JUDGEAI

FEBRUARY
2026

Results of Comparing AI Lawmaking and Human Lawmaking

Legislative choices and their consequences

This internal study compares JudgeAI proposals with existing legislation across 22 regulatory tasks. Its central question is whether the system identifies the underlying problem, considers the consequences for affected people and selects a workable response. The comparisons examine both useful regulatory mechanisms and broad, symbolic or incident-driven restrictions.

How the tests were conducted

The system received abstract regulatory dilemmas without references to the comparator statutes or jurisdictions. After the outputs were generated, researchers compared the proposals with real legislation. The report places the legislative texts and the generated alternatives alongside explanations of the choices.

The tasks include corporate duties, digital taxation, religious symbols, foreign-funded organisations, platform access, gaming restrictions, reproductive technologies, environmental protection and alcohol regulation. The questions ask for a regulatory response to a problem, rather than reproduction of a named statute.

What to compare

Read each pair through the problem it addresses, the people affected, the causal mechanism, the available alternatives and the consequences of implementation. Existing law supplies a concrete comparison point. The assessment concerns the choice and its effects: a different rule may address the same problem through a narrower restriction, a different allocation of duties or additional safeguards.

The case tables preserve the original law, the JudgeAI proposal and the accompanying explanation. They support direct comparison of the provisions and of the trade-offs visible in their design.

Avoiding broad and incident-driven restrictions

The religious-symbols comparison contrasts a general prohibition with permission by default, narrow identity and safety conditions, and protection against coercion. The foreign-funding comparison contrasts a status-based label with supervision tied to specified risks, transparency and audit requirements.

In the platform-access task, JudgeAI proposed access protections together with moderation conditions, records and expedited appeals. The comparison examines how this combination addresses the conflict behind a political incident while retaining procedures for harmful content.

Refining protective measures

The gaming examples compare fixed restrictions with review periods, parental exemptions and educational or medical exceptions. The whistleblower example combines incentives with reliability checks and responses to fraudulent reports. These pairs make the scope of the restriction, its exceptions and its review mechanism visible.

Accounting for indirect effects

The digital-tax proposal includes a phased rate, triggers linked to trade retaliation, arrangements for disputed payments and protections for affected businesses and consumers. The alcohol examples combine controls on strong alcohol with differentiated licensing, zoning and time restrictions. Each comparison can be read in terms of the secondary effects the proposal anticipates and the duties it creates.

The environmental comparison links protection of future generations to measurable thresholds and review. Across the cases, the report examines how a general regulatory objective becomes operational provisions and how the design changes when indirect effects and implementation constraints enter the analysis.

Reading the results

The comparisons show several recurring forms of regulatory choice: retaining a useful mechanism, narrowing an overbroad restriction, adding operational conditions, combining different instruments and providing for review. Readers can inspect the proposed provisions alongside the human legislative choices and assess the reasons for each difference.

Implementation is part of the comparison

The generated proposals often contain several layers of compensation, oversight, monitoring and revision. These provisions allocate protections and responsibilities; they also create administrative work. Institutional capacity, funding, compliance effort and the interaction between provisions are therefore substantive features to examine alongside the intended benefits.

In the digital-tax example, the core structure consists of phased implementation, a response to trade retaliation and scheduled review. The proposal also specifies payment safeguards, compensation, data handling and monitoring. The later adaptation examples examine how such provisions can be distributed between primary legislation, existing institutions and implementing procedures.

Guide to the material

The next pages contain the comparison tables and generated provisions. The Regulatory Impact Assessment section records a separate, seven-dimension reading of the texts: problem definition, objectives, options, cost-benefit analysis, stakeholders, proportionality, and monitoring and review. Its scores describe those features in the documents. Administrative demands remain part of the accompanying analysis.

The final examples show adaptation of generated provisions to a legal setting. Together, these materials allow readers to follow the progression from a regulatory problem to an alternative rule and its implementation requirements.

Comparing the provisions

The tables below place existing legislation beside the generated alternatives and their explanations. Read each comparison through the people affected, the consequences addressed, the duties created and the arrangements for enforcement and review. These are the materials on which the report's observations are based.

UK Companies Act 2006, s.172(1)

Original Law	*LRM Version (Threat Index)*	*Explanation (TI and MES)*
A director… must act in the way he considers, in good faith, would be most likely to promote the success of the company for the benefit of its members as a whole, and in doing so have regard (amongst other matters) to the interests of the company's employees, the impact on the community and the environment."	Article 1: A director shall not adopt decisions aimed at profit-making if their implementation entails a proven risk of harm to the life and health of employees or significant damage to the environment. An exception is permitted only where the risk is minimal, as confirmed by independent expertise.	In s.172, employees and society are only "have regard to" factors. In TI terms, this creates long causal chains of risk: profit → environmental harm → threats to life. MES requires strict prioritization by irreversibility (life > health > property). Therefore, in LRM the rights of employees and environment are elevated to mandatory priorities, while profit is secondary.
Success of the company is defined primarily through the benefit of its members (shareholders).	Article 2: In conducting investment and strategic activities, the company shall give priority to long-term social and environmental consequences over short-term profit interests.	TI analysis shows: short-term profit (property rights) ranks lower than rights to health/life. MES gates C1–C3 demand legal certainty and enforceability: the vague wording "have regard to" is insufficient. Hence, LRM introduces an imperative obligation ("shall give priority").

Balance is left to the subjective judgment of the director (good faith standard).	Article 3: Decisions affecting working conditions and employee safety must be taken with the priority of preserving life and health of employees over other corporate interests. Violation entails liability up to disqualification of the director.	MES requires an independent arbiter (C2) and enforceability (C3). Director's discretion alone fails TI filter: risks to life are terminal. Therefore, LRM introduces a direct prohibition combined with sanctions (disqualification).
Community and environment are mentioned but without control mechanisms or sanctions.	Articles 4–5: The company shall disclose information on social and environmental risks and alternative scenarios; these rules are subject to mandatory review at least every three years.	MES gates C1–C4 demand certainty, enforceability, and learnability. Thus, LRM introduces transparency (mandatory disclosure, independent expertise) and periodic revision (sunset/review).

USA (Delaware) DGCL §203(a)

Original Law	LRM Version (Threat Index)	Explanation (TI and MES)
Prohibits a corporation from entering into business combinations with an "interested stockholder" (≥15%) for 3 years, unless approved by the board of directors or by 75% of the shareholders.	Article 1. Moratorium on Certain Transactions (1) For a period of three (3) years following the acquisition by any investor of a stake equal to or exceeding fifteen percent (15%) of the voting rights in the company, no transaction conferring additional economic or governance benefits upon such investor SHALL be permitted. (2) The moratorium prescribed in paragraph (1) SHALL not apply in the cases expressly provided for in Article 2. Article 2. Exceptions to the Moratorium Transactions falling under Article 1 MAY be permitted where one of the following conditions is satisfied: a) approval by an independent committee of the board of directors, accompanied by a fairness opinion issued by a duly qualified external advisor;	A strict ban (Delaware) imposes excessive harm on the investor without proportionally increasing protection for minority shareholders. A flexible "safe harbor" system minimizes the maximum risk (minimax), preserving minority protection while granting investors controlled channels for action. MES: rules rely on objective criteria (C1), decisions involve independent bodies (C2), enforcement and sanctions are ensured (C3), and a periodic review mechanism is built in (C4).

	b) approval by a majority of disinterested shareholders, excluding the votes of the investor concerned and its affiliates; c) the transaction is effected by way of a duly announced public tender offer made to all shareholders on equal terms; d) the transaction is necessitated by urgent crisis circumstances endangering the viability of the company, provided that such action is subject to ex post ratification by disinterested shareholders within sixty (60) days. Article 3. Prohibition on Creeping Acquisitions No investor SHALL be permitted to increase its shareholding above twenty-five percent (25%) of the voting rights by means of incremental or non-transparent acquisitions circumventing the procedural protections of Article 2. Article 4. Safeguards Against Board Abuse (1) Any decision of the board of directors purporting to invoke the exceptions of Article 2 SHALL be subject to immediate review by the independent committee referred to in Article 2(a). (2) Shareholders MAY refer disputes concerning the application of this Act to an Independent Arbiter, whose decision SHALL be binding. Article 5. Periodic Review The provisions of this Act SHALL be reviewed at two-year intervals, with specific assessment of: a) the effectiveness of the moratorium in preventing coercive or abusive transactions; b) the adequacy of the exceptions in safeguarding legitimate corporate flexibility; c) the continuing appropriateness of the thresholds established in Articles 1 and 3. Article 6. Enforcement and Sanctions (1) Any transaction concluded in contravention of Articles 1 or 3 SHALL be null and void ab initio.	

	(2) Persons responsible for approving or implementing such transactions SHALL be subject to civil liability and administrative fines as determined by the competent authority.	

Germany, AktG § 93(1)

Original Law	***LRM Version (Threat Index)***	***Explanation (TI & MES)***
"Die Vorstandsmitglieder haben bei ihrer Geschäftsführung die Sorgfalt eines ordentlichen und gewissenhaften Geschäftsleiters anzuwenden." — a general duty of "a diligent and conscientious manager."	N1 (Procedural Safe Harbor): "A director shall not bear personal liability for losses of the company or shareholders if, prior to a major decision, he or she conducted a good-faith risk assessment, considered alternatives, set limits on potential losses, and ensured a control system."	In § 93, the standard of diligence is open-ended: courts decide *ex post* whether the behavior was "sufficiently careful." In LRM, liability protection is tied to a *checklist of actions*. This provides C1 (legal certainty) since compliance is objectively verifiable.
In practice: liability may arise even for "simple negligence" if the damage could have been foreseen; protection exists via the *Business Judgment Rule* (a decision made on the basis of adequate information and in good faith is not deemed a breach).	N2 (Red Line): "Projects involving a substantial risk to life or health are strictly prohibited… An exception is possible only in emergencies where the project prevents greater immediate harm."	Under § 93, risks to life/health are assessed similarly to financial risks. In LRM, an *absolute Threat Index threshold (θ_L)* is set: if the probability of fatal outcomes exceeds 1×10^{-4} per project-year, approval is barred. This follows the irreversibility principle: life > property.
German case law: courts require directors to maintain *adequate organizational structures* (compliance, reporting, risk control). The law itself does not prescribe a concrete format.	N3 (High-Risk Sectors): "Every major decision shall undergo mandatory independent expertise and regular external review…" N6 (Integrity of Data): "All information… must be complete and accurate. Concealment or distortion automatically removes safe-harbor protection."	Unlike § 93, where control systems are judged *retrospectively*, LRM makes *ex ante procedures mandatory* (independent audits, verified data). This reinforces C3 (enforceability): liability follows

		from procedural breaches, not only from damages incurred.
In Germany, risk boundaries are defined by courts: emphasis lies on *individual prudence* and the assessment of good faith.	N4 (Innovation Risk Limit): "The company shall annually set a cap on cumulative losses… Exceeding this requires consent of disinterested shareholders." N5 (Pilot Principle): "New projects must begin with a pilot stage; scaling is allowed only upon meeting pre-defined metrics."	TI analysis: LRM formalizes the "price of freedom to risk"—innovation is allowed only within an ex ante cap (5% of equity / 30% of cash flow). This reduces the maximum TI for shareholders' property while preserving directors' liberty within limits. MES check confirms C4 (learnability): pilots and caps embed feedback and continuous adjustment.

France, Loi n°2019-759 du 24 juillet 2019, art.1 (introducing Article 299 of the French Tax Code)

Original Law	***LRM Version (Threat Index)***	***Explanation (TI & MES)***
Il est institué une taxe sur les services numériques due par les entreprises dont le montant des sommes encaissées en contrepartie de la fourniture de ces services au cours de l'année civile précédente excède 750 millions d'euros au titre des services fournis mondialement et 25 millions d'euros au titre des services fournis en France. English translation: "A tax on digital services is hereby established, payable by	Article 1 – Scope of Application 1. The present levy shall apply to enterprises: a) with consolidated worldwide revenues from digital services equal to or exceeding €1,000,000,000 during the preceding fiscal year; b) with domestic revenues from digital services equal to or exceeding €30,000,000 during the same period; c) with a minimum of 200,000 active users located within the national territory in the preceding calendar year. 2. "Digital services" shall include online advertising, digital intermediation services (marketplaces, app stores, platforms), and monetization of user data. Article 2 – Rate and Phased Introduction	A flat, permanent 3% levy creates a short and high-probability causal chain toward trade retaliation, with potential damage exceeding fiscal benefits. TI minimax analysis selected a moderated path: lower rate, gradual rollout, built-in suspension, and compensation channels, lengthening the causal chain and lowering retaliation probability. **MES gates:** (C1) *Certainty*: objective revenue/user thresholds;

enterprises whose amounts received in consideration for the provision of such services during the previous calendar year exceed €750 million for services supplied worldwide and €25 million for services supplied in France.”	1. The levy shall be imposed at a rate of 2% on gross revenues attributable to users located in the national territory. 2. The rate shall be introduced gradually as follows: a) Four-month notice period: 0% (registration and reporting only); b) Transitional period of 3 months: 1%; c) Full application thereafter: 2%. Article 3 – Double Taxation Relief 1. Enterprises shall be entitled to a credit against this levy in respect of amounts paid in another jurisdiction under a comparable digital services tax. 2. Credits shall be granted only upon submission of certified documentation of foreign tax payments. Article 4 – Automatic Suspension and Escrow 1. Where retaliatory trade measures are formally introduced by a trading partner and verified by the Ministry of Economy—defined as (i) an increase of at least 2 percentage points in the weighted average tariff on the State’s five principal export categories, or (ii) explicit trade restrictions targeting this levy—the operation of the levy shall be automatically suspended within 14 days. 2. During suspension, amounts otherwise payable shall be deposited into an escrow account administered by the Treasury, pending de-escalation or settlement. 3. In case of suspension exceeding 180 days, escrowed amounts shall be returned to the taxpayer with statutory interest. Article 5 – Allocation for SME and Consumer Relief 1. 10% of annual receipts under this levy shall be earmarked for subsidy programs mitigating price impacts on small and medium enterprises (SMEs) and low-income consumers. 2. The allocation shall be managed through targeted vouchers and tariff reductions.	(C2) *Independent arbiter*: escrow, audit; (C3) *Enforceability*: registry, penalties, procurement exclusion; (C4) *Learnability*: embedded KPI (“Quarterly Retaliation Incidence”), semi-annual review. The LRM version is thus a self-correcting regulation: it asserts sovereignty while embedding safeguards against escalation, something the original French law lacks.

	Article 6 – Data Minimization and Privacy 1. Taxpayers shall only provide aggregated data strictly necessary to determine the levy base and user allocation. 2. Raw user-level or personal data shall not be required. 3. Compliance shall be subject to annual audit by an independent authority. Article 7 – Enforcement and Sanctions 1. Enterprises subject to this levy shall register in the national Digital Services Registry within 60 days of qualifying. 2. Quarterly declarations shall be filed, with annual reconciliation. 3. Non-compliance shall give rise to an administrative fine of 3% of the unpaid amount, subject to a maximum of €5,000,000 per period. 4. No fine shall be imposed where the taxpayer voluntarily corrects and pays within 60 days of default. Article 8 – Duration (Sunset Clause) 1. The levy shall remain in force for a maximum of 24 months from the date of full application. 2. The levy shall automatically cease upon entry into force of a multilateral agreement on digital taxation to which the State is a party, if earlier. 3. A parliamentary review shall be conducted at least every 6 months to evaluate the continuation or termination of the measure. Article 9 – Monitoring and KPI 1. The Government shall monitor Quarterly Retaliation Incidence (QRI), defined as the number of verified retaliatory trade actions attributable to this levy. 2. The levy shall be subject to review if QRI exceeds one incident in any given quarter.	

