Constitutional and Parliamentary Information

ASGP

New technology in Parliaments

The parliamentary system of Cyprus

1st Series - No. 1 of 1991 — Issued Half-yearly

INTER-PARLIAMENTARY UNION

Aims

The Inter-Parliamentary Union whose international Statute is outlined in a Headquarters Agreement drawn up with the Swiss federal authorities, is the only world-wide organization of Parliaments.

The aim of the Inter-Parliamentary Union is to promote personal contacts between members of all Parliaments and to unite them in common action to secure and maintain the full participation of their respective States in the firm establishment and development of representative institutions and in the advancement of the work of international peach and co-operation, particularly by supporting the objectives of the United Nations.

In pursuance of this objective, the Union makes known its views on all international problems suitable for settlement by parliamentary action and puts forward suggestions for the development of parliamentary assemblies so as to improve the working of those institutions and increase their prestige.

Membership of the Union (June 1991)

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'lvoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Laos, Lebanon, Libya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, San Marino, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Surinam, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, USSR, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Associated members: Andean Parliament, European Parliament.

Structure

The organs of the Union are:

1. *The Inter-Parliamentary Conference* which meets twice a year.

2. The Inter-Parliamentary Council, composed of two members from each affiliated Group. *President:* Mr. Daouda Sow (Senegal).

3. *The Executive Committee,* composed of twelve members elected by the Conference, as well as of the Council President acting as *ex officio* President. At present, it has the following composition:

President: Mr. D. Sow (Senegal)

Members: Mr. Arguello Morales (Nicaragua); L. Fonka Shang (Cameroon); Fu Hao (China); Sir M. Marshall (United Kingdom); M. A. Martinez (Spain); L. McLeay (Australia); H. Megahed (Egypt); E. Mulet Lesieur (Guatemala); J. Onyszkiewicz (Poland); Y. Tavernier (France); V. Valkov (Bulgaria); N. Vejjajiva (Thailand).

4. *Secretariat of the Union,* which is the international secretariat of the Organization, the headquarters being located at: Place du Petit-Saconnex, CP 99, 1211 Geneva, Switzerland.

Secretary general: Mr. Pierre Cornillon.

Official publication

The Union's official organ is the *Inter-Parliamentary Bulletin,* which appears quarterly in both English and French. This publication is indispensable in keeping posted on the activities of the Organization. Subscription can be placed with the Union's Secretariat in Geneva.

Constitutional and Parliamentary Information

Association of Secretaries General of Parliaments

1st Series - No. 16111st Half-year -1991
First Serie - Forty-first year

Contents

III. The Assembly of the Portuguese Republic

I. Report on the introduction of new technology in parliaments

by Mr. Helge Hjortdal (Denmark)

1. Introduction and background of the report

Prompted by discussions at the Autumn Session in Sofia in 1988 and the Spring Session in Budapest in 1989, a questionnaire on Information Technology in Parliaments was sent out. The conclusions which can be drawn from the replies received are described below in Paragraph 2, while the following Paragraphs 3 and 4 are attempt at setting some guidelines as to how one may obviate some of the difficulties which will not fail to occur in the, at times, long and strenuous way towards a parliamentary administration run by Electronic Data Processing (EDP).

2. Conclusions drawn from the replies received

A total number of 37 countries have replied. And to this should be added replies from the European Parliament, the Western European Union and the IPU. The replies come from 26 countries in which Parliaments have already introduced EDP and 8 countries which are deliberating on it and will introduce it in the near future.

It appears from the IPU's series "Reports and Documents No. 11/84" entitled "Computers in Parliaments" that at the time 21 Parliaments had, to a greater or lesser extent, introduced EDP while 18 Parliaments were planning to do so. Though a number of countries have introduced EDP since 1984, the replies at hand do, it must be: assumed, represent the majority of countries having introduced EDP equipment.

The following conclusions can be drawn from the replies:

2.1. EDP began to be used in the seventies or the latter half of the eighties. So with regard to introducing EDP there has been a standstill since the beginning of the present decade.

2.2. The majority of bicameral Parliaments have decided to let each of the Chambers run their EDP systems separately. However, in many countries, the two Chambers co-ordinate and co-operate on EDP.

It may be expected that in countries where EDP is only being introduced now there will be a greater tendency to use one co-ordinated system or at least that the system will be planned in a way which allows for the greatest possible exchange of data among the systems.

2.3. There are no clear indications showing whether one general or several different information systems have been adopted. But there is a tendency to abandon systems consisting of separate computers which are not connected via network. And Parliaments which have introduced EDP in recent years have chosen to establish one co-ordinated, integrated system.

2.4. EDP is used mainly for text processing and search in external and internal data bases. Also electronic mail and electronic file transfer of texts to printing houses are widely used. Videotext facilities and EDP systems used for sending and receiving telex and telefax are only used in a few countries. Furthermore, a number of countries have said that they use EDP mainly for controlling wages and staff.

2.5. Many countries have got access to search in governmental data bases while only a few countries have access to economic models. However, a number of Parliaments are contemplating setting up economic models, but this might involve serious problems, particularly with regard to the assumptions on which the calculations are made.

2.6. Governments' access to parliamentary bases is found less frequently. This may also be due to the fact that no great number of Parliaments have begun to use their own information bases. On the number hand quite a number of countries are aiming at providing the press and the public with information on the parliamentary work, particularly by means of videotext/text t.v. facilities.

2.7. It appears from more than fifty per cent of the replies that Parliaments put EDP at the disposal of MPs without charging anything. Only very rarely do MPs pay for their equipment. And when they do so, it is mainly in connection with equipment which they are going to use outside the Parliament building.

2.8. In many countries, the tendency is that it is, generally, not the MPs themselves but their personal staff who make use of the EDP facilities. However, in certain countries the MPs are frequent users, and in the future MPs are likely to get more familiar with the use of EDP. But for the time

being the percentage of MPs who have EDP equipment at their disposal varies a great deal, ranging from one hundred per cent (Canada and Holland) to 5-6 per cent (Greece and Italy). For further details on MPs' use of EDP see also Paragraph 4 below.

2.9. With regard to administrative staff, the percentage also varies a great deal. This is also due to the different ways of counting administrative staff. In countries in which EDP systems are fully developed the terminal coverage tends to be 6 terminals per 10 staff.

2.10. A general tendency to draw in external (private or public) advisers at the planning stage is noted, and furthermore the majority of countries have had to set up an independent EDP department in connection with the procuring of EDP equipment.

2.11. The introduction of EDP has in most cases brought about a change in working procedures and organization structures. In many cases, these changes have been envisaged during the planning stage; and often they have only touched upon certain parts of the Administration. And only very few countries have subsequently had to deliberate on an eventual change of the general structure.

2.12. From the answers received nothing unequivocal as to the difficulties encountered can be deduced. Each country has had particular problems of its own. However, it can be mentioned that no country has had problems with regard to keeping the schedule made for introducing EDP. Certain countries do, on the other hand, state that they have problems making the equipment work as desired and a few countries have - due to the rapid development within the field - had to procure new equipment after a few years.

