

UNION INTERPARLEMENTAIRE



INTER-PARLIAMENTARY UNION

ASSOCIATION DES SECRÉTAIRES GÉNÉRAUX DES PARLEMENTS
ASSOCIATION OF SECRETARIES GENERAL OF PARLIAMENTS

FINAL REPORT

of

Mr Ian HARRIS
Clerk of the House of Representatives of Australia

on

PROMOTING THE WORK OF PARLIAMENT

Santiago Session
April 2003

Genève : ASGP c/o Union Interparlementaire – Place du Petit-Saconnex – case postale 438 – 1211 Genève 19 – SUISSE
London (Londres) : ASGP Joint Secretary – House of Commons – London SW1A 0AA – UNITED KINGDOM
Paris : Co-Secrétaire de l'ASGP – Assemblée Nationale – 126, rue de l'Université 75355 Paris SP 07 – FRANCE

The A.S.G.P. is a consultative body of the Inter-Parliamentary Union and first met in Oslo (Norway) on 16 August 1935.
L'A.S.G.P. est un organisme consultatif de l'Union Interparlementaire et s'est réunie pour la première fois le 16 août 1935 à Oslo (Norvège)

PROMOTING THE WORK OF PARLIAMENT

Report by Mr Ian HARRIS, Clerk of the House of Representatives of Australia

Introduction

A review of how the public is provided information about the operation and work of Parliament was launched at the Conference of the *Association of Secretaries General of Parliaments* which was held in autumn 2000 in Jakarta.

Facing the challenge of generally unfavourable perception of parliamentarians, the aim of this survey was to elicit information on the way in which the public receives information about the Parliament as a whole. The objective was thus to enhance the perception of Parliament and its committee system, and the focus of the following survey was on the way in which the public accesses parliamentary information as distinct from information that is of a political nature.

It was therefore decided to devise a questionnaire designed to reveal, beyond the diversity of parliamentary institutions, the common difficulties likely to exist in this area of public communication.

At the outset, a draft version of the questionnaire was discussed in April 2001, at our meeting in Havana. The discussion at that meeting led to a number of improvements in the draft version and a revised questionnaire was then distributed to all Secretaries General in October 2001. At our following meeting in Marrakech, in March 2002, we discussed further the matter of *Promoting the work of Parliament* and the revised questionnaire on that topic. The responses to the questionnaire were distributed together with six additional questions that had been suggested during that meeting. A summary of the first additional questions was later presented in Geneva in September 2002.

Overall the questionnaires covered six main subjects, namely, the responsibility for public information; the provision of public information about the operation and work of Parliament; the relation with the media along with the public awareness of committee activities; the direct delivery of parliamentary proceedings by radio, television and the electronic means of communication; the educational services, promotional mechanisms and involvement of parliamentarians; and lastly, the evaluation of information programs. Overall, 48 countries responded to the questionnaires, which equates, after taking bicameral systems into account, to a total of 62 responses.

This report presents an overview of all responses to questions on promoting the work of Parliament. It presents a summary of the main lessons to be drawn from the responses given on the relevant topics, which form the object of a detailed analysis in synoptic tables.

1. Responsibility for public information

a) Autonomy and specificity of public information offices

Analysis of the responses returned reveals that the great majority of, if not all, assemblies, have a public information or public affairs office responsible for the formulation, implementation and management of public relations programs that are designed to strengthen the image of Parliament. As a general rule, these offices are engaged in a very wide range of activities: from media liaison and support, to answering questions from the general public; from publishing information brochures, audio-visual

material and web site publishing, to supporting educational seminars and guided tours; and from receiving public petitions, to preparing daily or sessional reports of activities.

Reading the synoptic tables attached to this report shows that 87% of those Parliaments that responded have a public information or public affairs office, with the vast majority of these offices (88%) being distinct units within the parliamentary administration. However, the staffing arrangements of these units vary considerably, some having small offices of between 1 and 4 staff (25% of them) and some having large offices of more than 20 staff (25% as well). The most common public information office size is between 5 and 9 staff (which 31% of Parliaments report).

b) The duality of public information offices in bicameral Parliaments

Most bicameral Parliaments operate public information offices, with only 10% responding that such units are part of a single parliamentary administration. A very large proportion of those Parliaments without a separate public information office nevertheless provide a wide range of public information services. In these instances, the services are provided by units with other, broader responsibilities (6% of those that have a shared unit being accountable to both administrations).

With regard to that general observation it is interesting to note, however, that so many bicameral Parliaments have chosen to establish separate public information offices. Indeed, as a logical consequence, 90% of those bicameral Parliaments that responded have separate public information units for each house. It does suggest a widely held view that there is value in co-locating such activities and allowing staff to focussing on this set of responsibilities alone. However, the particular case of the UK Parliament should be noted. There are indeed separate information offices but combined arrangements for education and broadcasting. This unit is managed by the House of Commons on behalf of both Houses.

2. Providing public information about Parliament

a) Providing information to the public

Almost all Parliaments provide information services for visitors, including information brochures, guided tours and, in some Parliaments, multi-media information displays. 77% produce a wide range of information, with 88% of those that produce publications reporting that they use in-house production. There is also a tendency not to charge for any publication (59%), with only 30% charging for all or some of them.

Similarly, a very large majority of Parliaments (88% of responses) provide information on their rules of procedure, with 12% reporting that activities of this kind are subject to administrative limits. The majority of Parliaments (50%) report that public information is subject to freedom of information legislation, with only half indicating that such of legislation, or its absence, has had any impact on promoting the work of Parliament.

However, although public information offices are responsible for informing the general public about the operation and work of the legislature, half of Parliaments (53% of those that responded) do not provide information on the work of individual parliamentarians. Moreover, 8% of those that responded favourably report that such information is only provided if a member is representing Parliament.

An even greater proportion of Parliaments (76% of respondents) do not provide information on political parties. If information on political affiliation of every parliamentary member is generally provided, agenda, views on particular matters and any other vital detailed information on political programs are provided by each political party. It should also be noted that of all responses received only 30% of respondents do not provide information on the remuneration of members. However, 43% of those Parliaments that responded positively report that such information is only available upon request.

b) Communicating with the public

Public information offices are directly responsible for informing the public about the operation and work of Parliament as a whole. They are also responsible for engaging civil society in law making processes of the legislature. Analysis of the responses reveals that a great majority of respondents (76%) conduct seminars or information sessions to publicise the work of Parliament, the topics for which vary widely, from seminars on basic parliamentary procedures to major exhibitions on the history of Parliament.

