

# 4th Global Conference on Parliamentary Studies

13 June 2025

Athens, Greece

# 2025

## Book of Abstracts



Published by



## Copyright Disclaimer

This Book of Abstracts for the 4th Global Conference on Parliamentary Studies is edited by the conference's Scientific Committee:

- Fotis Fitsilis, Hellenic Parliament, Greece
- Zsolt Szabó, Széchenyi István University, Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church, Hungary
- Peter Smuk, Széchenyi István University, Hungary
- Evangelos Kalampokis, University of Macedonia, Greece
- Spyridon Vlachopoulos, University of Athens, Greece
- George Mikros, Hamad Bin Khalifa University, Qatar
- Juan de Dios Cincunegui, Universidad Austral, Argentina
- Stéphane Gagnon, Université du Québec en Outaouais, Canada
- Iasonas Lamprianou, University of Cyprus, Cyprus

It is published by the conference organizers, the Hellenic OCR Team and Széchenyi István University. This version of the abstracts includes minor syntactical and grammatical corrections, as well as paraphrasing, to enhance readability.

This publication is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) license. This license permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original authors and source are properly credited.

Suggested citation (APA style):

Fitsilis, F., Szabó, Z., Smuk, P., Kalampokis, E., Vlachopoulos, S., Mikros, G., Cincunegui, J. D., Gagnon, S., & Lamprianou, I. (Eds.). (2025). *Book of abstracts: 4th Global Conference on Parliamentary Studies, 13 June 2025, Athens, Greece*. <https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.29687015>



Link to the open conference repository:

[https://figshare.com/projects/4th\\_Global\\_Conference\\_on\\_Parliamentary\\_Studies/243029](https://figshare.com/projects/4th_Global_Conference_on_Parliamentary_Studies/243029)

Copyright © 2025 by the Hellenic OCR Team and Széchenyi István University



## Contents

Copyright Disclaimer .....	2
Conference Program.....	8
Session 1 – Keynotes.....	13
Mario Hernández Ramos (Complutense University of Madrid, Chair of the Council of Europe’s Committee on Artificial Intelligence) – “Aspects of the Council of Europe’s Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence and human rights, democracy and the rule of law on parliamentary institutions” .....	13
Josefa Fuentes García (Senate of Spain / IFLAPARL member) & Lila Theodosi (Hellenic Parliament / IFLAPARL Information Coordinator) – “IFLAPARL: Networking for stronger and better-informed democracies” .....	13
SESSION 2 – AI in Legislative Processes .....	14
Sotiris Leventis (Qognity) – “Drafting Legal Texts with Embedded Intelligence” .....	14
Spyridon Vlachopoulos (University of Athens) – “Parliamentary Code of Conduct for the use of artificial intelligence applications” .....	14
Giovanni Rizzoni (Italian Chamber of Deputies / LUISS Guido Carli) – “AI-mediated deliberation and Parliaments: competition, integration or substitution?” .....	15
Jörn von Lucke (Zeppelin University) – “Approaching the Integration of Large Language Models in the Parliamentary Workspace: Enhancing Parliamentary Processes with Large Language Models” .....	15
Marci Harris (POPVOX Foundation) – “AI and the Legislative Supply Chain” .....	16
SESSION 3 – Combating Disinformation and Hate Speech.....	17
Stéphane Gagnon (University of Quebec) – “Enabling Parliaments to Fight Disinformation and Corruption: Toward AI-Enabled ‘Chief Reality Officers’ (CRO) as Extensions to the Digital Trust Ecosystem Framework” .....	17
Ylenia Citino & Nicola Lupo (LUISS Guido Carli) – “Election Validation and Annulments in the era of online disinformation, between Parliaments and (Constitutional) Courts” .....	17
Lilian Olivia Orero (University of Bristol) – “Leveraging Emerging Technologies to Combat Disinformation and Safeguard Democratic Integrity in the 21st Century” .....	18
Roland Kelemen, Dorina Bosits & Zsófia Réti (Széchenyi István University) – “Hate Speech in the Digital Age: User Perception, Platform Governance, and Legal Challenges” .....	18
Gergely G. Karácsony Legislative and technical responses to the proliferation of AI generated fake images in public discourse.....	19
SESSION 4 – Democratic Reforms and Emergency Governance.....	20
Antonios Kouroutakis (IE University) – “Recall Elections in Parliamentary Systems in the Digital Era” .....	20
Meray Maddah (University of Konstanz) – “Window-Dressing or Real Reform? Compliance with International Democratic Reform Agendas” .....	20
Attila Horváth (Ludovika University of Public Service) – “Five Years in a State of Danger: Insights from Emergency Legislation in Hungary” .....	21
Jordi Xuclà (Ramon Lull University) – “Open Parliament Plan in Spain: evaluation of proposals and challenges in a changing world” .....	21

Tomasz Litwin (Ignatianum University in Cracow) – “How the United Right Justified Unconstitutional Changes to the Judiciary in Parliamentary Debates – An Analysis of Sejm Stenographic Reports” .....	22
SESSION 5 – Digital Transformation of Parliaments .....	23
Aleksandra Maatsch (University of Wroclaw) – “Digitalisation of Parliaments in the Post-Pandemic Period: Stumbling Blocks and Stepping Stones” .....	23
Jindřiška Syllová (Parliament of the Czech Republic & Charles University) – “Parliamentary Democracy and the Digital Gap” .....	23
Csaba Erdős (Széchenyi István University) – “The Role of e-parliament Tools in Augmenting Better Legislation” .....	24
Dimitris Koryzis (Hellenic Parliament) – “Digital Parliamentary Strategies in an emerging environment” .....	24
Vasiliki Artemis Mitselou (University of Athens) – “Digital Ready Policy Making in Greece” .....	24
SESSION 6 – Authoritarianism, Democracy, and Public Trust.....	26
Juan de Dios Cincunegui (Universidad Austral) – “Authoritarianism and Democracy. The role of parliaments in mitigating one of the greatest global risks of the 21st century” .....	26
Tsveta Petrova (Columbia University) – “Democracy and Its Competitors in Contemporary Europe: What Democracy Do European Citizens Prefer?” .....	26
Ioanna Christodoulaki (University of Wroclaw) – “Debates on Democracy and the Rule of Law in National Parliaments in the EU: Technical and Methodological Challenges” .....	27
Katerina Lambrinou (Hellenic Parliament) – “Placing Parliaments at the forefront of the Future Generations agenda – how innovative and citizen-centric anticipatory governance can future-proof parliamentary practice” .....	27
Elise Uberoi (House of Commons Library) – “Misinformation, trust and truth: the role of parliamentary research services” .....	28
SESSION 7 – Geopolitical Threats and Parliamentary Diplomacy.....	29
Peter Smuk (Széchenyi István University) – “Foreign agent legislation and protecting the electoral process – the Central European experience” .....	29
Meriem Naïli (Université Grenoble-Alpes) & Stelios Stavridis (ARAIID/Universidad de Zaragoza) – “The European Parliament as an international moral actor in the Mediterranean: comparing and contrasting the EP’s reactions to the war in Gaza and to the Western Sahara conflict” .....	29
Vassilis Kessidis (Panteion University) & Emilio Mourad-Saber (Tulane University) – “European politics threatened by Russian influence and the risks to democracy” .....	30
Alberto Atelli & Michail Kokkaliaris (LUISS Guido Carli) – “Democratic resilience through parliamentary cooperation: the European society perspective” .....	31
Umberto Lattanzi (Bocconi University) – “Parliaments and the international export of weapons: a comparative study on the relevance of international legal considerations in parliamentary deliberations” .....	31
SESSION 8 – AI Analytics on Parliamentary Corpora .....	33
George Mikros (Hamad Bin Khalifa University) – “Stylometric Fingerprints in the Greek Parliament: Cross-Party Discourse Analysis Through Computational Stylometry” .....	33