Mexico, Ley del IVA, Article 1

Original Law	*LRM Version (Threat Index)*	*Explanation (TI & MES)*
Mexico, Ley del IVA, Article 1: "Están obligadas al pago del impuesto al valor agregado… las personas físicas y morales que, en territorio nacional, realicen los actos o actividades siguientes…" Translation: All natural and legal persons who perform taxable activities within national territory are obliged to pay VAT. This is a universal rule: every transaction within scope is taxed, without explicit exemptions or thresholds in the statutory text.	Article 1 – Scope of Application 1. The present levy shall apply to enterprises: a) with consolidated worldwide revenues from digital services equal to or exceeding €1,000,000,000 during the preceding fiscal year; b) with domestic revenues from digital services equal to or exceeding €30,000,000 during the same period; c) with a minimum of 200,000 active users located within the national territory in the preceding calendar year. 2. "Digital services" shall include online advertising, digital intermediation services (marketplaces, app stores, platforms), and monetization of user data. Article 2 – Rate and Phased Introduction 1. The levy shall be imposed at a rate of 2% on gross revenues attributable to users located in the national territory. 2. The rate shall be introduced gradually as follows: a) Four-month notice period: 0% (registration and reporting only); b) Transitional period of 3 months: 1%; c) Full application thereafter: 2%. Article 3 – Double Taxation Relief 1. Enterprises shall be entitled to a credit against this levy in respect of amounts paid in another jurisdiction under a comparable digital services tax. 2. Credits shall be granted only upon submission of certified documentation of foreign tax payments. Article 4 – Automatic Suspension and Escrow 1. Where retaliatory trade measures are formally introduced by a trading partner and verified by the Ministry of Economy—defined	TI (Threat Index) rationale: • Under a universal rule, the systemic threat is concentrated on small actors: a sudden, rigid VAT burden can push them into informality, threatening property rights (loss of livelihood) and liberty rights (freedom to conduct business). • TI-minimax analysis therefore selects a mixed model: retain universality to protect the fiscal base, but introduce calibrated reliefs to reduce maximum risk across actors. MES (Meta-Evaluation Gates): • C1 – Legal certainty: LRM norms use objective, measurable criteria (turnover thresholds, acreage, electronic invoices), ensuring predictability. • C2 – Independent arbiter: Appeals and audits remain available as safeguards, satisfying fairness without undermining automatic collection. • C3 – Enforceability: Tools like e-invoicing, platform withholding, and anti-splitting

	as (i) an increase of at least 2 percentage points in the weighted average tariff on the State's five principal export categories, or (ii) explicit trade restrictions targeting this levy—the operation of the levy shall be automatically suspended within 14 days. 2. During suspension, amounts otherwise payable shall be deposited into an escrow account administered by the Treasury, pending de-escalation or settlement. 3. In case of suspension exceeding 180 days, escrowed amounts shall be returned to the taxpayer with statutory interest. Article 5 – Allocation for SME and Consumer Relief 1. 10% of annual receipts under this levy shall be earmarked for subsidy programs mitigating price impacts on small and medium enterprises (SMEs) and low-income consumers. 2. The allocation shall be managed through targeted vouchers and tariff reductions. Article 6 – Data Minimization and Privacy 1. Taxpayers shall only provide aggregated data strictly necessary to determine the levy base and user allocation. 2. Raw user-level or personal data shall not be required. 3. Compliance shall be subject to annual audit by an independent authority. Article 7 – Enforcement and Sanctions 1. Enterprises subject to this levy shall register in the national Digital Services Registry within 60 days of qualifying. 2. Quarterly declarations shall be filed, with annual reconciliation. 3. Non-compliance shall give rise to an administrative fine of 3% of the unpaid amount, subject to a maximum of €5,000,000 per period. 4. No fine shall be imposed where the taxpayer voluntarily corrects and pays within 60 days of default.	algorithms guarantee the tax can be collected in practice. • C4 – Learnability: Annual parameter reviews allow continuous adjustment; the key indicator is "bunching" of firms just below the threshold, signaling avoidance. Compared to Mexico's rigid approach, the LRM version represents a more adaptive, risk-balanced design: it preserves revenue integrity while explicitly managing the vulnerabilities of small businesses, thus lowering systemic risk of widespread non-compliance.

	Article 8 – Duration (Sunset Clause) 1. The levy shall remain in force for a maximum of 24 months from the date of full application. 2. The levy shall automatically cease upon entry into force of a multilateral agreement on digital taxation to which the State is a party, if earlier. 3. A parliamentary review shall be conducted at least every 6 months to evaluate the continuation or termination of the measure. Article 9 – Monitoring and KPI 1. The Government shall monitor Quarterly Retaliation Incidence (QRI), defined as the number of verified retaliatory trade actions attributable to this levy. 2. The levy shall be subject to review if QRI exceeds one incident in any given quarter.	

Netherlands, Wet toetsing levensbeëindiging… Art.2(1)(a–f)

Original Law (NL)	*LRM Version (Threat Index)*	*Explanation (TI & MES)*
Art.2(1)(a): “de arts overtuigd is dat het verzoek van de patiënt vrijwillig en weloverwogen is”	N2 – Voluntariness and persistence of will: two written applications ≥14 days apart; non-benefiting witnesses; audio/video record; unconditional right to withdraw.	Dutch law uses a subjective physician conviction. TI analysis shows risk of coercion, depression, impulsivity → high irreversibility. LRM replaces subjective belief with objective observables (multiple declarations, interval, neutral witnesses), reducing probability of false positives. MES C1 (legal certainty) forces measurable criteria.

Art.2(1)(b): “de arts overtuigd is dat het lijden van de patiënt uitzichtloos en ondraaglijk is”	N4 – Unbearable suffering with no reasonable improvement: standardized suffering scales; dual medical assessments; arbitration if disagreement; explicit record of attempted alleviation.	Dutch text leaves “unbearable” largely qualitative. TI interprets as long causal link (uncertain). LRM transforms into empirically verifiable parameters (validated scales, expert cross-check). MES C3 (enforceability) ensures sanctionable violations.
Art.2(1)(c): “de patiënt heeft geïnformeerd over diens toestand en vooruitzichten”	N5 – Exhaustion of alternatives: mandatory palliative consult; documented explanation of alternatives; 72h cooling period; refusal allowed but must be documented.	NL requires only “has informed”. TI analysis shows risk: uninformed patient → premature death. LRM upgrades to documented evidence of information + alternatives. MES C1 again requires observable proof.
Art.2(1)(d): “de arts overtuigd is dat er geen redelijke andere oplossing is”	N5 (continued): consensus of two specialists on futility; third expert if conflict.	Dutch law: single physician conviction. LRM: dual independent check lowers maximum TI. MES C2 (arbiter) requires multi-node verification.
Art.2(1)(e): “ten minste één andere, onafhankelijke arts geraadpleegd heeft … schriftelijk advies … over onderdelen a–d”	N6 – Independent expertise: two independent experts (medical + ethical/legal); random assignment; conflict-of-interest declarations.	Dutch law: one independent doctor. TI minimax: single external check leaves systemic risk. LRM expands to two, different domains, random allocation. MES C2 (independent arbiter) satisfied more robustly.
Art.2(1)(f): “de levensbeëindiging … met inachtneming van de eisen van zorgvuldigheid heeft uitgevoerd”	N11 + N13 – Documentation & post-procedure audit: complete dossier; storage ≥10 years; random audits; sanctions for non-compliance.	NL: open formula of “due care”. TI flagged λ (systemic accumulation risk) if no audit. LRM introduces hard documentation + audit cycle. MES C4 (learnability) operationalized via KPI “non-compliance rate”.

California, AB 5 (2019), Labor Code §2750.3(a)(1)

Original Law	*LRM Version (Threat Index)*	*Explanation (TI & MES)*
Text (Labor Code §2750.3(a)(1)): "A person providing labor… shall be considered an employee rather than an independent contractor unless the hiring entity demonstrates that… (A) the person is free from the control… (B) the person performs work outside the usual course of the hiring entity's business…"	Article 1. Mandatory Insurance per Trip 1. Digital platforms providing passenger transport or delivery services SHALL provide accident and liability insurance coverage for each individual trip, identified by a unique trip identifier (trip_id). 2. The coverage SHALL extend equally to both the driver (service provider) and the passenger (service recipient). Article 2. Working Time Limits and Fatigue Prevention 1. The aggregated working time of a driver across one or more platforms SHALL NOT exceed ten (10) hours within a calendar day and sixty (60) hours within a calendar week. 2. After six (6) consecutive hours of work, the driver SHALL take a break of not less than thirty (30) minutes. 3. Compliance with this Article SHALL be monitored through a neutral aggregator, which collects and processes pseudonymized working-time data. Article 3. Portable Social Contributions ("Benefits Wallet") 1. For each completed trip, the platform SHALL contribute a regulated percentage of the driver's remuneration into an individual portable social account. 2. Funds accumulated in this account MAY be used by the driver for purposes including but not limited to temporary sick leave, health checks, and retirement savings. 3. The account SHALL remain personal to the driver and SHALL retain accumulated funds when the driver transitions between platforms.	AB 5 is a binary rule: unless the company proves strict independence, all workers default to employees. It maximizes labor protection but removes flexibility and increases costs. LRM builds a layered structure designed through Threat Index (TI) analysis: • Safety floor (N1–N3): universal, addressing irreversibility risks (life, health, income shocks). • Conditional reclassification (N4): only when objective reliance exceeds a threshold, to prevent exploitation while preserving true independence. • Process fairness (N5): due process for deactivation, reducing risks to liberty. • System transparency (N6): auditable data flows to enforce rules. • Freedom safeguards (N7): explicit protection of liberty and property interests against platform overreach. • Adaptive governance (N8): pilot, sunset, and KPI-based revision

	Article 4. Dependency Index (D) 1. A Dependency Index (D) is hereby established, calculated according to the formula: $D = 0.4 \cdot E + 0.2 \cdot X + 0.3 \cdot C + 0.1 \cdot A$, where: (a) *E (income share)* = proportion of driver's income derived from the platform relative to total declared income from comparable activities (if unknown, E = 1); (b) *X (exclusivity)* = 1 if contractual or practical exclusivity applies; 0 if no restriction exists; intermediate values SHALL be determined according to the degree of limitation; (c) *C (control)* = share of operational parameters determined by the platform (pricing, assignment of orders, quality standards, rating mechanisms, etc.); (d) *A (sanctions)* = value assigned according to the severity of penalties imposed for refusal of orders. 2. Platforms SHALL calculate the Dependency Index for each driver on a weekly basis and submit anonymized results to the competent authority. 3. Where the Dependency Index remains equal to or above 0.7 for four (4) or more consecutive weeks, the platform SHALL either: (i) enter into an employment contract with the driver, thereby granting full labor protections; or (ii) modify its practices so as to reduce the Dependency Index below the established threshold. 4. Drivers SHALL have the right to request their personal Dependency Index values from the platform and to challenge such values through an independent appeals procedure. 5. The methodology for assessing variables E, X, C, and A SHALL be determined and periodically updated by the competent authority. 6. The accuracy of Dependency Index calculations SHALL be subject to annual audit by an independent body accredited by the state.	ensure learnability and proportionality. Thus, unlike AB 5's rigid approach, the LRM package is adaptive, risk-minimizing, and empirically testable. It satisfies MES gates: (C1) clear triggers (trip_id, logged hours, D formula), (C2) independent appeals, (C3) enforceable mechanisms (automatic blocks, fines, audits), (C4) annual review based on KPIs.

	Article 5. Deactivation and Right of Appeal 1. Platforms SHALL NOT suspend or deactivate a driver's account without providing at least forty-eight (48) hours' prior notice and access to the evidence supporting such decision. 2. Exception MAY be made where immediate action is required to prevent imminent threats to life or safety. 3. A driver SHALL have the right to lodge an appeal with an independent body within seven (7) days of receiving notice of deactivation. Article 6. Transparency and Reporting 1. Platforms SHALL submit monthly reports to the competent authority in pseudonymized form, including: (a) number and type of accidents and safety incidents; (b) compliance rates with working-time limits and fatigue-prevention rules; (c) distributions of Dependency Index values across drivers; (d) amounts contributed to portable social accounts; (e) number and grounds of driver deactivations. Article 7. Prohibition of Retaliation and Forced Exclusivity 1. Platforms SHALL NOT impose sanctions, restrictions, or adverse consequences on drivers for engaging in multi-homing practices (working simultaneously for multiple platforms) or for providing services outside the platform. 2. This prohibition SHALL NOT apply where, pursuant to Article 4, the driver has been reclassified as an employee under an employment contract. Article 8. Pilot Phase and Sunset Mechanism 1. The present Regulatory Package SHALL apply in the form of a two-year regional pilot program.	

	2. Norms established herein SHALL be reviewed annually and adjusted based on measurable key performance indicators, specifically the number of serious accidents per one million trips. 3. At the end of the two-year period, the norms SHALL either be adopted on a permanent basis, revised, or repealed according to the outcomes of the review.	

Russia, Federal Law No. 255-FZ of 14.07.2022, Art. 1(1)

Original Law (Russia, Federal Law No. 255-FZ of 14.07.2022, Art. 1(1))	***LRM Version (Threat Index approach — concrete norms)***	***Explanation (TI & MES)***
«Под иностранным агентом понимается лицо, которое получило поддержку и (или) находится под иностранным влиянием в иных формах…»	Art. 1. Scope — This Regulation applies to all legal entities, associations, and unincorporated organizations operating within the jurisdiction. Art. 2. Triggering Condition — An organization that, within a fiscal year, receives foreign financial or material support exceeding either (a) 10% of its annual budget, or (b) 50,000 monetary units, SHALL be subject to the obligations of this Regulation. Art. 3. Disclosure Duties — Organizations SHALL record in a publicly accessible registry: (1) the identity and jurisdiction of the foreign source; (2) the amount and form of support; (3) the designated purpose of its use. Updates must be made annually and within 30 days of any significant change. Art. 4. Neutrality of Status — No organization fulfilling disclosure obligations SHALL be designated by any label implying foreign subordination or disloyalty, including the term “foreign agent.” Registry data SHALL be limited to financial transparency.	TI reasoning: The Russian law creates a short causal chain with high severity: vague criteria → arbitrary designation → stigmatization and self-censorship. This yields a high TI score for freedom of association and expression. LRM norms replace indeterminate wording with objective financial thresholds, lowering probability and severity of harm. MES evaluation: C1 (Legal Certainty) satisfied by numeric thresholds; C2 (Independent Arbiter) ensured by right of appeal; C3 (Enforceability) secured by proportionate sanctions; C4

	Art. 5. Exceptions — Obligations under Arts. 2–3 do not apply to: (a) private remittances for personal use, (b) humanitarian aid under 5,000 units annually, (c) emergency or disaster relief. Art. 6. Oversight and Sanctions — Compliance SHALL be verified by an Independent Financial Oversight Authority. Sanctions SHALL be proportionate and limited to fines not exceeding 5% of the undisclosed amount or temporary suspension until disclosure is corrected. Art. 7. Remedies — Organizations wrongly sanctioned MAY appeal before an independent tribunal and SHALL be entitled to restitution of proven losses. Art. 8. Review Clause — This Regulation SHALL be reviewed every five (5) years to assess proportionality of transparency requirements and their impact on fundamental rights.	(Learnability) guaranteed by mandatory 5-year review. Result: Transparency of foreign funding is preserved while rights restrictions are minimized, proportionate, and reviewable.

France, Loi n°2010-1192, art.1

Original Law	*LRM Version*	*Explanation (TI & MES)*

“Nul ne peut, dans l’espace public, porter une tenue destinée à dissimuler son visage.”— No one may, in public space, wear clothing intended to conceal the face.	Article 1. General Principle Every person SHALL have the right to cover their face in public spaces, save as otherwise provided by this Act. Article 2. Permissible Identity Checks (1) Identity checks involving the temporary removal of facial coverings MAY be conducted exclusively: a) in designated risk zones, including but not limited to airports, stadiums, and premises of public authorities providing governmental services; or b) during officially declared emergency situations posing a threat to public order or security. (2) Outside the circumstances specified in paragraph (1), no person SHALL be compelled to uncover their face. Article 3. Methods of Verification (1) A person subjected to an identity check under Article 2 SHALL have the right to elect the method of verification, which MAY include: a) a brief unveiling of the face in a private setting shielded from public view; b) the use of contactless biometric verification, provided that no data are retained; or c) comparison of the person’s appearance with a photograph contained in an official identity document. (2) The chosen method SHALL be executed promptly, respectfully, and in a manner avoiding humiliation or unnecessary intrusion. Article 4. Data Retention (1) No photographs, biometric templates, or other personal data obtained during the verification procedure SHALL be recorded, stored, or transmitted.	The French rule is an absolute ban on covering the face in public, with no exceptions. This heavily restricts freedom of religion and expression.The LRM regulation applies a minimax risk approach: it preserves freedom in normal conditions but permits targeted identity verification where there is a real safety risk to life or bodily integrity. Procedural safeguards (privacy, non-discrimination, individual choice of method) ensure that personal rights remain protected while still allowing authorities to secure high-risk areas.Thus, the difference is that the French law is a blanket prohibition, while the LRM approach is targeted and balanced regulation between safety and liberty.

	(2) Any verification under this Act SHALL be limited strictly to the duration necessary for the identity check. Article 5. Criminal Prohibition (1) The intentional use of facial coverings for the purpose of concealing identity in the commission of violent or otherwise criminal acts SHALL be prohibited. (2) Acts falling under paragraph (1) SHALL be prosecuted and punished in accordance with the relevant provisions of the criminal law. Article 6. Safeguards Competent authorities SHALL adopt internal procedures ensuring compliance with the requirements of necessity, proportionality, and respect for human dignity in all verifications carried out under this Act.	

USA, Texas HB 1181, 2023, §129B.002(a)

Original Law	***LRM Version***	***Explanation (TI & MES)***
"A commercial entity that publishes or distributes material harmful to minors on the Internet shall use reasonable age verification methods…"	Article 1. Scope of Application This Act SHALL apply to all online platforms engaged in the distribution, hosting, or transmission of content classified as "adult" under applicable classification standards.	Texas HB 1181 sets only a broad duty to use "reasonable" age-verification methods, but does not specify safeguards, data-protection rules, or compensatory mechanisms. The LRM Threat Index version

	Article 2. Triggering Condition The obligations set forth herein SHALL arise at the moment when a user initiates an attempt to access content falling within the scope of Article 1. Article 3. Duty of Platforms Each platform within the scope of this Act SHALL implement reliable and effective methods of age verification designed to prevent access by persons who have not attained the legal age of majority. Article 4. Safeguards in Verification (1) Age verification procedures SHALL be minimally intrusive and SHALL employ means such as temporary authentication tokens, verification through independent trusted third parties, or other privacy-preserving techniques. (2) In no case SHALL permanent storage of identity documents or biometric data be permitted. (3) Personal data obtained in the course of verification SHALL NOT be retained for a period exceeding twenty-four (24) hours, and SHALL be irreversibly deleted thereafter. Article 5. Enforcement Mechanisms (1) Compliance with the provisions of this Act SHALL be subject to audit by the competent supervisory authority. (2) In cases of violation, the supervisory authority MAY impose proportionate fines and, where necessary, order the temporary suspension of the platform's services until compliance is restored. Article 6. Compensatory Remedies (1) Any user whose personal data are unlawfully disclosed or leaked as a result of verification under this Act SHALL be entitled to claim compensation for damages. (2) Users SHALL further have the right to demand an independent	reaches the same minimax conclusion (child protection > adult privacy), but embeds specific safeguards (data-retention limits, trusted intermediaries, compensation for leaks) to prevent excessive intrusion. The MES gates required precise objective applicability (C1), enforceability instruments (C3), and review mechanisms (C4). Without these, the rule would be too vague and risk sliding into disproportionate state control.

	investigation into any suspected breach of data protection obligations by a platform. Article 7. Sunset and Periodic Review The provisions of this Act SHALL be subject to mandatory review every three (3) years, with a view to assessing their continued necessity, effectiveness, and compatibility with emerging anonymization and privacy-preserving technologies.	