The issue of the exhibitions that are not strictly related to the work of Parliament was subsequently raised and the analysis of additional findings shows that the same proportion do arrange exhibitions, either directly (70%) or not directly related to Parliaments (75%). These include artworks, photographic displays or musical evenings or any other activities designed to depict the Parliament as a good corporate citizen. This is the case, for example, in Estonia where free concerts are organised on festive days, and where various works of art like paintings, drawings, etchings, engravings, pieces of jewellery have been shown in the Riigikogu building. In France, the Senate sponsors successful art exhibitions, and for example, an exhibit on volcano. The Dutch Parliament has an arrangement with the art museum. In Germany, the Bundestag supports two kinds of exhibitions: firstly, art exhibitions selected by the Art Council and the Curator of the Art Collection, and secondly, exhibitions on political and parliamentary issues or topics of importance to politics at the federal level. In the same vein, the Belgian Chamber organised an exhibition on Belgium's efforts in the matter of cooperation and development, along with other exhibitions tending to represent Parliament as an institution willing to assume its social responsibility. Exhibitions can also be a special occasion to celebrate inter-parliamentary relationships. For instance, the Romanian Chamber of Deputies organised, in cooperation with the French National Assembly, the "150 years of French-Romanian Parliamentary Relations" along with the "Convergences in the history of the Romanian-French relations".

There is little doubt that overall most Parliaments recognise the value of conducting seminars and exhibitions. However, most public information offices have been even quicker to recognise the value of establishing and maintaining parliamentary web sites. For almost all countries, especially those with a large landmass and geographically dispersed population centres, the Internet has become an important adjunct to more traditional means of communication. The technology of digital broadcasting, cable satellite television, along with the development of broadband connections promise exciting new opportunities for interactivity and feedback. However, if the value of communicating with the public is becoming a major issue, there are still a lot of problems associated with the very notion of 'interactivity' - as different from e-mail communication.

3. Media relations and publicising committees

a) Use of the media to publicise the work of Parliament

The obvious result in this area is that nearly all Parliaments (94%) use the media to publicise the work of Parliament. As a general rule, most Parliaments (91%) use what may be called conventional means of communication (advertisements, press releases, daily publications and briefings). Some others mention Internet services (36%), publication of magazines (9%), dedicated cable television services (7%), and publication of parliamentary business programs on the teletext service of a national broadcaster (3%).

Similarly, nearly all Parliaments (82% of those that responded favourably) mention that parliamentary staff, some of whom have media qualifications, are responsible for media relations. Yet, only 12% of respondents mention having made an attempt to define State of the Art public relations activities. For instance, the House of Councillors in the National Diet of Japan has made a general plan to extend public relations activities in accordance with a policy promoting the work of Parliament. However, no such definition has actually been made, State of the Art public relations activities being implemented

(CD-ROM, DVD, Internet, WAP etc.) but not necessarily defined. In a like manner, a large majority of Parliaments (76%) report having issued accreditation for journalists who cover Parliament. For instance, the Parliament of the Republic of South Africa first level accreditation is granted to permanent members of the parliamentary press gallery, while second level accreditation is granted to visiting journalists and groups monitoring Parliament. Yet, only half of them (38% of respondents) have clearly identified a media spokesperson or liaison officer to publicise the work of Parliament.

b) Use of the media to publicise committee activities

Only a small minority of responses received (19%) indicate that public information offices employ a public relations officer specialising in committee activities, although 12% of these respondents report that committees have the capacity to employ media consultants. Quite often, Chairpersons can make public statements, with the agreement of the committee, to inform the public of committee process on a matter. Yet, as committees may not have their own budgets, a single Select Committee Office handles advertising for submissions in the major daily newspapers on items before committee. Overall, such a Committee Office would inform the public about the work of committees by relying on publications including press releases (65%), followed by the Internet (50%), public access to committee reports (29%), advertisements (16%), live radio and television broadcasts (9%) and teletext on the national broadcaster (6%).

4. Use of new technology to promote the work of Parliament

a) Direct delivery of proceedings to the public via the media

Nearly all respondents report that summaries of major parliamentary events are broadcast regularly, often at the discretion of the media. Arrangements vary greatly. For instance, Zimbabwe Broadcasting Corporation covers the proceedings of Parliament without seeking special clearance from Parliament, while in Thailand it is with permission of the President that proceedings of the Senate are deliverable via radio and television. However, it is also a common view that the media tend to reduce and draw out the most salient points that hopefully arrive at snapshots that capture the essence of proceedings. This is one of the reasons why the full version of parliamentary events is regarded by many Parliaments as supplementing and complementing reports on the work of the legislature.

While a majority of respondents mention that parliamentary proceedings are broadcast on radio or television, there is a split between those countries in which the media is compelled to broadcast proceedings (34%) and those countries with radio and television stations dedicated to the broadcast of proceedings (51%). The range of experience is exemplified by the fact that in some countries the national broadcaster covers proceedings (either in full or in part); in some countries proceedings are (or at least were) available on privately operated cable or satellite services; and in others, the Parliament itself operates its own broadcasting services.

b) Direct communication via the Internet - delivering our own message

An overwhelming majority of respondents (92%) operate a web site, with 82% of those that responded favourably reporting that such web sites were managed and developed by parliamentary staff using parliamentary resources. Only a small minority of responses received state that parliamentary resources are supplemented by executive funding. As a logical consequence, 61% of respondents communicate directly with the public, providing access to a comprehensive range of information, including, in some instances, searchable databases and multilingual sites. The National Council of the Republic of Slovenia, for instance, has its own homepage in Slovenian, English and French languages. The Secretary General is responsible for its management, while its contents and form are the responsibility of the National Council employees.

In addition, a surprising 70% of Parliaments report that they 'deliver proceedings via the Internet'. However, it should be stressed that such a figure is somewhat inflated. Indeed, both transcripts of proceedings and report 'live' webcast of proceedings are included under the same heading. Nonetheless, most Parliaments have made a deliberate decision to use the electronic means of communication as a medium to disseminate information to the public. It is very clear indeed from the responses received that many Parliaments are actively exploring the potential of interactivity while attempting to make the web site more useful in terms of the information that is supplied.