Angeliki Skoura (Hellenic OCR Team) – “Analyzing documents of the legislation procedure of the Artificial Intelligence Act in terms of ethical principles” .....	33
Rudolf Berkes (HUN-REN Centre for Social Science) – “Risks and limitations of integrating automated speech recognition into parliamentary operations” .....	34
Giuseppe Mobilio (University of Florence) – “LLMs in Parliaments: Fostering Technological Innovation, Cooperation and Democratic Principles” .....	34
SESSION 9 – Inclusive Governance and Remote Procedures .....	36
Danny Schindler (Institute for Parliamentary Research) – “What drives the selection of young candidates? Evidence from Germany’s mixed-member proportional systems” .....	36
Federico Musso (Università degli Studi di Roma “Tor Vergata”) – “From emergency to permanence? A comparative analysis between Italy, the UK and Spain on the evolution of remote parliamentary procedures” .....	36
Stefano Bargiacchi (Università di Firenze) – “Parliaments and disability: strengthening democratic institutions through inclusive policies and technological innovation” .....	37
SESSION 10 – AI, Creativity and Legislative Innovation.....	38
Mattia Angeleri (LUISS Guido Carli) & Sofia Ranchordas (Tilburg Law School / Luiss Guido Carli) – “AI for the legislative process: authentic participation or participation washing?” .....	38
Aglaia-Maria (Mirela) Pachou (University of Athens) & Maria Biliri (Lawyer) – “Reframing creativity: Legal challenges of generative Artificial Intelligence in the cultural landscape” .....	38
Pier Francesco Bresciani (University of Bologna) – “Rethinking Parliamentary Autonomy in the Age of AI: A Study of Digital Constitutional Theory” .....	39
Martin Montes (Universidad Austral) – “Bringing AI to parliament in Argentina: the role of Universidad Austral in supporting legislative innovation” .....	39
Charalampos Alexopoulos (University of the Aegean) – “NLP and RuleAsACode in Action: Automated Rule Extraction in legal drafting procedures” .....	40
SESSION 11 – Digital Engagement and Media Accountability .....	41
Caoímhe O’Rourke (Irish Parliament) – “Broadcasting Parliament from an Offshore Island – An Innovation in Parliamentary Communications” .....	41
Geraldine Castel (Grenoble Alpes University) – “Online Petitioning in the Scottish and British Parliaments: a New Look at its Democratic Potential” .....	41
Áron Ósze (Széchenyi István University) – “The role of the media in the dissemination of scientific results and possible legislative responses” .....	42
Michał Jabłoński (University of Warsaw) – “Parliamentary privilege and social media activity of members of parliament: a comparative study on parliamentary freedom of speech in time of disinformation” .....	42
SESSION 12 – Oversight and Legislative Challenges.....	44
Ariadne – Maria Angelopoulou (Hellenic OCR Team) & Haralambis Kyrkos (Hellenic Parliament) – “Parliamentary Oversight in Greece in the early Post Dictatorship Period” .....	44
Giuliano Vosa (University of Catania) – “Parliamentary control on European military issues: a matter of constitutional law” .....	44
Peter Vaczi (Széchenyi István University) – “The legislative anomalies of the Electronic Real Estate Registry in Hungary” .....	45

Zuzanna Żurawska (University of Miskolc / Central European Academy) – “Legal status of the President of the Chamber of Deputies of Romania” .....	45
Weronika Pietras (University of Miskolc / Central European Academy) – “Legal Status of Deputy President in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania” .....	46
SESSION 13 - Constitutional Resilience in the AI Era .....	47
Gianmario Demuro (University of Cagliari) – “The crisis of political constitutionalism and a new parliamentary constitutionalism” .....	47
Piero Gambale (Italian Chamber of Deputies / Luiss Guido Carli) – “The constitutional reform of article 9 and the future generations in Italy: towards a generational impact assessment of laws in Parliament?” .....	47
Sofia Caporiccio (University of Pavia) – “Constitutional challenges of AI in the Italian law-making process” .....	47
Giulia Sulpizi (Ca’ Foscari University – Université Sorbonne Paris Nord) – “Parliamentary immunities dealing with new tools of political communication” .....	48
Angelo Schillizzi (University of Ferrara) – “Which Legal Norms Govern the Procurement and Development of AI Systems for Legislative Activity? Short Notes on a Contemporary Problem Starting from the Principle of Parliamentary Autonomy” .....	48
SESSION 14 – Innovations in Parliamentary Practices .....	50
Antonios Kasotakis (European Parliament) – “Effective Project Management in the European Parliament: The ENGAGE Methodology” .....	50
Maria Kamilaki (Hellenic Parliament) – “Engaging with Parliamentarism through the Hellenic Parliament Library Repository” .....	50
Franklin De Vrieze (Westminster Foundation for Democracy) – “Parliamentary innovation through Post-Legislative Scrutiny and Technology” .....	51
Addie Erwin (Inter-Parliamentary Union) – “Parline Today: Enhancing Access, Transparency, and Insights into Global Parliamentary Data” .....	51
SESSION 15 - AI’s Role in Future Parliaments .....	53
Aleksandra Jovanovic (National Assembly of the Republic of Serbia) – “Artificial Intelligence in the National Assembly of the Republic of Serbia and Assembly of Montenegro: opportunities and challenges in legislative processes, parliamentary diplomacy and EU accession” .....	53
Boldizsár Szentgáli-Tóth & Klára Szalay (HUN-REN Centre for Social Sciences) – “Generative AI in parliaments: at the beginning of a new era” .....	53
Kevin Wayne Settles (Institute for Parliamentary Research) – “From Pixels to Parliament: How AI is Reshaping Legislative Governance” .....	54
Ioannis Gianniadis (Hellenic OCR Team) – “Potential Operational Risks – Preliminary Analysis of the Standing Orders of the Hellenic Parliament” .....	54
SESSION 16 – Privacy, Defense, and Regional Cooperation .....	56
Mónica Velasco-Pufleau (European Institute of International Studies / University of Luxembourg) & Laura Gil-Besada (University of Luxembourg / Complutense University of Madrid)– “Who is who in Privacy and Personal Data Protection: A Case-based Analysis of the Parliamentary Diplomacy of National Delegations to the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe” .....	56