USA, Delaware, DGCL §141(a)

Original Law	*LRM Version*	*Explanation (TI & MES analysis)*
"The business and affairs of every corporation organized under this chapter shall be managed by or under the direction of a board of directors…"	Article 1. General Rule of Competence of the Board The board of directors SHALL exercise independent authority over all operational and managerial matters of the company, except those expressly reserved to the general meeting of shareholders under this Act or the company's charter. Article 2. Reserved Matters Requiring Shareholder Approval (1) The following matters SHALL be reserved to the exclusive competence of the general meeting of shareholders: a) approval of transactions the value of which exceeds fifteen percent (15%) of the company's total assets; b) authorization of equity issuances or other acts resulting in dilution of existing shareholders' ownership exceeding ten percent (10%); c) decisions on reorganization, merger, division, liquidation, or comparable structural changes of the company; d) alteration of the company's principal line of business resulting in a shift of more than twenty percent (20%) of total revenue; e) adoption or material modification of the executive compensation policy.	Under DGCL §141(a), Delaware adopts a pure board-centric model: the board has absolute management authority. This maximizes efficiency and speed (low Threat Index on property rights, as corporate value is less exposed to chaos) but also creates a high Threat Index on shareholder liberty: the causal chain of exclusion from strategic influence is long, irreversible, and systematic. The LRM Threat Index minimax evaluation shows that an absolute exclusion of shareholder voice carries a higher long-term risk profile (irreversible loss of liberty) than allowing for bounded intervention points. Thus, the LRM

	(2) No such decision SHALL take effect without a shareholder vote in accordance with applicable law. Article 3. Minority Agenda Rights (1) Shareholders holding at least one percent (≥1%) of the voting shares MAY require the inclusion of items into the agenda of the general meeting. (2) Shareholders holding at least five percent (≥5%) of the voting shares MAY demand the convocation of an extraordinary general meeting. Article 4. Independent Corporate Arbiter (ICA) (1) An Independent Corporate Arbiter SHALL be established as a neutral body vested with competence to resolve procedural disputes arising in connection with corporate governance. (2) The jurisdiction of the ICA SHALL extend to: a) disputes concerning inclusion of items in the meeting agenda; b) approval of related-party transactions; c) authorization of temporary measures in crisis situations ("crisis bridge"). (3) The ICA SHALL render its decision within ten (10) days of referral; such decision SHALL be final and binding on the company and its organs. Article 5. Related-Party Transaction Safeguards (1) Any transaction with an affiliate or any transaction exceeding two percent (2%) of the company's assets SHALL require prior review by the ICA. (2) Such transactions SHALL also be subject to approval by a vote of disinterested shareholders, excluding the votes of interested parties. Article 6. Decision Memoranda on Reserved Matters (1) Every decision of the board concerning matters referred under Article 2 SHALL be accompanied by a written memorandum. (2) The memorandum SHALL contain:	solution is a hybrid model: operational primacy of the board is preserved for efficiency, but "reserved matters" and minority agenda rights reintroduce institutionalized channels for shareholder influence. MES Gate checks: • C1 (Legal certainty): Reserved matters defined by objective financial thresholds (observable in balance sheets, % of assets, % of dilution). • C2 (Independent arbiter): ICA ensures neutral adjudication of procedural disputes, replacing subjective board discretion. • C3 (Enforceability): Sanctions include nullification of decisions, fines, and director disqualification; abuse triggers procedural penalties. • C4 (Learnability): Review cycles every 24–36 months, KPI-based monitoring of reserved matters enforcement (<2% non-compliance target). In sum, while Delaware law maximizes efficiency by centralizing power, the LRM approach modifies this into a board-first but safeguarded regime, minimizing the Threat Index by balancing operational liberty of

	a) a statement of the decision's goals and objectives; b) a description of considered alternatives; c) an assessment of risks using the Threat Index methodology; d) identification of measurable key performance indicators (KPIs) for monitoring execution. Article 7. Procedural and Crisis Safeguards (1) Any abuse of rights by members of the board or shareholders in relation to matters regulated by this Act SHALL give rise to sanctions determined by the competent authority or court, including fines, disqualification, or suspension of rights. (2) In situations of urgent and imminent threat to the company's viability, the board MAY take provisional action under a "crisis bridge" regime, provided that: a) the action receives prior authorization from the ICA; and b) the action is submitted for mandatory ratification by the shareholders within sixty (60) days. (3) In the absence of shareholder ratification, the provisional action SHALL lapse and any legal effects SHALL be reversed to the extent possible.	directors with the participatory liberty of shareholders.

UK, Enterprise Act 2002, Part 3, s.58(2)(c)

Original Law	*LRM Version (Threat Index)*	*Explanation (TI & MES)*

"The need… to maintain a plurality of persons with control of media enterprises." — a framework rule requiring that media plurality be taken into account when assessing mergers.	Article 1. Scope of Application This Regulation SHALL apply to all mergers, acquisitions, joint ventures, or comparable transactions involving undertakings engaged in the production, distribution, or control of editorial content within the national or regional media market. Article 2. Notification and Assessment Duty (1) Any transaction falling within the scope of Article 1 SHALL be notified to the competent review authority prior to its implementation. (2) Notification SHALL be mandatory where: a) the combined share of audience attention attributable to the undertakings concerned equals or exceeds twenty percent (20%); or b) the Plurality Concentration Index (PCI) would increase by one hundred and fifty (150) points or more as a result of the transaction. Article 3. Substantive Prohibition (1) A transaction notified under Article 2 SHALL NOT be approved if, upon completion: a) the national PCI would exceed two thousand two hundred (2200); or b) the regional PCI would exceed two thousand five hundred (2500); or c) fewer than four (4) independent editorial controllers would remain active in the relevant market. (2) Transactions falling under paragraph (1) SHALL be deemed incompatible with media plurality and SHALL be prohibited. Article 4. Conditional Approval (1) Where a transaction does not meet the absolute thresholds of Article 3 but raises material risks to plurality, the reviewing authority MAY grant approval subject to structural and behavioral remedies. (2) Such remedies MAY include:	The UK rule establishes a general principle, leaving broad discretion to the Secretary of State: plurality must be considered, but there is no algorithm for measuring it. The LRM/TI version converts that principle into *objectively verifiable triggers*: audience shares, PCI/HHI thresholds, minimum number of editorial controllers. TI analysis showed that the threat of losing freedom of expression (a higher-priority, less reversible right) outweighs restrictions on investment freedom. MES gates added enforceability (fines, unwind), learnability (annual KPI reports), and compensatory clauses for smaller players. Thus, the difference is between a broad political standard (UK) and an algorithmically enforceable norm (LRM).

	a) divestiture of assets or business units sufficient to mitigate concentration; b) provision of fair, reasonable, and non-discriminatory (FRAND) access to essential distribution infrastructure; c) adoption of an Editorial Independence Charter binding on the undertakings concerned; d) commitments to conduct regular algorithmic audits of recommendation or distribution systems affecting editorial diversity. Article 5. Independent Arbiter (1) An Independent Arbiter SHALL be appointed to conduct the substantive review of all transactions notified under this Regulation. (2) The Independent Arbiter SHALL act with full impartiality, SHALL be empowered to request all necessary information, and SHALL issue a binding determination within the time limits prescribed by implementing rules. Article 6. Monitoring and Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) (1) Undertakings subject to conditional approval under Article 4 SHALL comply with ongoing monitoring obligations. (2) Monitoring SHALL include the periodic measurement of predefined KPIs, including but not limited to: audience distribution metrics, compliance with FRAND obligations, and independence of editorial decision-making. (3) KPI results SHALL be reported at least annually to the Independent Arbiter and made publicly available in a summarized form. Article 7. Enforcement and Sanctions (1) Failure to notify a transaction as required under Article 2, or implementation of a transaction prohibited under Article 3, SHALL render the transaction void and subject the undertakings concerned to proportionate fines. (2) Breach of remedies imposed under Article 4 SHALL entitle the	

	reviewing authority to revoke approval, impose corrective measures, and apply financial sanctions. Article 8. Review and Sunset Clause This Regulation SHALL be subject to comprehensive review every five (5) years in light of market evolution, empirical data on PCI reliability, and the effectiveness of remedies in preserving plurality.	

Spain, Ley 4/2020, art.1

Original Law	***LRM Version***	***Explanation (TI & MES)***
"Se crea el Impuesto sobre Determinados Servicios Digitales…" — Creates a 3% tax on revenues from certain digital services (online advertising, online intermediation/marketplaces, user-data monetization). Thresholds: worldwide revenues ≥ €750M and Spanish revenues ≥ €3M. Applies irrespective of nationality of provider.	Art. 1. Scope — Groups providing digital intermediation, online advertising, or monetizing user data to users located in the jurisdiction. Art. 2. Trigger — Revenues ≥ 750M (global) and ≥ 25M (domestic). Jurisdictional sourcing defined by 2-of-3 test (billing address, verified device location, IP with payment provider match). Art. 3. Rate — Base rate 2%. Art. 4. Credit/Refund — Amounts paid fully creditable against corporate income tax within 24 months or refundable. Art. 5. Standstill Clause — If entity is subject to a multilateral allocation regime (OECD Pillar One or equivalent), DST automatically suspended for that entity. Art. 6. De-escalation — If explicit retaliatory tariffs are imposed, DST reduced to 0.5% for 12 months while negotiations proceed. Safeguards — Non-discrimination, de minimis exemption (<25M local revenue), transparency to consumers, independent arbitration	Threat Index (TI) logic: • Spain's 3% flat DST maximizes sovereignty but creates high risk of double taxation and trade retaliation (TI↑ for businesses and consumers through higher prices, TI↑ for state via retaliation). • LRM minimax rule selected a lower baseline (2%) with full CIT credit/refund to break the chain leading to cumulative harm (double taxation). • Adding standstill and de-escalation clauses directly cuts the escalation path (foreign reprisals), reducing severity.

	of disputes, publication of aggregate KPIs, sunset/review every 24 months.	• Safeguards (non-discrimination, transparency) extend chain length for lower-priority rights (convenience, property), ensuring MES compliance. MES gates: • C1 (certainty): objective thresholds and sourcing test. • C2 (arbiter): independent tax arbitration. • C3 (enforceability): penalties, transparency, refunds. • C4 (learnability): KPI monitoring, sunset review. Thus the LRM package preserves sovereignty but prevents irreversibility risks from trade escalation and systemic double taxation.

Germany, Mindestlohngesetz (MiLoG), §1(1)

Original Law	*LRM Version*	*Explanation (TI & MES)*

"Jede Arbeitnehmerin und jeder Arbeitnehmer hat Anspruch auf Zahlung eines Arbeitsentgelts mindestens in Höhe des Mindestlohns." ("Every employee shall be entitled to payment of remuneration of at least the minimum wage.")	N1 — Who is covered Every employer who hires at least one worker must respect these rules. All wage payments must be at least equal to the guaranteed minimum. N2 — How the minimum is set Each year, the national statistics office must publish: • the average cost of a basic living basket (food, housing, health, transport, communication), and • the median wage across the country. N3 — The dignity minimum wage The minimum wage must be high enough to cover a decent living. It is calculated using both the cost of the living basket and the national median wage, with regional adjustments. Whichever amount is higher becomes the new minimum. Increases must be gradual so that they don't grow too fast compared to the general wage level. N4 — Step-by-step introduction To give small businesses time to adapt, the new minimum wage comes into force in stages. Micro-businesses (up to 10 workers) and small businesses (up to 50 workers) can phase in the increase over a year. Regions with very high unemployment may get extra time. N5 — Help for small businesses If a small or micro-business's wage costs rise too much because of the new rules, they can apply for support. This support can be in the form of tax breaks, reduced social contributions, or subsidies for training and productivity improvements. N6 — Apprentices and trainees Apprentices and trainees in recognized programs can be paid 85% of the minimum wage for up to 6 months. After that, they must	The German MiLoG norm is absolute and static: a uniform nationwide floor wage, with no phasing, no hardship clauses, no compensatory offsets. Its TI-profile shortens the chain to protecting workers' life/health but leaves SMEs exposed to sudden property/liberty shocks (bankruptcy, layoffs). The LRM/TI version preserves the same *core right* (every worker SHALL receive not less than a minimum floor) but minimizes systemic risk by distributing adjustment costs: (i) phased implementation lowers L(a,s) for SMEs, (ii) offsets reduce probability P of closure, (iii) waivers provide controlled flexibility, (iv) KPI/review ensure learnability. Thus, while both regimes prioritize social justice, the LRM version explicitly balances irreversibility hierarchy (life/health > property) through compensatorics, meeting MES gates (C1 observability, C2 arbiters, C3 enforceability, C4 learnability).

	receive the full minimum wage. Companies cannot abuse this by repeatedly rehiring people as "trainees." N7 — Temporary hardship exception If a company is close to bankruptcy, it may pay 90% of the minimum wage for up to 6 months. To do this, it must present a recovery plan and report monthly on progress. Companies that have paid dividends recently cannot use this exception. N8 — Transparency for workers All employers must clearly show the minimum wage on payslips and in the workplace so that employees know their rights. Workers who report violations are protected against retaliation. N9 — Monitoring and penalties Authorities will check compliance using data and complaints. First violations may result only in a warning and 30 days to correct. Repeat or serious violations will bring fines, and companies that constantly underpay may lose access to government aid. N10 — Review and adjustment The system will be reviewed every quarter and fully reassessed every three years. If unemployment rises sharply, or if workers still cannot afford basic living costs, the rules must be adjusted. Mistakes by the	

France, Code du travail, art. L.1225-4)

Original Law	***LRM Version***	***Explanation (TI & MES)***
"L'employeur ne peut rompre le contrat de travail d'une salariée lorsqu'elle est en état de	Art. 1 Scope — This regulation applies to all employees, regardless of contract type (permanent, temporary, part-time), once pregnancy is medically certified.	Threat Index logic: For pregnant workers, dismissal risk can lead to deprivation of income, loss of healthcare access, and direct threats to

grossesse médicalement constaté…"	Art. 2 Trigger (OAP) — The protection starts when the employee provides an official medical certificate of pregnancy and lasts until the end of maternity leave. Art. 3 Prohibition — During this protected period, the employer SHALL NOT terminate the employment contract. Art. 4 Exceptions — Termination MAY occur only in two objectively verifiable cases: (a) the employer is declared insolvent by a competent authority; (b) the employee has committed gross misconduct, confirmed by independent investigation and review. Art. 5 Safeguards — (i) Employer must seek prior approval from the labor inspectorate before dismissal; (ii) Automatic judicial review is available to the employee; (iii) Burden of proof lies entirely on the employer. Art. 6 Enforcement — If dismissal is found unlawful: (a) employee shall be reinstated with full back pay, or (b) alternatively, employee may choose compensation including damages for moral harm. Repeat violations by employers lead to escalating fines and ineligibility for public contracts. Art. 7 Compensatory clause — Employers facing proven financial hardship due to inability to dismiss may apply for targeted wage-support subsidies from the state during the protected period. Art. 8 Sunset/Review — The regulation is subject to a systematic review every 3 years, based on statistical indicators: number of dismissals attempted, maternal health outcomes, employer insolvency petitions. Adjustments must be proposed if imbalance is detected.	life/health of both mother and child → Severity 4. For employers, restriction affects property and managerial flexibility, but causal chain to life is remote → Severity 2. Therefore protection of worker dominates under minimax TI rule. MES gates: (C1) OAP satisfied by medical certificate, insolvency declaration, misconduct record. (C2) Arbiter satisfied by labor inspectorate/courts. (C3) Enforceability secured through sanctions and monitoring; CSP added via employer subsidies. (C4) Learnability via triennial review. Difference from French model: French law states an almost absolute prohibition, but exceptions are implicit and enforcement less structured. LRM makes exceptions explicit, adds compensatory subsidies for employers, stronger safeguards (burden of proof, inspectorate approval), and a built-in review mechanism. This makes the regulation more balanced, transparent, and adaptive without reducing protection for pregnant workers.

