



END TO END LEGISLATIVE PROCESS: SOME INTERNATIONAL EXAMPLES OF GOOD PRACTICE



Introduction

- The End to End Legislative Process leaflet describes good and bad practices at each stage of the legislative journey.
- This paper supplements that leaflet, concentrating on how things can be done well.
- Illustrative examples of good practice are given from a range of countries.
- Examples are not necessarily transferable to the VRU, but they may stimulate discussion as the VRU thinks about reform of its own legislative procedures.

Good sources for legislation

- Effective legislation needs to be founded on a solid basis.
- That means that
 - a rational process of evaluation has taken place
 - a real problem has been identified
 - the only or best way to solve that problem is by legislation.
- Ideas for legislation can come from a variety of sources - from parliamentary inquiries or reports from expert bodies or from stakeholder groups or simply from seeing what works well elsewhere in the world or what will appeal to the electorate.
- In **Denmark**, a Minister frequently sets up an expert Committee or a commission to consider the need for legislation.
- A parliamentary inquiry can draw on international examples to propose legislative changes, as the Constitutional Arrangements Committee did in **New Zealand** when it reviewed the New Zealand Constitution.
- Sometimes an unexpected event happens, or something goes wrong, and a group of experts is established to suggest a remedy: after a series of railway accidents in **Canada**, an expert panel was established to make recommendations on improvements to rail safety – including legislative changes.
- Good legislative ideas are not necessarily top down: in some countries, popular pressure can lead to legislation: in **Spain**, a “people’s legislative initiative” (a legislative proposal signed by 500,000 citizens) must be debated in the Congress.
- In **Italy**, 50,000 electors, or one of the Governments of Italy’s regions, can propose a Law.
- The most usual source of legislation is the implementation of a governing party’s ideas. In most countries, political parties stand for election with manifesto commitments to deliver policies. Policy delivery will often need legislation. For example, in the **USA**’s recent elections, Republicans stood with a commitment to repeal President Obama’s health policies. Legislation will be necessary to bring that about.
- In the **Netherlands**, facing an election later in 2017, the Prime Minister’s party (the VVD) has published a 100-page on-line manifesto containing its promises for the 2017 to 2021

electoral period. Many of these promises will require legislation. Other Dutch political parties have done the same.

- Parliaments are very often forced to legislate. Reasons can include:
 - International agreements
 - For countries that wish to join the EU, compliance with the European *acquis*
 - Unplanned events require legislation
 - Court decisions can mean that Laws need to change
 - because the courts find existing Laws to be unconstitutional
 - because the Laws are interpreted in a way that is different from what the Legislature intended
- In the **United Kingdom**, a recent decision of the Supreme Court required the British Government to introduce legislation to allow Brexit to be triggered.
- Post-legislative scrutiny can also be a fruitful source for new legislation: in **Honduras**, the Law on people trafficking has recently been subject to post-legislative scrutiny. The resulting report has called for legislative changes to make the Law work more effectively.

Ideal conception stage

- Rushing into legislation is never sensible: hasty and badly thought through legislation causes more difficulties than it solves.
- After identifying a problem that suggests that legislation is necessary, there are therefore two further questions to ask:
 - Is legislation in this area a priority over legislation in other areas?
 - Are funding and other resources available for effective implementation of the legislation?
- If the answers to those questions is negative, legislation is unlikely to be the best way forward.
- Panic led to ill-thought through legislation in the **United Kingdom** when legislation to ban dangerous dogs was introduced in the wake of several attacks on children by dogs. The legislation proved to be unworkable.
- On the plus side in the **United Kingdom**, there is a Ministerial Committee, headed by a senior non-departmental Minister, that judges between competing claims to introduce legislation from different Ministries. This is a rigorous process that ensures that only priority legislation that can be passed in the available parliamentary time is brought forward.
- **Sweden** has a careful process of assessment and evaluation before a new Law is introduced: very often an expert Committee of Inquiry is appointed by the Executive with terms of reference set by them. When this Committee reports, its recommendations are circulated for comment to interested parties. There must then be consensus across Government that new legislation is really necessary.