There have also been suggestions that the mass media are very jealous of their role in informing the public about activities in Parliament. However, judging by the majority of responses received, there has been little or no tension at all between Parliaments and the media. The case is quite the opposite, with a number of respondents indicating that the media greatly values the information services provided by Parliaments. Only 8% report that parliamentary publicity work has led to tension with the media, although the information services provided are now highly valued by information agencies. 66% of those that responded having no tension with the media, which 90% of Parliaments report, mention the establishment of parliamentary web sites and web broadcasting as key measures used to get their message across.

However, only a very small minority report having been able to introduce Internet based opinion polls as a direct tool of communication, with 11% of respondents providing some sort of interactive computer based public communication services. If it is clear that parliamentary web sites now play a central role in the 'distribution of information' about the work of Parliament, the extent to which these assemblies 'communicate directly' via the Internet is influenced very directly by the resources available to support such new activities. Impact of limited resources is particularly evident in the provision of computer-based communication services, and a number of Parliaments clearly admit that if more resources were available, more extensive (and experimental) use would be made of interactive communication services.

5. Education, promotion and participation

a) Parliamentary education

A great majority of Parliaments (73%) provide educational services for their people (ranging from tours and subsidised school visits, to teacher training, curriculum kits, publication of games and comics). 17% of those that do not currently provide such services have plans to do so within the next twelve months. As a general rule, parliamentary education depends on budgeted allocations for financial support, in some cases, supplemented by sales at parliamentary shops. In some other cases, it may depend on foreign aid. For instance, in 1999, as part of a United Nations Development Project and assistance of the Australian Federal Parliament, the Parliament of Fiji Islands had prepared pamphlets and brochures about the process and work of Parliament, in addition to guided tours and talks on school visits. This led to the inclusion of the subject of "Parliament" as part of the curriculum for primary school.

b) Other promotional mechanisms

The range of other promotional activities undertaken by Parliaments includes open days, participation in community and trade fairs, touring exhibitions on the work of the legislature, and regional sittings of Parliament. It can be noted that 68% of respondents undertake promotional activities ranging from press briefings, distribution of videos to schools and community groups, public information telephone and e-mail services to public access to sittings, theme days and national day celebrations. In Macedonia, for instance, the Parliament organises commemorations in order to celebrate important events from the history of the Republic, emphasising the importance of the legislative institution in the adoption of certain crucial decisions for the country.

c) Involving parliamentarians

A majority of respondents (69%) report that they regularly involve parliamentarians in their promotional activities. These include, press briefings on matters before Parliament, participation in seminars, open days, educational events and touring information stands at fairs. Only 29% of respondents report that they are not currently involving parliamentarians in their promotional activities.

6. Evaluating information programs

a) Monitoring publicity given to the Parliament

The majority of Parliaments are yet to design a real evaluation system to gauge if their initiatives are genuinely working. Indeed, 42% of respondents report that they monitor the publicity they receive from the public, with nearly half of them (45% of affirmative responses) mentioning that daily press coverage is collated and distributed to members of Parliament. For instance, in the Swedish Parliament, the Office of the Speaker has its own monitoring arrangement with a company that monitors everything written in the national press, plus radio and television programs, on the basis of certain specific search terms. The methods of evaluation used include questionnaires, interviewing visitors, electronic survey, on-line focus groups and hiring of consultants.

An even smaller proportion (14% of those that responded favourably) report that there has been an evaluation of the extent to which there is an impact on the esteem in which the Parliament is held. In these instances, the poor attendance of members in the sittings of plenary assemblies is often considered by the public to be deficient, while the representation of parliamentarians in international organisations is generally regarded as positive. For the majority of respondents, Parliament's public esteem is still best reflected through the media. Yet, only 29% of Parliaments have actually been able to evaluate whether the effect of increasing visibility has made their institution more relevant to the public.

b) Undertaking evaluation of the information services provided to the public

Among this small minority of responses stating the existence of systematic evaluation, 14% of Parliaments report that there is little awareness of the information that is available to the public. 10% also mention that a parliamentary radio and television broadcast network will be established to overcome communication concerns. There is also a considerable body of anecdotal evidence suggesting that modern media coverage tends to favour short messages with points of view lacking of nuance – or in some cases, that the reporting by media concentrates far too much on the combative nature of parliamentary proceedings. In some cases, Parliament's visibility has grown but the image has not been modified as such. Overall, the majority of responses mention that electronic means of communication provide a new base line for access to information about public affairs. Indeed, 57% of respondents report that there has been an indication that increased media exposure has modernised, or otherwise affected, Parliament and its operation. It is also a common view that televising proceedings has affected the public perception and this, in turn, affects the way Members behave when they know they are on television. Similarly, direct means of communication via the Internet are reported to act positively on the public perception of Parliament.

With regard to that final observation concerning the widening of the public space, it seems necessary to attach great importance to the very accessibility of the information that is provided to the public. Indeed, it is now widely recognised that the official record of proceedings has long consisted of documents that were produced and hardly read by anyone. The thinking behind this was based on the general assumption that everyone is literate and at ease with written texts. Another crucial concern was that parliamentary activities were frequently technical and, therefore, too difficult for members of the general public. Interestingly enough, 26% of those respondents who undertook an evaluation of their own information services report that published information must not be too

theoretical and must avoid making use of parliamentary jargon. The assumption is that taking the Parliament to the people requires the establishment of public information offices capable of interacting mutually with the community. There is, therefore, a need to feature more modern 'look & feel' web sites that attract a wider range of non-specialist users, thus increasing the consumption of unmediated information about the work of Parliament. This, in my view, would greatly enhance the way in which the population views the political process and its major participants.