Ludovica Tripodi (Università di Parma) & Paolo Pensabene (Sapienza, University of Rome) – “Old questions and possible perspectives for the establishment of a Common European Defence System in the light of the Italian constitutional framework” .....	56
Jordi Xuclà (Ramon Lull University) – “The Spanish presidency of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Union for the Mediterranean (2024-2025): analysis of contents and achievements” .....	57
List of Contributors.....	58
Sponsors and Supporters .....	63

## Conference Program

**Venue: History Museum of the University of Athens**

**8:30 – 9:15 Session #1 (plenary), Room: “Ilias Crispis”**

Moderator: Olga Giannadi, CEO Innovative Tech for the Next Generation

Opening remarks:

- Fotis Fitsilis (Hellenic Parliament), conference co-chair
- Zsolt Szabó (Széchenyi István University, Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church in Hungary), conference co-chair
- Nikos Thomaidis (Vice President of the Administration Council, University of Athens)
- Dimosthenis Asimakopoulos (Advisor to the Speaker of the Hellenic Parliament, former Rector of the University of Athens) [Not present; message read in absentia]

Keynotes:

- Mario Hernández Ramos (Complutense University of Madrid, Chair of the Council of Europe’s Committee on Artificial Intelligence) – “Aspects of the Council of Europe’s Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence and human rights, democracy and the rule of law on parliamentary institutions”
- Josefa Fuentes García (Senate of Spain / IFLAPARL member) & Lila Theodosi (Hellenic Parliament / IFLAPARL Information Coordinator) – “IFLAPARL: Networking for stronger and better-informed democracies”

**9:15 – 9:30 Group photograph / Dissemination of participants to the four rooms**

**9:30 – 11:30 Session #2, Room: “Ilias Crispis”**

Chair: Fotis Fitsilis (Hellenic Parliament)

- Sotiris Leventis (Qognity) – “Drafting Legal Texts with Embedded Intelligence”
- Spyridon Vlachopoulos (University of Athens) – “Parliamentary Code of Conduct for the use of artificial intelligence applications”
- Giovanni Rizzoni (Italian Chamber of Deputies / LUISS Guido Carli) – “AI-mediated deliberation and Parliaments: competition, integration or substitution?”
- Jörn von Lucke (Zeppelin University) – “Approaching the Integration of Large Language Models in the Parliamentary Workspace: Enhancing Parliamentary Processes with Large Language Models”
- Marci Harris (POPVOX Foundation) – “AI and the Legislative Supply Chain”

**9:30 – 11:30 Session #3, Room: Museum 1st floor**

Chair: George Mikros (Hamad Bin Khalifa University)

- Stéphane Gagnon (University of Quebec) – “Enabling Parliaments to Fight Disinformation and Corruption: Toward AI-Enabled ‘Chief Reality Officers’ (CRO) as Extensions to the Digital Trust Ecosystem Framework”
- Ylenia Citino & Nicola Lupo (LUISS Guido Carli) – “Election Validation and Annulments in the era of online disinformation, between Parliaments and (Constitutional) Courts”
- Lilian Olivia Orero (University of Bristol) – “Leveraging Emerging Technologies to Combat Disinformation and Safeguard Democratic Integrity in the 21st Century”
- Roland Kelemen, Dorina Bosits & Zsófia Réti (Széchenyi István University) – “Hate Speech in the Digital Age: User Perception, Platform Governance, and Legal Challenges”

- Gergely G. Karácsony Legislative and technical responses to the proliferation of AI generated fake images in public discourse

#### **9:30 – 11:30 Session #4, Room: Annex ground floor**

Chair: Peter Smuk (Széchenyi István University)

- Antonios Kouroutakis (IE University) – “Recall Elections in Parliamentary Systems in the Digital Era”
- Meray Maddah (University of Konstanz) – “Window-Dressing or Real Reform? Compliance with International Democratic Reform Agendas”
- Attila Horváth (Ludovika University of Public Service) – “Five Years in a State of Danger: Insights from Emergency Legislation in Hungary”
- Jordi Xuclà (Ramon Lull University) – “Open Parliament Plan in Spain: evaluation of proposals and challenges in a changing world”
- Tomasz Litwin (Ignatianum University in Cracow) – “How the United Right Justified Unconstitutional Changes to the Judiciary in Parliamentary Debates – An Analysis of Sejm Stenographic Reports”

#### **9:30 – 11:30 Session #5, Room: Annex 1st floor**

Chair: Juan de Dios Cincunegui (Universidad Austral)

- Aleksandra Maatsch (University of Wroclaw) – “Digitalisation of Parliaments in the Post-Pandemic Period: Stumbling Blocks and Stepping Stones”
- Jindřiška Syllová (Parliament of the Czech Republic & Charles University) – “Parliamentary Democracy and the Digital Gap”
- Csaba Erdős (Széchenyi István University) – “The Role of e-parliament Tools in Augmenting Better Legislation”
- Dimitris Koryzis (Hellenic Parliament) – “Digital Parliamentary Strategies in an emerging environment”
- Vasiliki Artemis Mitselou (University of Athens) – “Digital Ready Policy Making in Greece”

#### **11:30 – 12:00 Coffee break**

#### **12:00 – 14:00 Session #6, Room: “Ilias Crispis”**

Chair: Iasonas Lamprianou (University of Cyprus)

- Juan de Dios Cincunegui (Universidad Austral) – “Authoritarianism and Democracy. The role of parliaments in mitigating one of the greatest global risks of the 21st century”
- Tsveta Petrova (Columbia University) – “Democracy and Its Competitors in Contemporary Europe: What Democracy Do European Citizens Prefer?”
- Ioanna Christodoulaki (University of Wroclaw) – “Debates on Democracy and the Rule of Law in National Parliaments in the EU: Technical and Methodological Challenges”
- Katerina Lambrinou (Hellenic Parliament) – “Placing Parliaments at the forefront of the Future Generations agenda – how innovative and citizen-centric anticipatory governance can future-proof parliamentary practice”
- Elise Uberoi (House of Commons Library) – “Misinformation, trust and truth: the role of parliamentary research services”

#### **12:00 – 14:00 Session #7, Room: Museum 1st floor**

Chair: Zsolt Szabó (Széchenyi István University, Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church)