Ideal consultation stage

- Many Parliaments espouse transparency.
- Good legislative practice usually involves an open and transparent consultation process before the legislation is finalised.
- Interested people and organisations are encouraged to take part and facilitated in doing so.
- Citizens are cynical about consultation and suspicious that governments only pretend to listen to the views expressed.
- To meet this cynicism, there must be
 - sufficient time for a proper consultation process to be conducted
 - the consultation must be accessible to all interested parties – including by non-standard means
 - a genuine willingness to listen to those consulted and to consider their comments in an open way.
- This does not mean that all views need to be accepted – a consultation process will usually throw up contradictory views.

- In **Spain**, the Congress complies with the Law of transparency that applies to all Spanish public institutions. Its website highlights “transparency” as the most important feature of the Congress.
- **Denmark** has a long tradition of openness in public decision-making. When a Bill is introduced, the parties who will be affected are usually given an opportunity to be heard. This consultation phase comes before the formal introduction of the Bill in the Parliament. Interest groups, representatives of the business community and ordinary citizens are consulted.
- Initiatives that encourage the electronic participation of individuals and minority groups in the legislative process include regulations.gov in the **USA**, osale.ee in **Estonia** and edemocracia.camara.gov.br in **Brazil**.
- It is particularly effective to publish legislation in draft as part of a consultation. In 2015, the Government of the **United Kingdom** published draft legislation to alter the constitution in respect of Wales. There was a great deal of criticism of the draft legislation thrown up during the consultation period. Much to the credit of the Minister involved, the draft legislation was re-written and much improved as a result.

Ideal drafting process

- Though legislation in some countries is drafted by the officials concerned with the policy area, legislative drafting is best done by lawyers with specialist drafting skills.
- It is not something that ought to be done by generalists, even generalist lawyers.

- Drafters must have a proper understanding of existing law so that what they draft is compatible with the existing corpus of law.
- Drafters need clear instructions as to what they should draft – though it is part of the job of skilful and experienced drafters to point out to those who instruct them (usually Ministers and their officials) where there are logical or legal problems with the instructions.
- In **Australia**, an Office of Parliamentary Counsel employs around 100 staff, around half of whom are drafting lawyers. The Office is responsible for drafting all national primary and subordinate legislation, for drafting amendments to legislation going through Parliament and for compiling and publishing Australian national legislation (the Australian federal States have similar bodies for State legislation). The main Corporate Objectives of the Office are:
 - to provide a timely and high quality service in the performance of its drafting and publication functions
 - to draft legislation in as clear a style as possible, consistent with maintaining precision; and
 - to promote the development of new approaches to legislative drafting to reflect changes in legal policy and in the expectations of the community.
- Some countries do not centralise their legislative drafting but have central mechanisms to ensure standards.
 - In **France**, where the expert in the Ministry is responsible for drafting, subject to later legal checking, there is a comprehensive handbook for drafters that contains practical tips for achieving watertight legislation.
 - In **Portugal**, an office in the Presidency is responsible for ensuring that legislative drafting is consistent and of high quality.
 - The Council on Legislation in **Sweden**, a body whose members are judges drawn from the Supreme Court and the Supreme Administrative Court, has the task of ensuring that draft legislation is in conformity with the legal system and is compatible with constitutional law.
 - A similar procedure is followed in the **Netherlands**.
- In response to the problem of inadequate drafting, the Parliament in **Denmark** established a joint working commission with the Government on law quality. As a result, the Government has issued a detailed set of guidelines on law quality to the civil servants at the individual Ministries where Bills are prepared, detailing a number of central requirements for drafting. A Bill must contain an account of its financial and administrative consequences for the public sector and the business community, its environmental consequences and its relation to EU law.
- The International Network to Promote the Rule of Law (inprol.org) has useful material on best practice in legislative drafting, and the Ministry of Justice of **Finland** publishes a valuable drafting guide (<http://lainvalmistelu.finlex.fi/en/tietoa-palvelusta/>)

- The drafting process should be the first stage of an efficient digitised legislative workflow, with the electronic files re-used during the parliamentary stages of the legislation and after promulgation. As in many other areas of digital public life, **Estonia** is a leader in the field.

