze at the part level for several reasons. Parts are present in every CFR title, unlike some division types, and are generally concerned with only one relatively specific topic, without being so specific as to lose important context. Moreover, it is at the part level that authoring agencies and authorizing legislation are identified in the CFR indices. Parts are parsed out of the raw text using regular expressions and extracted into individual files for analysis. Because both the OCR-processed documents and the HTML volumes occasionally suffer from missing data or difficult-to-parse formatting, we employ an error detection and smoothing algorithm to produce the final series. This procedure affected less than 5 percent of all CFR parts analyzed.

Source of Industry Relevance Estimates

For each unit of analysis (i.e., for each CFR part), we estimate the probability of relevance to industries as defined by the 2007 NAICS. NAICS specifies a mutually exclusive and collectively exhaustive set of industry definitions at levels of specificity, with 2-digit codes corresponding to the most general industries, and 6-digit codes corresponding to the most specific. More specific industries are subdivisions of more general ones, so that industries have exactly one parent and one or more children.

Our training data comes from the XML version of the historical Federal Register. In some proposed and final rules, agencies use the NAICS codes and descriptions to identify the industries to which their rules are expected to apply. We searched all 106,966 proposed and final rules published in the Federal Register from 2000 to 2017 for exact matches of the full NAICS industry name, the name of a parent industry, or the name of a child industry as indicators of direct relevance to an industry. Matches must be non-overlapping, with the longest match taking precedence; for example, an occurrence of the term "Basic Chemical Manufacturing" will match for the industry of that name, but not for its parent industry named simply "Chemical Manufacturing."

While most industry names are only meaningful in the context of the industry, a few (such as industry 51, "Information") have more generally used names and are therefore blacklisted as matches, although child and parent industries of these are still used. Two agencies—the Small Business Administration and the Office of Personnel Management—both frequently publish rules about the formal definition of NAICS industries that are not actually restrictions on those industries. Rules from these two agencies are therefore excluded. Additionally, any rules that matched more than 2.5 standard deviations above the mean number of matched documents were assumed not to be industry-specific and were dropped.

The full final training set for each NAICS-defined industry consists of all rules that are labeled positive for at least one industry, provided that there are also a minimum five individual documents that are positively labeled for that industry. The training documents were vectorized using bigram counts. Words for vectorization were defined as sequences of two or more alphabetic characters, with English stop words excluded. The vocabulary was limited to bigrams occurring in at least 0.5 percent but not more than 50 percent of trainers.

Because a CFR part can and often will be relevant to more than one industry, we use a multilabel approach for classification. We tested one parametric and one nonparametric model: Logistic regression (Logit) and Random Forests, respectively. In our Logit model, we used a lasso penalty and implemented multilabeling using a one-vs.-rest strategy. In both models, we employed a Term Frequency–Inverse Document Frequency preprocessor to normalize document length and, in the case of the Logit model, to normalize coefficients for the purposes of calculating the penalty. The models were tuned and compared using fivefold cross-validation using the average F1 score across all classes. For each level of NAICS, the Logit model was the superior classifier. The smallest regularization parameter that was within one standard deviation of the top score was selected for training the model on the full training set for each level.

For the model selected using cross-validation, we additionally estimate a variety of performance metrics for each class individually. Table 1 explains these performance metrics and their definitions. Since these performance metrics are primarily useful for comparing models, we produced a normalized score that represents the percentage of possible improvement over the baseline actually seen in the trained classifier. Because the training documents are overwhelmingly true negatives, the baseline classifier for accuracy is an all-negative classifier. For all other metrics, the baseline classifier is one that randomly classifies as positive or negative.

Metric	Description	Definition
F1	Balances recall and precision in a combined score.	Geometric mean of precision and recall.
Precision	Measures resistance to false positives.	Percentage of positive-classified documents that are true positives.
Recall	Measures detection ability.	Percentage of true positive documents that are classified positive.
Accuracy	Measures exact correctness but is subject to inflated scores when most observations are false.	Percentage of documents correctly classified.
Receiver Operator Characteristic (probability)	Measures that true positives generally have a higher predicted probability than true negatives.	Area under a curve plotting the false positive rate (percentage of true negative documents classified positive) against the recall at every probability threshold from 0 to 1.