DETAILED ANALYSIS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRES RESPONSES

**DETAILED ANALYSIS OF THE ANSWERS SENT BY THE MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION OF SECRETARIE GENERAL OF PARLIAMENTS
TALLY OF QUESTIONNAIRES RESPONSES**

RESPONSIBILITY FOR PUBLIC INFORMATION		
<p>1. Do you have a public information or public affairs office?</p> <p>▪ Tasks</p> <p>▪ Structure</p> <p>▪ Staffing</p>	<p>YES</p> <p>87% of responses: Australia - HR, Austria, Belarus, Belgium - HR & SE, Brazil, Canada - HC & SE, Croatia, Czech Republic - HR & SE, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany - Bsrat & Bstag, Hungary, Iceland, India - LS & RS, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy - HR & SE, Japan - HC, Korea, Macedonia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines - HR & SE, Poland, Portugal, Romania - CD & SE, Russia, Rwanda, Slovenia - NA & NC, Spain - CD & SE, Sweden, Thailand - HR & SE, Togo, United Kingdom - HL, Yugoslavia, Zambia, South Africa, Zimbabwe</p> <p>Publication of daily or sessional reports of activities & events; media liaison & press briefings; provision of media advice to committees; provision of non-partisan information to the public; support for educational seminars & guided tours; publication of information brochures and audio-visual materials; coordination of exhibitions; receipt of public petitions</p> <p>A distinct part of the parliamentary administration (88% of those that responded YES); part of a separate parliamentary institution (8% of those that responded YES responses)</p> <p>1-4 staff members (25% of those that responded YES); 5-9 staff (31% of those that responded YES); 10-20 staff (19% of those that responded YES) more than 20 staff (25% of those that responded YES). 59 % of those that responded YES report that staff of the office are parliamentary officers. 47% of those that responded YES report that staff have media qualifications</p>	<p>NO</p> <p>13% of responses</p> <p>76% of those that responded NO report that public information is provided by a unit with broad responsibilities</p> <p>7% of those that responded NO report that public information is provided by the Secretary General and on the Parliament's web site</p>

<p>2. If you have a bicameral Parliament, are there separate public information or public affairs areas for each House?</p>	<p>SEPARATE UNITS FOR EACH HOUSE</p> <p>90% of responses (from bicameral legislatures only): Australia - HR & SE, Belarus - NA, Belgium - HR & SE, Brazil - SE, Canada - HC & SE, Czech Republic - HR & SE, France - NA, Germany - Bsrat, India - LS & RS, Ireland, Italy - CD & SE, Netherlands - HR, Pakistan - SE, Philippines - HR & SE, Poland - Sejm, Romania - CD & SE, Russia - FA, Slovenia - NA & NC, Spain - CD & SE, Thailand - HR & SE, United Kingdom - HC & HL</p>	<p>SHARED UNIT</p> <p>10% of responses (part of a single parliamentary administration)</p> <p>6% of responses (accountable to both administrations)</p>
<p>PROVIDING PUBLIC INFORMATION</p>		
<p>3. Is information provided on the work of individual parliamentarians?</p>	<p>YES</p> <p>45% of responses: Belarus, Belgium - HR, Brazil, Canada - HC & SE, Croatia, Cyprus, Estonia, Germany - Bstag, Hungary, Italy - SE, Macedonia, Pakistan, Philippines - HR & SE, Portugal, Romania - CD & SE, Russia, Rwanda, Slovenia - NA, Spain - SE, Thailand - SE, United Kingdom - HC & HL, Yugoslavia, South Africa, Zimbabwe</p> <p>8% of those that responded YES report that such information is only provided if an MP is representing Parliament</p> <p>38% of those that responded YES report that information is available about MP's legislative or parliamentary activities only</p>	<p>NO</p> <p>53% of responses (never or not generally)</p> <p>3% of those that responded NO report that the parliamentary web site contains a link to MP's home pages</p>

<p>4. Is information provided on the remuneration of members?</p>	<p>YES</p> <p>70% of responses: Belarus, Belgium - HR & SE, Brazil, Canada - HC & SE, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech - HR & SE, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany - Bstag, Iceland, India - LS & RS, Ireland, Israel, Italy - CD, Japan - HC, Korea, Macedonia, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines - HR, Poland, Portugal, Romania - CD & SE, Slovenia - NA & NC, Spain - CD & SE, Sweden, Thailand - HR & SE, Togo, Yugoslavia, South of Africa, Zimbabwe</p> <p>43% of those that responded YES report that such information is available upon request</p> <p>10% of those that responded YES report that such information is available on the parliamentary web site</p>	<p>NO</p> <p>30% of responses</p> <p>45% of those that responded NO note that the material is publicly available from other sources</p>
<p>5. Are the interests of members of Parliament defined and monitored?</p>	<p>YES</p> <p>19% of responses: Australia - HR, Belgium - HR, Canada - HC & SE, Ireland, Israel, Korea, Philippines - HR, Spain - SE, Sweden, South Africa, Zimbabwe</p> <p>50% of those that responded YES report that MPs rights and duties are defined in law and subject to examination by a parliamentary ethics Committee</p>	<p>NO</p> <p>71% of responses</p> <p>7% of those that responded NO report that MP are expected to register their interests and declare them when any related matter is being debated</p> <p>9% of those that responded NO report that a Code of Conduct prohibits the misuse of confidential information</p>

<p>6. Is information provided on political parties?</p>	<p>YES</p> <p>24% of responses (through Library and/or Internet links): Belgium - HR, Benin, Canada - HC, Czech Republic - SE, Fiji, India - LS, Italy - CD & SE, Norway, Philippines - SE, Portugal, Sri Lanka, Thailand - HR, Yugoslavia, South Africa</p>	<p>NO</p> <p>76% of responses</p> <p>20% of those that responded NO report that, other than advising of party affiliations, such information is not generally available</p>
<p>7. Is information provided on your rules of procedure or standing orders?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information and administrative limits • Impact of public information legislation 	<p>YES</p> <p>88% of responses: Australia - HR & SE, Austria, Belarus, Belgium - HR & SE, Benin, Brazil, Canada - HC & SE, Cyprus, Czech Republic - HR & SE, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India - LS & RS, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy - HR & SE, Japan - HC, Korea, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines - HR, Poland, Portugal, Romania - HR & SE, Russia, Rwanda, Slovenia - NC, Spain - HR & SE, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Thailand - HR & SE, Togo, United Kingdom - HC & HL, Yugoslavia, Zambia, South Africa, Zimbabwe</p> <p>12% of those that responded report that activities of this kind are subject to administration limits</p> <p>50% of those that responded report that public information is subject to freedom of information legislation. However, only half (25%) report that freedom of information legislation (or its absence) has had any impact on promoting the work of parliament</p>	<p>NO</p> <p>10% of responses</p>