Ideal process for introduction to VRU

- The ease with which legislation can be introduced into the VRU is seen by some as problematic – it has resulted in “a legislative tsunami”, with log-jams of draft Laws that make little or no progress and that often do not comply with basic requirements for constitutional and procedural compliance.
- Efficient Parliaments ensure that there are firm and rapid checks on draft proposals with those that are not compliant not being allowed to proceed or not even allowed to be introduced.
- In **Spain**, the Bureau assesses parliamentary papers and documents in accordance with the Standing Orders, and decides whether they are admissible or inadmissible.
- In **Finland**, ensuring the constitutionality of proposed legislation is the responsibility of the Speaker, assisted by a Constitutional Law Committee. This Committee examines each Bill to ensure that it complies with the Constitution. If there is a discrepancy between the Bill and the Constitution, the Committee will indicate how the Bill ought to be amended. The Committee exercises this controlling task with the help of academics and constitutional lawyers, who are heard as outside experts in Committee meetings.
- The Parliament of **Greece** has a Scientific Service composed mainly of university law professors. Their reports on Bills identify any possible contradictions or discrepancies of the proposed legislation as regards the Greek Constitution and national legislation, international or European law.
- In **Italy**, the Chamber of Deputies has a special legislative Committee, composed equally of members of the majority and opposition parties, ‘which assesses the quality of legislative texts to see if they are homogenous, simple, clear and appropriate to their purpose, as well as their effectiveness in simplifying and reorganizing the legislation in force, and based on these parameters, issues opinions to the Committees.’
- In the **United Kingdom**, it is the responsibility of the Parliament’s secretariat (ultimately relying on the Speaker’s authority) to decide whether any proposed legislation complies with parliamentary rules.
- A busy Parliament also needs some form of rationing of legislative opportunities if log-jams are to be avoided.
- For Executive Bills, the Executive should have an achievable and rational legislative plan, with priorities properly established across Government

- This needs to be supplemented by agreement between the Executive and the various factions inside the Parliament so that a balance is struck between the Government achieving its legislative proposals and the opposition factions having a proper opportunity to express their opposition.
 - In **Canada**, the Minister in charge of parliamentary business holds House Leaders' meetings in private to discuss, negotiate and arrange legislative business between the political parties so that the legislative process flows as smoothly as possible.
 - In **France**, two weeks out of every four are given to government legislative business, with the agenda for these weeks controlled entirely by the Executive according to their priorities. One week in four is given over to legislative proposals that do not come from the Executive – the proposals that are to be debated in this week are selected by the Conference of Presidents, a body made up of the President and Vice-Presidents of the House, the Chairs of the permanent Committees and the Chairs of the Political Groups.
-
- The French system + one way in which effective Parliaments ration legislative opportunities by limiting ordinary MPs' rights of initiative: the draft Laws judged by senior MPs as most important, whether because they attract most support or because they deal with pressing issues, are the ones chosen for debate.
 - In some other Parliaments, like the **United Kingdom**, ballots are used to decide which MPs have priority in introducing legislation.
 - In other Parliaments, minimum numbers of supporters for an ordinary MP's Bill are required:
 - In **Spain**, ordinary MPs require the support of 14 other MPs to be able to propose Bills, and the Government is asked to express its view on whether any such Bill should proceed (with power to block the Bill if it involves expenditure). The Bill can only proceed if the whole Congress agrees.
 - In **Germany**, a Bill must either be supported by a political group or by five per cent of the Bundestag's membership – at present, this is 31 Deputies.

Ideal process for Laws to implement AA/acquis

- Much of the legislative activity of countries aspiring to EU membership is necessarily taken up with complying with the *acquis*, and with harmonisation of their Laws with those of the EU.
- Demands on the legislative time in their Parliaments is especially acute.
- Ukraine is unlikely to become a full EU member for some time: this means that a process of rational prioritisation of compliance can take place, ideally with coordination between the European Integration Office, the CMU and the European Integration Committee (EIC)
 - But the different roles that each plays needs to be respected – the EIC should have sources of expert advice independent from the Executive.