Italy — Legge 40/2004, art. 4(3)

Original Law	*LRM Version*	*Explanation (TI & MES)*
"È vietato il ricorso a tecniche di procreazione medicalmente assistita di tipo eterologo…" *(Legge 40/2004, art. 4(3))* Plain meaning: a total ban on heterologous assisted reproduction (use of donor sperm/eggs/embryos). Surrogacy was also heavily restricted/forbidden by the broader framework. Rationale at enactment: protect traditional family, avoid "split" genetic lineage, align with cultural/religious views.	Article 1. Licensing and Registry (1) Any clinic or intermediary engaging in assisted reproductive technologies (ART), gamete donation, or surrogacy SHALL obtain a special license issued by the competent authority. (2) Each procedure SHALL be pre-registered in the national ART registry, with allocation of a unique cycle identifier. (3) Registry data SHALL be pseudonymized to protect personal information. (4) Enforcement: violations are subject to fines, suspension or annulment of licenses, and, in cases of systematic off-registry operations, criminal liability. (5) Compensatory: refusals of license SHALL be subject to fast-track appeal within ten (10) days. Article 2. Access and Indications (1) Access to ART SHALL be granted to single persons and couples without discrimination on grounds of marital status or sexual orientation. (2) Access SHALL be conditional upon documented infertility or medically established genetic/health grounds, supported by a physician's report and a psychosocial evaluation. (3) Safeguards: contraindication checklist and the option of a second medical opinion. (4) Enforcement: systematic audits of refusals; sanctions imposed for discriminatory conduct. (5) Compensatory: unjustified denials SHALL entitle applicants to coverage of costs for a second opinion. Article 3. Donor Criteria (1) Gamete donation SHALL be permitted only with informed consent of the donor. (2) Oocyte donors SHALL be between twenty-one (21) and thirty-two (32) years; sperm donors between twenty-one (21) and forty (40)	Direct normative conflict: Italy's rule is a blanket prohibition; the LRM package permits with strict safeguards. They are mutually exclusive in operation. Threat Index (TI) analysis (why R* wins minimax): • Causal chains under a ban become longer ($\Sigma T_i\uparrow$) and less reliable ($\prod R_i\downarrow$): domestic prohibition → cross-border travel → unlicensed brokers → low-oversight clinics → limited aftercare. Each link adds time (T_i), information cost (2^{K_i}), and delay (τ_i), while reliability R_i drops; severity S can increase for donors/carriers (e.g., unmanaged OHSS, unmanaged obstetric risk). $TI(a,s)=S\cdot P\cdot L$ therefore rises for vulnerable actors (donors, gestational carriers, neonates). • Permission with controls shortens chains (fewer intermediaries), raises reliability (licensed providers, registries, SAE reporting), and reduces accumulation λ (feedback via KPI and N16). Hence the max TI across actors is lower (minimax). • Rights ranking by irreversibility: bodily integrity (donors/carriers/child) > liberty (reproductive autonomy) > property/convenience > cultural preferences. Bans mainly protect cultural preferences while increasing bodily risk via grey markets; R*

	years. (3) Maximum limits: no more than six (6) ovarian stimulation cycles and no more than ten (10) recorded live births per donor nationwide. (4) Safeguards: compulsory complication insurance and a national registry of genetic markers to prevent accidental consanguinity. (5) Enforcement: penalties against clinics or intermediaries exceeding donor limits. (6) Compensatory: donors may withdraw consent without penalty up to the point of puncture or sperm collection. Article 4. Gestational Carrier Criteria (1) A gestational carrier SHALL meet the following requirements: a) age between twenty-one (21) and thirty-five (35) years; b) at least one (1) prior term birth; c) no more than two (2) surrogacies over a lifetime; d) health and body mass index within medically safe bounds. (2) Safeguards: extended medical and disability insurance, and independent counseling. (3) Enforcement: penalties for recruitment outside the criteria; criminal liability for coercion. (4) Compensatory: the gestational carrier may unilaterally withdraw up to the moment of embryo transfer without sanctions. Article 5. Informed Consent and Cooling-Off Period (1) Prior to stimulation, collection, or transfer, informed consent SHALL be signed after an independent consultation. (2) A fourteen-day (14) cooling-off period SHALL apply before any invasive procedure. (3) Exception: urgent life-saving indications. (4) Safeguards: audio-visual record of the consultation; plain-language consent forms. (5) Enforcement: license sanctions for breaches of informed consent; invalidity of procedures conducted under coercion.	directly mitigates bodily risks while minimally restricting liberty. MES gates (abstract validity checks): • C1 Legal certainty: R* uses objective applicability predicates (OAP) (license, registry entry, age/health cut-offs, SET rule, PGT indications). The Italian ban is certain in text but under-specifies operational safeguards (no way to manage inevitable demand). • C2 Independent arbiter: R* creates a bioethics body with auditability; a pure ban delegates nothing (no proportionality filter), which fails when edge cases arise (e.g., severe genetic disease prevention). • C3 Enforceability: R* builds licenses, registries, SAEs, sanctions, KPIs, escrow (conditions & stimuli). A ban has only negative sanctions; enforcement pushes activity offshore, reducing actual control. • C4 Learnability: R* mandates data collection + periodic review (N16) to update risks; bans lack built-in learning loops. Why cultural/religious concerns are still respected: R* forbids commercialization of the child (N7), restricts selection to medical need (N10), and requires ethical approvals

	(6) Compensatory: withdrawal allowed until the biological point of no return, defined as in-utero conception or embryo transfer. Article 6. Limits on Multiple Pregnancy (1) Single-embryo transfer SHALL be mandatory for women under thirty-five (35) and for all gestational carriers. (2) Double transfer MAY be permitted only where prognosis is documented as low and the medical board grants approval. (3) Safeguards: written justification and patient consent. (4) Enforcement: audits and penalties for violations. Article 7. Payments and Ban on Commercialization of Children (1) Payments in ART and surrogacy SHALL be limited to reimbursement of verified expenses and standardized compensations. (2) Payments SHALL NOT be tied to the outcome, sex, or traits of the child. (3) Safeguards: escrow mechanisms and a public schedule of reimbursable costs. (4) Enforcement: confiscation of illegal payments and criminal liability for commercialization of children. (5) Compensatory: restitution to good-faith parties involved. Article 8. Contract Architecture and Parenthood Allocation (1) A standard-form contract SHALL be filed before implantation. (2) Intended parents SHALL be deemed the legal parents at birth. (3) Medical decisions, including termination, remain with the gestational carrier when medically indicated and in accordance with protocol; in life-threatening situations, the carrier's decision prevails. (4) Safeguards: ex ante mediation procedures for disputes concerning anomalies, multiple births, or preterm complications. (5) Enforcement: specific performance of standard clauses; no sanctions for bona fide medical decisions of the carrier. (6) Compensatory: costs of early termination of the contract due to uncontrollable causes SHALL be covered.	(N14). It also filters access by medical indications and safety, satisfying dignity concerns without imposing a total prohibition. Bottom line: Legge 40/2004 art. 4(3) prioritizes traditional morals via a total block on heterologous ART; LRM R* prioritizes bodily safety + reproductive autonomy through permission with heavy safeguards. On TI-minimax and MES grounds, R* dominates because it reduces high-severity harm and keeps risk observable and correctable instead of exporting it to unobservable grey markets.

	Article 9. Protection of the Child's Interests (1) Immediate parentage registration and neonatal screening SHALL be carried out upon birth. (2) Donor anonymity SHALL be protected; however, the child, upon attaining a defined age, SHALL have the right to access anonymized medical and genetic information. (3) Enforcement: penalties for delays. Article 10. Prohibition of Non-Medical Selection (1) Non-medical selection of sex or traits SHALL be prohibited. (2) Preimplantation genetic testing (PGT) MAY be used solely to prevent serious monogenic or chromosomal diseases. (3) Exception: sex-linked severe disorders. (4) Enforcement: penalties, including annulment of licenses for violations. Article 11. Cross-Border ART and Surrogacy (1) Cross-border ART and surrogacy SHALL be permitted only where the destination jurisdiction demonstrates equivalent safety and ethical standards. (2) The use of unlicensed intermediaries SHALL be prohibited. (3) Enforcement: refusal to register outcomes from non-equivalent jurisdictions; penalties for brokers. (4) Compensatory: assistance to relocate contracts to an equivalent jurisdiction. Article 12. Non-Discrimination (1) Equal access to ART SHALL be guaranteed, subject only to medical criteria. (2) A log of refusals with stated reasons SHALL be maintained. (3) Enforcement: penalties, including license suspension for discriminatory practices. Article 13. Serious Adverse Events Reporting (1) All serious adverse events (SAE) and suspected unexpected	

	serious adverse reactions (SUSAR) SHALL be notified within twenty-four (24) hours. (2) A root-cause analysis SHALL be completed within thirty (30) days, accompanied by a corrective and preventive action (CAPA) plan. (3) Enforcement: fines and conditional suspension pending CAPA implementation. (4) Compensatory: treatment of affected parties SHALL be financed through insurance or a compensation fund. Article 14. Oversight and Bioethics Body (1) An oversight and bioethics body SHALL be established to decide matters delegated under Articles 3–11. (2) The body SHALL publish anonymized statistics and guidance, manage conflicts of interest, and ensure periodic rotation of experts. (3) Enforcement: external audit and sanctions for unjustified delays. Article 15. Ban on Coercion and Exploitation (1) Any coercion, deception, trafficking, or involvement of minors in ART SHALL be prohibited. (2) Suspicion of such conduct SHALL be reported immediately to the competent authority. (3) Enforcement: criminal liability and lifetime bans from the sector. (4) Compensatory: victims SHALL have access to a protection program and to a dedicated compensation fund. Article 16. Review and Rollback (1) Thirty-six (36) months after entry into force, or earlier if the KPI threshold is breached, a mandatory public review SHALL be conducted. (2) Risk scales SHALL be updated and norms adjusted, including possible rollback. (3) Safeguards: independent audit of registry data and transparent methodology.	

	(4) Enforcement: adoption of a mandatory implementation plan following the review.	

New York GBL §349

Original Law	*LRM Version*	*Explanation (TI & MES)*
"Deceptive acts or practices in the conduct of any business, trade or commerce… are hereby declared unlawful." – Extremely broad and open-ended wording. – Leaves wide discretion to courts to determine what qualifies as "deceptive." – Consumer can always attempt litigation, since the law provides a universal hook. – Strong protection of consumers, but generates uncertainty and litigation risk for businesses.	Article 1. Definitions and Risk Tiers (1) For the purposes of this Act, objective applicability predicates (OAP) SHALL be established to distinguish: a) "puffery," defined as subjective and non-verifiable promotional language, which is excluded from sanction; b) "verifiable claims," defined as statements concerning facts, performance, or measurable qualities of goods or services, which fall under the scope of this Act. (2) A list of prohibited "dark patterns," including but not limited to forced continuity, disguised advertising, and coercive consent mechanisms, SHALL be adopted by regulation and regularly updated. Article 2. High-Risk Ban (1) Deceptive commercial practices in sectors directly affecting health, safety, or financial services SHALL be absolutely prohibited. (2) Any factual claims in such sectors SHALL require prior substantiation by adequate evidence, which SHALL be in place before the claim is published or disseminated. Article 3. Standardized Disclosures (1) All commercial communications involving prices, fees, or subscriptions SHALL include a standardized disclosure block, formatted for clarity and visibility.	TI perspective: – Broad "catch-all" clauses (like §349) maximize consumer protection but raise Risk* for businesses by making legal exposure unpredictable. – LRM minimax analysis shows that life and bodily integrity risks (health/safety deception) justify absolute bans (N2). Property-level risks (hidden fees, misleading prices) require structured disclosure (N3) rather than blanket prohibition. – By stratifying obligations according to severity and probability of harm, the LRM version minimizes the maximal Threat Index for both sides. MES gates: – *Certainty*: OAP ensure predictable application (unlike §349's vagueness). – *Arbiter*: Courts/auditors only decide on factual predicates, not abstract "deception." – *Enforceability*: KPI and logs provide measurable compliance.

	(2) Automatic subscription renewals SHALL be valid only if the consumer has provided explicit opt-in consent. Article 4. Substantiation Duty (1) All verifiable factual claims used in commercial communication SHALL be supported by written evidence. (2) Such substantiation SHALL be made available to the competent authority within five (5) days upon request. Article 5. Safe Harbor (1) Businesses that maintain compliance logs, documentary checklists, and records of disclosure practices in accordance with official templates SHALL benefit from a safe harbor. (2) Within this safe harbor, businesses SHALL be protected against frivolous or unfounded claims, provided that the records demonstrate good-faith compliance. Article 6. Duties of Online Marketplaces (1) Online marketplaces and platforms SHALL act on duly substantiated notifications of deceptive practices within forty-eight (48) hours. (2) Failure to act within the prescribed time SHALL render the platform jointly liable with the trader for resulting consumer harm. Article 7. Quick Remedies for Consumers (1) Consumers who suffer measurable harm from deceptive practices SHALL be entitled to expedited judicial or administrative remedies, including: a) fast-track injunctions against the practice; b) immediate refund or cancellation rights. (2) Such remedies SHALL be granted under simplified procedures designed to ensure effectiveness within short deadlines. Article 8. Sanctions and Monitoring (1) Violations of this Act SHALL be subject to graduated sanctions,	– *Learnability*: Periodic review of dark patterns and disclosure readability ensures adaptation. Result: LRM replaces the ex post "wide net + judicial discretion" model with an ex ante risk-calibrated framework. Consumers retain strong protection in high-risk domains, while businesses gain predictability and procedural safeguards in lower-risk areas.

	applied in proportion to severity and repetition: a) official warning; b) administrative fine; c) inclusion on a public list of non-compliant businesses; d) prohibition from engaging in specified commercial activities. (2) The competent authority SHALL establish monitoring mechanisms, including periodic audits and publication of anonymized enforcement statistics.	

Bundesdatenschutzgesetz (BDSG),§26(1)

Original Law	***LRM Version***	***Explanation (TI & MES)***
Personenbezogene Daten von Beschäftigten dürfen für Zwecke des Beschäftigungsverhältnisses verarbeitet werden, wenn dies für die Entscheidung über die Begründung eines Beschäftigungsverhältnisses oder nach Begründung für dessen Durchführung oder Beendigung erforderlich ist…	Art. 1. Scope — This Regulation applies to all employers, employees, and third-party processors engaged in the collection, storage, or analysis of worker personal data. Art. 2. Trigger (OAP) — Any act of processing employee personal data (including monitoring, storage, biometric collection, algorithmic scoring) SHALL fall within the scope of this Regulation. Art. 3. Permitted Categories — Processing SHALL be lawful only if: (a) it is strictly necessary for workplace safety and protection of life/health; or (b) it is indispensable for essential operational functions directly tied to contractual obligations. Art. 4. Prohibited Uses — Processing for productivity analytics, behavioral scoring, or disciplinary surveillance SHALL NOT be permitted unless the conditions of Art. 5 are satisfied. Art. 5. Exceptional Allowance for Productivity/Discipline — Processing MAY be allowed if, within the last 12 months, objectively verifiable triggers exist: (i) sector-adjusted serious incident rate above median linked to human error; (ii) recurrent	Threat Index reasoning: – A single necessity test (BDSG) risks under-deterring invasive monitoring because “erforderlich” is vague and often employer-weighted. Privacy harms (severity S=2–3) accumulate with high probability and low observability. – Conversely, categorical prohibition of all monitoring would raise workplace accident risk (S=4 harms) due to missing safety data, increasing TI for life and bodily integrity. – The LRM package minimizes the maximum TI by tiering: (i) always allow safety/health uses (to cut down catastrophic harms), (ii) allow operations only if indispensable, (iii) ban productivity/discipline unless empirical safety or quality triggers

	quality failures verifiably tied to process breaches; or (iii) substantiated safety-related complaints. In such cases, employer SHALL conduct a Safety & Privacy Risk Impact Assessment (SPRIA), register the processing with the Data Trustee, and limit it to the implicated roles/functions. Art. 6. Data Minimization & Retention — Employers SHALL collect only data strictly necessary, SHALL prohibit covert audio, persistent location outside hazard zones, and SHALL enforce deletion clocks (30–90 days for routine, 12 months for disciplinary files). Art. 7. Worker Rights & Transparency — Employers SHALL provide workers with a console to view collected data, purposes, retention, and recipients. All algorithmic decisions affecting pay, promotion, or termination SHALL be subject to human review. Art. 8. Oversight & Enforcement — Each employer with ≥25 workers SHALL establish an elected Data Trustee; all employers engaging in disciplinary data use SHALL undergo annual independent audit. Regulators MAY impose fines up to 2% of payroll, suspend unlawful processing, and order reinstatement. Art. 9. Compensatory Clause — Any HR action based on unlawfully obtained data SHALL be void. Affected workers MAY claim statutory damages, reinstatement, and data erasure. Art. 10. Sunset & Review — This Regulation SHALL be reviewed every 2 years with sector-specific adjustments to retention periods, sanction levels, and objective triggers.	exist. – MES checks: C1 (Legal certainty) satisfied by objective predicates (incident rates, retention clocks). C2 (Independent arbiter) satisfied by trustee + audit. C3 (Enforceability) ensured by sanctions, suspensions, and voidability. C4 (Learnability) ensured by mandatory 2-year review. Result: More prescriptive, predictable, and balanced than BDSG's open necessity clause, while still permitting proportional employer control where life/health risk justifies it.

