



IFLA Section Library and Research Services for Parliaments

Survey results IFLAPARL and IPU Joint Conference

“Parliamentary library & research services – towards an agenda for the next decade”

6 – 8 October 2021

Analysis and comments on the results of the survey

1. Channels by which notion about holding the conference was obtained

- Predominance “through direct communication”: colleagues, newsletter, mailing list.
- Practically nobody has known it from the websites, or through social networks.
 - o *Questions that arise:*
Due to the absence of sufficiently clear and prominent information on the websites? Are we a group that does not use social networks?

2. Reasons for registering

- The program is the fundamental aspect in general or due to a specific matter of the program.
- Institutional participation is relevant, but not the reason for so many participants (many of those who select the IPU option also do so with IFLAPARL).
- Online mode represents a reason for registering in less than 30%; it contrasts with answer 8, according to which 56% prefer the virtual celebration.
 - o *It could be because they prefer it, but it does not determine their decision to participate.*

3. Effective participation

This answer provides little information by itself (unless it were contrasted with the data on the number of registered and the number of participants), although it is a

good piece of information to consider possible proportional data in the rest of the survey.

4. Fulfillment of expectations

In general, a high number of answers are 'high' or 'very high'. It may have been useful to have data to compare with previous years (not the case, as it has been tackled for the first time in this virtual mode).

5. Most interesting sessions

The fact of putting the general sessions and the workshops at the same level can be misleading since there is a bias in the possibility of participating; on the other hand, all the workshops were developed in the same time slot.

Worthy of being highlighted, the session dedicated to data -in percentages of preference- as it has been a session with a less traditional subject and it has been the second one preferred.

6. Balance listening / participation

Result, in principle, unsatisfactory.

The survey participants do not seem to be particularly satisfied at this point: an imbalance is detected as having given too much priority to the interventions of the panelists whereas the participation of the audience with the formulation of questions and their response has not been very well looked after.

7. Proposals for improvement

- General success of the online celebration, with very few problems and complaints (only one, same as in answer 11: one person registered and did not participate due to problems to connect successfully).
- Need to improve the translation service and expand simultaneous interpretation.

There are several ways to improve indirectly, maybe not so much the improvement of the subtitles (AI technology) but through the previous handling of the presentations or clarifying documents to the interpreters.

- Proposals for organization: workshops distributed throughout the conference, without the need to choose one or the other; extension to one more day ...
- Proposals on subjects (e.g.: more on developing countries) or approach (How v. What).

8. Interest in upcoming events, both online and in person

- High general interest in participating actively.
- In the online / face-to-face division, there is an important difference between those who are interested in attending and those who also want to speak.
- There is a sufficiently high percentage of people in both options, so it could be convenient to hold a mixed conference, with face-to-face participants - especially speakers- and online broadcasting.
- More than a half of those who are interested in participating prefer an online format. Perhaps a mixed format for next year (face-to-face and virtual) will help keep participation numbers high. But that it is not only online, but in a way the audience can somehow send their questions.

9. Aspects to be addressed in the future

(Note: Proposals are presented according to the interest expressed by the respondents)

- Forms of **exchange of information and resources** between services and libraries of different institutions, both between parliamentary assemblies and with other bodies and research institutions, including academia, NGOs, etc. Among other issues, it is proposed to promote the exchange of experiences, resources, the use of free software that facilitates access to information repositories. They also propose the development of a website in which to **compile national and international legislation as an instrument to support comparative law research**.
- **New technologies** played a prominent role, specifically: the use of artificial intelligence tools to improve the services provided in libraries and research services, **practical experience in creating knowledge management systems**, its execution and project; experiences in the application of innovations, the use of geospatial data in the legislative process, etc.
- **Training of staff** of research services and parliamentary libraries. It is proposed to address the different training models, continuous training, training in parliamentary procedures, the **creation of a platform to improve learning among professionals from different countries**, etc.
- Relationship with citizens and associations. Encourage public participation in legislative procedures and in general in parliamentary life, by disseminating information to civil society organizations, easing the participation in parliamentary debates, etc.

- Mechanisms to identify truthful information.
- Marketing practices.
- Hybrid working models.
- Accessibility.
- Transparency
- Guarantee impartiality in the performance of our duties
- **History of parliaments and evolution of libraries.**

10. General remarks; other comments

Doubts must be posed about the adequacy of the data obtained in the survey as reliable indicators to make decisions about the celebration of future conferences, especially due to two facts:

- The number of answers, excessively low.
- The bias of the sample - important, for example, if we bear into account that practically only the people who actually had attended answered the survey (answer 3) and not all of them.