Table 1: Metrics of Performance

Receiver Operator Characteristic	Balances recall against	True positives rate (recall)
(binary)	resistance to false positives	multiplied by one minus the
		false positive rate.

If classifications for a given industry do not exceed a minimum performance threshold (based on F1 scores), that industry is excluded from the dataset. The minimum performance threshold uses a conservative value for the normalized F1 score calculated by subtracting one standard deviation from the mean score obtained in the train-test splits. This conservative normalized F1 must be higher than 0.5 to pass the filter, yielding confidence that the classification for that industry is at least halfway between random and perfect. Those industries for which the F1 is below the minimum performance threshold are made available in a separate, and clearly marked, unfiltered dataset for researchers wishing to use their own threshold. Median normalized score results for each NAICS level are presented in table 2, while median non-normalized score results are presented in table 3.

NAICS Digit	Industries	F1	Precision	Recall	Accuracy	ROC- AUC	ROC- AUC (binary)
2	15	0.729	0.829	0.369	0.534	0.946	0.679
3	54	0.739	0.833	0.355	0.534	0.951	0.676
4	127	0.800	0.900	0.508	0.641	0.973	0.753
5	289	0.739	0.862	0.333	0.556	0.955	0.667
6	490	0.782	0.887	0.467	0.607	0.969	0.732

Table 2: Normalized Median Scores for Filtered Industries

 Table 3: Non-Normalized Median Scores for Filtered Industries

NACIS Digit	Industries	F1	Precision	Recall	Accuracy	ROC- AUC	ROC- AUC (binary)
							· · · · ·
2	15	0.746	0.831	0.684	0.992	0.973	0.840
3	54	0.742	0.837	0.677	0.996	0.976	0.838
4	127	0.804	0.901	0.754	0.997	0.987	0.877
5	289	0.742	0.864	0.667	0.998	0.977	0.833
6	490	0.784	0.890	0.733	0.997	0.984	0.866

Obtaining Data

With the QuantGov.org website, users can customize data downloads by using the API or by using the interactive downloader. This means that an individual can choose which industries or agencies to download metadata for personal use. In addition, the entire document-level metadata can be

downloaded. With this release, users are also able to access past versions of the RegData US project through the API.

Table 4 covers all of the different variables that are available in RegData U.S. 4.0 and the definitions for those variables. For more information about these variables, how to obtain data, or RegData U.S. 4.0, please email <u>info@quantgov.org</u>.

Name:	Description:		
year	Year that the part was published in. Ranging from 1970 to 2020.		
title	Title containing the CFR part. Ranging from 1 to 50.		
part	Part number within the title, range varies by title.		
agency	Name of the agency as given in the CFR Index.		
agency_id	Budget code for the agency.		
department	Name of the department associated with the agency.		
department_id	Budget code for the department.		
words	Total number of words.		
shall	Occurrences of the word shall.		
terms - must	Occurrences of the word <i>must</i> .		
may not	Occurrences of the words <i>may not</i> .		
required	Occurrences of the word <i>required</i> .		
prohibited	Occurrences of the word <i>prohibited</i> .		
restrictions	Total number of the five restrictive terms.		
restrictions 2.0	Total number of the five restrictive terms using the restrictions 2.0		
	methodology to include lists and bullet points.		
naics-code	The NAICS code as defined in the 2007 NAICS.		
industry-relevance	Probability that the CFR part is relevant to the industry.		
industry-relevant-restrictions	Number of restrictions relevant to a specific industry. Calculated by		
	multiplying restrictions by industry_relevance at the document level.		
shannon entropy	Shannon entropy score for the given part.		
conditionals	Number of conditionals for the given part.		
sentence length	Average sentence length for the given part.		
last-updated	Last date that the given part's <i>wordcount</i> changed by at least 1%.		

Table 4: Variable Descriptions