- One of the tests that should be applied to any legislation introduced in the VRU (including Deputy-proposed legislation) is whether it is compliant with the *acquis*. Legislation that is incompatible with the *acquis* should not be allowed to proceed.
- The fact that only Executive-proposed legislation was originally assessed for EU compatibility in **Poland** was regarded as a dangerous loop-hole at an early stage in the Polish accession process. As in Ukraine, much Polish legislation has traditionally not been Executive-driven.
- Conforming to the *acquis* is complex: for example, **Croatia** needed to dedicate significant government and parliamentary resources to ensure that its public procurement law was compliant. This took more than 11 years from the enactment of the first public procurement law in 2001, and involved an iterative process of scrutiny and reform, before a compliant legal framework was achieved at the end of 2012, six months before Croatian accession to EU.
- Many other countries that have recently joined the EU, or which are advanced in their candidacy, can also show examples of good practice in a variety of areas.
 - **Lithuania** and **Estonia** are commonly regarded as having been particularly successful at the integration process – and their Parliaments are leaders in having their governments' databases on dealings with EU matters available online to the Parliament
 - **Cyprus** is one of many countries that has a form of expedited legislative procedure for Laws to implement EU directives
 - **Macedonia** has established a National European Integration Council that brings together MPs, Ministers and representatives of business and civil society
 - the European Integration Committee in **Georgia** has secured invitations to meetings of the important Conference of Parliamentary Committees for Union Affairs of Parliaments of the European Union (COSAC).
- One issue that needs to be considered is whether compliance with European law should be the job of all Committees in a Parliament, or whether it should be the task of a specialist European Committee. **Germany** is often regarded as having done well to mainstream its EU work into its sectoral Committees, as opposed to leaving it all to the EU Affairs Committee – this is regarded by many in the Bundestag as the key to having a real impact.
- Inside the VRU, at the very least, the EIC needs to work cooperatively with other Committees, and if resources are limited, there is merit in concentrating support and expertise on EU matters to the EIC.
- The European Parliament hosts the useful website of the European Centre for Parliamentary Research and Documentation: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/webnp/cms/pid/1887>. Several national Parliaments are

members of the Centre, including the VRU. The VRU can use the Centre to find information from other Parliaments on EU integration issues, or, indeed, on any other issue where comparative information from other Parliaments might be useful.

Ideal consideration in VRU – plenary and committee

- The plenary Chamber of every Parliament is the theatre where the most important decisions are taken.
- Most Parliaments follow similar plenary legislative procedures
 - Debate on the principle of the Bill
 - Consideration in detail in Committee, with amendments
 - Plenary consideration of amendments made in Committee and further amendments
 - Opportunity to send the Bill back to Committee for further consideration
 - Final approval in Plenary before the Bill passes and is sent to the Head of State
 - In bicameral Parliaments, both Chambers normally need to agree
 - Many Parliaments also have procedures for overturning in Plenary any veto by the Head of State.
- There are many varieties between countries in terms of detailed mechanisms (for example, a Bill is not subject to full debate before it is sent to Committee in **Germany** but it is in the **United Kingdom**) – there is no ideal path so long as all MPs have an opportunity to propose amendments and to vote on the Bill.
- The **Netherlands** procedure is typical.
 - A Bill (and the accompanying advice from the Council of State) is first examined by a Standing Committee of the House of Representatives.
 - All political groups can propose changes to the Bill, comment and pose questions.
 - The Standing Committee may ask experts and stakeholders from society to comment on controversial plans.
 - The House of Representative draws up a report on the examination of the bill by the Standing Committee.
 - The Minister in charge replies to this report by means of a memorandum of reply. Both documents are public.
 - After Standing Committee, the Bill is defended in a plenary meeting of the House by those who proposed it.
 - Amendments can be proposed.
 - MPs vote on the amendments and then on the Bill, as amended (if it has been).
 - The Bill is submitted to the Senate. The Senate examines and discusses the Bill in detail, but may only adopt or reject it. It cannot amend it.
 - After it is passed by the Senate, the Bill is sent to the King for signature.

- Best parliamentary practice is to ensure that –
 - only amendments that make sense and that are within the scope of the Bill should be permitted to be considered
 - amendments are considered in a logical order – for example, amendments ought to be voted upon sequentially, even if related amendments that arise in different areas of the Bill may be “grouped” so that they can be debated together
 - there is sufficient notice of amendments, with oral amendments only being allowed if no MP objects
 - many Parliaments also ban amendments from ordinary Deputies that would commit the spending of public money.
- These rules about amendments can sometimes cause friction between MPs, and it is important that they are enforced fairly by the Speaker.
- The Speaker’s role in fairly conducting Plenary business applies to all business, but it is particularly important in legislative business.
- Not all Speakers are lawyers, and even those who are may not be experts in parliamentary procedure.
- High quality advice on the legislative process must be available to the Speaker before Plenary proceedings begin, and immediate advice must be available to him or her as proceedings take place.
- The Secretary General and other senior officials will provide this advice, and, in a well-functioning Parliament, their advice will be accepted by the Speaker because its quality will be unimpeachable.
- Parliamentary officials should not only give advice to the Speaker. Their high-quality advice should be available to Deputies generally, including Opposition Deputies.
- It is vital that the objectivity and independence of parliamentary officials is trusted by *all* Deputies.
- The need for fairness by the Chair and for high quality advice from officials to be available to all Deputies applies equally in Committee proceedings.
- In **France**, the Secretary General of the Assembly and of the Presidency is essentially responsible for procedural, legislative and research functions. In this s/he is answerable to the President. Though appointed by the Bureau, the Secretary General is drawn from the long-term non-political staff of the Assembly. Although the President has formal responsibility for all matters, operational management is left to the Secretary General who enjoys the confidence of all Deputies. In fact, the official texts speak of the Secretary General “collaborating with” the President.