2.13. It is quite obvious that the introduction of EDP entails a higher standard of service. However, it does not lead to reductions in the staff. Whereas it has often been seen that an increased amount of work does not lead to a proportional increase in staff. And no economic gains are made either because the procuring and maintenance of equipment as well as the education of users imply expenses and swallow up what has already been saved by the rationalization. A vast majority of countries have said that the printing expenses have, in particular, become considerably reduced after EDP has been introduced. But the general impression is that no net saving is obtained; on the contrary, expenses rather tend to be greater.

2.14. The majority of countries have had bilateral contacts in connection with the introduction of EDP. The exchange of experience has primarily been taking place between countries which are close to one another (geographically and/or from a cultural point of view). In a European context can also be

mentioned the "Centre Européen de Recherche et de Documentation" of which more or less all members of the Council of Europe have been making use with the aim of exchanging experience.

2.15. Many Parliaments have themselves elaborated material for inviting tenders as well user's guides, which provide information to users and other persons about EDP systems.

Besides a number of countries have elaborated reports etc. which comprise information on the use of EDP in Parliaments, as this matter is often the subject of great interest e.g. among researchers.

A more detailed survey of the analysis of the questionnaire received is enclosed.

3. Management problems in connection with the introduction of EDP

3.1. Training of users/retraining of staff

Generally, readjustment to new technology gives rise to a number of problems because in most cases this means that the present staff has to adjust to new technology. Experience shows that it is mainly older members of the staff who have problems in this respect, but also that these are first and foremost occasioned by psychological blocks.

When introducing EDP it is very important to consider what form the teaching shall take. There are four ways of doing it and these may be co-ordinated according to need.

a: Courses supplied by the EDP supplying firm.

b: Courses given by parliamentary staff who have themselves had a basic training with the supplying firm.

c: A greater extent of internal, mutual instruction among the staff internally.

d: It is left to the staff themselves to try to be acquainted with the systems e.g. by means of manuals which are distributed to them.

With regard to item a., it can be said that it is an advantage to be taught by persons who have a thorough knowledge of the systems while it is a disadvantage that the instructors are not, necessarily, familiar with parliamentary circumstances, which are often very special.

With regard to item b., one might claim the opposite i.e. the instructors do not necessarily have a thorough knowledge of the systems, but they do have the advantage of being able to demonstrate what the systems are actually destined at rather than coming up with theoretical examples to which the participants can draw no parallels in their every-day work.

With regard to item c, it can be said that informal, internal instruction presupposes that those being taught (e.g. the very first users) have had some kind of instruction beforehand e.g. a course given by the supplying firm. Or that persons from outside Parliament having the qualifications needed to use the systems are employed. If there is no proper method in the teaching there will be a risk that certain members of the staff fall behind as there is no guarantee that they have any kind of instruction.

With regard to item d., it can be said that only the very best motivated among the staff will have a chance of making use of the possibilities implied by EDP.

No matter what form is chosen, another kind of problem does, however, occur - i.e. whether the members of the staff know how to profit fully from the opportunities offered by EDP. It is possible to learn a few basic elements in particular in connection with text processing whereupon one can produce a written document by making use of the text processing system more or less as a typewriter. It is no easy task to find out whether the members of the staff make use of all the facilities in the text processing system; and thai: is why - without introducing a proper control - it has to be checked at regular intervals how much the members of the staff have learned. If the possibilities of the systems are found, generally, not to be used to the full, some kind of post-training taking the form of refresher courses or extensions of the basic instruction must be offered. This of course, is particulary important to older persons for whom it is not easy to adapt themselves to new technology. On the other hand, one should be very careful not to put pressure on the persons in question because psychological blocks may in that case become quite insuperable.

Some of these blocks against using EDP might be avoided by not inserting into instructions and manuals foreign languages and EDP terms and abbreviations, which are incomprehensible to uninitiated persons.

3.2. New, changed work tasks subsequent to the introduction offEDP

Introducing EDP means that there will be new work tasks in the Parliament. There will be a need for soft- and hardware technicians who are to see to it that the system works. These persons are usually employed in connection with the introduction of EDP and they are typically recruited from outside Parliament. The EDP technicians are often working together in an EDP department which becomes an independent section of the parliamentary administration. In a few instances, the EDP department is, however, part of the information service.

Further to the tasks which are of a technical nature, new and at times difficult tasks occur. They relate to e.g. data discipline and the control with introducing data, the setting up of eventual internal data bases, procuring of text for external data bases, internal backing up of users, providing information on the possibilities of the EDP systems, elaborating instructions, setting up of a common filing system, laying down standards for documents which are to be used again or collected in other departments, setting up delivery procedures for sending and receiving electronic mail etc.

The biggest problems in connection with the new tasks are, it must be assumed, that they are difficult to plan in advance. It is typically a question of needs which only arise at the stage where the system begins to be used, and it is important that the needs for carrying out the new tasks are evaluated in a centrally placed body e.g. and EDP control group. If this body does not currently establish development plans for the EDP process, there is a risk that the necessary balancing of and giving of priority to the needs do not take place. When making a plan of developments, there is a guarantee that the EDP department and others do not waste time and resources on trifling matters - while basic time-consuming problems are not solved. Furthermore, the work of the EDP department can be planned in a far more appropriate way.

Apart from these new tasks EDP also means that already known routines of work change. Certain tasks are abolished all together, others are carried in a new way. Here the problem consist first and foremost in adapting the members of the staff to the new way. In this connection, it is an advantage to involve the members of the staff as much as possible. All things considered, the individual person will feel more motivated if he or she is entrusted with a responsibility at the point of introducing new working routines, and if the members of the staff are not involved at an early stage, the result will typi-

cally be that a long span of time will elapse - and a lot of errors occur - before the person in question is familiar with the new tasks.

3.3. The effects of an increased level of service

The replies received do unequivocally show that the introduction of EDP results in an increased level of service. It is often the Administration itself which - when an opportunity offers - provides new services or renders already known services in a better and faster way. This is a natural consequence of one's being a little proud of the result. And of course, the Administration also sees it as an advantage that matters are attended to in a faster and better way.

Offers of new services almost automatically imply that the Administration is faced with new demands from the users. As is the case with developments within EDP - it is necessary to get an impression of the new demands and wishes; whether to meet them and if so in what order. Decisions relating to this have to be made centrally, but may be taken in the departments concerned, unless it is a question of projects which concern several aspects of the organization structure. Several of the replies have, by the way, stated that it has been very difficult to suppress the need for a fast development within EDP as far as offers of new or better services are concerned; and this applies also to the pace at which new terminals begin to be used (number of newly established working terminals per year). In both cases, it is advisable to have a gradual development in the light of an overall planning.

Naturally, greater activity follows from an increased level of service. In most cases the level of service increases without a corresponding increase in the staff. The number of staff may increase but the conclusions drawn from all replies venturing upon this aspect is that EDP involves a rationalization gain in that far more and higher quality tasks are carried out and that these are done by an unchanged and only vaguely increasing number of staff. In other words, the introduction of EDP does not entail dismissals or refraining from new appointments in case of natural retirement.