- Peter Smuk (Széchenyi István University) – “Foreign agent legislation and protecting the electoral process – the Central European experience”
- Meriem Naïli (Université Grenoble-Alpes) & Stelios Stavridis (ARAIID/Universidad de Zaragoza) – “The European Parliament as an international moral actor in the Mediterranean: comparing and contrasting the EP’s reactions to the war in Gaza and to the Western Sahara conflict”.
- Vassilis Kessidis (Panteion University) & Emilio Mourad-Saber (Tulane University) – “European politics threatened by Russian influence and the risks to democracy”
- Alberto Atelli & Michail Kokkaliaris (LUISS Guido Carli) – “Democratic resilience through parliamentary cooperation: the European society perspective”
- Umberto Lattanzi (Bocconi University) – “Parliaments and the international export of weapons: a comparative study on the relevance of international legal considerations in parliamentary deliberations”

#### **12:00 – 14:00 Session #8, Room: Annex ground floor**

Chair: Dimitris Koryzis (Hellenic Parliament)

- George Mikros (Hamad Bin Khalifa University) – “Stylometric Fingerprints in the Greek Parliament: Cross-Party Discourse Analysis Through Computational Stylometry”
- Angeliki Skoura (Hellenic OCR Team) – “Analyzing documents of the legislation procedure of the Artificial Intelligence Act in terms of ethical principles”
- Rudolf Berkes (HUN-REN Centre for Social Science) – “Risks and limitations of integrating automated speech recognition into parliamentary operations”
- Giuseppe Mobilio (University of Florence) – “LLMs in Parliaments: Fostering Technological Innovation, Cooperation and Democratic Principles”

#### **12:00 – 14:00 Session #9, Room: Annex 1st floor**

Chair: Franklin de Vrieze (Westminster Foundation for Democracy)

- Danny Schindler (Institute for Parliamentary Research) – “What drives the selection of young candidates? Evidence from Germany’s mixed-member proportional systems”
- Federico Musso (Università degli Studi di Roma “Tor Vergata”) – “From emergency to permanence? A comparative analysis between Italy, the UK and Spain on the evolution of remote parliamentary procedures”
- Stefano Bargiacchi (Università di Firenze) – “Parliaments and disability: strengthening democratic institutions through inclusive policies and technological innovation”

#### **14:00 – 14:45 Light lunch**

#### **14:45 – 16:45 Session #10, Room: “Ilias Crispis”**

Chair: Jörn von Lucke (Zeppelin University)

- Mattia Angeleri (LUISS Guido Carli) & Sofia Ranchordas (Tilburg Law School / Luiss Guido Carli) – “AI for the legislative process: authentic participation or participation washing?”
- Aglaia-Maria (Mirela) Pachou (University of Athens) & Maria Biliri (Lawyer) – “Reframing creativity: Legal challenges of generative Artificial Intelligence in the cultural landscape”

- Pier Francesco Bresciani (University of Bologna) – “Rethinking Parliamentary Autonomy in the Age of AI: A Study of Digital Constitutional Theory”
- Martin Montes (Universidad Austral) – “Bringing AI to parliament in Argentina: the role of Universidad Austral in supporting legislative innovation”
- Charalampos Alexopoulos (University of the Aegean) – “NLP and RuleAsACode in Action: Automated Rule Extraction in legal drafting procedures”

**14:45 – 16:45 Session #11, Room: Museum 1st floor**

Chair: Stéphane Gagnon (Université du Québec en Outaouais)

- Caoímhe O'Rourke (Irish Parliament) – “Broadcasting Parliament from an Offshore Island – An Innovation in Parliamentary Communications”
- Geraldine Castel (Grenoble Alpes University) – “Online Petitioning in the Scottish and British Parliaments: a New Look at its Democratic Potential”
- Áron Ősze (Széchenyi István University) – “The role of the media in the dissemination of scientific results and possible legislative responses”
- Michał Jabłoński (University of Warsaw) – “Parliamentary privilege and social media activity of members of parliament: a comparative study on parliamentary freedom of speech in time of disinformation”

**14:45 – 16:45 Session #12, Room: Annex ground floor**

Chair: Tsveta Petrova (Columbia University)

- Ariadne – Maria Angelopoulou (Hellenic OCR Team) & Haralambis Kyrkos (Hellenic Parliament) – “Parliamentary Oversight in Greece in the early Post Dictatorship Period”
- Giuliano Vosa (University of Catania) – “Parliamentary control on European military issues: a matter of constitutional law”
- Peter Vaczi (Széchenyi István University) – “The legislative anomalies of the Electronic Real Estate Registry in Hungary”
- Zuzanna Żurawska (University of Miskolc / Central European Academy) – “Legal status of the President of the Chamber of Deputies of Romania”
- Weronika Pietras (University of Miskolc / Central European Academy) – “Legal Status of Deputy President in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania”

**14:45 – 16:45 Session #13, Room: Annex 1st floor**

Chair: Giovanni Rizzoni (Italian Chamber of Deputies / LUISS Guido Carli)

- Gianmario Demuro (University of Cagliari) – “The crisis of political constitutionalism and a new parliamentary constitutionalism”
- Piero Gambale (Italian Chamber of Deputies / LUISS Guido Carli) – “The constitutional reform of article 9 and the future generations in Italy: towards a generational impact assessment of laws in Parliament?”
- Sofia Caporiccio (University of Pavia) – “Constitutional challenges of AI in the Italian law-making process”
- Giulia Sulpizi (Ca' Foscari University – Université Sorbonne Paris Nord) – “Parliamentary immunities dealing with new tools of political communication”
- Angelo Schillizzi (University of Ferrara) – “Which Legal Norms Govern the Procurement and Development of AI Systems for Legislative Activity? Short Notes on a Contemporary Problem Starting from the Principle of Parliamentary Autonomy”

**16:45 – 17:15 Coffee break**

**17:15 – 18:45 Session #14, Room: “Ilias Crispis”**

Chair: Fotis Fitsilis (Hellenic Parliament)

- Antonios Kasotakis (European Parliament) – “Effective Project Management in the European Parliament: The ENGAGE Methodology”
- Maria Kamilaki (Hellenic Parliament) – “Engaging with Parliamentarism through the Hellenic Parliament Library Repository”
- Franklin De Vrieze (Westminster Foundation for Democracy) – “Parliamentary innovation through Post-Legislative Scrutiny and Technology”
- Addie Erwin (Inter-Parliamentary Union) – “Parline Today: Enhancing Access, Transparency, and Insights into Global Parliamentary Data”

**17:15 – 18:45 Session Session #15, Room: Museum 1st floor**

Chair: Haralambis Kyrkos (Hellenic Parliament)