Ideal VRU Committee process

- If the Plenary Chamber is the theatre, Committees are the place where the solid legislative work of Parliaments is done.

- Bills should emerge from their Committee consideration in a better state than when they entered Committee.
- This is achieved when Committees –
 - act consensually and in a participatory way
 - take account of external expert opinion
 - work together as Committee members with a common purpose to improve the legislation in the interests of the people they represent, rather than acting as political rivals.
- This is not possible when a Bill is highly contentious politically, but international experience is that most legislation is not controversial in factional terms.
- Deputies need to be committed, industrious and either well-informed already about the subject of the legislation, or willing and able to become informed
- Committees need to have necessary resources:
 - the time to do their work properly, though they also need to be disciplined so that they deal with the legislation before them without undue delay
 - the cooperation of the Executive, with Ministers and senior officials as willing witnesses
 - the right personnel in terms of staff and advisers, but most especially the right Deputies to serve on them
- Committees should have clear responsibilities, and this is best achieved by them matching the responsibilities of Government Ministries.
- Even when this happens, there will be some areas of ambiguity, and there then needs to be a mechanism for resolving any “territorial disputes” between Committees. If a Bill is referred to one main Committee, it often makes sense for other relevant Committees’ opinions also to be sought.

- **In Germany**
 - the Council of Elders recommends to Plenary which Committee or Committees should consider a Bill.
 - If several Committees are designated, one is given overall responsibility and is responsible for the Bill’s passage through Parliament.
 - The other Committees give their opinions on the Bill.
 - The detailed work on legislation takes place in these permanent Committees, which are made up of MPs from all the parliamentary groups.
 - Committee members familiarise themselves with the Bill’s material and deliberate on it at their meetings.
 - They are also able to invite representatives of interest groups and experts to public hearings.
 - Collaboration between the governing and opposition parliamentary groups is common with the result that most Bills are revised to a greater or lesser extent as a result.
- It is a standard procedure in the Althingi, the Parliament of **Iceland**, for the legislative standing Committees to ask for written opinions from interest groups and similar non-governmental organisations and societies and others who are affected by the Bills they are dealing with. This reflects an established parliamentary opinion that those affected

by legislation have a democratic right to be heard and consulted. Any member of the public has a direct access to the standing Committees by submitting a written submission to Committees. These ‘spontaneous’ submissions are made available to Committee members and to the public.

- **In New Zealand**
 - a Bill is usually referred to a Committee for examination in detail
 - the Committee usually calls for public submissions, by advertising and by approaching organisations and individuals with a known interest in the legislation
 - a very useful guide to those who wish to make representations on a Bill is available on the Parliament’s website
 - six months is normally allowed for consideration of each Bill but this can be either extended or shortened by the House
 - citizens can ask to give an oral presentation to the Committee, in addition to providing written submissions
 - the Committee considers matters raised in submissions and receives advice from its appointed advisers
 - it then decides whether to recommend the Bill be passed, and recommends in a report to the full House any amendments it considers necessary.

Law implementation: ideal process

- Successful implementation of a Law happens when clear policy objectives are turned into a legal text that changes behaviour in exactly the way intended.
- Sometimes Parliaments pass Laws and complacently claim that they have achieved something positive just by having completed a parliamentary process.
- But they have achieved nothing if the Law cannot be implemented.
- Inability to implement a Law may happen because the Law has been ill-thought through and would never work anyway. Or there may be circumstances that were unforeseen. If the legislative process we have already described takes place, the risk in these cases should be mitigated.
- More frequently, a Law fails to achieve the change that parliamentarians wanted either because
 - affected people do not understand its implications and can comply with it, or
 - those who are responsible for implementing it do not have the necessary resources to do so
- Resources can include money, people, infrastructure and training.
- A legislative process should not be begun if resources for implementation are not going to be available.
- Good project planning should accompany the parliamentary process so that the Law can speedily be brought into effect.
- Sometimes a Law can deliberately be passed some time before it is to be implemented, with the intervening period used for publicity and training.