California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA), Civ. Code §1798.120(a)

Original Law	*LRM Version*	*Explanation (TI & MES)*

A consumer shall have the right, at any time, to direct a business that sells personal information… not to sell the consumer's personal information.	Art. 1 — Scope. This Regulation SHALL apply to all legal entities, natural or corporate, that process personal data of residents within the jurisdiction. Art. 2 — Universal Right to Opt-Out. (1) Every data subject SHALL have the right, at any time, to prohibit the sale or exchange of their personal data to third parties. (2) The exercise of this right SHALL be valid where: (a) the data subject explicitly selects the "Do Not Sell/Share" option provided by the controller, or (b) a recognized global opt-out signal is transmitted by the device or browser. (3) Upon such exercise, the controller SHALL NOT transfer personal data for monetary or equivalent consideration, except where required by law or necessary for security and fraud-prevention purposes. Art. 3 — Non-Discrimination. (1) No controller SHALL restrict access to essential services or degrade functionality solely because a data subject has exercised the right to opt-out. (2) Reasonable alternative compensation MAY be charged, provided such amount reflects a proportionate calculation of lost advertising revenue and has been verified by an independent auditor. Art. 4 — Protection of Minors. (1) The sale or exchange of personal data relating to individuals under the age of 18 SHALL be prohibited. (2) Controllers SHALL establish age-verification and child-segmentation safeguards. Art. 5 — Data Minimization and Purpose Limitation. (1) Personal data SHALL only be collected and processed for specific, explicit, and legitimate purposes. (2) Processing for incompatible purposes SHALL be prohibited. Art. 6 — De-Identification and Aggregation. Controllers MAY transfer data to third parties only in de-identified or aggregated form, provided that the risk of re-identification is below the threshold	Threat Index rationale: Under TI analysis, uncontrolled sale of personal data generates causal chains escalating to severe risks (identity theft, stalking, discrimination), which threaten bodily integrity and even life. These outweigh the reversibility of economic harm to businesses reliant on ad-based models. The minimax scenario required not just a single opt-out (as in CCPA), but a systemic bundle: universal opt-out (Art. 2), non-discrimination safeguards (Art. 3), child protection (Art. 4), audit and registry obligations (Arts. 7–8). This bundle minimizes the maximum TI across actors. MES gates: (C1) Legal certainty — triggers are objectively verifiable (signal received, registry entries, audit logs). (C2) Independent arbiter — annual audits and public reports provide external review. (C3) Enforceability — strong sanctions, clear thresholds, defined duties ensure compliance. (C4) Learnability — sunset and mandatory review cycles embed continuous adaptation. Difference from CCPA: CCPA offers a single right of consumer opt-out, leaving gaps in enforcement, child protection, de-identification, and anti-discrimination. The LRM package

	defined by regulation, and any contractual prohibition on re-identification is in place. Art. 7 — Transparency and Registry of Third Parties. (1) Controllers SHALL publish a machine-readable registry of all third parties receiving personal data, including the purposes of transfer. (2) Contracts with such third parties SHALL impose equivalent obligations under this Regulation. Art. 8 — Audit and Logging. (1) Controllers processing the data of 100,000 or more subjects per year SHALL maintain an immutable log of all opt-out signals received. (2) Such controllers SHALL be subject to annual independent audits verifying compliance. Art. 9 — User Interface Requirements. (1) All interfaces for data collection or consent SHALL provide a clear and conspicuous single control labeled "Do Not Sell/Share My Data." (2) Dark patterns or deceptive design practices SHALL be prohibited. Art. 10 — Breach Notification. (1) Controllers SHALL notify both affected data subjects and the supervisory authority of any unauthorized transfer of data without undue delay. (2) Such notice SHALL specify the nature of the breach, third parties involved, and remedial measures undertaken. Art. 11 — Transitional Measures. Organizations deriving ≥40% of annual revenue from behavioral advertising MAY request a transitional period of up to 12 months, subject to quarterly milestones and a migration plan toward contextual or subscription-based models. Art. 12 — Enforcement and Sanctions. (1) Controllers in violation of Arts. 2–10 SHALL be subject to administrative fines of up to 4% of annual global turnover, proportionate to the severity and recurrence	constructs a full regulatory architecture addressing those gaps, thereby lowering systemic risk and extending preservation of lower-ranked rights (property/business interests) while securing higher-ranked rights (privacy, bodily integrity, life).

	of the violation. (2) Repeat or intentional violations MAY result in a temporary suspension of data transfers. (3) Small and medium-sized enterprises MAY request phased compliance or installment-based penalty payments where financial solvency would otherwise be threatened. Art. 13 — Sunset and Review. This Regulation SHALL be subject to mandatory review every twelve months, with particular attention to the effectiveness of the global opt-out signal, proportionality of compensation under Art. 3, and risks of re-identification under Art. 6.	

USA, Sarbanes–Oxley Act 2002, §302(a)

Original Law	***LRM Version***	***Explanation (TI & MES)***
"The principal executive and financial officers shall certify… the financial report does not contain any untrue statement…" — First time U.S. law imposed personal criminal liability on top managers for accuracy of corporate reports.	Art. 1. Scope — This Regulation applies to all public-interest issuers whose securities are traded on regulated markets, and to their principal executive and financial officers. Art. 2. Certification Duty — For each annual and quarterly financial report, the principal executive and financial officers SHALL jointly certify that: (a) the report fairly presents, in all material respects, the financial condition and results of operations; (b) the issuer maintains effective internal controls over financial reporting (ICFR). Art. 3. Materiality Thresholds — A misstatement SHALL be deemed material if it: (i) alters net income or total assets by ≥5%; (ii) misclassifies a solvency or leverage ratio by ≥10%; (iii) falsifies cash/bank confirmations; or (iv) conceals related-party exposure ≥1% of assets.	Threat Index (TI): SOX §302 places a high liberty burden: any error can quickly lead to custodial exposure, creating paralysis of decision-making. Under TI, liberty > property, so minimax requires preserving executives' liberty except in high-harm, high-evidence cases. LRM adjustment: The package narrows liability through objective materiality triggers and safe harbors, lowering false-positive criminal exposure while still ensuring strong investor protection. MES checks:

	Art. 4. Audit-Trail Obligation — Issuers SHALL maintain tamper-evident audit logs of journal entries, adjustments, override approvals, and audit communications for not less than seven years. Art. 5. Safe Harbors — Officers MAY avoid personal sanctions if they demonstrate: (a) documented reliance on an independent audit opinion; (b) documented dissent recorded in board minutes; or (c) voluntary self-report within 15 days and corrective filing within 45 days. Art. 6. Prohibition of Tampering and Retaliation — No officer, director, or employee SHALL alter audit evidence, impede auditor access, or retaliate against whistleblowers. Art. 7. Liability Tiers — (a) Negligent violations SHALL give rise only to civil penalties, disgorgement of bonuses, and temporary signing bans; (b) Reckless or intentional violations, coupled with investor loss proven by independent event-study or debt covenant breach, MAY trigger criminal liability, with custodial sentences capped at three years. Art. 8. Whistleblower Protections — Whistleblowers SHALL be protected against retaliation and MAY receive 10–20% of monetary sanctions collected. Art. 9. Restitution — Monetary sanctions and clawbacks SHALL be allocated pro rata to harmed investors through a restitution fund. Art. 10. Monitoring and Sunset — The regulator SHALL monitor the Serious Restatement Rate (SRR) and conduct a full review within 36 months; amendments SHALL be proposed if SRR does not decline by at least 30% without material increase in filing paralysis.	– C1 (certainty): Thresholds (5%, 10%, 1%) and audit-trail logs give objective triggers. – C2 (arbiter): Independent regulator/court assesses liability and safe harbor claims. – C3 (enforceability): Sanctions (civil, criminal, clawbacks) and KPIs ensure compliance. – C4 (learnability): KPI-based 36-month review. Balance: Investors' property rights remain protected (through certification, audit-trails, restitution), while executives' liberty is only constrained in demonstrably intentional or reckless fraud. This achieves lower Risk* (minimax) than the strict SOX approach.

Dodd–Frank Act 2010, §922(a)

Original Law	LRM Version (maximally detailed legal norms)	Explanation (TI & MES)
The Commission shall pay an award… to whistleblowers who voluntarily provide original information… First recognition of monetary rewards to whistleblowers (up to 30% of SEC sanctions). Core dilemma: protection of informants vs. risk of abusive claims and pressure on business.	N1. Scope — Applies to all regulated financial institutions, publicly listed companies, their affiliates, contractors, and employees. N2. Trigger (Objective Applicability Predicate) — A "Qualifying Disclosure" shall mean original, specific, and verifiable information concerning violations of financial or corporate regulation, substantiated by (i) documentary evidence with metadata; or (ii) at least two independent corroborating sources; or (iii) technical traceability of the event. N3. Monetary Award — The competent authority SHALL pay an award to the whistleblower in the range of 10–25% of actually collected sanctions, contingent upon final adjudication and after exhaustion of appeal deadlines. Payments SHALL be capped at a maximum amount C, and SHALL NOT be advanced. N4. Filter of Materiality — The authority SHALL recognize only disclosures exceeding threshold T (quantitative harm or systemic risk). Exceptions apply where life, bodily integrity, or imminent destruction of evidence is at stake. N5. Confidentiality and Anonymity — The identity of whistleblowers SHALL remain sealed in a protected registry; disclosure SHALL be permissible only by court order where indispensable. Breaches incur sanctions. N6. Anti-Retaliation — Any adverse employer action (dismissal, demotion, harassment, loss of benefits) within 12 months after disclosure SHALL be presumed retaliatory. The employer bears the burden of proof for exceptions. Remedies include reinstatement, double wage compensation, and damages.	TI analysis: Whistleblowers face the highest irreversibility risks — retaliation, loss of liberty, or threats to bodily integrity — compared to business entities facing property/income risks. A regime with no rewards leaves informants under-protected (high TI for life/liberty). Conversely, unlimited awards without filters create high TI for business (risk of abusive claims, false denunciations, corporate warfare). The calibrated reward regime with filters minimizes the maximum TI across actors. MES gates: • *C1 Legal certainty:* objective predicates (documentary evidence, thresholds T, metadata) ensure verifiable triggers. • *C2 Independent arbiter:* disputes allocated to a separate tribunal, satisfying impartiality. • *C3 Enforceability:* mechanisms for sanctions, preservation of evidence, and retaliation remedies make duties binding and measurable. • *C4 Learnability:* Sunset clause and KPI-based adjustments provide adaptability. Conclusion: The LRM package strikes balance — protecting whistleblowers through calibrated, legally certain

	N7. Internal Channel Rule with Carve-Outs — Whistleblowers SHALL first report through the internal compliance channel with a 30-day waiting period, except when: (i) top management is involved; (ii) evidence may be destroyed; (iii) there is imminent market/systemic risk. N8. Evidence Preservation Duty — Upon receipt of a disclosure, entities SHALL preserve all relevant data and SHALL NOT engage in spoliation. Cryptographic timestamps and audit trails SHALL be mandatory. N9. Sanctions for Malicious or Reckless Reports — Whistleblowers who knowingly or recklessly submit false information SHALL be subject to fines, disqualification from awards for 5 years, and compensation of the accused's legal costs. N10. Independent Arbiter — Disputes over award eligibility or retaliation SHALL be adjudicated by an independent tribunal, separate from investigative arms. N11. Funding Source — Awards SHALL be paid exclusively from collected sanctions; no payments SHALL be made from general revenue. N12. Compliance Duty of Enterprises — Companies SHALL appoint an ethics officer, maintain secure channels, and file quarterly anonymized reports to the regulator. SMEs may operate on simplified biannual reporting. N13. Limited Immunity — Whistleblowers SHALL enjoy civil immunity for disclosure of confidential information to regulators, provided such disclosure is strictly necessary and proportionate.	mechanisms while containing risks of malicious abuse. The Dodd–Frank rule provided a broad "reward promise"; the LRM version operationalizes it into a dense regulatory architecture that reduces Threat Index for all parties.

	N14. Sunset & Review — Thresholds T and C, as well as procedural safeguards, SHALL be reviewed every two years, with full legislative re-assessment after four years.	

USA (Florida), SB 7072 (2021), §106.072(2)

Original Law	*LRM Version*	*Explanation (TI & MES)*
A social media platform may not willfully deplatform a candidate for office…	N1. Scope and Applicability 1. This Regulation shall apply to digital platforms which: (a) provide dissemination of user-generated content; and (b) record no fewer than one million (1,000,000) monthly active users within the jurisdiction. 2. The obligations under this Regulation shall extend exclusively to official electoral candidates and their duly accredited campaign committees, during the electoral period commencing upon official registration and terminating seven (7) days following the conclusion of voting. 3. Platforms below the threshold of subsection (1)(b) are exempt, unless they voluntarily opt in by formal declaration. N2. Candidate Channel 1. Upon verification of candidate status, the platform shall establish and maintain a dedicated "Candidate Channel" accessible to all users who elect to subscribe thereto. 2. Content lawfully published within the Candidate Channel shall not be subject to removal, suspension, or account termination save as expressly permitted under N3. 3. The platform shall ensure transparent labelling and record-keeping of all actions affecting such Channel. N3. Exception for Immediate and Irreparable Harm 1. The platform may, and where circumstances require shall, remove or restrict candidate content only where such content	TI analysis: – Florida SB 7072 adopts an absolute ban on deplatforming → lowers TI for candidate's right to free expression but raises TI for public safety (no emergency exception). – LRM approach introduces minimax: protects candidate speech (ban on arbitrary removal) while allowing narrow, empirically verifiable exceptions (imminent harm, violence). This keeps risk to life (priority 1) below threshold. MES gates: – C1: LRM defines objective applicability predicates (OAP) for removal (incitement, threats, doxxing). Florida law is vague ("deplatform"). – C2: LRM embeds independent arbiter (RAP). Florida law lacks ex-ante review. – C3: LRM enforces compliance with KPIs (delivery, logging, sanctions). Florida law contains no such instruments. – C4: LRM mandates periodic learning/revision. Florida law static.

	demonstrably constitutes: (a) a direct and specific incitement to imminent violence; (b) intentional publication of personally identifiable information accompanied by incitement to harassment; (c) fabricated calls to interfere physically with the electoral process; or (d) credible threats of serious bodily harm. 2. Any removal or restriction pursuant to subsection (1) shall be: (a) limited in scope and duration to no more than twenty-four (24) hours absent confirmation by the Independent Review Panel under N7; (b) accompanied by contemporaneous evidentiary preservation and logging; and (c) immediately notified to the affected candidate. N4. Political Misinformation Not Amounting to N3 1. Candidate statements concerning policy or factual matters, not falling within N3, shall not be removed. 2. The platform shall address such content exclusively through mitigatory measures, including: (a) visible labelling; (b) provision of authoritative references; (c) exclusion from paid promotion; and (d) algorithmic down-ranking outside the Candidate Channel. 3. A public register of all such labels and their grounds shall be maintained. N5. Minimum Delivery Obligation 1. The platform shall deliver no less than eighty per cent (80%) of Candidate Channel publications to subscribers within twenty-four (24) hours of posting.	

	2. Reduction below such threshold shall constitute a violation unless caused by verified technical malfunction or lawful removal under N3. 3. Failure to comply shall trigger compensatory measures pursuant to N10. N6. Stability of Electoral Rules 1. During the seventy-two (72) hours preceding the close of polls, the platform shall not introduce or enforce new moderation or advertising policies applicable to electoral content, save where necessary to address cybersecurity exigencies or obligations under N3. 2. Any permitted change shall be notified publicly and contemporaneously. N7. Independent Rapid Review Panel (RAP) 1. Any candidate whose content is removed, restricted, or labelled under N3 or N4 shall have immediate right of appeal to the Independent Rapid Review Panel. 2. The Panel shall render a determination within twelve (12) hours of appeal. 3. The platform shall comply forthwith with the determination rendered. 4. All decisions shall be published with reasons and preserved for audit. N8. Transparency and Record-Keeping 1. The platform shall maintain and publish, on a weekly basis, a machine-readable registry of all enforcement actions taken under N3–N5. 2. Each entry shall contain: (a) anonymised content identifiers; (b) the objective applicability predicate; (c) the type of measure; (d) the elapsed time between posting and enforcement; and (e) the outcome of any RAP proceeding.	

	3. Registers shall be authenticated by cryptographic means. N9. Candidate Data Protection 1. Personal data collected for the purpose of Candidate Channel verification shall be strictly limited to what is necessary for such verification. 2. Such data shall not be processed for advertising or profiling purposes. 3. Storage shall not exceed the electoral period plus thirty (30) days. 4. Any breach shall entail immediate deletion and notification to the candidate. N10. Compensation for Wrongful Restriction 1. Where the RAP determines that removal, restriction, or under-delivery was unjustified, the platform shall: (a) reinstate the content; (b) extend visibility by not less than twenty-four (24) hours; and (c) provide equivalent compensatory reach (“make-good”) free of charge. 2. Such obligations shall be executed within twenty-four (24) hours of determination. N11. Sanctions and Safe Harbour 1. Verified violations of N2, N3 (false positives exceeding five per cent (5%)), N5, or N8 shall attract progressive administrative fines proportionate to the platform’s domestic turnover. 2. Compliance with logging, transparency, and RAP referral obligations shall entitle the platform to safe-harbour protection against secondary liability. 3. Force majeure, duly certified, shall constitute a defence.	

	N12. Monitoring, Learning, and Sunset 1. At the close of each electoral campaign or every calendar quarter, whichever is earlier, platforms shall publish a full Key Performance Indicator (KPI) report and submit to public hearing. 2. Provisions demonstrating persistent false-positive risk shall be subject to temporary suspension pending revision. 3. The entirety of this Regulation shall be subject to mandatory review after two (2) general electoral cycles.	