- Aleksandra Jovanovic (National Assembly of the Republic of Serbia) – “Artificial Intelligence in the National Assembly of the Republic of Serbia and Assembly of Montenegro: opportunities and challenges in legislative processes, parliamentary diplomacy and EU accession”
- Boldizsár Szentgáli-Tóth & Klára Szalay (HUN-REN Centre for Social Sciences) – “Generative AI in parliaments: at the beginning of a new era”
- Kevin Wayne Settles (Institute for Parliamentary Research) – “From Pixels to Parliament: How AI is Reshaping Legislative Governance”
- Ioannis Gianniadis (Hellenic OCR Team) – “Potential Operational Risks – Preliminary Analysis of the Standing Orders of the Hellenic Parliament”

**17:15 – 18:45 Session Session #16, Room: Annex ground floor**

Chair: Nicola Lupo (LUISS Guido Carli)

- Mónica Velasco-Pufleau (European Institute of International Studies / University of Luxembourg) & Laura Gil-Besada (University of Luxembourg / Complutense University of Madrid)– “Who is who in Privacy and Personal Data Protection: A Case-based Analysis of the Parliamentary Diplomacy of National Delegations to the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe”
- Ludovica Tripodi (Università di Parma) & Paolo Pensabene (Sapienza, University of Rome) – “Old questions and possible perspectives for the establishment of a Common European Defence System in the light of the Italian constitutional framework”
- Jordi Xuclà (Ramon Llull University) – “The Spanish presidency of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Union for the Mediterranean (2024-2025): analysis of contents and achievements”

**18:45 – 19:00 Session 17 (plenary), Room: “Ilias Crispis”**

Moderator: Olga Giannadi, CEO Innovative Tech for the Next Generation

Closing remarks:

- Fotis Fitsilis (Hellenic Parliament), conference co-chair
- Zsolt Szabó (Széchenyi István University, Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church in Hungary), conference co-chair

## Session 1 – Keynotes

Mario Hernández Ramos (Complutense University of Madrid, Chair of the Council of Europe's Committee on Artificial Intelligence) – “Aspects of the Council of Europe's Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence and human rights, democracy and the rule of law on parliamentary institutions”

The Council of Europe's Framework Convention on AI and Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law, open for signature on 5 September 2024, is the first legally binding international treaty on the subject, which aims to ensure that activities within the lifecycle of artificial intelligence systems are fully consistent with human rights, democracy and the rule of law. According to the scope of the Framework Convention, which includes both the public and the private sector, parliamentary institutions shall respect the principles and obligations of the Convention in each and every activity within the lifecycle of artificial intelligence systems. In order to meet the aforementioned objective, the Convention establishes a variety of principles, from basic constitutional principles such as respect for the integrity of democratic processes, the rule of law, and the protection of human dignity and individual autonomy, to principles related to the functioning and activity of AI systems such as transparency, oversight, accountability, responsibility, equality and non-discrimination, personal data protection and reliability; not forgetting specific chapters on the essential remedies and procedural safeguards, and on the assessment and mitigation of risks and adverse impacts.

Josefa Fuentes García (Senate of Spain / IFLAPARL member) & Lila Theodosi (Hellenic Parliament / IFLAPARL Information Coordinator) – “IFLAPARL: Networking for stronger and better-informed democracies”

This keynote presentation explores the critical role of access to information in sustaining democratic societies, drawing parallels between literary dystopias and contemporary challenges. Referencing George Orwell's 1984 and Margaret Atwood's *The Handmaid's Tale*, it highlights how totalitarian regimes manipulate or restrict information to maintain control, contrasting these with the democratic ideal of free, reliable, and equitable access to information.

The discussion extends to the modern information landscape: the challenges of misinformation and disinformation in the digital age, the information overload, the renegotiation of trust in traditional institutions, the need for new skills, and the pursue for digital equity, all identified in the IFLA 2024 Trend Report. It further highlights the essential role of information professionals—particularly within parliamentary libraries and research services—in upholding transparency and supporting legislative functions through impartial, timely, and credible information. The presentation then focuses on the work of the IFLA Library and Research Services for Parliaments Section (IFLAPARL), which supports democratic institutions by promoting best practices in legislative information services. Key IFLAPARL initiatives are explored, including the evolution of the IFLAPARL Guidelines, the World Directory of Library and Research Services for Parliaments, and the innovative COMLAW database.

These tools exemplify the power of global collaboration in building inclusive, well-informed democracies, where access to information is safeguarded and shared knowledge strengthens civic engagement. Ultimately, the paper argues that in reimagining democracy for the 21st century, ensuring access to trustworthy, unbiased information—and fostering the networks that support it—is not just a technical challenge but a democratic imperative.

## SESSION 2 – AI in Legislative Processes

### Sotiris Leventis (Qognity) – “Drafting Legal Texts with Embedded Intelligence”

This presentation highlights the structural inefficiencies embedded in legal drafting processes. These range from version control complexity and fragmented research workflows to compliance risks due to manual edits. Legal professionals spend a disproportionate amount of time on low-value tasks, diverting focus from substantive legal reasoning. In response, an alternative approach of integrating AI assistance directly into the drafting environment is suggested. Rather than relying on separate tools or workflows, the proposed model brings agent-based intelligence into the tools where legal work already happens.

This multi-agent system should support key functions, such as suggesting clause language from internal libraries, validating consistency and formatting, generating standard sections, and simplifying dense provisions within the user's secure environment. Emphasis must also be given on tailored use cases, simplified user experience, and the ability to interoperate across tools and platforms without compromising privacy or policy constraints. A live demonstration of such a system developed by Qognity concludes the presentation illustrating how a coordinated team of domain-specific AI agents (proofreader, fact-checker, legal reviewer, final drafter) can augment human expertise inside familiar tooling. The approach reflects a shift from AI as a destination to AI as an embedded capability that is context-aware, adaptable, and governed by the user's existing rules and ecosystem.

### Spyridon Vlachopoulos (University of Athens) – “Parliamentary Code of Conduct for the use of artificial intelligence applications”

Artificial intelligence poses new challenges to society and the state. Exploiting its potential opens up new horizons, but at the same time it carries risks. The question is how to deal with these risks. An important chapter is the use of artificial intelligence in the three state powers. However, while there are problematic points in common for all three state powers, especially with regard to Parliament, the problematic displays some special features linked to the autonomy of the Parliament and its status as the people's representative.

One of the issues raised is whether a Parliamentary Code of Conduct for the use of artificial intelligence applications should be established or, at the very least, the existing parliamentary code of conduct should be supplemented with specific rules on the use of artificial intelligence. Such a code would have to be broadly worded to adapt to the rapid changes in technological data. In terms of content, it could contain a number of simple rules, such as verifying the reliability of the artificial intelligence media used by the members of the Parliament, checking the content provided by the productive artificial intelligence media and pointing out by themselves (the members of the Parliament) in their texts and speeches that what they say or write has been drawn from artificial intelligence applications.