Post-legislative scrutiny

- The most effective Parliaments supplement the formal stages of legislative consideration with post-legislative scrutiny.
- It is only after a Law has been put into effect that its real effectiveness can be judged – even the best drafted Laws are of no use unless they work in practice and unless they bring about change on the ground.
- Post-legislative scrutiny is not just about discovering things that have gone wrong – it is also about discovering things that have worked well and using them as precedents for future legislation.
- It is best done three to five years after a Law is passed: enough time has passed for initial teething troubles to be over and for those affected to make better judgements.
- Post-legislative scrutiny is best conducted by a specialist Committee. Some Parliaments appoint a special Committee for the purpose; others use one of their existing Committees.
- A Committee doing post-legislative scrutiny needs to gather information from written submissions received, from holding formal hearings, from social media and, most importantly, from going out into the country to meet people affected by the Law. After gathering information, the Committee should analyse the information, come to a judgement about the key issues and publish a report. This report should set out its conclusions, including any recommendations for amendment of the Law or for changes in practice, as well as lessons learned.
- Different questions will be appropriate for different Laws, but in general, post-legislative scrutiny will focus on the following questions:
 - Does the Law work effectively?
 - What strengths and weaknesses have been shown as the Law has been put into operation?
 - Is the Law operating in the way that it was intended to? Are there any unforeseen effects? Is it operating fairly? Has it caused unexpected problems?
 - Have the courts found the Law to be ambiguous?
 - Has the funding for implementation been sufficient, and has the Law given value for money?
 - What good practice and other lessons can be learned from the implementation of the Law?
 - Have circumstances changed so that the Law is no longer necessary?
- Post-legislative scrutiny should not be used as an opportunity to re-run any political arguments that took place when the Law was being considered originally in Congress.
- Post-legislative scrutiny has become part of regular **United Kingdom** parliamentary activity. The UK Government provides a Memorandum on every Law's effectiveness to the relevant specialist parliamentary Committee between three and five years after the Law is passed. In most cases, the Committee takes no further action; but in a few selected cases, perhaps three or four Laws in total across Parliament each year, the Committee decides that the Law should be subject to a full post-legislative scrutiny

inquiry. A Scrutiny Unit which contains expert research staff including lawyers provide specialist analysis.

- In **Chile**, the Department of Law Evaluation operates as part of the Chamber of Deputies' administration. The Department examines selected Laws, studying how they have operated since implementation; and whether they have achieved their goals effectively, or if they have become obsolete because of the changes in society. A number of criteria are used to select a Law for examination: political neutrality, the extent of applicability of the Law, its public status, and the feasibility of review in terms of methodology, time and technical issues.
- The Human Rights Committee in the **Iraqi** Council of Representatives conducted in 2016 successful post-legislative scrutiny of the Human Trafficking Law 2012. The Committee took extensive evidence from interested parties, identified loopholes in the Law and made a series of recommendations for improvement and better implementation by the Executive, the Judiciary and the Human Rights Commission. As part of its inquiry, the Human Rights Committee received correspondence from those affected by human trafficking and held face-to-face discussions with key individuals, such as judges, and civil society organisations.
- A form of post-legislative scrutiny is also found in **Switzerland** where Control Committees are mandated by the Federal Assembly to exercise oversight of the federal government and administration. The Committees focus on verifying that the activities of the federal authorities comply with the constitution and legislation (legality control); that the measures taken by the state are appropriate (control of appropriateness); and that the measures taken by the state bear fruit (efficiency control).

Conclusion

- Each Parliament conducts its legislative business differently.
- Procedures vary depending on each country's Constitution, heritage, traditions, size and wealth.
- There are many good practices scattered around the Parliaments of Europe and the wider world.
- Often the most innovative practices can be found in the new democracies.
- Ukraine's willingness to consider legislative reform is its opportunity to be in the vanguard of integrated and effective end-to-end legislative practice.

Paul Silk