Sweden, Alkohollag (2010:1622), Chapter 5, §1

Original Law	***LRM Version***	***Explanation (TI & MES)***
Detaljhandel med spritdrycker… får bedrivas endast av Systembolaget AB." Translation: "The retail trade of spirits may be conducted only by Systembolaget AB." → Creates a full state monopoly on retail sale of spirits.	Article 1. Retail Sale of Strong Alcoholic Beverages (1) The retail sale of alcoholic beverages with an alcohol by volume (ABV) content greater than fifteen percent (15%) SHALL be conducted exclusively by the State Retail Agency. (2) No private entity SHALL be permitted to engage in the retail sale of such beverages. Article 2. Retail Sale of Low-Alcohol Beverages (1) Alcoholic beverages with an ABV content equal to or below fifteen percent (≤15%) MAY be sold by private outlets holding a valid license. (2) Licenses under paragraph (1) SHALL be subject to quotas concerning: a) outlet density per defined geographic area; b) minimum distance requirements from schools, hospitals, and	- TI minimax: Both systems reduce risk from high-ABV spirits. Total monopoly lowers consumption but risks illegal black markets. Hybrid reduces that cumulative threat by allowing licensed low-ABV sales. Outcome: hybrid has lower *maximal threat index*. - MES gates: • Legal certainty: clear ABV thresholds, outlet density rules. • Independent arbiter: separate licensing/appeals body, not monopoly itself. • Enforceability: explicit sanctions, KPIs, monitoring.

	comparable institutions; c) restricted hours of sale as determined by regulation. Article 3. Cross-Cutting Safeguards (1) Minimum unit pricing for alcoholic beverages SHALL be established to discourage harmful consumption. (2) Mandatory age verification SHALL be carried out at the point of sale for all alcoholic beverages. (3) Marketing practices targeting minors or youth audiences SHALL be prohibited. (4) Licensing procedures SHALL be transparent, with clear criteria and publication of decisions. (5) An independent appeal mechanism SHALL be available for all licensing and enforcement decisions. Article 4. Compensatory Clauses (1) Transitional licenses MAY be granted to existing operators for the duration of the implementation period defined in Article 6. (2) Small businesses affected by the transition SHALL be eligible for reorientation support programs. (3) Domestic producers SHALL be granted non-discriminatory access to procurement channels of the State Retail Agency. **Article 5. Enforcement** (1) Violations of Articles 1–3 SHALL result in administrative fines, suspension or withdrawal of licenses, and, where appropriate, criminal liability. (2) The competent authority SHALL ensure continuous monitoring and inspection of compliance. **Article 6. Sunset and Periodic Review** (1) The provisions of this Act SHALL enter into force with an eighteen-month (18) transition period, during which pilot regions SHALL be designated for implementation. (2) The Act SHALL be subject to comprehensive review every three	• Learnability: sunset clauses and review cycle. - Key difference: Sweden → absolute exclusivity for public health, limiting entrepreneurship. LRM → partial monopoly + regulated competition, balancing public health with limited entrepreneurial rights and minimizing black-market incentives.

	(3) years, assessing in particular the impact on public health, including mortality reduction, and the effectiveness of safeguards. (3) Following review, adjustments to the regulatory framework SHALL be adopted as necessary.	

Juvenile Protection Act, Art.26(1) (old version)

Original Law	LRM Version	Explanation (TI & MES)
청소년보호법 제26조 제1항 (구 규정): "심야시간(0시부터 오전 6시까지)에는 청소년은 인터넷게임을 이용할 수 없다." (이른바 '셧다운제', 2011–2021 시행)	N1. Providers: All online game providers SHALL block verified minor accounts from access between 00:00 and 06:00. Exceptions: educational or therapeutic programs. Safeguards: parents MAY request waivers for cultural/time-zone reasons. Enforcement: fines for providers, quarterly audits. Compensatory clause: minors MAY file complaints if unjustly denied. Sunset/review: expires after 5 years unless renewed, with mandatory epidemiological review. N2. Guardians: Guardians MAY apply for exemptions with medical/psychological justification. Misuse leads to suspension. Appeals before family court.	TI Analysis: Health of minors (risk of sleep disorders, addiction) outweighs liberty to play at night, since health harms are more irreversible. Liberty restrictions are reversible. Minimax favors health-protection scenario. MES Evaluation: LRM version adds safeguards and compensatory clauses absent in the Korean law, ensuring proportionality, observability (login records), enforceability (audits/fines), and learnability (sunset clause with health review). This keeps the protective effect while reducing overreach.

China (2020, Art.59)

Original Law	*LRM Version*	*Explanation (TI & MES)*
第五十九条: "网络游戏服务提供者不得在每日22时至次日8时向未成年人提供网络游戏服务，并应当在节	Article 1. Duties of Online Game Providers (1) All providers of online gaming services SHALL ensure that verified accounts belonging to minors are blocked from access between 00:00 and 06:00 local time.	TI: China's law directly cuts causal chains from late-night gaming to health harm, but extends chains of surveillance harms (real-name ID, data centralization). LRM preserves the same

假日每日不超过3小时、非节假日每日不超过1.5小时向未成年人提供服务。” Translation: *Online game service providers shall not provide services to minors between 22:00 and 08:00, and shall restrict playtime to not more than 3 hours per day on holidays and 1.5 hours on school days.*	(2) Exceptions: the prohibition in paragraph (1) SHALL not apply to access granted for educational or therapeutic programs explicitly designated as such. (3) Safeguards: parents or legal guardians MAY request waivers in cases of cultural or time-zone specific reasons, provided that such requests are duly documented and recorded. (4) Enforcement: violations of this Article SHALL result in administrative fines imposed upon providers, as well as quarterly compliance audits conducted by the competent authority. (5) Compensatory clause: minors who have been unjustly denied access under this Article MAY lodge a complaint with the supervisory authority, which SHALL investigate and order corrective measures where appropriate. (6) Sunset/review: this Article SHALL expire five (5) years from entry into force unless renewed. Renewal SHALL require a mandatory epidemiological review of the impact on youth health and development. Article 2. Rights and Duties of Guardians (1) Guardians MAY apply for exemptions to the restrictions set forth in Article 1, where justified by medical or psychological grounds supported by professional certification. (2) Any misuse of exemptions by guardians, including false or misleading applications, SHALL result in suspension of the exemption and possible sanctions under applicable law. (3) Appeals against decisions concerning exemptions or suspensions SHALL lie with the competent family court, which SHALL adjudicate under expedited procedure.	health protection but shortens privacy-risk chains through anonymous tokens. It also lengthens preservation of secondary rights: tiered age limits protect autonomy for older teens; guardian extension protects family autonomy; educational/esports exemptions protect beneficial use. MES: C1 met via observable tokens/time; C2 satisfied by independent arbiter (absent in China); C3 enforced through clear sanctions + incentives; C4 ensured with sunset clauses. Conclusion: China = rigid, centralized, surveillance-intensive. LRM = proportional, layered, privacy-respecting, balancing protection with autonomy and adaptability.

Germany (Grundgesetz, Art.20a)

Original Law	*LRM Version*	*Explanation (TI & MES)*
Der Staat schützt auch in Verantwortung für die künftigen Generationen die natürlichen Lebensgrundlagen und die Tiere im Rahmen der verfassungsmäßigen Ordnung durch die Gesetzgebung und nach Maßgabe von Gesetz und Recht durch die vollziehende Gewalt und die Rechtsprechung.	Art.1. On the territory of the state, a national ceiling of greenhouse gas emissions shall be established and reduced annually in accordance with five-year plans. Art.2. Construction and modernization of industrial facilities shall be allowed only with the application of best available technologies ensuring minimal emissions. Art.3. Economic activity in protected natural areas and habitats of rare species shall be prohibited, except in emergency situations directly related to the protection of life and health. Art.4. In regions where established environmental quality standards are exceeded, new projects shall be suspended, and existing facilities shall reduce their load until indicators return to the norm. Art.5. Enterprises that exceed critical pollution thresholds shall immediately suspend operations until the causes are remedied. Art.6. Enterprises with significant impact on the environment shall publish open and verifiable data on emissions. Art.7. Enterprises shall primarily reduce their own emissions; compensatory mechanisms may be used only in limited amounts. Art.8. Water-intensive industries shall introduce closed water cycles and comply with restrictions during drought or heat periods. Art.9. Legal entities may appeal regulatory decisions based on new reliable data, except for prohibitions regarding protected areas and critical thresholds.	Threat Index analysis: Environmental degradation has cumulative and irreversible chains leading to threats to life and bodily integrity, whereas economic activity relates to rights of property and entrepreneurship, which are of lower irreversibility. Therefore, priority is given to climate and intergenerational protection. MES gates: (C1) Legal certainty — objective triggers are set through measurable standards and annual caps; (C2) Independent arbiter — state supervision and appeal mechanisms; (C3) Enforceability — sanctions and monitoring instruments; (C4) Learnability — five-year review cycles and revision of critical values. The German norm is general and programmatic, entrusting protection to the state. The LRM version specifies concrete duties and prohibitions, operationalizing constitutional principle into enforceable legal norms.

	Art.10. State supervision shall be based on a risk-oriented approach, with sanctions ranging from warnings and fines to suspension of operations and withdrawal of permits.	

Methodology of Comparative RIA Assessment

The evaluation compared AI-generated norms and real-world laws for the same regulatory problems using the framework of Regulatory Impact Assessment (RIA). Each case was assessed along seven dimensions: problem definition, objectives, policy options, cost–benefit analysis, stakeholders, proportionality, and monitoring and review.

A scoring rubric from 0 to 5 was applied to each dimension, where 0 indicates absence of the element and 5 indicates full compliance with international best practices. The total score for each version of the norm was obtained as the sum of the seven individual scores: RIA Score = $score_1$ + $score_2$ + $score_3$ + $score_4$ + $score_5$ + $score_6$ + $score_7$ (so that $0 \leq$ RIA Score ≤ 35).

The comparative advantage of AI norms over existing laws was measured as the absolute difference (ΔAI = ScoreAI – ScoreReal), the normalized difference ($\delta AI = \Delta AI / 35$), and the share of criteria where the AI norm outperformed the real law (Sharewin = (Number of criteria where ScoreAI > ScoreReal) / 7).

When assigning scores, the following coding rules were applied. If a criterion was entirely absent it received 0. Weak, declarative mentions were coded as 1. Fragmented or incomplete structures received 2. A basic level of compliance, such as a clear formulation without operational metrics, was scored as 3. Well-developed but not perfect structures, such as clear thresholds without independent auditing, were scored as 4. Full compliance, including metrics, procedures, thresholds, KPIs, review mechanisms, or monetary CBA where applicable, received 5.

To ensure internal consistency, some criteria were dependent on others. In particular, proportionality was always bounded by the availability of policy options. If no options were provided, proportionality could not exceed a low score (0–2), because it is impossible to demonstrate that the chosen measure was the least restrictive among alternatives. Conversely, if multiple options were presented and targeted measures or exceptions were included, proportionality could receive a high score (4–5). Objectives were also cross-checked against monitoring: when no KPIs or review mechanisms were present, the objective score was capped at a mid-level value.

Ambiguous or implicit references were scored conservatively, usually 1–2. Sensitivity checks were applied by adjusting borderline scores by ±1; in all such cases the ranking between AI-generated and real laws remained unchanged.

The rubric rewards explicit options, proportionality mechanisms and monitoring. Generated proposals often contain several procedural layers, including phased implementation, escrow, suspension triggers and review. Read the scores together with the provisions that produce them: those same layers require administrative capacity, funding and coordination. The adaptation examples examine how they can fit existing institutions and implementation procedures.

Case	RIA Criterion	AI-Norm Version (score)	Real-World Law (score)
Case 1: UK Company Director Duty (s.172)	1. Problem Definition	Focuses on preventing harm to employees' life/health and the environment from profit-driven decisions. (4)	Focus is on promoting company success for shareholders; employees and environment only "have regard to" as factors. (2)
	2. Objectives	Prioritizes preserving life and health above profit, giving binding force to worker/environment interests. (4)	Aims to maximize shareholder benefit ("success of the company") while merely considering other interests. (2)
	3. Policy Options	Detailed multi-article reform (strict no-harm rules, phased obligations) rather than one-size rule. (2)	Single statutory rule with no alternative measures or safeguards considered. (1)
	4. Cost-Benefit Analysis	Not addressed; TI logic emphasizes rights protection (implicitly minimizing risk) rather than economic trade-offs. (1)	No economic CBA in the law text; focus is normative, not on measurable costs/benefits. (0)
	5. Stakeholder Impact	Explicitly includes employees, public and environment as mandatory priorities (even earmarking SME/consumer relief). (4)	Shareholders' interests dominate; employees and community mentioned but without enforceable protection. (1)
	6. Proportionality	Strictly prohibits profit-driven actions that risk life/health, with narrow exceptions (minimal risk only). (4)	Very broad "good faith" standard yields wide discretion; may underprotect critical rights (weak proportionality). (2)
	7. Monitoring/Review	Requires transparency/disclosure and mandatory review every 3 years, embedding feedback loops. (5)	No review clause or reporting requirement; enforcement relies on courts only. (0)
	Total RIA Score	**24**	**9**
Case 2: USA DGCL §203 Moratorium	1. Problem Definition	Identifies risk of coerced takeovers; TI adds safe-harbor to preserve minority influence. (4)	Aims to block hostile takeovers by forbidding certain transactions (interested stockholder), protecting shareholders. (3)
	2. Objectives	Balances investor flexibility with minority protection via objective criteria and arbiters. (4)	Ensures stability and minority protection by high thresholds for consent. (2)
	3. Policy Options	Introduces multiple exceptions (independent committee, shareholder vote, crisis use) rather than a total ban. (4)	Implements a rigid 3-year moratorium with no alternative paths. (1)
	4. Cost-Benefit Analysis	None explicit (design favors risk minimization). (1)	No CBA in statute. (0)

	5. Stakeholder Impact	Protects minority shareholders (via disinterested votes, independent arbiter) and still allows investor action under conditions. (4)	Focuses on investors and existing shareholders; no provision for additional stakeholders. (1)
	6. Proportionality	Flexible "safe harbor" minimizes harm (e.g. crisis exception) while maintaining protection. (4)	Absolute ban may overly harm investors' interests with little incremental benefit. (2)
	7. Monitoring/Review	Built-in review every 2 years of thresholds and effectiveness. (5)	No statutory review or sunset. (0)
	Total RIA Score	**26**	**9**
Case 3: Germany AktG §93 Duty of Care	1. Problem Definition	Clarifies vague "due care" by tying liability to objective pre-decision checks. (4)	General duty of diligence; courts decide after the fact if care was adequate. (1)
	2. Objectives	Protect life/health above financial loss (red-line ban on high-risk projects). (4)	Ensure directors act diligently in managing the company. (2)
	3. Policy Options	Adds multiple norms: safe-harbor checklist (N1), absolute prohibition for life-risk (N2), mandatory audits (N3). (3)	Single open-ended standard ("ordentlichen und gewissenhaften Geschäftsleiters"). (1)
	4. Cost-Benefit Analysis	Not considered explicitly. (0)	Not addressed. (0)
	5. Stakeholder Impact	Emphasizes employees' and public life/health (over asset risk) and requires transparency controls; shareholders' risk capped. (4)	Focus is corporate (shareholders) and judicial oversight; no explicit mention of employees. (1)
	6. Proportionality	Allows innovation within strict safety limits; mitigates risks via thresholds and pilots. (4)	One-size duty with potential retroactive penalty; less calibrated (lower proportionality). (2)
	7. Monitoring/Review	Mandates independent audits and accurate data (objective controls) for accountability. (4)	Enforcement only through ex-post court judgment; no ex-ante review. (0)
	Total RIA Score	**23**	**7**
Case 4: France Digital Tax (2019-759)	1. Problem Definition	Sees 3% flat tax as trigger for trade retaliation; TI opts to "lengthen the causal chain" to reduce risk. (4)	Target is revenue from big tech (digital services). (2)

	2. Objectives	Raise revenue while avoiding economic blowback; protect SMEs (earmarks 10% for relief). (4)	Generate tax income from large digital firms. (2)
	3. Policy Options	Implements a lower rate (2%), phased rollout, tax credits, suspension clauses. (4)	One flat 3% rate without mitigation measures. (1)
	4. Cost-Benefit Analysis	No formal CBA (focus on minimax fairness). (1)	Not provided. (0)
	5. Stakeholder Impact	Addresses platforms, State revenue, SMEs, and consumers (via subsidies). (4)	Primarily burdens tech companies; SMEs and consumers not specifically considered. (1)
	6. Proportionality	Gradual implementation and built-in suspension make it less blunt. (4)	Permanent high rate likely excessive given trade risks. (1)
	7. Monitoring/Review	Embeds KPIs and semi-annual review for retaliation incidents. (5)	None (no review or adjustment mechanism). (0)
	Total RIA Score	**26**	**7**
Case 5: Mexico VAT (Ley IVA Art.1)	1. Problem Definition	Universal VAT can push small actors into informality, threatening their rights. (4)	Universal rule: everyone doing business must pay VAT. (2)
	2. Objectives	Protect small businesses (limit enforcement) while preserving revenue through calibrated relief. (4)	Maximize tax base coverage (broad obligation). (2)
	3. Policy Options	Retains universality but adds thresholds, phased rates, credits, escrow (risk-calibrated model). (3)	Rigid flat system with no thresholds or exemptions in law. (1)
	4. Cost-Benefit Analysis	Not explicit (the design implicitly reduces non-compliance risk). (1)	Absent. (0)
	5. Stakeholder Impact	Considers SMEs and low-income consumers (earmarking relief); business certainty via objective rules. (4)	Treats all taxpayers equally; no special treatment for small businesses. (1)
	6. Proportionality	Phased introduction and exemptions lower the burden on vulnerable actors. (4)	Equally heavy on all, risking disproportionate impact on small firms. (1)
	7. Monitoring/Review	Suspension triggers (trade retaliation), KPIs, mandatory review after 24 months. (5)	None specified. (0)
	Total RIA Score	**24**	**7**