<p>8. Is information provided on your Parliament's international operations, and on other parliaments of the world?</p>	<p>YES</p> <p>72% of responses (information about other parliaments is available, most often by Internet link): Austria, Belarus, Belgium - HR & SE, Benin, Brazil, Canada - HC & SE, Cyprus, Czech Republic - SE, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany - Bsrat, Greece, Iceland, India - LS, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy - SE, Japan - HC, Luxembourg, Macedonia, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines - HR, Poland, Portugal, Romania - CD & SE, Russia, Rwanda, Slovenia - NA & NC, Spain - CD & SE, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Thailand - HR & SE, Togo, Yugoslavia, Zambia, South Africa</p> <p>43% of those that responded YES report that information is available about all parliaments</p> <p>17% of those that responded YES report that information is not available about other parliaments</p> <p>9% of those that responded YES report that information is available upon request</p>	<p>NO</p> <p>26% of responses (never or not generally)</p>
<p>9. Are special steps taken to provide information to remote areas?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What steps? 	<p>YES</p> <p>52% of responses: Australia - HR, Austria, Brazil, Canada - HC & SE, Czech Republic - HR & SE, Finland, France, Germany - Bsrat & Bstag, Greece, Iceland, India - LS & RS, Indonesia, Israel, Japan HC & HR, Philippines - HR & SE, Romania - CD & SE, Russia, Rwanda, Slovenia - NC, Sweden, Thailand - HR & SE, Zambia, South Africa, Zimbabwe</p> <p>Internet web site; distribution of publications, including to provincial libraries; toll free telephone information service; broadcast of proceedings (via, radio, TV or the Internet)</p>	<p>NO</p> <p>39% of responses</p> <p>10% of those that responded NO report that financial constraints limit such measures</p> <p>19% of those that responded NO report that web sites make such information widely available</p>

10. What types of publications are produced?	WIDE RANGE	SELECT RANGE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Publication 	<p>77% of responses: Australia - HR & SE, Austria, Belgium - HR & SE, Brazil, Canada - HC & SE, Czech Republic - HR & SE, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany - Bsrat & Bstag, Greece, India - LS & RS, Ireland, Israel, Italy - CD & SE, Japan HC & HR, Korea, Luxembourg, Macedonia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines - HR & SE, Poland, Portugal, Romania - CD & SE, Russia, Slovenia - NA & NC, Spain - SE, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Thailand - HR & SE, United Kingdom - HC & HL, South Africa, Zimbabwe</p> <p>88% of those who produce publications use in-house production; 43% of those who produce publications mentioned publication on the Internet; 17% of those who produce publications mentioned use of audio-visual displays</p>	<p>23% of responses</p> <p>38% of those that responded NO report that publication activities have been significantly reduced as a result of financial difficulties</p> <p>NO PUBLICATIONS</p> <p>2% of responses</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Distribution 	<p>54% of those who produce publications distribute publications to a mailing list, including libraries, government agencies, non-government agencies and the media</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Charging 	<p>30% of those who produce publications charge for all or some publications; 59% of those who produce publications do not charge for any publications</p>	

<p>11. Do you conduct seminars or information sessions?</p>	<p>YES</p> <p>76% of responses: Australia - HR & SE, Austria, Belarus, Belgium - HR & SE, Brazil, Canada - HC & SE, Cyprus, Czech Republic - HR, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, Germany - Bsrat & Bstag, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India - LS & RS, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy - CD & SE, Japan - HC, Korea, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines - HR & SE, Poland, Portugal, Romania - CD & SE, Slovenia - NA & NC, Spain - CD & SE, Sweden, Thailand - HR & SE, Togo, Zambia, South Africa, Zimbabwe</p>	<p>NO</p> <p>21% of responses</p> <p>17% of those that responded NO report that information seminars are being planned for the future</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Topics and presenters 	<p>75% of those that responded YES refer to a wide range of topics (from parliamentary practices and procedures to current public policy issues) delivered by parliamentary staff (or, in some cases, by external experts)</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Audience 	<p>95% of those that responded YES refer to a wide range of targeted audiences: MPs, civil servants, school & university groups, teachers, industry groups, community groups, interested members of the public</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Location 	<p>75% of those that responded YES provide seminars in their parliament buildings; 31% also provide seminars at other locations</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Charging 	<p>9% of those that responded YES charge for seminar sessions; 71% do not charge for seminar sessions; 4% charge for some seminar sessions</p>	

12. Do you arrange exhibitions?	YES	NO
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Location ▪ Frequency ▪ Responsibility ▪ Examples • Promotion 	<p>70% of responses: Australia - HR & SE, Belarus, Belgium - HR & SE, Brazil, Canada - HC, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic - HR & SE, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany - Bsrat & Bsrat, Greece, Iceland, India - LS, Indonesia, Israel, Italy - CD & SE, Japan - HC & HR, Korea, Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, Philippines - HR & SE, Poland, Portugal, Romania - CD & SE, Slovenia - NC, Sweden, Thailand - HR & SE, Togo, United Kingdom - HC & HL, South Africa, Zimbabwe</p> <p>66% of those that responded YES provide exhibitions in their parliament buildings; 37% also provide travelling exhibitions</p> <p>46% of those that responded YES provide exhibitions regularly; 50% provide exhibitions occasionally</p> <p>64% of those that responded YES coordinate exhibitions using parliamentary staff; 12% indicate that exhibitions occasionally draw on external expertise</p> <p>The First Parliament; Women in Parliament; History of Parliament; Constitutional Development; History of Parliamentary Buildings; Democracy at Work; parliamentary proceedings & current activities, including major Bills under consideration; Politics & Caricature; Parliament & Press; Day in the Life of Parliament; Law in Pictures; biographical exhibitions; significant historical anniversaries</p> <p>75% of those that responded report that they promote or sponsor exhibitions that are not directly related to parliament</p>	<p>30% of responses</p> <p>6% of those that responded NO report that financial constraints limit such measures</p> <p>6% of those that responded NO report that a parliamentary museum is being established</p>