3.4. Controlling expenses for EDP

In most cases, it is very difficult to make up the expenses implied by procuring EDP. Only equipment (machines, terminals, printers, possibly networks etc.) and software can be valued at a certain price, and as far as

software is concerned it is not always possible to do it in an exact way. In many cases, software has to be adapted to the individual institution, and this applies particularly to Parliaments, the tasks of which are of such a special nature that no usable standard programmes are to be found on the market.

Besides there are expenses for the work with procuring equipment e.g. fees for external advisers and expenses for study tours, education and support to users, possibly new furniture, possibly charges for searching external data bases etc. It is typical of these expenses that they are apparent and can be made up. But at the stage of procuring equipment, one is likely not to make a close estimate. Many people have got a surprise when they have found out what these necessary ensuing expenses may amount to. It is a question of amounts which are far from insignificant.

A third kind of expenses are those which cannot be estimated exactly, namely expenses which follow from a higher level of activity. As instances of this can be mentioned that more printed matter is being produced, that the consumption of paper increases, that the postage and telephone expenses increase etc. It can, however, also be a matter of savings e.g. in the form of lower costs for printing purposes because texts are delivered electronically, or because the Administration can itself produce documents which look like proper, printed matter. Thus both costs and benefits are limited but it is very difficult to form a general view of the overall effect.

Thus it is possible to control the major EDP expenses but that presupposes at the same time that one has a good, general view of the matter, and that one takes into account the problems which may occur as early as at all possible. In many cases, the EDP expenses run riot, and it is impossible to put a halt to them at the time when major investments take place. There is no going back unless one puts aside all EDP ambitions. If the equipment does not work satisfactorily, it may at times be necessary to replace it with an entirely new set. And the public authorities, and least of all a Parliament, cannot afford to go wrong (at least not work-wise and prestige-wise).

3.5. The management's involvement in the automation off offices

In order to ensure that the introduction of EDP in Parliaments is as successful as possible it is very important to involve also the management (the heads) for instance by giving them their own terminals. As tasks are carried out on the initiative and responsibility of the management, the invest-

ment in EDP will give the greatest outcome, if the management knows what demands can be made and what new opportunities EDP offers. The persons working in front of the terminals are, usually, the first to see the new possibilities, but in certain cases, in particular if the training of users has not had a great effect, the heads themselves must be aware of the opportunities in order to be able to control the tasks and demand that relevant new ones are carried out. If the members of the staff are of the kind who try out all possibilities for themselves - play with the new equipment - the result will often be, at least temporarily — that it is they who come to decide the tasks within new fields of work. Thus the management may risk not being involved when it is a question of major tasks. Of course, one cannot expect that a given head is himself familiar with all the details of say a text processing system, but apparently it is a great advantage for a head if he makes himself acquainted with the possibilites implied by the text processing system in question at a theoritical level.

In many cases, an interplay takes place between the members of the staff and the head but only if the staff of that particular department on their own initiative try to use the opportunities offered by EDP when dealing with the actual tasks of the office. If some of the staff of the office use the EDP system as a typewriter, and the tasks are of a nature to be solved without the use of EDP, the staff will only profit from investing in EDP if the head himself makes some demands. And these can only be made if the head is aware that it is possible to meet the demands. With regard to heads, it is important that these are involved as early as possible when procuring EDP equipment. And experience shows that this is also what motivates the staff to the greatest extent.

4. MPs' use of EDP

Most of the countries which have begun to use EDP see to it that MPs have access to terminals.

As MPs are often pressed for time, and come from very different backgrounds, ordinary user's instructions are not always to be preferred. Many Parliaments have introduced a high degree of individual training for Members, the training being undertaken by the Parliament's own staff and taking place in the Parliament building. Being pressed for time the Members, after having finished their very first training, only make use of the opportunities implied by EDP if the system is very easy to use. The reason for this is that if it takes a certain routine to learn to use the EDP systems, MPs do not

have time for acquiring the necessary routine. If it demands more time to solve the tasks by means of EDP for instance because one needs to look up manuals and instructions, the MP in question will, almost certainly, leave the task for some one else to do. And the routine required, which on a longer view might save time for the MP, will not be established.

If on the contrary, it is simple to use EDP and the use of it is extensive as is the case with the French Minitel-system, no time is wasted, and MPs find themselves with a perfect tool for seeking information.

It must be assumed that it is first and foremost the seeking of information by means of EDP from which MPs might profit. However, text processing might be of great help, particularly to MPs who have a certain experience in using text processing system themselves or at least in using a typewriter. MPs cannot be expected to have time to acquire knowledge of a keyboard at the same time as that of a more or less complex text processing system.

Seeking information in internal and external data bases forms part of the solutions to EDP in most countries. Many countries have spent large resources on building up internal data bases concerning parliamentary work, and, in the countries which have come a long way with respect to introducing EDP technology, the public is being provided with information particularly by means of videotext systems. In many cases, the internal bases replace registers which have formerly been operated manually. It is not too difficult to search in such bases, and the searching is therefore often undertaken by MPs themselves after brief instructions have been given. In many Parliaments, it is likewise possible to search in external bases. However, it is characteristic that MPs search themselves, to a far lesser extent, in such bases, because the systems are often very different from one another and extremely complex. Therefore, an administrative staff, often an information service, undertakes the searching.

5. Winding up and conclusion

Going through the subject of the introduction of new technology into the parliamentary world was first begun as a Topical debate. The idea was to get an up-to-date survey of how the work with the modernizing of the methods used in Parliaments was planned, started, carried through and used in everyday life.

The material at hand which is described above and in the annex containing an analysis of the answers to the individual questions gives you an

impression of the main subjects. And everyone is left to draw his or her own conclusion.

The present account should not be regarded as an attempt at drawing a general conclusion as this would not only be rather difficult but also somewhat arbitrary. Allowance should be made for the fact that though the number of answers provided is satisfactory, they only stem from 34 countries which might be said to be a small part of the parliamentary world.

In conclusion, it might be appropriate to make some comments and put forward a few suggestions on the use of EDP technology in Parliaments.

It appears from the information received in connection with the questionnaire at hand that the Parliaments, which are at present introducing EDP, hope that it will give MP's and the Administration a better and more comprehensive survey of the various matters characterizing parliamentary agendas. One of the aims is that it will be easier to assess important matters with far-reaching consequences for the development of society while political considerations are taking place. In the light of comments from Parliaments, which *have already* begun to use the new technology, one might well conclude that improved possibilities seem to have been achieved. As a counterpart to this important outcome of the new technology might be mentioned that one should be cautious not to exaggerate the possibilities implied in information technology when settling less important matters in which too many trifles, detailed information and considerations, which are not too relevant, might hamper or delay the work. Within these areas there does indeed seem to be a risk that too great a number of details might only cause confusion when submitted to the decision-makers.