The adoption of such and other similar rules is necessary in order to ensure the principle of transparency (which primarily governs the functioning of Parliament), to counter, as far as possible, the spread of fake news and to shield, again as far as possible, the people's delegation and democracy from possible distortions and indirect guidance resulting from the concentration

of the most and most important applications of artificial intelligence in a few and powerful economic centers.

**Giovanni Rizzoni (Italian Chamber of Deputies / LUISS Guido Carli) – “AI-mediated deliberation and Parliaments: competition, integration or substitution?”**

The Artificial Intelligence Act (AI Act) represents a landmark regulatory framework for AI governance in the European Union. The legislative procedure of the AI Act unfolded numerous documents, however, assessing these documents in relation to fundamental AI principles is challenging. This study presents methodology for comparing legislative documents from the legislative procedure of the AI Act against the seven AI ethical principles: transparency, accountability, fairness, privacy, safety, human oversight and societal well-being.

More specifically, this study focuses on three documents of the legislative procedure, namely the proposal by the European Commission (April 2021), the landmark agreement composed by the European Parliament's Committees (February 2024) and the finally adopted text of the act published in the Official Journal of the European Union (July 2024). The fundamental AI ethical principles are derived by the document entitled "Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy AI" written by the High-Level Expert Group on AI set up by the European Commission (April 2019).

Our methodology starts with the preprocessing of the texts to eliminate common words and to perform lemmatization. Following, the TF-IDF (Term Frequency-Inverse Document Frequency) technique is employed to assign a weight of significance to each term presented in the set of documents. The similarity between each legislative document and each fundamental AI principles is quantified using the cosine similarity metric. The similarity results reveal variations in how different institutions prioritize AI principles, with some principles receiving more attention. In addition, the weights of terms representing the AI principles are analyzed and the most representative terms for each principle are presented.

The methodology facilitates a comparative analysis of legislative evolution, highlighting shifts in emphasis on specific AI principles across different stages of the legislative process. By systematically evaluating the AI Act's legislative documents, this study contributes to a deeper understanding of regulatory debates and informs policymakers about inconsistencies in AI governance

**Jörn von Lucke (Zeppelin University) – “Approaching the Integration of Large Language Models in the Parliamentary Workspace: Enhancing Parliamentary Processes with Large Language Models”**

The integration of generative artificial intelligence, particularly Large Language Models (LLMs), into parliamentary workspaces offers both transformative potential and significant challenges. This lecture presents a structured analysis of LLM adoption in legislative environments, assessing their theoretical foundations, practical applications, and broader implications. The study situates LLMs within the wider landscape of AI in parliamentary processes, examining their unique characteristics and their applicability in legislative environments. It explores key integration strategies, including the use of external LLM service providers, in-house deployment, and the training of models on parliamentary data to enhance relevance and accuracy. Additionally, the presentation underscores the necessity of LLM literacy and capacity building among parliamentary staff to ensure responsible and effective utilization. Performance benchmarks tailored to parliamentary needs are also discussed. A comprehensive SWOT analysis

systematically evaluates the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats associated with LLM adoption in parliaments. This includes potential efficiency gains in legislative drafting and policy analysis, alongside risks such as bias, misinformation, susceptibility to political manipulation, and broader ethical and regulatory challenges. Finally, the presentation reflects on the implications of LLM use in parliaments. These reflections emphasize the necessity of a balanced approach that leverages technological innovation while maintaining democratic integrity, transparency, and accountability. By providing a comprehensive overview, the presentation contributes to the ongoing discourse on AI in governance and offers strategic recommendations for integrating LLMs into parliamentary operations effectively and responsibly.

#### Marci Harris (POPVOX Foundation) – “AI and the Legislative Supply Chain”

The legislative process is an intricate supply chain, transforming diverse inputs—constituent concerns, policy proposals, expert analysis—into laws and regulations. However, this system is constrained by information overload, manual workflows, and legacy technology. Artificial Intelligence (AI) has the potential to modernize each stage of this process, enhancing efficiency, accuracy, and accessibility. Yet, its adoption must align with democratic principles, ensuring transparency, accountability, and security.

Harnessing the potential of AI in the legislative workflow requires institutional buy-in, data and technological readiness, and coordination among disparate stakeholders in the institution. In many cases the challenge is less of a technical question and more of a human “change management” process that must address constituent, lawmaker, staff and institutional experts’ needs and concerns. As the U.S. House of Representatives and several parliaments around the world begin experimenting with early versions of an AI-enabled legislative supply chain, they offer lessons and examples for others contemplating similar steps.

The paper will discuss global examples, implementation challenges, and recommendations for the next phase of AI adoption in legislative supply chains.

## SESSION 3 – Combating Disinformation and Hate Speech

Stéphane Gagnon (University of Quebec) – “Enabling Parliaments to Fight Disinformation and Corruption: Toward AI-Enabled ‘Chief Reality Officers’ (CRO) as Extensions to the Digital Trust Ecosystem Framework”

Several institutions must typically report to parliaments, e.g., democratic and electoral institutions oversight, public accounts audits, ethical review commission, national security advisors, etc. We argue that this model of "parliament accountability" is the best institutional arrangement to Fight Disinformation and Corruption.

We propose that parliaments develop innovative practices of creating an AI-Enabled "Chief Reality Officers" (CRO) as independent agency reporting to them directly. Its mandate would be fighting Disinformation and Corruption in partnership with businesses and governments, requiring constant vigilance, due diligence, and collaboration in open source intelligence (OSINT).

As a framework to help guide these new CRO capabilities, we propose an extension to ISACA's Digital Trust Ecosystem Framework (DTEF), or the "Trust Framework", which can serve as the "glue" to bind all other frameworks covering the internal, external, ecosystem, as well as the public space of organizations.

A new core process should focus on corruption allegations against elected officials as the primary opportunity to first disambiguate mis-, mal-, and dis-information, and second once disambiguated to take actions directly in fighting both disinformation if it occurs AND corruption if allegations are confirmed, relying on trusted information as essential evidence to expedite due diligence functions.

Ultimately, the CRO would become a guardian of integrity and coherence, preventing foreign interference in democratic processes, as well as ensuring all other institutions remain safe from disinformation and corruption.

Ylenia Citino & Nicola Lupo (LUISS Guido Carli) – “Election Validation and Annulments in the era of online disinformation, between Parliaments and (Constitutional) Courts”

The annulment of national elections—whether parliamentary or presidential—represents a high-stakes and politically sensitive decision, raising fundamental tensions between constitutionalism and democracy. While democratic legitimacy stems from popular sovereignty, ensuring that elections remain free, fair, and protected from external manipulation is a core principle included in the rule of law. Recent cases, such as the annulment of the first round of 2024 presidential elections in Romania by the Constitutional Court due to disinformation campaigns and foreign interference, highlight the growing challenge of safeguarding electoral processes from illicit influence and digital threats, at the same time without disowning the foundational democratic principles and dynamics.