<p>13. What information services are available for visitors?</p>	<p>WHAT SERVICES ARE AVAILABLE?</p> <p>Brochures, booklets, bulletins, posters, guided tours & information sessions, video and audio information, multimedia CDs, web kiosks, public access to Parliament, parliamentary libraries and parliamentary museums</p>	<p>NO SERVICES ARE AVAILABLE</p> <p>2% of responses</p>
<p>MEDIA RELATIONS</p>		
<p>14. Do you use the media to publicise the work of your Parliament?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How? ▪ Who is responsible? 	<p>YES</p> <p>94% of responses: Australia - HR & SE, Austria, Belarus, Belgium - HR & SE, Benin, Brazil, Canada - HC & SE, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic - HR & SE, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany - Bsrat & Bstag, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India - LS & RS, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy - CD & SE, Japan - HC, Korea, Luxembourg, Macedonia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, Philippines - HR & SE, Poland, Portugal, Romania - CD & SE, Russia, Rwanda, Slovenia - NA & NC, Spain - CD & SE, Sweden, Thailand - HR & SE, Togo, United Kingdom - HC & HL, Yugoslavia, Zambia, South Africa, Zimbabwe</p> <p>91% of those that responded YES mentioned advertisements, press releases, daily publications or briefings; 9% mentioned publication of magazines and press resumes; 36% mentioned Internet advice; 10% mentioned sessional publications; 7% mentioned dedicated cable television services; 18% mentioned provision of press rooms/media centre/other similar facilities; 3% mentioned publication of a parliamentary business program on the teletext service of the national broadcaster</p> <p>82% of those that responded YES report that parliamentary staff (some of whom have media qualifications) are responsible for media relations; 3% report that the Presiding Officer and committee Chairs also act as spokespeople</p>	<p>NO</p> <p>6% of responses</p>

<p>15. Has your publicity work led to tension with the media?</p>	<p>YES</p> <p>8% of responses (there was initial resistance, but information services are now highly valued by the media): Japan - HC, Portugal, Romania - SE, Slovenia - NC, Zambia</p>	<p>NO</p> <p>90% of responses</p> <p>5% of those that responded NO report that information is provided to enhance press coverage</p>
<p>16. Do you communicate directly with the public rather than communicating through the media?</p>	<p>YES</p> <p>61% of responses: Australia - HR & SE, Austria, Benin, Brazil, Canada - HC & SE, Croatia, Finland, France, India - LS & RS, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy - CD & SE, Japan - HC, Korea, Luxembourg, Macedonia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines - HR & SE, Poland, Portugal, Romania - CD & SE, Rwanda, Slovenia - NA & NC, Sweden, Thailand - SE, United Kingdom - HC & HL, Zambia, South Africa, Zimbabwe</p> <p>66% of those that responded YES mention the establishment of web sites and web broadcasting as key measures; 18% of those that responded YES report the introduction of direct radio & TV broadcasts by satellite or cable as a key measure; 3% of those that responded YES report the introduction of internet based opinion polls as a key measure</p>	<p>NO</p> <p>35% of responses</p> <p>4% of those that responded NO report that it is a result of using available technology</p>

PUBLICISING COMMITTEES	
19. How do parliamentary committees inform the public about their work?	<p>Advertisements (16% of responses) Direct mail (6% of responses) Publications, including press releases (65% of responses) Internet advice (50% of responses) Teletext on national broadcaster (6% of responses) Live radio & TV broadcasts (9% of responses) Public access to committee reports (29% of responses)</p>
20. Do you employ a public relations officer specialising in committee activities?	<p>YES</p> <p>19% of responses: Australia - HR, Finland, Germany - Bstag, Hungary, Indonesia, Macedonia, Pakistan, Philippines HR & SE, Russia, Rwanda, Zimbabwe</p> <p>13% of those that responded YES report that some committee do</p>
DIRECT DELIVERY OF PROCEEDINGS - RADIO AND TELEVISION	
21. Are parliamentary proceedings broadcast on radio or television?	<p>YES</p> <p>82% of responses: Australia - HR & SE, Austria, Belarus, Belgium - HR & SE, Benin, Brazil, Canada - SE, Croatia, Czech Republic - HR & SE, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany - Bstag, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India - LS & RS, Indonesia, Israel, Italy - CD & SE, Japan - HC & HR, Korea, Luxembourg, Macedonia, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines - HR & SE, Poland, Portugal, Romania - CD & SE, Russia, Rwanda, Slovenia - NA, Spain - SE, Sweden, Thailand - HR & SE, United Kingdom - HC & HL, Zambia, South Africa, Zimbabwe</p> <p>18% of responses (partly) 10% of responses (occasionally)</p>
	<p>NO</p> <p>16% of responses</p> <p>12% of those that responded NO report that committees have the capacity to employ media consultants</p>

<p>22. Are the media compelled to broadcast parliamentary proceedings?</p>	<p>YES</p> <p>34% of responses: Australia - HR & SE, Belarus, Benin, Brazil, Canada - HC & SE, Croatia, France, Hungary, Iceland, India - LS & RS, Israel, Italy - CD & SE, New Zealand, Thailand - SE, United Kingdom - HC & HL</p> <p>13% of those that responded YES report that only the broadcast of question time is compulsory</p> <p>4% of those that responded YES report that the Government may request such broadcasts</p>	<p>NO</p> <p>62% of responses</p>
<p>23. Are summaries of major parliamentary events broadcast regularly?</p>	<p>YES</p> <p>87% of responses (at the discretion of the media)</p> <p>Australia - HR & SE, Austria, Belarus, Belgium - HR, Benin, Brazil, Canada - HC & SE, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic - HR & SE, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India - LS & RS, Indonesia, Israel, Italy - CD & SE, Japan - HC & HR, Korea, Luxembourg, Macedonia, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines - HR & SE, Portugal, Romania - CD & SE, Russia, Rwanda, Slovenia - NA & NC, Spain - CD & SE, Thailand - HR & SE, Togo, United Kingdom - HC & HL, Yugoslavia, Zambia, South Africa, Zimbabwe</p>	<p>NO</p> <p>11% of responses</p>