One should take care not to provide too much information but always try to concentrate on the questions which are relevant and useful for elucidating the subjects. When introducing EDP, it is advisable to focus on the safe element first. Experience shows that the introduction of text processing offers great advantages the effects of which you will soon come to realize. If your ambitions with regard to the EDP project go beyond simply making the text processing work, you can always extend the-system once you have made the text processing part of it work satisfactorily.

A current use of the technology is a prerequisite for keeping up the purely technical knowledge of the possibilities implied in the system. What the user gets out of modern technology is directly related to the individual user's ability for making use of it. A prerequisite for achieving this aim seems to be that one finds oneself pretty close to the technical equipment. This means that in order to consider the equipment your natural everyday

working tool, it should be within easy reach physically. This applies both to MPs and their staff.

In order for the equipment to become a daily working tool, the staff and to some extent the MPs must be ready to adapt to new working routines and functions and to make changes in existing ones. The development, which is currently taking place in the parliamentary work, regarding extent, contents and time factors, presupposes current intervention in the working procedures, and this applies not least to the processes which are related to or stem from EDP technology.

It remains to be seen whether the public will, in practice, derive noticeable benefit from the new technology, but at the beginning, the decisive factor will be that it will enable private persons, to a greater extent, to follow parliamentary work and the decision-making process resulting from it. But a number of other factors in society will also contribute to deciding whether this more direct or immediate form of access is to be preferred to other means of communication such as T.V., the daily press, professional journals etc.

One of the circumstances which might be of importance to certain parties, e.g. decision-making within trade, is that the access to knowledge on the relevant parliamentary material is readily available; and not least the time factor may be decisive here.

The setting up of bigger, common EDP systems is instrumental in increasing the speed of information and in improving the level. This, it is true, *may* only be important to a rather limited number of persons and enterprises but these may, on the other hand, occupy very central positions in society and have an influence on trade production and outlets.

It appears from the material on which the report is based that the investment in and the running of the new equipment is a costly affair compared to parliamentary expenses hitherto. It will presumably be rather difficult to assess whether the expenses have led to a reasonable outcome and whether the results obtained have been worth the trouble and the money. However, it seems to have been proved that the investment pays, and in places where the system has already been used for some time, it appears that there is no going back. The future efforts are not aimed at abolishing the new technique in order to revert to former working methods but on the contrary to keep up with new trends offered by the technique.

It might be quoted as an instance that there might still be societies in which Parliaments will be able to accomplish their working tasks by means of a more modest technique and nevertheless reach satisfactory results. The

control of Governments and the criticism which has been made of them is probably related to a wish to achieve the greatest possible knowledge of and insight in individual matters which are under consideration. But a number of more traditional tasks will still play an important role, and they may well, be accomplished at a lower level of information than that supplied by EDP.

In conclusion, it should be said that Parliaments must endeavour to ensure that the new technology does not get the better of the MPs and does not ruin the environment and the atmosphere which should form the natural background of parliamentaiy work. It is essential that the performers of parliamentary work feel at home and at ease in the surroundings which are the natural background of their work.

ANNEX I

Annex to the Report! on the Introduction of New Technologies in Parliaments

The following countries have completed the questionnaire:

Austria
Belgium (Chamber of Representatives)
Belgium (Senate)
Brasil
Cameroon
Canada (House of Commons)
Cape Verde
Central African Republic
Denmark
Ethiopia
Finland
France (Senate)
France (National Assembly)
Federal Republic of German)' (Bundesrat)
Federal Republic of Germany (Bundestag)
Greece
Holland (Both Chambers)
Iceland
India
Indonesia

Ireland
Israel
Italy
Japan (House of Representatives)
Japan (House of Councillors)
Kenya
Malta
Norway
Pakistan
Philippines
Poland
Portugal
Rwanda
South Korea
Spain
Sweden
Tunisia
United Kingdom (House of Commons)
United Kingdom (House of Lords)
USA (House of Representatives)
Zaire
Zimbabwe
Western European Union
European Parliament
IPU

ANNEX II

Analysis of the replies received:

QUESTION 1

Is electronic data processing (EDP) used in your Parliament or are you planning to introduce it?

Started using:

Austria: August 1989
Belgium (Chamber of Representatives): 1986
Belgium (Senate): 1989
Brazil: Only to a limited extent

Cameroon
Canada (House of Commons)
Denmark: 1986
Finland: 1988
France (Senate): Since the end of the seventies
France (National Assembly): Since the end of the seventies
Federal Republic of Germany (Bundesrat): Introduced in 1969
Federal Republic of German;/ (Bundestag): Introduced in 1969
Greece: February 1988
Iceland: 1984
India
Ireland
Italy (Senate): In the seventies
Italy (Chamber of Deputies): Since the end of the sixties
Israel: Since 1981
Japan (both Chambers)
Holland (both Chambers): 1978
Norway: 1985
Philippines
Poland: 1987
Portugal: 1988
Spain: 1986
Sweden: 1985
Tunisia: 1985
United Kingdom (House of Commons): 1979
United Kingdom (House of Lords): At the beginning of the eighties
USA (House of Representatives): Introduced in 1969
Western European Union
European Parliament: In the seventies
IPU

Considering to start using

Cape Verde
Ethiopia
Kenya
Malta
Pakistan: Pilot project initiated
South Korea, major procurement of EDP in 1990 at the earliest
Zaire
Zimbabwe

Not under consideration yet

Central African Republic
Indonesia
Rwanda

QUESTION 2

If your Parliament is bicameral, are information technology issues dealt with for the parliament as a whole or separately?

On an overall basis

Austria
Cape Verde (being planned)
Federal Republic of Germany
Holland: Second Chamber responsible in practice
Iceland
India

Separately

Belgium
Canada
France (possible to make text transfers)
Italy (with a high degree of technical co-ordination, however)
Japan
Philippines
Spain
United Kingdom (the person responsible for EDP serves both Houses)
USA

QUESTION 3

Does your Chamber have or plan to have:

a) one single integrated EDP information system to be used by the entire Parliament/Chamber, or

b) different EDP information systems in one or more departments of your Parliament? or

c) stand alone computers in various offices meant for separate EDP functions

An integrated system

Austria
Belgium (one for each Chamber)
Canada (House of Commons)
Denmark
Federal Republic of Germany (Bundestag)
Finland
France (National Assembly): only as far as information bases are concerned
Greece
Holland (both Chambers)
Iceland
India (being planned)
Israel
Italy (both Chambers)
Malta (being planned)
Norway
Pakistan (being planned)
Philippines (being planned)
Portugal
Sweden
Tunisia
European Parliament (networks connect minicomputers and PCs which makes the system appear to the world as one central system).

Several information systems

Canada (House of Commons). Separate systems which are independent of the central system
Federal Republic of Germany (Bundesrat)
France (Senate): 2 central systems
France (National Assembly). Certain internal bases
Ireland
Japan (House of Councillors)
Kenya (being planned)
Poland (integrated mini-computers)
Spain: Independent systems which can communicate
United Kingdom (House of Commons). To a certain extent
USA (integrated, independent systems)

Separate computers in the various departments

Cameroon

Canada (House of Commons). Most of them are connected to the network

France (National Assembly). The political parties and others have their own mini-computers

Japan (both Chambers)

Philippines. Pro tempore

United Kingdom (both Houses): general tendency

Western European Union

QUESTION 4

Which EDP functions are available in your Parliament?