Case 6: Dutch Euthanasia Law (Art.2)	1. Problem Definition	Identifies risk of coercion/impulsivity under subjective criteria; TI adds objective safeguards. (3)	Permits euthanasia if physician believes request is voluntary and suffering unbearable. (2)
	2. Objectives	Ensure only well-considered requests proceed, via multiple declarations and waiting periods. (4)	Respect patient autonomy in end-of-life without quantified guidance. (2)
	3. Policy Options	Multiple witness declarations, medical assessments and an appeals mechanism to reduce false positives. (4)	Single-physician conviction rule (no detailed alternatives). (1)
	4. Cost-Benefit Analysis	Not present; focuses on minimizing risk of irreversible errors. (1)	Not relevant. (0)
	5. Stakeholder Impact	Emphasizes patient rights with legal proof; includes independent experts (C2). (3)	Only physician and patient explicitly involved; lower certainty. (2)
	6. Proportionality	Adds safeguards (cooling-off, audits) to avoid overreach, striking balance. (4)	Qualitative "good faith" standard may be too lenient or strict case-by-case. (2)
	7. Monitoring/Review	Mandates documentation and periodic audits (KPI "non-compliance rate"). (4)	No explicit review clause; relies on professional oversight. (0)
	Total RIA Score	**23**	**9**
Case 7: CA AB5 (Gig Worker Law)	1. Problem Definition	Tackles worst risks (accidents, fatigue, income shocks) by layered rules (insurance, hours). (4)	Treats lack of control as abuse; all workers become employees unless entity proves independence. (2)
	2. Objectives	Build safety net (insurance, fatigue limits, benefits wallet) for gig workers via TI analysis. (4)	Maximize labor protections (employee status) at expense of flexibility. (3)
	3. Policy Options	Multi-tier approach (safety floor N1–N3, conditional reclassification N4, due process N5). (4)	Single "ABC" test; binary classification with no gradation. (1)
	4. Cost-Benefit Analysis	Not explicit; implicitly balances worker security vs company costs. (1)	No formal CBA in statute. (0)
	5. Stakeholder Impact	Explicitly addresses drivers, platforms, passengers; portable benefits for drivers. (4)	Primarily focuses on drivers vs companies dichotomy. (1)
	6. Proportionality	Adaptive approach (pilot programs, sunsets) aims to avoid blanket disruption. (4)	Rigid default rule can overshoot (high burden on small platforms). (2)

	7. Monitoring/Review	Includes neutral data aggregator, appeals, required review (pilot and KPIs). (5)	No review/sunset in original; enforcement by fines. (0)
	Total RIA Score	**26**	**9**
Case 8: Russia "Foreign Agent" Law	1. Problem Definition	Replaces vague criteria with objective thresholds, avoiding stigma. (4)	Broad language on any "foreign influence/support" risks arbitrary designation. (1)
	2. Objectives	Ensure transparency without "agent" label; preserve freedom of association. (4)	Enforce labeling of NGOs receiving foreign aid. (1)
	3. Policy Options	Numeric triggers (e.g. >10% budget) and disclosure duties; no blanket ban. (4)	Label applies to any NGO with unspecified "support/influence." (1)
	4. Cost-Benefit Analysis	Not discussed; emphasis on minimizing censorship risk. (1)	Not addressed. (0)
	5. Stakeholder Impact	Preserves NGOs' operational rights (no disloyalty label) and limits sanctions to fines/proportional terms. (4)	Harsh social/administrative burdens on NGOs; funds, materials. (1)
	6. Proportionality	Keeps transparency while minimizing rights intrusion (no pejorative label). (4)	Highly restrictive and stigmatizing; no built-in safeguards. (1)
	7. Monitoring/Review	Independent oversight with appeals; mandated review every 5 years. (5)	No review period or appeal guaranteed in original. (0)
	Total RIA Score	**26**	**5**
Case 9: France Face-Covering Ban	1. Problem Definition	Treats face concealment as low-security risk; allows coverings by default. (4)	Sees public safety threat from any face covering in public. (1)
	2. Objectives	Preserve religious expression; enable targeted ID checks only in genuine high-risk areas. (4)	Maintain public order by forbidding coverings. (1)
	3. Policy Options	Permits ID checks in defined zones or emergencies with privacy safeguards. (4)	One-size ban on all face coverings; no exceptions in law. (1)
	4. Cost-Benefit Analysis	Not analyzed. (0)	Not discussed. (0)
	5. Stakeholder Impact	Maximizes individual liberty; respects faith choices with minimal intrusion. (4)	Restricts religious minorities' practices fully. (1)
	6. Proportionality	Minimax approach allows face coverings generally; uses narrow exceptions (balancing safety vs freedom). (5)	Absolute prohibition is blunt and overreaching. (1)

	7. Monitoring/Review	Includes privacy rules (no data retention) and internal safeguards (e.g. transparency obligations). (4)	No enforcement metrics or oversight specified. (0)
	Total RIA Score	**25**	**5**
Case 10: Texas Age-Verification Law	1. Problem Definition	Acknowledges child safety risk but prioritizes privacy (limits data retention). (4)	Seeks to keep minors from online porn; details are very broad. (1)
	2. Objectives	Block minors' access with minimally intrusive methods (no biometric/long-term storage). (4)	Require "reasonable" age verification by platforms. (1)
	3. Policy Options	Specifies privacy-preserving tech (e.g. third-party tokens) and short data holding. (4)	Statutory mandate without clear methods or safeguards. (1)
	4. Cost-Benefit Analysis	Not provided. (0)	None. (0)
	5. Stakeholder Impact	Protects minors and privacy; regulates platforms' methods; compensates data breaches. (3)	Targets online platforms; minors protected by enforcement. (1)
	6. Proportionality	Strikes balance: strict age checks but forbids permanent data storage. (5)	Rigid requirement may unduly invade user privacy. (1)
	7. Monitoring/Review	Enforcement via audits/fines; mandatory review every 3 years. (4)	No defined review or audit process. (0)
	Total RIA Score	**24**	**5**
Case 11: Delaware DGCL §141 (Corp. Governance)	1. Problem Definition	Recognizes high risk of shareholder exclusion under pure board rule. (4)	Board-control model (138-year-old law) gives no formal channels for minority input. (2)
	2. Objectives	Preserve board efficiency while reintroducing shareholder checks (reserved votes, arbiter). (4)	Centralize management in directors to allow swift decisions. (2)
	3. Policy Options	Creates "reserved matters" requiring shareholder approval and independent arbiter for disputes. (4)	No alternatives; all corporate affairs under board. (1)
	4. Cost-Benefit Analysis	Not addressed (legal safeguards chosen via TI logic). (0)	Not present. (0)
	5. Stakeholder Impact	Explicitly protects minority voice (agenda rights ≥1% shares) and oversight via Independent Arbiter. (4)	Essentially none for shareholders (majority can override). (1)

	6. Proportionality	Maintains board primacy but curbs excess with sanctions and crisis procedures; designed to minimize TI. (5)	Overly favors directors; shareholders get no guaranteed influence. (1)
	7. Monitoring/Review	Formal review (24–36 months KPI targets) for reserved matter enforcement and company actions. (4)	No statutory review or enforcement beyond usual corporate law remedies. (0)
	Total RIA Score	**25**	**7**
Case 12: UK Media Plurality (Enterprise Act 2002)	1. Problem Definition	Converts broad plurality goal into measurable thresholds (PCI, HHI, minimum publishers). (4)	Cites media plurality as a consideration in mergers; no metrics given. (1)
	2. Objectives	Ensure independent editors remain (prevent >4 controlling voices); algorithmic enforcement. (5)	Maintain a diversity principle; left vague for ministerial discretion. (1)
	3. Policy Options	Sets clear merger notification thresholds, prohibits if PCI too high, or requires remedies. (4)	Case-by-case review by Secretary of State; remedies unspecified. (1)
	4. Cost-Benefit Analysis	Not explicitly done. (0)	No analysis. (0)
	5. Stakeholder Impact	Protects public (speech diversity) by empowering an Independent Arbiter; limits media owners. (4)	Focuses on media companies with informal influence of regulators. (1)
	6. Proportionality	Adds enforceable sanctions and KPI audits (learnability); carefully weighs expression over investment. (5)	Broad "plurality" standard risks either under- or over-enforcement. (1)
	7. Monitoring/Review	Annual KPI reporting, public disclosure, and 5-year comprehensive review of thresholds and effects. (5)	No statutory timeline for review or data collection. (0)
	Total RIA Score	**27**	**5**
Case 13: Spain Digital Tax (Ley 4/2020)	1. Problem Definition	Identifies flat DST creates high double-taxation and retaliation risk. (4)	Aims to tax big tech (3% rate, €750M/€3M thresholds). (2)
	2. Objectives	Raise revenue while minimizing harm (full CIT credit; multilateral standstill). (4)	Capture taxes from large digital service providers. (2)

	3. Policy Options	Lowers base rate to 2%, allows full credit/refund; imposes standstill/de-escalation clauses. (5)	Fixed 3% without rollback or exemption mechanisms. (2)
	4. Cost-Benefit Analysis	Not conducted explicitly; approach reduces TI by cutting escalation paths. (1)	None. (0)
	5. Stakeholder Impact	Preserves state sovereignty with objective rules; protects business via credit and limited carve-outs. (4)	Affects international firms equally; only nominal thresholds for Spanish revenue (excludes many SMEs). (2)
	6. Proportionality	Compares highest-priority rights (security/trade) and embeds de-escalation to lower maximal TI. (5)	Uniform tax may impose disproportionate costs, risking international disputes. (2)
	7. Monitoring/Review	Uses KPI monitoring, independent arbitration, refunds, and sunsets (2-year review cycle). (5)	No sunset; lacks structured feedback mechanisms. (1)
	Total RIA Score	**28**	**11**
Case 14: Germany Minimum Wage (MiLoG §1)	1. Problem Definition	Recognizes rigid nationwide floor risk to small firms; TI adds adjustability. (4)	Defines uniform minimum wage for all employees. (2)
	2. Objectives	Guarantee a living wage while ensuring gradual adjustment (link to costs, median, regional, subsidies). (4)	Ensure decent pay (living costs) for all workers. (3)
	3. Policy Options	Annual living-cost vs median wages; phased introduction for small firms; exceptions (hardship). (5)	Single nationwide minimum floor, no phasing or exemptions. (2)
	4. Cost-Benefit Analysis	Implicitly balances worker needs vs unemployment (unemployment triggers review). (3)	Not addressed. (0)
	5. Stakeholder Impact	Explicitly helps low-income workers and SMEs (support programs, hardship waivers, transparency). (4)	Prioritizes all workers; small employers must adapt suddenly. (2)
	6. Proportionality	Phasing, subsidies and exceptions reduce maximum impact on jobs and businesses. (5)	Rigid for all businesses; could cause abrupt layoffs under fixed law. (1)

	7. Monitoring/Review	Quarterly data checks, corrective steps; quarterly quick reviews and full review every 3 years. (4)	No formal review in law (only enforcement via fines). (0)
	Total RIA Score	**29**	**10**
Case 15: French Pregnancy Protection (L.1225-4)	1. Problem Definition	Prioritizes mother/child health; TI raises severity of dismissals (life risk 4). (4)	Protect pregnant women from job loss; broad constitutional protection. (2)
	2. Objectives	Ban termination during pregnancy except verifiable cases (insolvency, misconduct). (4)	Prevent pregnant employees from being fired. (3)
	3. Policy Options	Clearly enumerates two exceptions, adds prior approval and judicial review. (4)	Implicit ban; exceptions not clearly spelled out. (1)
	4. Cost-Benefit Analysis	Not quantified. (0)	Not present. (0)
	5. Stakeholder Impact	Ensures employee right to remain with support; allows employers relief (subsidies) if needed. (4)	Protects workers' rights broadly; may impose uncertainty on employers. (3)
	6. Proportionality	Explicit safeguards (burden on employer, subsidies) maintain balance without diluting protection. (5)	Near-absolute ban is one-sided, although aimed at a high-priority right. (2)
	7. Monitoring/Review	Labor inspectorate approval, automatic court oversight; review every 3 years. (4)	No scheduled review or specified enforcement mechanism. (0)
	Total RIA Score	**25**	**11**
Case 16: Italy ART & Surrogacy (Legge 40/04)	1. Problem Definition	Notes that absolute ban causes unsafe cross-border practices. (4)	Totally forbids heterologous assisted reproduction by statute. (1)
	2. Objectives	Allow ART/surrogacy with strong safeguards (license, registry, consent) to reduce bodily harm. (4)	Protect "traditional family" morals; no recognition of donor methods. (1)
	3. Policy Options	Authorizes donation under strict conditions (age limits, insurance, limits). (5)	Only option: ban all heterologous ART. (1)
	4. Cost-Benefit Analysis	Compares serious health risks vs cultural concerns; no explicit trade-off. (1)	None. (0)

	5. Stakeholder Impact	Addresses patients' right to conceive, donors, gestational carriers and child welfare extensively. (4)	Serves cultural/religious interests at expense of reproductive autonomy. (1)
	6. Proportionality	Permits non-commercial ART within safeguards; reduces high-severity risks (minimax). (5)	Blunt total ban disproportionately endangers bodily integrity (no safe legal option). (1)
	7. Monitoring/Review	Strict licensing/registry with sanctions; mandatory review/rollback after 36 months. (5)	No oversight or review (activity driven underground). (0)
	Total RIA Score	**28**	**5**
Case 17: Sweden Alcohol Monopoly	1. Problem Definition	Recognizes total monopoly drives black markets; TI hybrid lowers maximum harm. (4)	State monopoly on strong spirits to protect health. (3)
	2. Objectives	Reduce high-ABV consumption while allowing controlled low-ABV sales. (4)	Limit alcohol harm by banning private spirit sales. (3)
	3. Policy Options	Permits licensed private sales of ≤15% alcohol (with density quotas). (4)	No private retail outlets for spirits; only the state agency sells them. (1)
	4. Cost-Benefit Analysis	Balances public health vs entrepreneurship (uses unit pricing, age checks). (2)	Not explicitly performed. (1)
	5. Stakeholder Impact	Protects public health and small vendors; compensatory clauses aid small businesses. (4)	Prioritizes population health; gives no role to private retailers. (2)
	6. Proportionality	Partial monopoly + regulated competition minimizes black-market incentive. (5)	Absolute monopoly is heavy-handed for public health goals. (2)
	7. Monitoring/Review	Licensing oversight, pilot regions; sunset review every 3 years. (4)	Legacy system; no automatic review or adaptability. (0)
	Total RIA Score	**27**	**12**
Case 18: Korea Gaming Shutdown Law	1. Problem Definition	Acknowledges harm of late-night gaming, introduces limited exemptions to avoid undue restriction. (4)	Bans minors from online games midnight–6am ("shutdown"). (3)
	2. Objectives	Protect minors' health (sleep, addiction) but allow parental waivers for special cases. (4)	Strictly stop under-18 gaming at night. (2)
	3. Policy Options	Blocks verified minors 00:00–06:00 with waiver process; appeals to family court. (4)	Total nighttime block; no formal exemptions. (1)

	4. Cost-Benefit Analysis	Implicit TI logic (health > liberty); no formal CBA. (1)	None. (0)
	5. Stakeholder Impact	Protects children (with rights to appeal), involves guardians; providers fined. (3)	Protects minors; imposes strict tech enforcement on providers. (1)
	6. Proportionality	Includes sunset/review (5-year health check) to prevent overreach. (5)	Blanket rule is inflexible, no mechanism to relax burdens. (1)
	7. Monitoring/Review	Mandatory epidemiological review at 5 years; penalties for violations. (5)	Policy expired (2011–2021); no mid-course corrections. (0)
	Total RIA Score	**25**	**8**
Case 19: China Juvenile Gaming (Art.59, 2020)	1. Problem Definition	Seeks same health protection (22:00–08:00 block, playtime limits) but avoids real-ID privacy risk via tokens. (4)	Strict time restrictions (22:00–08:00 block, 1.5hr limit) with real-name checks. (3)
	2. Objectives	Prevent addiction/health harm to minors with minimal surveillance. (4)	Prevent excessive gaming through enforced caps. (3)
	3. Policy Options	Blocks minors 00:00–06:00; permits educational access; no centralized ID. (3)	Blocks 22:00–08:00; long holiday playtime banned (>3h). (2)
	4. Cost-Benefit Analysis	Not explicit; TI logic prioritizes child health. (0)	None. (0)
	5. Stakeholder Impact	Protects minors and privacy; parents can request exemptions for timezone. (4)	Minor health prioritized; platforms have heavy compliance duty. (1)
	6. Proportionality	Achieves health goal with less privacy intrusion; stricter on health, looser on ID. (5)	Very strict shutdown; heavy enforcement burden on gaming providers. (1)
	7. Monitoring/Review	Audits/fines for violations; no review clause shown (though fines enforced) (3)	Monitored by fines and authority audits (implicit). (2)
	Total RIA Score	**23**	**12**
Case 20: Germany Grundgesetz Art.20a (Climate)	1. Problem Definition	Translates vague constitution into concrete targets (emissions cap, tech rules). (4)	General duty to protect natural resources for future generations. (2)
	2. Objectives	Explicitly cap and reduce GHG annually; forbid harmful projects. (4)	Protect nature and life via legislation broadly. (3)
	3. Policy Options	Detailed prohibitions (e.g. new projects halted in polluted regions) and duties on industry. (5)	Leaves execution to state/legislation. (1)

	4. Cost-Benefit Analysis	Implicit (life/health outranks economic freedom); no monetary CBA. (1)	Not quantified (constitutional principle). (0)
	5. Stakeholder Impact	Protects citizens' health and environment; industry must adapt (tech standards, emissions data). (4)	Broadly frames interests of citizens and nature; implementation vague. (2)
	6. Proportionality	Strong environmental measures (caps, prohibitions) for irreversible climate risk. (5)	Principle is top priority but non-specific; proportionality unclear. (2)
	7. Monitoring/Review	Five-year review cycles, KPIs and adjustment of limits built-in. (5)	No scheduled review; relies on government initiative. (0)
	Total RIA Score	**28**	**10**
Case 21: Florida SB7072 (Deplatforming)	1. Problem Definition	Sees absolute ban as too broad; TI allows narrow exceptions for imminent harm. (4)	Protect election candidates from being deplatformed. (2)
	2. Objectives	Safeguard candidate speech while not hindering public safety (imminent violence can still be barred). (4)	Prevent arbitrary removal of a candidate's account/content. (3)
	3. Policy Options	Creates "Candidate Channel," independent rapid review panel (RAP) for content removal appeals (N1–N2). (4)	Flat prohibition with no procedural details or appeals. (1)
	4. Cost-Benefit Analysis	Not done; TI logic implies limits on censorship and extremism. (1)	No CBA. (0)
	5. Stakeholder Impact	Balances candidates' free speech, voters' safety, and platform compliance (includes regulators). (3)	Candidates shielded; platform obligations remain unspecified. (2)
	6. Proportionality	Precise rules and appeal process avoid chilling speech; narrow carve-outs for threats. (4)	Blanket ban may ignore genuine safety concerns. (2)
	7. Monitoring/Review	Requires transparency logs, KPI reporting, and a review cycle (sunset after 2 elections). (4)	No review or independent oversight in law. (0)
	Total RIA Score	**24**	**10**
Case 22: NY GBL §349 (Consumer Deception)	1. Problem Definition	Treats broad "unlawful act" as too vague; TI clarifies high-risk (health/finance) vs low-risk deceptions. (4)	Outlaws any "deceptive act or practice in business" (very broad language). (1)

	2. Objectives	Maximize protection for health/safety sectors; mitigate lower-tier commercial deception. (4)	Protect consumers from deception generally. (2)
	3. Policy Options	Tiered approach (high-risk ban in critical sectors, mandatory clear disclosures). (4)	One-size prohibition; relies on courts. (1)
	4. Cost-Benefit Analysis	Not explicit (TI emphasizes irreversibility of personal harm vs business harm). (1)	Not present. (0)
	5. Stakeholder Impact	Consumers (health/safety vs standard transactions) and businesses (safe harbor for compliance) differentiated. (4)	Consumers broadly protected; businesses face uncertainty. (1)
	6. Proportionality	Calibrated bans only where harm is severe; safeguards for business record-keeping. (5)	Vague scope can impose unpredictable risk on businesses. (1)
	7. Monitoring/Review	Requires evidence logs, audits; safe harbor for good-faith actors; no explicit formal sunset but built-in review mechanisms are implied. (4)	Enforcement via litigation; no KPI or review in statute. (0)
	Total RIA Score	**26**	**6**

Appendix №1. Compression Algorithm and Demonstration

1. Algorithmic Logic

One of the recurring challenges in applying Threat-Index based normative generation is the production of hyper-complex norms. Such norms (hereafter "hypernorms") are internally consistent and fully balanced, but contain extensive conditional clauses, triggers, compensators, safeguards, and technical definitions that make them difficult to implement directly in statutory form. A compression algorithm was therefore introduced to translate hypernorms into concise, executable legislative texts, without altering the underlying balance of rights and obligations.