<p>24. Are any television or radio stations dedicated to the broadcast of parliamentary proceedings?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Content ▪ Funding • Coverage • Directive 	<p>YES</p> <p>51% of responses: Brazil, Canada - HC & SE, Croatia, Czech Republic - HR & SE, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany - Bstag, Iceland, India - LS & RS, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy - CD & SE, Japan - HC & HR, Luxembourg, Pakistan, Philippines - HR & SE, Portugal, Russia, Spain - CD & SE, Thailand - HR & SE, United Kingdom - HC & HL, Zambia, South Africa</p> <p>Live proceedings, delayed replays and news highlights</p> <p>Government funding (46% of those that responded YES); private funding (23% of those that responded YES); mix of government and private funding (23% of those that responded YES)</p> <p>12% of those that responded YES report that full coverage is available on a low power transmitter service, but that highlights are replayed on the national broadcaster</p> <p>16% of those that responded YES report that radio and TV services are run by the Parliament</p>	<p>NO</p> <p>48% of responses</p> <p>7% of those that responded NO report that although there is no dedicated service, full coverage is available on the public radio broadcaster and selected coverage on the public TV broadcaster</p> <p>7% of those that responded NO report that full coverage plus commentary was available on a subscription service between 1998 and 2001, but that the service closed because of low subscription levels</p> <p>4% of those that responded NO report that parliamentary broadcast service will soon be commenced</p>
--	--	---

<p>33. What has your evaluation revealed?</p>	<p>26% of those that responded report that published information must not be too theoretical and must not use parliamentary jargon; 14% of those that responded YES report that there is little awareness of the information that is available; 12% of those that responded YES report that a poster was developed to target younger visitors; 10% of those that responded YES report that a parliamentary radio and TV broadcast network will be established to overcome communication concerns</p>	
---	--	--

NOTES:

1. Not all respondents answered all questions.
2. The percentage calculations have been rounded, so they may not tally accurately.

10 April 2003

DIRECT DELIVERY OF PROCEEDINGS - INTERNET			
<p>25. Are parliamentary proceedings delivered via the internet?</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="558 107 798 784"> <p>YES</p> <p>70% of responses (some of these report publication of transcripts of proceedings and others report 'live' webcast of proceedings): Australia - HR & SE, Austria, Brazil, Canada - HC & SE, Cyprus, Czech Republic - HR & SE, Estonia, France, Germany - Bstg, Greece, Iceland, India - LS & RS, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy - CD & SE, Japan - HC & HR, Korea, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines - HR, Poland, Portugal, Romania - CD & SE, Slovenia - NA, Spain - CD & SE, Sweden, Thailand - SE, Togo, United Kingdom - HC & HL, Yugoslavia, Zambia, South Africa, Zimbabwe</p> <p>10% of those that responded YES report that, as well as live coverage, 'video on demand' coverage of past speeches is available</p> </td> <td data-bbox="798 107 1037 784"> <p>NO</p> <p>29% of responses</p> <p>25% of those that responded NO report that such coverage is being considered, subject to funding</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p>YES</p> <p>70% of responses (some of these report publication of transcripts of proceedings and others report 'live' webcast of proceedings): Australia - HR & SE, Austria, Brazil, Canada - HC & SE, Cyprus, Czech Republic - HR & SE, Estonia, France, Germany - Bstg, Greece, Iceland, India - LS & RS, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy - CD & SE, Japan - HC & HR, Korea, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines - HR, Poland, Portugal, Romania - CD & SE, Slovenia - NA, Spain - CD & SE, Sweden, Thailand - SE, Togo, United Kingdom - HC & HL, Yugoslavia, Zambia, South Africa, Zimbabwe</p> <p>10% of those that responded YES report that, as well as live coverage, 'video on demand' coverage of past speeches is available</p>	<p>NO</p> <p>29% of responses</p> <p>25% of those that responded NO report that such coverage is being considered, subject to funding</p>
<p>YES</p> <p>70% of responses (some of these report publication of transcripts of proceedings and others report 'live' webcast of proceedings): Australia - HR & SE, Austria, Brazil, Canada - HC & SE, Cyprus, Czech Republic - HR & SE, Estonia, France, Germany - Bstg, Greece, Iceland, India - LS & RS, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy - CD & SE, Japan - HC & HR, Korea, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines - HR, Poland, Portugal, Romania - CD & SE, Slovenia - NA, Spain - CD & SE, Sweden, Thailand - SE, Togo, United Kingdom - HC & HL, Yugoslavia, Zambia, South Africa, Zimbabwe</p> <p>10% of those that responded YES report that, as well as live coverage, 'video on demand' coverage of past speeches is available</p>	<p>NO</p> <p>29% of responses</p> <p>25% of those that responded NO report that such coverage is being considered, subject to funding</p>		

<p>26. Do you operate a website?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Management and resourcing ▪ Information 	<p>YES</p> <p>92% of responses: Australia - HR & SE, Austria, Belarus, Belgium - HR & SE, Benin, Brazil, Canada - HC & SE, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic - HR & SE, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany - Bsrat & Bstag, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India - LS & RS, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy - CD & SE, Japan - HC & HR, Korea, Luxembourg, Macedonia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines - HR & SE, Poland, Portugal, Romania - CD & SE, Rwanda, Slovenia - NA & NC, Spain - CD & SE, Sweden, Thailand - HR & SE, Togo, United Kingdom - HC & HL, Zambia, South Africa, Zimbabwe</p> <p>84% of those that responded YES report that their web sites are managed & developed by parliamentary staff using parliamentary resources; 11% of these report that parliamentary resources are supplemented by Executive resources</p> <p>84% of those that responded YES report that a comprehensive range of parliamentary information is available through their web sites, including (in some instances) searchable databases</p>	<p>NO</p> <p>7% of responses (but is being considered, subject to funding)</p>
---	--	--

<p>27. Do you provide interactive computer based public communication services?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public debate • Staffing and interactive services • Number of questions • Assessment of public participation 	<p>YES</p> <p>11% of responses (providing more than e-mail communication, for instance, chat room, e-polls, electronic forums etc): Austria, Brazil, France, Germany - Bsrat & Bstag, Israel, Spain - SE</p> <p>34% of those that responded YES report that on-line conference & discussion groups are run through parliamentary web sites</p> <p>17% of those that responded YES report that 'e-polls' are run through parliamentary web sites</p> <p>33% of those that responded YES report that parliamentary staff manage the discussion groups</p> <p>17% of those that responded YES report that the number of participants is small</p>	<p>NO</p> <p>84% of responses (with most reporting that, other than e-mail communication, such services are not available)</p> <p>16% of those that responded NO report that 'chat rooms' and moderated discussion forums are under consideration</p>
---	--	---