— ***Text processing***
— ***Electronic mail***
— ***Search in internal data bases***
— ***Search in external data bases***
— ***Videotext etc.***
— ***Transfer of text to printing office by means of data medium***
— ***Telex***
— ***Telefax***
— ***Other functions***

Text processing

Austria; Belgium; Cameroon; Canada (House of Commons); Denmark; Federal Republic of Germany (Bundesrat); Federal Republic of Germany (Bundestag); Finland; France (both Houses); Holland; Iceland; Ireland; Israel; Italy (both Houses); Japan (both Chambers); Norway; Philippines; Poland; Portugal; Spain; Sweden; Tunisia; United Kingdom (both Houses); USA; European Parliament; Western European Union.

Electronic mail

Belgium; Canada (House of Commons) 1000 users on 300 addresses; Denmark; Federal Republic of Germany (Bundestag) (being planned); Finland; France (both Houses); Iceland; Israel; Italy (Senate); Japan (both Chambers), Holland (being planned to comprise other things than summons to meetings); Norway; Philippines; Portugal; Sweden; USA.

Internal bases

Belgium; Cameroon; Canada (House of Commons); Denmark; Federal Republic of Germany (Bundesrat); Federal Republic of Germany (Bundestag); Finland; France (both Houses); Greece; Holland; Iceland; Israel; Italy (both Houses); Japan (both Chambers); Norway; Philippines; Poland; Portugal; Spain; Sweden; Tunisia; United Kingdom (both Houses); USA; European Parliament.

External bases

Austria; Belgium; Canada (House of Commons); Denmark; Federal Republic of Germany (Bundesrat); Federal Republic of Germany (Bundestag) (being planned); Finland; France (both Houses); Greece; Holland; Iceland; Ireland; Israel; Italy (both Houses); Japan (both Chambers); Norway; Portugal; Spain; Sweden; Tunisia; United Kingdom (both Houses); USA; European Parliament.

Videotext etc.

Belgium (Chamber of Representatives); Canada (House of Commons); Federal Republic of Germany (Bundesrat): Teletext; Finland; France (both Houses); Israel; Italy (Chamber of Deputies); Norway; Philippines; Portugal (being planned); Sweden; United Kingdom (both Houses); and in USA, the House of Representatives is providing a private company (CATV) with data; European Parliament (being planned).

Transfer to printing houses

Belgium; Canada (House of Commons); Denmark (being planned); Finland; France (Senate) (disks); France (National Assembly); United Kingdom (both Houses); Holland (planning stage); Iceland; Ireland; Israel; Italy (both Houses); Japan (House of Councillors); Norway; Philippines; Spain; Sweden; USA; European Parliament.

Telex

Austria; Belgium (Chamber of Representatives); Canada (House of Commons); Denmark; Federal Republic of Germany (Bundesrat and Bundestag); Finland; Italy; Norway; Philippines; Portugal (being planned); United Kingdom (both Houses); European Parliament.

Telefax

Austria; Belgium; Canada (House of Commons); Denmark; Federal Republic of Germany (Bundesrat and Bundestag); Finland; Italy; Japan (both Cham-

bers); Norway; Philippines; Portugal; Sweden; United Kingdom (both Houses); European Parliament; Western European Union.

Sundry matters

Austria; Documentation on literature; Belgium (Chamber of Representatives): Filing of pictures; Cameroon: Economy and staff systems; Canada (House of Commons): Desk top publishing; Federal Republic of Germany (Bundestag): Calendarsystem and desk top publishing (being planned); Greece: Publishing of Parliamentary documents (registers and remuneration systems); Holland: Planning of meetings, committees and Parliament; India; Statistical information, MPs' biographies, remuneration systems, etc.; Israel: Catalogue of library publications and follow-up concerning admission cards; Japan (both Houses): Electronic attendance boards for MPs, Facsimile; Norway: Teletext; Philippines: Remuneration and staff systems; Poland: Remuneration and staff systems; Sweden: Calendar system, planning of meetings and desk top publishing; European Parliament: Remuneration and staff systems i.a.

QUESTION 5

***Does your Parliament have** access **to Government and other data bases or is it planning to provide such** access?*

Does this** access **include** access **to economic models?

Yes

Government data bases

Austria (being planned); Belgium (including videotext in the Chamber of Representatives); Canada (House of Commons); Denmark (being planned); France (both Houses): only possible via the Information Service; Greece (being planned); Holland; Iceland; India (being planned); Ireland (being considered); Israel (Ministry of Finance and Justice); Italy (both Houses); Norway; Philippines (being planned); Poland (being planned); Portugal (Ministry of Justice); Spain; Sweden; Tunisia; United Kingdom (House of Commons), House of Lords only via library; European Parliament: Access to the bases of the Commission.

Bases of other authorities

Federal Republic of Germany (Bundestag) (Indirect access); Holland; Iceland (Body of Law); Japan (both Houses); Spain (EEC bases).

No

Cameroon; Federal Republic of Germany (Bundesrat); Finland (being planned); Japan (both Chambers); USA; Western European Union.

Economic models

Austria (being planned); Belgium (being planned); Canada (House of Commons); Finland (being planned); France (Senate); India (being planned); Italy (being planned); Japan (both Chambers); Philippines; United Kingdom (House of Commons).

QUESTION 6

Does your Parliament by means of EDP provide information to the Government, other bodies and/or the public, including the press?

Government

Denmark; Federal Republic of Germany (Bundesrat and Bundestag); Finland (being planned); France (both Houses) via networks; Iceland; India (being planned); Israel; Italy; Japan (House of Councillors) being planned; Philippines; Spain; Sweden.

Other authorities

Iceland (Body of Law); Italy (Universities, unions and others); Japan (House of Councillors) (being planned).

The Press

Belgium (Chamber of Representatives); Denmark (being planned); Finland (being planned); France (both Houses); India (being planned); Japan (House of Councillors) being planned; Sweden; United Kingdom (House of Commons).

The Public

Austria: The plan is to put parliamentary documentation at the disposal of those who might be interested; Belgium (Chamber of Representatives) Videotext; Denmark: Hansard, bills and all documents relating to bills are part of the Government law data bases; Finland: the plan is to inform the public by means of videotext/text t.v. and law data bases; Federal Republic of Germany (Bundestag, being considered); France (both Houses) base for questions and replies to which any one has access; Holland; India (being planned); Israel; Italy; Japan (House of Councillors) being planned; Norway; Poland; Sweden (mainly via service centre, however); United Kingdom (House of Commons)

only via service centre; the European Parliament puts several bases at the disposal of other bodies, particularly foreign Parliaments.

None

Belgium (Senate); Cameroon; Canada (House of Commons); Greece; Ireland; Japan (both Houses); Tunisia; USA; Western European Union.