In Europe, during the XX century, the main threats to the integrity of electoral processes came from anti-constitutional political parties, which sought to undermine democratic institutions through collective, organized actions. Today, however, liberal democracies must also account for new forces shaping public discourse, which are not structured political movements but rather fragmented, individual actors operating in the digital sphere. These dispersed subjects in the digital ecosystem – easily supported and manipulated by foreign powers and wealthy private

actors – influence public opinion, distort electoral debates, and contribute to the spread of disinformation.

In this context, the paper seeks to compare the institutional models for reviewing the integrity of elections in the European Union. The analysis is conducted in light of challenges such as disinformation, cyber interference, and foreign influence. The objective is to identify the most balanced approach to reconciling democratic legitimacy with rule of law principles, wondering how the imperative to protect electoral integrity can be enforced in an era where voters' manipulation is easily available to diffused, unpredictable and borderless digital actors.

Lilian Olivia Orero (University of Bristol) – “Leveraging Emerging Technologies to Combat Disinformation and Safeguard Democratic Integrity in the 21st Century”

The rise of disinformation presents a major danger to democratic governance, undermining public trust, jeopardizing electoral integrity, and reducing policy transparency. This study explores the ways in which emerging technologies, particularly artificial intelligence (AI), blockchain, and big data analytics, can be employed to tackle disinformation and enhance democratic integrity in parliamentary systems. Tools powered by AI, like machine learning and natural language processing, facilitate the immediate identification of misleading narratives by examining extensive datasets for patterns that suggest disinformation. These technologies can evaluate the trustworthiness of sources, identify deceptive content, and assist parliamentarians in overseeing public discussions. Blockchain technology improves democratic integrity by providing decentralized, immutable verification of digital content, particularly in the battle against deepfakes and manipulated media. By ensuring transparency and traceability, blockchain can enhance the trustworthiness of information exchanged in the digital space. Big data analytics allows for broad monitoring of information spread across social media and news platforms, employing sentiment analysis and social network analysis to identify coordinated disinformation campaigns. These insights allow parliaments to identify new threats and develop responsive, evidence-informed policies. Furthermore, these technologies are essential in tackling gendered disinformation, especially online gender-based violence (OGBV), by detecting specific harassment and false information directed at women in both political and social contexts. This abstract supports a multi-stakeholder strategy, integrating legal, ethical, and technological structures to govern the responsible use of these tools. Utilizing AI, blockchain, and big data, legislatures can protect democratic processes, fight against disinformation, and boost public confidence in the digital age.

Roland Kelemen, Dorina Bosits & Zsófia Réti (Széchenyi István University) – “Hate Speech in the Digital Age: User Perception, Platform Governance, and Legal Challenges”

Digital platforms, particularly social media, have fundamentally reshaped the boundaries between hate speech and freedom of expression, posing new challenges for societal resilience and legal frameworks. This presentation examines the conceptual elements of hate speech in the digital space, focusing on young users' perception patterns and platform moderation practices.

The research addresses three key questions. First, it reviews the legal dogmatics of hate speech in international and European contexts, with particular attention to the jurisprudence of the UN, the European Union, and the European Court of Human Rights. Second, it analyzes Meta's content moderation system, comparing its principles with traditional legal norms. Third, it conducts an

empirical study exploring how young users recognize different forms of hate speech and respond to platform-imposed restrictions.

Findings indicate significant discrepancies between user perceptions and platform regulations. Many users interpret hate speech differently and often fail to recognize content that platforms remove. Arbitrary moderation can lead to self-censorship, weaken societal resilience, and undermine the rule of law, hindering the achievement of SDG 16. This research highlights the necessity of aligning platform governance with fundamental rights jurisprudence, which also requires a critical reassessment of the algorithms governing content moderation.

#### **Gergely G. Karácsony** [Legislative and technical responses to the proliferation of AI generated fake images in public discourse](#)

In this paper I focus on one specific aspect of dis/mis-information: the fake image material generated by various Artificial Intelligence (AI) applications. Information found online is shaping public discourse in an ever-increasing pace. A recent study shows (Pew Research Center, September 2024) that social media sites became the primary source of information for Americans, with a stunning 54% of respondents indicating to consume news on these platforms. The fastest growing demand for news information is linked to video- and picture-based social media, such as Instagram (40% of its users regularly get news there), TikTok (52%) and YouTube (37%). In this media consumption landscape it becomes more important than ever to be able to verify the authenticity of images and videos displayed on these sites.

In this paper I will examine whether current legislative and technical measures are adequate for combating “fake news”, and if there are any more effective methods in sight. I will also point out that the social media platforms in question may be disinterested in a harder crackdown on fake content, due to their business model.

## SESSION 4 – Democratic Reforms and Emergency Governance

Antonios Kouroutakis (IE University) – “Recall Elections in Parliamentary Systems in the Digital Era”

The digital era has transformed democratic processes, reshaping how citizens engage with governance and accountability. This study explores the potential for recall elections in parliamentary systems within the context of the digital age, where technology facilitates greater civic participation but also introduces unique challenges. While recall mechanisms are traditionally associated with presidential or direct electoral systems, their application in parliamentary frameworks raises questions about compatibility with existing structures, the role of technology in mobilizing recall efforts, and the impact on political stability.

The paper examines how digital tools, such as online petitions and social media platforms, can enhance citizen engagement in initiating and executing recall elections. At the same time, it addresses critical risks, including disinformation, digital divides, and the potential for misuse of recall mechanisms to destabilize governance. Drawing on case studies and contemporary examples, this research evaluates whether the digital era offers a viable pathway for implementing recall elections in parliamentary systems, balancing greater accountability with the preservation of institutional integrity.

By bridging discussions of technology and parliamentary democracy, the study provides fresh insights into how digital innovations could redefine democratic accountability in the 21st century.

Meray Maddah (University of Konstanz) – “Window-Dressing or Real Reform? Compliance with International Democratic Reform Agendas”

Autocratic regimes often join international organizations to strengthen their legitimacy through external cooperation while using these platforms for symbolic ‘window dressing’. The paper compares Jordan and Morocco’s compliance with political reforms under the ‘Partner for Democracy’ status granted by the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE). Against the backdrop of international parliamentary institutions (IPIs) that promote democratic norms, PACE stands out as a significant actor in the consolidation of democratic ideals. This status, offered within the framework of the European Neighborhood Policy and OSCE cooperation, sought to encourage political reforms across four key areas: electoral systems, gender parity, civil society engagement, and adherence to the Rule of Law. Both countries display autocratic features, including suppression of freedoms, regime entrenchment, and limited political engagement for citizens. Despite this, PACE’s efforts present a unique opportunity for democratic advancement through external oversight and support mechanisms. The study employs a most-similar case design to explore the differing levels of reform compliance in Morocco and Jordan. It probes whether external pressures from PACE, combined with internal sociopolitical challenges like protests, state crackdowns, and socioeconomic inequalities, can drive meaningful reform. Although both nations operate under similar conditions of political constraint, their responses to PACE’s reforms reveal distinct patterns of adherence and resistance. The analysis highlights the limitations of the dissemination of democratic norms within autocratic settings. It argues that while external mechanisms like the Partner for Democracy status create opportunities for reform, their effectiveness is constrained by domestic

political realities. Morocco shows more substantial progress in areas such as gender parity and civil society reforms, attributed to a combination of external incentives and relatively greater internal pressure. In contrast, Jordan exhibits slower and less compliance, hindered by regime control and limited political will. This paper contributes to the paradox of autocracies engaging with international democratic institutions where this engagement signals legitimacy and cooperation, it falls short of producing substantive democratic transformation.