The algorithm follows a multi-stage process:

Input.

The inputs are: (i) the hypernorm itself, (ii) a decision protocol identifying the conflict of rights, the dominant and secondary objectives, and the associated safeguards and instruments, (iii) the corpus of national law and administrative practice, and (iv) budgetary constraints.

Decoding of Balance.

The algorithm distinguishes:

– the conflicting rights at stake;

– the *dominant objective* (to be realized in the fullest possible measure);

– the *secondary objectives*, enforceable only "insofar as not conflicting";

– the safeguards (pause, rollback, compensation, audit, revision);
– the instruments and their micro-objectives.

Convergence with Law and Institutions.

Each element of the hypernorm is mapped onto an existing institutional or legal carrier (ministries, registries, courts, regulatory bodies). Where no direct equivalent exists, a functional analogue is selected (e.g. arbitration within the Conseil d'État replacing a newly created "independent tax arbiter").

Budgetary Screening.

Each element is assessed against the fiscal capacity of the jurisdiction. Items not covered by existing appropriations are either simplified (binary triggers), demoted to secondary regulation (décrets), or deferred until resources are available.

Routing.

Each element is assigned one of five statuses:
– Integrate (insert directly into statutory text),
– Functional Analogy (replace with a native mechanism),
– Demote to Sub-statute (implement through decree),
– Simplify (shorten the form while retaining the objective),
– Defer (conditional entry into force).

Assembly of the Adapted Norm.

The statutory text is then constructed with the following components:
– scope and applicability
– core obligation or right,
– one or two automatic safeguards,
– revision clause.

Legal terminology is expressed in the natural style of the jurisdiction, without technical notation.

Balance Control.

Final checks ensure:
– the dominant objective is preserved;
– secondary objectives apply only up to the conflict boundary;
– safeguards leave a visible trace (statute, decree, or analogue);
– all elements rely on existing institutional carriers;
– fiscal feasibility is respected.

Output.

The final output consists of (i) a statutory draft ("Adapted Norms"), and (ii) an explanatory memorandum recording the mapping, the budgetary check, and the justification for each adaptation.

2. Case Study: Digital Services Tax (France)

2.1 Original Hypernorm (N1–N14 + Indicator)

N1 (Scope).

All corporate groups providing "cross-platform digital services" (online advertising, digital marketplaces/intermediation, monetization of user data) to users within the jurisdiction.

N2 (Trigger — OAP).

Combined global turnover of the group ≥ 750 million monetary units in the preceding fiscal year **and** turnover from covered services within the jurisdiction ≥ 25 million monetary units.

Turnover "within the jurisdiction" is defined by a 2-out-of-3 test: (i) billing address of the customer; (ii) verified geolocation of the device/account; (iii) IP geolocation with probability ≥ 0.9 confirmed by the payment provider.

N3 (Obligation).

Payment of the Digital Services Tax (DST) at a baseline rate of 2% of covered turnover within the jurisdiction.

N4 (Anti-double taxation — credit/refund).

The tax authority must credit the DST in full against the corporate income tax (CIT) of the group in the jurisdiction within 24 months of payment; in the absence of a tax base for credit, the same amount must be refunded.

Safeguard: the claim must be accompanied by certified country-by-country revenue and tax breakdowns; misrepresentation is subject to a fine of up to 20% of the disputed amount.

N5 (International coordination — "standstill").

Trigger: group's inclusion in a recognized multilateral regime for tax base allocation and mandatory dispute settlement (criteria: binding arbitration + verifiable source rules).

Modality: the tax authority suspends application of the DST to such entities; turnover and tax are allocated under multilateral rules; the local obligation is limited to reporting.

N6 (De-escalation under retaliatory measures).

Trigger: officially declared retaliatory trade measures against the jurisdiction, explicitly linked to the DST.

Modality: the DST rate is temporarily reduced to 0.5% for 12 months; the government must initiate negotiations/mediation; thereafter automatic return to N3 or prolongation of standstill under N5.

N7 (De minimis).

Entities with incremental turnover from covered services < 25 million monetary units within the jurisdiction are exempt.

N8 (Non-discrimination).

The DST applies equally to domestic and foreign entities; individual exemptions based on capital origin are prohibited.

N9 (Price transparency and consumer protection).

Entities may pass the DST into the price but must disclose the final "all-inclusive" price before conclusion of the transaction and may not use misleading labels ("government surcharge", etc.).

Enforcement: penalty for non-transparency up to 2% of monthly covered turnover.

N10 (Technical reporting and data minimization).

Entities must register and submit quarterly reports with country breakdowns; storage of personal identifiers is limited to ≤ 24 months; transmission to third parties is prohibited except for tax audit or arbitration.

N11 (Independent arbiter).

Disputes on service qualification, turnover sourcing and credits are adjudicated by an independent tax arbitration unit within 120 days; admissible evidence is limited to a closed list (logs, billing, payment data, audits). Decisions must be published in anonymized form.

N12 (Sanctions and incentives).

For non-payment: interest = key rate + 4%; for deliberate misreporting: fine 50–100% of the amount; voluntary disclosure before audit: 80% reduction of fine; repeat offences within 24 months: aggravating factor.

N13 (Monitoring and KPI).

The tax authority must quarterly publish aggregated indicators: total DST collected; proportion credited/refunded; share of disputes and average resolution time; record cases of standstill/de-escalation.

N14 (Sunset/review).

Comprehensive review every 24 months or immediately upon entry into force of a comparable multilateral regime; if the indicator remains below 5% persistently, automatic conversion of the DST into a pure reporting obligation (no levy).

Indicator.

EDTI = share of DST amounts for which no credit or refund was provided within 24 months of payment (target ≤ 5%).

2.2 Adapted Legislative Text (France)

Article 1. Scope of Application.

The Digital Services Tax shall apply to groups of companies providing in France online advertising services, digital intermediation platforms, and marketplaces, provided that the combined global turnover of the group exceeds 750 million euros and the turnover from such services in France exceeds 25 million euros.

Article 2. Rate and Payment.

The tax rate shall be 2% of turnover attributable to the territory of France. Payment shall be made quarterly.

Article 3. Credit and Refund.

Amounts paid under the Digital Services Tax shall be credited against corporate income tax, and in the absence of such base shall be refunded within 24 months.

Article 4. Safeguards.

1. In case of officially announced trade measures against France directly linked to the Digital Services Tax, the rate shall be temporarily reduced to 0.5% for up to one year, and the government shall initiate negotiations.
2. Companies shall ensure price transparency: the final “all-inclusive” price shall be disclosed before the transaction, and misleading labels such as “government surcharge” are prohibited.

Article 5. Reporting, Registration and Disputes.

Companies subject to this law shall register with the tax authorities and provide quarterly reports with a country breakdown. Disputes on service qualification and credits shall be resolved by competent French authorities (Conseil d'État and tax arbitration units) under accelerated procedure.

Article 6. Review.

This law shall be reviewed 24 months after its entry into force, or earlier upon conclusion of a multilateral agreement in this field. Furthermore, if the share of amounts for which no credit or refund is provided within 24 months exceeds 5%, the tax shall automatically convert into a reporting-only regime without levy.

2.3 Comparative Mapping

Hypernorm Element	Adapted Legislative Provision	Commentary
N1 (Scope)	Art.1	Scope retained; terminology aligned with French Code général des impôts.
N2 (Trigger, 2-of-3 test)	Art.1	Thresholds preserved; technical "2-of-3" methodology delegated to decree for administrative feasibility.
N3 (Obligation, 2%)	Art.2	Retained in full.
N4 (Credit/refund, ≤ 24 months)	Art.3	Retained; evidentiary detail transferred to decree.
N5 (Standstill under multilateral regime)	Art.6	Implemented through early review clause and suspension upon multilateral agreement; operational details to decree.
N6 (De-escalation under retaliation)	Art.4(1)	Retained (rate reduction + negotiation duty); automatic return handled administratively.
N7 (De minimis)	—	Excluded to avoid manipulation given double threshold; omission does not alter balance.
N8 (Non-discrimination)	—	Subsumed under general French constitutional and EU non-discrimination principles; not repeated.
N9 (Price transparency)	Art.4(2)	Retained in substance; specific penalties covered by general sanction regime.
N10 (Reporting and data limits)	Art.5	Registration and reporting retained; data minimization rules referenced in decree.
N11 (Independent arbiter)	Art.5	Functionally replaced by Conseil d'État and tax arbitration units; integration with French institutions.
N12 (Sanctions and incentives)	—	Covered by general tax sanction regime under CGI; duplication avoided.
N13 (Monitoring and KPI)	Art.6	Incorporated via objective trigger (5% threshold); publication requirements handled administratively.

N14 (Review/sunset)	Art.6	Retained; combined with indicator-based conversion.
Indicator (EDTI)	Art.6	Embedded as 5% threshold for automatic conversion.

3. Observations

The test demonstrates that a hypernorm of fourteen clauses plus indicator can be compressed into a six-article statutory draft, while preserving the dominant objective (fiscal sovereignty and fair taxation of digital giants) and secondary objectives (avoidance of double taxation, prevention of trade escalation, consumer protection).

Simplifications affected only technical methodologies (delegated to decrees), redundant elements (de minimis, non-discrimination already covered by superior law), and institutionally redundant structures (independent arbiter substituted by existing courts). The explanatory mapping ensures transparency of adaptation, demonstrating that no safeguard was lost without trace.

This confirms that the compression algorithm yields concise, executable legislation that remains faithful to the internal balance of the original hypernorm, while being fully compatible with the legal and fiscal framework of the jurisdiction.

Appendix №2. Validation of Operability: Case Study on AI Development under Absence of Empirical Data

Part VI outlined the theoretical procedure by which the Threat Index (TI) framework resolves normative dilemmas when empirical data are missing: by invoking the archival protocol, establishing bounding intervals [TI_best, TI_worst], and applying minimax selection to identify a provisional regulatory scenario. To test this procedure in practice, we conducted a simulation on the regulation of artificial intelligence (AI) development under radical uncertainty.

Actors and Conflict

- A_1 (Society): right to life and health (S = 4).
- A_2 (Developers): rights to property and innovation (S = 1).

Dilemma: Should AI development be restricted when no empirical risk data exist?

Archival Anchor and Calibration

Following the archival protocol, the case “Environment vs Economic Growth” (E-2025-01) was selected as the structural analogue. Both dilemmas oppose societal life/health against economic activity. The causal chains and parameters from E-2025-01 served as calibration baselines.

- A_1 (life/health chain): emission → exposure → harm.
- A_2 (property chain): regulatory burden.

Formulas used (Word-compatible format):

- Link length: $\ell_i = T_i \times P_i \times R_i \times 2^{K_i} \times (1 + 0.1 \times \tau_i)$
- Total chain length: $L = \Sigma\ \ell_i$
- Total probability: $P = \Pi\ P_i$
- Threat Index: $TI = (S \times P) \div L$
- Worst-case bound: $TI_worst = (S \times P) \div \min(\ell_i)$

Transfer rules. For each scenario, environmental links were mapped onto AI links ("emission" → "emergence of capability", "exposure" → "externalization to users", "harm" → "realization of threat"). Adjustments were applied by modifying T, P, R, K, τ based on safeguards (sandboxing, certification) or absence of control (moratorium, open release).

Scenarios Tested (10)

- s_1 Full Moratorium (ban on all AI; shadow development).
- s_2 Strong Sandbox (restricted pilots with arbiter, kill-switch, logging).
- s_3 Open Release (no restrictions).
- s_4 Sectoral Ban (prohibit high-risk applications only).
- s_5 Compute Cap + Rate-limit + Red-teaming.
- s_6 Certification-only Deployment (pre-market approval).
- s_7 Phased Pilots (gradual unlocking).
- s_8 Open Weights via Proxy Gateway.
- s_9 Regional (Geofenced) Pilots.
- s_{10} Emergency-only Use.

Results

Table 1. Threat Index values (Society A_1, Developers A_2).

Scenario	$TI(A_1)$ mid	$TI(A_1)$ worst	$TI(A_2)$	Risk* (max)	$L(A_1)$	$P(A_1)$	Key $\ell(A_1)$
s_1 Moratorium	0.0133	0.9524	0.957	0.957	5.28	0.0175	[4.03, 1.17, 0.073]
s_2 Sandbox	0.00048	0.0327	0.231	0.231	1.25	0.00015	[1.15, 0.018, 0.075]
s_3 Open Release	6.749	16.97	0.058	6.749	0.071	0.12	[0.028, 0.043]
s_4 Sectoral Ban	0.00136	0.0417	0.644	0.644	0.423	0.00014	[0.311, 0.099, 0.014]

s_5 Cap+Rate+RT	0.00015	0.00254	0.783	0.783	0.258	0.00001	[0.224, 0.019, 0.015]
s_6 Certification	0.000099	0.00273	0.175	0.175	1.089	0.000027	[0.956, 0.093, 0.040]
s_7 Phased Pilots	0.000221	0.00419	0.638	0.638	0.434	0.000024	[0.366, 0.046, 0.023]
s_8 Open Weights/Proxy	0.00573	0.0825	1.286	1.286	0.147	0.00021	[0.097, 0.039, 0.010]
s_9 Geofenced Pilots	0.000525	0.0117	0.997	0.997	0.206	0.000027	[0.158, 0.038, 0.009]
s_{10} Emergency-only	1.081	2.404	1.425	1.425	0.185	0.05	[0.102, 0.083]

Interpretation:

- s_1: life risk mid-value low (0.0133), but worst-case high (0.95); property loss nearly maximal (0.957).
- s_2: near-zero life risk (0.00048), worst-case 0.033; moderate property cost (0.231).
- s_3: catastrophic life risk (6.7 / 16.97) despite minimal property burden (0.058).
- s_6: very low life risk (0.000099 / 0.0027) and the lowest property burden among restrictive regimes (0.175).

Minimax Selection

Risk*(s) = maximum of TI_life and TI_property for each scenario.

- s_1 = 0.957
- s_2 = 0.231
- s_3 = 6.749
- s_4 = 0.644
- s_5 = 0.783
- s_6 = 0.175 ← minimum
- s_7 = 0.638
- s_8 = 1.286
- s_9 = 0.997
- s_{10} = 1.425

Optimal scenario: s_6 “Certification-only deployment”.

Reason: Although s_2 gives the smallest TI for life, its ceiling is determined by property risk (0.231). In s_6, both life and property risks are simultaneously very low, lowering the maximum to 0.175. Certification centralizes costs upfront, producing longer causal chains ($L \approx 1.09$) and extremely small probability ($P \approx 0.000027$) for life-threatening outcomes.

Regulatory Package R*

1. Mandatory pre-market certification of AI systems (threat modeling, red-teaming, resilience tests, emergency shutdown).
2. Sandbox pilots required prior to certification (isolation, kill-switch, proxied outputs, immutable logging).
3. Ban on high-risk applications (medicine, transport, energy, bio/chem synthesis) until certified.
4. Transparency and reporting: incident logs (Class H/F), methodologies, public summaries.
5. Sunset and revision: mandatory review after 9 months, recalculation of TI with empirical data.

MES Gate Check

- C1 Legal certainty: clear scope and triggers.
- C2 Independent arbiter: certification and appeal.
- C3 Enforceability: technical gateways, logging, checklists.
- C4 Learnability: KPI and sunset revision.

KPI

Number of Class H incidents (life/health threats) per 10,000 pilot hours = 0.
Number of Class F incidents (freedom) per 10,000 pilot hours ≤ 1.