QUESTION 7

What direct access do MPs have to EDP systems and who provides and pays for them?

Direct access via terminals or PCs

Belgium (being planned); Canada (House of Commons); Denmark; Federal Republic of Germany (Bundesrat and Bundestag) (being planned); Finland; France (both Houses) including Minitel terminals; Holland; Iceland (being planned); Israel (the opportunity exists but it is not made the most of); Italy; Norway; Malta (being planned); Philippines; Poland (being planned); Spain; Sweden; Tunisia; USA.

Who pays for/provides services? NB: This should only be stated in cases in which Parliaments do not pay/provide service.

Belgium (Chamber of Representatives): 1 terminal per group but the groups do themselves pay for searching in external bases; Holland (equipment which is installed outside Parliament is paid for by the MPs themselves); Sweden; MPs do themselves pay for PCs which are installed in their private homes.

Other matters

United Kingdom: House of Commons: Computers can be bought. House of Lords: Members have to pay for secretarial assistance; European Parliament: No direct access.

QUESTION 8

How many EDP terminals for MPs' own use or use by their personal staff had been installed (a) in your Parliament of (b) elsewhere by May 1st 1989? And what is the total number of such terminals you intend to install? Please state the number of MPs in your Parliament.

Number of computers installed

NB: The figure are not consequently related to MPs as well as their own staff

Belgium (Chamber of Representatives): 10; Canada (House of Commons): All 295 offices have got equipment; Denmark: 80 MPs; Federal Republic of Germany (Bundestag): 1st March 1990 *(a)* 283 MPs with 496 PC's, *(b)* 283 MPs with 285 PC's; Finland: 102; France (Senate): 319 (videotext terminals); France (National Assembly): 250 Minitel terminals, other equipment is provided by the groups; Greece: 19; Holland: total number 250 (150/75); Iceland: 18 MPs; India: 0; Ireland: 0; Israel: 10-15 are used for searching made for the benefit of MPs (but not by themselves); Italy (Senate): 15; Japan (both Houses): 0; Norway: 135; Philippines: 200; Portugal: 30; Spain: 11; Sweden: 180 (+ 25 installed in private homes); Tunisia: 3.

Installations planned

Belgium (Chamber of Representatives): 14 in the near future; Canada (House of Commons): the present 130 computers installed in the MPs' constituency offices are expected to reach 250 before 1993; Denmark: the plan is to provide all interested persons with a terminal; Finland: 98; Iceland: 35-40 PC's being planned for 1992; Ireland: access to PC's is being planned; Philippines: 50 (one for each person); Portugal: 180; Sweden: in three years' time everyone will have a terminal in the Riksdag and in his or her home.

Number of MPs

Belgium (Chamber of Representatives): 212; Canada (House of Commons): 295; Denmark: 179; Federal Republic of Germany (Bundestag): 519; Finland: 200; France (Senate): 319; France (National Assembly): 577; Greece: 300; Holland: 75 + 150 = 225; Iceland: 63; Ireland: 166 (Rep.) and 60 (Sen.); Italy (Senate): 322; Norway: 157 (+52 employed by the Parties); Philippines: 250; Portugal: 250.

Percentage

Belgium (Chamber of Representatives): 5-11%; Canada (House of Commons): 100%; Denmark: 44.7%; Federal Republic of Germany (Bundestag): 100% is being planned; Finland: 51%; France (Senate): 100% but only videotext terminals; France (National Assembly): 43.3% (only Minitel terminals); Greece: 6%; Holland: 111% (MPs and their colleagues/staff. The 75 Members of the First Chamber do not have offices in Parliament); Iceland: 28,6%; Italy: 5%; Norway: 64.4% and 96% of whom

are employed by the Parties; Philippines: 80%; Portugal: 12% (an extension of this number to 100% is scheduled for 1989); Sweden: 51.6% (78.8% to be anticipated for 1990).

Do not know

United Kingdom (House of Commons)

QUESTION 9

How many EDP terminals for staff use had been installed by May 1st 1989? And what is the number of such terminals that you intend to install? Please state the total number of administrative, parliamentary staff.

Number of computers installed

Austria: 0; Belgium (Senate): 18 (planned in the first stage); Belgium (Chamber of Representatives): 50 + 30 PCs; Cameroon: 29; Canada (House of Commons): about 1025; Denmark: about 100; Federal Republic of Germany (Bundesrat): 14; Federal Republic of Germany (Bundestag): 300; Finland: 150; France (Senate): 97 + 180 videotext terminals; France (National Assembly): 310 (out of which 170 are Minitel ones); Greece: 37; Holland: 150; Iceland: 70; India: 8; Israel: 140; Italy (Senate): 115; Japan (House of Representatives): 19; Japan (House of Councillors): 28; Norway: 130; Philippines: 102; Portugal: 40; Spain: 68; Sweden: 230; Tunisia: 0; United Kingdom (House of Commons): about 160; United Kingdom (House of Lords): about 40; European Parliament: 970.

Installations planned

Belgium (Chamber of Representatives): 70 terminals; Cameroon: 13; Federal Republic of Germany (Bundesrat): 4 (until there is a proper framework plan); Federal Republic of Germany (Bundestag): 300; Finland: 100; Iceland: 5 PCs; Israel: 25; Philippines: 200; Portugal: 40; European Parliament: 530.

Number of staff

Austria: 80; Belgium (Chamber of Representatives): 150; Cameroon: 550; Canada (House of Commons): about 1700; Denmark: about 140 (only administrative staff); Federal Republic of Germany (Bundesrat): 135; Federal Republic of Germany (Bundestag): 2000; Finland: 150; France (Senate): 950; France (National Assembly): 520 (not including ushers etc.); Greece: 600; Iceland: 70; India: Not stated; Israel: 250; Italy (Senate): 900; Japan (House of Representatives): 1729; Japan (House of Councillors): 1267; Norway: 140 (only administrative staff); Philippines: 1075; Portugal: 337; Sweden: Not

stated; United Kingdom (House of Commons): about 470; United Kingdom (House of Lords): about 135; European Parliament: 3000.

Percentage:

Belgium (Chamber of Representatives): 53% (including PCs); Cameroon: 5%; Canada (House of Commons): 60%; Denmark: 71.4%; Federal Republic of Germany (Bundesrat): 10%; Federal Republic of Germany (Bundestag): 15%; Finland: 60%; France (Senate): 10% (29% if Minitel is included); France (National Assembly): 26.9% (59.6% including Minitel); Greece: 6%; Holland: 60%; Iceland: 50%; Israel: 56% at present, 66% in the course of a year; Italy (Senate): 13%; Japan (House of Representatives): 0.1%; Japan (House of Councillors): 0.2%; Norway: 92.8%; Philippines: 10%; Portugal: 11.9% (expected to be 23.7% in 1990); United Kingdom (House of Commons): 34%, (House of Lords) 29.6%; European Parliament: 32.3%.