EDUCATION, PROMOTION AND INVOLVING PARLIAMENTARIANS		
Parliamentary Education	<p>28. Do you provide educational services for young people?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What ▪ Who ▪ Where ▪ Funding 	<p>YES</p> <p>73% of responses: Australia - HR & SE, Austria, Belgium - HR & SE, Canada - HC & SE, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic - HR, Estonia, Fiji, France, Germany - Bsrat & Bstag, Greece, Iceland, India - LS & RS, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy - CD & SE, Japan HC & HR, Korea, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines - SE, Poland, Portugal, Romania - CD & SE, Slovenia - NC, Spain - CD, Sweden, Thailand - HR, Togo, United Kingdom - HC & HL, Zambia, South Africa, Zimbabwe</p> <p>Tours & subsidised school visits, teacher training, curriculum kits, youth parliaments & study centres, publications (including games & comics), youth & kids' web site components; meetings with MPs</p> <p>Parliamentary officers, Parliamentary Libraries</p> <p>At parliamentary buildings and other locations</p> <p>Through budget allocations, in some cases supplemented by sales at parliamentary shops or government funding</p>
	<p>NO</p> <p>26% of responses</p> <p>17% of those that responded NO report that a education program is likely to be established in the next 12 months</p>	

<p>Other promotional activities</p> <p>29. Do you undertake any other promotional activities?</p>	<p>YES</p> <p>68% of responses: Australia - HR & SE, Austria, Belarus, Belgium - HR & SE, Benin, Czech Republic - HR & SE, Estonia, France, Germany - Bsrat & Bstag, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy - CD & SE, Japan HC & HR, Korea, Luxembourg, Macedonia, Netherlands, Philippines - HR & SE, Poland, Portugal, Romania - CD & SE, Slovenia - NA & NC, Spain CD & SE, Sweden, Thailand - HR, Togo, United Kingdom HC & HL, South Africa, Zimbabwe</p> <p>Press briefings (including sessional briefings by Presiding Officers); public information telephone and e-mail services; public access to sittings; open days, theme days & national day celebrations; regional sittings of parliament and committees; distribution of videos to schools and community groups; participation in youth, community and trade fairs; book fairs and film screenings; touring parliamentary exhibitions</p>	<p>NO</p> <p>29% of responses (other than public access to sittings)</p>
<p>Involving parliamentarians</p> <p>30. Do you involve parliamentarians in your promotional activities?</p>	<p>YES</p> <p>69% of responses: Australia - HR & SE, Belarus Belgium - HR & SE, Canada - HC & SE, Croatia, Czech Republic - SE, Estonia, Finland, France, Iceland, India - RS, Indonesia, Italy - CD & SE, Japan - HR, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines - HR & SE, Poland, Portugal, Romania - CD & SE, Rwanda, Slovenia - NA & NC, Spain - SE, Sweden, Thailand - HR & SE, Togo, United Kingdom - HC & HL, Yugoslavia, Zambia, South Africa, Zimbabwe</p> <p>Press briefings on matters before parliament; participation in seminars, educational events; open days and touring information stands at fairs</p>	<p>NO</p> <p>29% of responses (not usually)</p>

EVALUATION

31. Do you monitor the publicity you receive?

YES

42% of responses: Belgium - HR & SE, Canada - SE, Croatia, Czech Republic - HR & SE, Estonia, Germany - Bsttag, Ireland, Italy - CD & SE, Japan - HC, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines - HR & SE, Romania - CD & SE, Slovenia - NA, Spain - SE, Sweden, Thailand - SE, United Kingdom - HC & HL, Zimbabwe

45% of those that responded YES report that daily press coverage is collated and distributed to members

14% of those that responded report that there has been an evaluation of the extent to which there is an impact on the esteem in which the parliament is held

43% of those that responded report that there has been an evaluation of the matters that are important to the general people

29% of those that responded report that there has been an evaluation of whether the effect of increasing visibility has made parliament more relevant

NO

52% of responses

3% of those that responded NO report that such a body is under consideration

20% of those that responded NO report that a Committee on Broadcasting and Parliamentary Information considers such matters

32. Do you evaluate the effectiveness of your information services?

YES

40% of responses: Australia - HR & SE, Austria, Belgium - SE, Brazil, Canada - HC & SE, Czech Republic - SE, Estonia, Germany - Bsttag, Indonesia, Italy - CD & SE, Japan - HC, Netherlands, Norway, Philippines - HR, Portugal, Romania - CD & SE, Sweden, Thailand - SE, United Kingdom - HC & HL, South Africa

Evaluation forms; surveys of visitors, monitoring web site access; public opinion polls; e-polls; feedback through web site; feedback from MPs, public and media

NO

51% of responses

6% of those that responded NO report ad hoc rather than systematic evaluation

<p>17. Do you have a clearly identified media spokesperson or liaison officer?</p>	<p>YES</p> <p>38% of responses: Australia - HR & SE - Belgium - SE, Benln, Canada - HC & SE, Cyprus, Czech Republic - SE, Germany - Bsrat & Bstag, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy - SE, Korea, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, Togo, Zambia, South Africa</p> <p>60% of those that responded YES report that the Presiding Officer or Secretary General performs this role; 62% of those that responded YES report that a parliamentary official has been appointed as press liaison officer</p>	<p>NO</p> <p>62% of responses</p> <p>36% of those that responded NO report that the Presiding Officer or Secretary General occasionally brief the media</p>
<p>18. Do you issue accreditation for journalists who cover parliament?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact of media exposure • Defining State of the Art public relations activities 	<p>YES</p> <p>76% of responses: Australia - HR & SE, Austria, Belgium - HR & SE, Benin, Brazil, Canada - HC & SE, Croatia, Czech Republic - HR & SE, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany - Bsrat & Bstag, Greece, India - LS, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy - CD & SE, Japan - HC, Korea, Macedonia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines - HR & SE, Poland, Portugal, Romania - CD & SE, Russia, Slovenia - NA & NC, Spain - CD, United Kingdom - HC & HL, Zambia, South Africa, Zimbabwe</p> <p>57% of those that responded report that there has been an indication that increased media exposure has modernised, or otherwise affected, parliament and its operation</p> <p>12% of those that responded report that there has been an attempt to define "State of the Art public relations activities"</p>	<p>NO</p> <p>24% of responses</p> <p>13% of those that responded NO report that the matter is under consideration; 27% of those that responded NO report that journalists are not accredited but the news agencies for which they work are</p>