QUESTION 10

Which preparations for installing EDP (pre-analysis, specifying of demands, tenders, choice of supplier, creation of separated office, special supervisory committees) have been/will be made in your Parliament? Have external consultants been employed?

Consultants employed

Austria: In connection with pre-analysis; Belgium: Government officials and technical advisers; Cameroon: External (French) advisers; Canada (House of Commons): External advisers; Denmark: Private firms and State adviser; Federal Republic of Germany (Bundestag): External advisers in the beginning; Finland: Various advisers; France (Senate): External advisers; France (National Assembly): EDP department, which does not work in the service of the Parties, has availed itself of advisers; Holland: External advisers, mainly Government staff; Iceland: External advisers; India: Advisers used by Government body for pre-analysis; Ireland: External advisers; Italy (Senate): Has only rarely used advisers; Japan (House of Representatives): Considers employment of external consultants; Norway: Advisers in connection with pre-analysis; Philippines: Government advisers; Poland: External advisers + setting up of a State Council which is to control legal information; Spain: External advisers; Sweden: External advisers used for pre-analysis; Tunisia: A State organization; United Kingdom (both Houses): External advisers, often a Government body; European Parliament; Western European Union.

QUESTION 11

Has the implementation of EDP given rise to changes in organization structures, in the working procedures or in staff numbers etc.?

Have these questions been analysed in detail, perhaps with assistance from external consultants?

Changes in organization structures

Belgium (Chamber of Representatives): Yes, after hearing of the staff; Cameroon; Denmark: Are under consideration; Federal Republic of Germany (Bundesrat): Documentation Service to which EDP belongs has been facing structural problems; Federal Republic of Germany (Bundestag): EDP activities have been grouped together in one directorate; France (National Assembly): The Information Service has been divided into two departments. Working groups have been set up in connection with the implementation; Greece; Holland: In the Documentation Service; Iceland: Yes as a by-product of the EDP-project; Ireland: Typical working group; Poland: To be expected; Sweden: Less than expected; Tunisia: Yes; United Kingdom (House of Commons): Yes; USA: No.

Change in working procedures

Belgium (Chamber of Representatives): Yes (through indexing of documents); Cameroon; Denmark; Finland; Greece; Japan (both Houses); Philippines; Sweden; Tunisia; European Parliament.

Number of staff

Cameroon: Increase in staff due to the setting up of "Service Informatique"; Canada: Net increase; Federal Republic of Germany (Bundestag): Increase; Holland: Slight increase; United Kingdom (House of Commons): New structures have led to an increase in the staff. The House of Lords has stated that due to EDP a smaller number of staff has been employed than anticipated by the increasing amount of tasks; European Parliament: A greater activity has not led to an increase in staff.

Analysis of the Administration effectuated

Denmark: Is being effectuated; Greece; Poland: An internal analysis is being prepared; United Kingdom (House of Commons): A gradual analysis of one department after another.

Consultants

Denmark: An external consulting firm undertakes the analysis of the Administration; Greece: University experts; Tunisia: A State organization.

No deliberations!changes

France (National Assembly); Holland; Iceland (Not analysed yet); Israel (necessary adjustments have been made); Italy; Portugal; Spain: Only changes in connection with the implementation. Carried out by means of external advisers; United Kingdom; USA; European Parliament; Western European Union.

QUESTION 12

Indicate major management difficulties (e.g. training, staff management, time schedule).

Difficulties
Instruction, user's support etc.

Denmark: Education of users is a great task but very important for a succesful introduction; Federal Republic of Germany (Bundestag): Training more demanding than planned; Finland: Education of users is a great task; Greece: Education of users as expected to be difficult; Italy (Senate); Japan: Difficult to train specialist-level staff; United Kingdom: Internal unstructured instruction has occupied a great number of staff.

Personal management

Belgium; Denmark: Great but necessary task to involve most of the staff concerned; Greece; Holland (not at ease with EDP); Ireland: Italy (Senate); Japan (House of Councillors): impossible to answer demands for local systems; Spain; Tunisia.

Postponements

None

Other matters

Belgium (Chamber of Representatives): No decision can be made in non-sessional periods. It has been necessary to set up a permanent body for educating users; Denmark: To be in control of the pace of developments; Finland: A rapid taking into use of equipment has given rise to problems; France (National Assembly): Extension of the central system; United Kingdom (House of Commons): Biggest problem: the "dinosaur effect"; also

the control of the economy implying that the public authorities cannot afford to go wrong; Holland: Problems of compatibility and to make sure that the process of introducing EDP is not too fast; Israel: To ensure an extension of the system without problems and at the same time to ensure impartial decisions; Norway: The introduction of searching in external data bases has given rise to more problems than expected; Portugal: Problems with providing an EDP staff; Spain: Introduction of new working procedures, economic control and procurement of software to meet the demands; Sweden: To keep down the pace of developments; Tunisia: The equipment; USA: Use of various kinds of hardware and software as well as being able to provide MPs with EDP via a central channel; European Parliament: Standardization of documents which are consequently being dealt with centrally, problems with adapting themselves to EDP for persons in higher ranking positions, problems with economic control, because the spans of time between the occurrence of needs and the allocation of funds on one hand and the requiring of personal assistance on the other hand are too large.

QUESTION 13

In your opinion, what benefits have been achieved? And to what extent do they correspond to what has been expected or the calculations made? We are thinking of e.g.:

— *Service level where Members are concerned,*
— *A speeding up of the printing process of parliamentary publications,*
— *Staff resources,*
— *Economy.*

Avantages
Higher level of service

Belgium (Chamber of Representatives): Higher level of information; Cameroon; Canada; Denmark; Federal Republic of Germany (Bundesrat and Bundestag); Finland; France (National Assembly); Greece; Holland: Processing of text and searching of information and calling of meetings improved; Israel; Italy; Japan (both Chambers); Norway; Philippines, Portugal; Spain; Sweden; Tunisia; United Kingdom (both Houses); USA; European Parliament.

Faster delivery of printed matter

France (Senate): Halving of production time; France (National Assembly); Holland: Hansard; Iceland; Israel: Reduced from 18 months to 3 weeks; Italy (Senate): To a certain extent; Japan (House of Councillors); Norway;

Philippines: Spain; Sweden;; United Kingdom (House of Lords); European Parliament: Also a reduction in the amount of "printed matter" which the Administration has to produce; Western European Union.

Reduction of staff

Canada: Reduction which is outweighed by employment of staff in connection with new tasks (training, keeping up of knowledge etc.); Holland: Secretaries to MPs/officials are no longer required to the same extent; Philippines: Less staff required and less overtime work.

Economic savings

Belgium (Chamber of Representatives): Smaller printing expenses. Incomes are expected as users from outside Parliament come to use the system. But the higher level of service acquired must be paid for. Finland: Savings more than outweighed by EDP expenses; France (National Assembly): Yes, as far as printed matter is concerned; Holland: Cheaper to print the proceedings; Norway: Cheaper printing bills; Philippines: No savings yet. To be expected on a longer view; Sweden: Cheaper to print matters; United Kingdom (House of Lords): Cheaper to print matters; European Parliament: EDP has generally led to savings.

QUESTION 14

Has your Chamber had any bilateral contacts with other Parliaments on information *technology matters (please give details).*

Yes:

Austria: Contacts at' civil servant level in various international bodies; Belgium (Chamber of Representatives): Contacts via CERDP and especially with Holland, Switzerland, Italy and France and her Senate as far as the filing of pictures is concerned; Belgium (Senate): Holland and Luxemburg; Denmark: The other Nordic countries, Holland, United Kingdom and CERDP; Federal Republic of Germany (Bundesrat): Bundestag, the constituent states legislatures and CERDP; Federal Republic of Germany (Bundestag): The states legislatures, European Parliament and other countries; Finland: The other Nordic countries; France (Senate): French National Assembly, Federal Republic of Germany and Belgian Senate; France (National Assembly): CERDP; Holland: Belgium, Federal Republic of Germany and Italy; Iceland: The other Nordic countries; Israel: France, Italy, Luxemburg, Belgium, Australia; Japan: Some bilateral contacts; Kenya: Commonwealth Hainsard Editors' Conference; Malta: United

Kingdom, Italy and Canada; Norway: The other Nordic countries; Portugal: European Parliament (regarding access to bases); Spain: Contacts via CERDP; Sweden: The other Nordic countries; United Kingdom (House of Commons): USA and Canada; European Parliament: CERDP and bilateral contacts especially with the Federal Republic of Germany, Spain and France.

No

Cameroon; Canada (House of Commons), which has had a number of visitors; Greece (considering using CERDP); Italy; Tunisia; Western European Union.

QUESTION 15

Please list any publications on the use of information technology in your Chamber.

User's information

Cameroon; Denmark; Finland; France (Senate): Brochure; France (National Assembly): Manuals; United Kingdom (House of Commons): Leaflet for MPs; Italy (Senate): A number of user's guides; Spain: Comprehensive information material for users; European Parliament: Various kinds of user's information.

None

Belgium (Senate); Iceland; Japan (both Chambers); Tunisia.

Other publications which also, to a certain extent, serve as information to the public

Belgium (Chamber of Representatives): Report by colleague at the Cipal Institute; Belgium (Chamber of Representatives): IBM Information No. 118; Canada (House of Commons): 6 reports mentioned; Denmark: EDP information letter to all persons in Parliament including the press, 4 numbers issued; Federal Republic of Germany (Bundesrat): Treated in various reports; Federal Republic of Germany (Bundestag): Various publications; Finland: Report elaborated by Digital; France (Senate): Report; United Kingdom (House of Commons): Report on MPs' need for EDP; Holland: Various publications; Israel: Study made by the ICA (Int. Council for Inf. Technology in Government Administration).

QUESTION 15

The complete answer from some countries:

Belgium (Chamber of Representatives): Overheidsinformatica in België, PHILIPS Arthur, CIPAL Institute ISBN-90-72505-02-6, IBM-Information, No. 118, April-June 1986.

Canada:

Related publications:
COMNET: A Broadband Voice, Video and Data Network for the Canadian House of Commons.
Part One: The Requirements
Juris Mazutis and James Phillips.
Part Two: The Design
Ronald A. Creamer and Joseph G. Aucoin
Part Three: The Impact
Robert J. Desramaux

Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Computer Communications, Sydney, Australia, October 30-November 2, 1984
pp 364-379
North-Holland Publishings
Amsterdam/New York

"Ottawa Builds Local Net"
Hans P. Hogers
Canadian Datasystems
August 1984
Pg32
MacLean Hunter Ltd.
Toronto, Ontario

"Power Politics"
Gerry Blackwell
Office Management & Automation
Volume 3, Number 10
pp 14-16
Plessman Publications Ltd.
Willowdale, Ontario

"Le r6seau OASIS"
Parlements et Francophonie
Revue de l'Association internationale des parlementaires de langue franchise

2e trimestre 1987
pp 74-77
Paris, France

"The Canadian Parliament's Automated Information Systems — An Update"
RJ. Desramaux and Mary Anne Griffith
The Parliamentarian
Journal of the Parliaments of the Commonwealth
April 1988, LXIX No. 2
pp 87-90
Commonwealth Parliamentary Association
London, UK

Finland:

The publications on the use of information technology in the Parliament of Finland include:

The Final Report on the Overall Preliminary Analysis of Data Processing in Support of Legislative Work;

The Final Report on the Overall Pre-analysis of Data Processing in the Administrative Department;

The corresponding reports on the overall pre-analysis of data processing in special administrative units;

Descriptions, user manuals, and training materials (partly in the Swedish language) pertaining to the use of the information system;

Information system for Legislative Work — Development Phase of Data Processing in the Finnish Parliament, a paper (in English) presented at the Digital European OIS Forum, May 31, 1989.

France (Senate):

Publications concernant l'usage de l'informatique au Se"nat:

"L'information du Parlement français" — Documentation française J.F. LE MEN.

Brochure relative à l'informatique documentaire au Sénat, éditée par le Service des I.D.P.I.

France (National Assembly):

Le manuel d'interrogation des bases de l'Assemblée nationale;

Le manuel d'utilisation du réseau télématique de l'Assemble'e nationale.

Holland:

Publications about the use of information technology:

— PCWorld (1987) 6, 99-10(5
— De Juridische Bibliothecaris 6 (1985), 11-12
— Open 15 (1983) 5, 232-239
— Informatie 25 (1983) 4, 13-19

Italy (Senate):

Manuels pour la consultation de bases de données:

Système d'information du Sénat

Procédure "Informations sur les sénateurs et les organes du Sénat" (février 1987)	MACASP 01
Informations générates pour l'accès aux services de documentation parlementaire — réseau Chambre-Sénat (février 1987)	
Manuel pour l'usage des procédures "Informations sur les Sénateurs et les organes du Sénat" et "Informations sur les Gouvernements" (février 1988)	MACASP 02
Manuel pour l'usage de la procedure "Etat projets de loi" (février 1988)	MACDLN 02
Manuel pour la liaison avec des Bases de données externes sur réseau ITAPAC (avril 1988)	MACSTX 01
Archives "Actes" — Manuel pour la recherche STAIRS-CMS (juillet 1988)	MACATT 01
Manuel pour la liaison avec des Bases de données externes sur réseaux ITAPAC (Janvier]989)	MACSTX 02
Manuel pour l'usage de la procédure "Informations sur l'activité non législative au Sénat" (Janvier 1989)	MACATS 01

United Kingdom (House of Commons):

Leaflet: Information Technology at Westminster, Notes for Peers and Members. Richard Morgan (Computer Officer), July 1988.

1st Report from the House of Commons (Services) Committee 1984-85: Information Technology: Members' requirements. HMSO House of Commons Paper 97-1 and 97-11 of Session 1984-85.

Federal Republic of Germany (Bundestag):

Publications:
— study on the PARLAKOM project
— report on the results of the PARLAKOM pilot project
— several internal publications on the conceptual development of the projects.