**Attila Horváth (Ludovika University of Public Service) – “Five Years in a State of Danger: Insights from Emergency Legislation in Hungary”**

In March 2020, it will have been five years since the Hungarian Government declared a state of danger (a form of emergency regime provided by the Hungarian Fundamental Law) due to COVID-19, which was subsequently replaced in May 2022 by a state of danger declared in response to the Russia-Ukraine war. This means that, with only a brief interruption between June and November 2020, Hungary has been governed under emergency rule for five years. My presentation first examines the constitutional and rule-of-law concerns arising from the Government's practice of continuously extending the state of danger approximately every six months without providing a substantive justification as to why the consequences of the war cannot be managed within the framework of normal legal order. The second focus of my contribution is on emergency government decrees (EGDs). Once a state of danger is declared, the Government can regulate virtually any matter through these special decrees, even overriding acts enacted by Parliament. Since March 2020, more than 1,000 EGDs have been issued, derogating more than 200 acts for longer or shorter periods. Although, under the constitutional and legal framework, EGDs should be aimed at addressing the crisis at hand, over the past five years, the Government has issued more than a hundred such decrees that bore no connection whatsoever to the pandemic or the war.

**Jordi Xuclà (Ramon Lull University) – “Open Parliament Plan in Spain: evaluation of proposals and challenges in a changing world”**

The Open Parliament Plan of the Congress of Deputies in Spain is an initiative aimed at promoting transparency, citizen participation and accountability in the Spanish parliamentary sphere. On April 9, 2024, the Bureau of the Congreso de los Diputados opened the process for the elaboration of the Plan. On June 9, the deadline for the parliamentary groups to submit proposals ended. Three parliamentary groups submitted proposals. On January 16, 2025, the Plan was presented. A period of citizen consultation was opened. This period ended on January 30, 2025. The Plan is developed in the period 2025-2027. In short, the Open Parliament Plan of the Congress of Deputies is an effort to modernize the institution, bringing it closer to citizens and strengthening democracy through transparency and active participation.

The objective of this research is to analyse the proposals for increasing transparency, citizen control and participation proposed by the Plan. Although the Plan could represent a significant step towards to greater openness and transparency of Congreso de los Diputados, some civil society organizations point out areas for improvement that will be also analysed. The methodology of this study is qualitative, based in analysis of content and in-dept interviews.

The research will analyse the following issues: the improvement of the deliberative and legislative quality of the Spanish parliament works; the improvement of the availability and clarity of parliamentary information; the creation of an electronic headquarters that allows

citizens to present written documents and proposals electronically, thus facilitating more direct interaction with their representatives; measures for improving the integrity and accountability of Congreso de los Diputados and its members; a training strategy for officials, staff of parliamentary groups and members of the House, with the aim of improving knowledge about legislative procedures and fostering a culture of transparency and participation.

**Tomasz Litwin (Ignatianum University in Cracow) – “How the United Right Justified Unconstitutional Changes to the Judiciary in Parliamentary Debates – An Analysis of Sejm Stenographic Reports”**

Years 2015–2023, during which Poland’s ruling coalition of right-wing parties (the United Right) pursued the subordination of the judiciary while frequently blatantly violating the Polish Constitution, are perceived as a period of populist democratic crisis in Poland. This democratic crisis is also seen as a global phenomenon, evident in many other Western countries. In my presentation, I’ll analyze the arguments presented during Sejm’s (first chamber of Polish parliament) sessions employed by the ruling coalition to justify its often unconstitutional actions. The central question is to what extent the unconstitutionality - and thus the illegality - of these actions mattered to the United Right politicians. Did they acknowledge that they were ignoring constitutional provisions, or did they attempt to portray their actions as lawful?

Examples of clearly unconstitutional measures, which took place in Sejm leading to the crisis of the Polish democracy, that will be examined include: the 2015 appointment of three Constitutional Tribunal judges to seats that were already properly occupied; the appointment of members of the National Council of the Judiciary – where judges were chosen by the Sejm rather than by the judicial community; and an attempt to shorten the constitutional term of the First President of the Supreme Court and eliminate the majority of Supreme Court judges by lowering the retirement age of its judges. The analysis is based on stenographic reports from Sejm sessions. A preliminary research hypothesis suggests that, within the Polish parliament, the United Right sought to legitimize its actions by frequently invoking the mandate to exercise power derived from the electorate’s will, thereby claiming adherence to the constitutional principle of national sovereignty.

## SESSION 5 – Digital Transformation of Parliaments

Aleksandra Maatsch (University of Wrocław) – “Digitalisation of Parliaments in the Post-Pandemic Period: Stumbling Blocks and Stepping Stones”

During the Covid-19 pandemic digitalisation of professional and private activity has rapidly accelerated. National legislatures and the European Parliament were not exempted from the process, to the contrary, most of them have turned to innovative digital measures in order to fulfil their constitutional functions but also to manage their administrative workload. Yet, while some parliaments maintained or even expanded the application of digital measures in the post-pandemic period, others have turned away from digital tools after the pandemic. Against that background, this paper poses the following research questions: which factors explain why national parliaments opt for or against digital measures in the post-pandemic period? Which factors constitute the stumbling blocks on the path towards digitalisation and which factors are the stepping stones in that process? The explanatory hypotheses depart from (1) structural factors and (2) political actors' preferences. The empirical analysis combines comparative analysis of digital practices during and after the pandemic with interview-data. The analysis covers selected EU member states.

Jindřiška Syllová (Parliament of the Czech Republic & Charles University) – “Parliamentary Democracy and the Digital Gap”

The study investigates the intersection of parliamentary democracy and the digital divide, two topics that appear unrelated at first glance. Over the past two decades, researchers have analysed the consequences of digitalization, with particular attention to the widening digital divide. Despite extensive theoretical discourse, significant progress in bridging this divide remains elusive. Legislative efforts have predominantly emphasized digital inclusion. However, the persistent challenges have sparked questions about the efficacy of these measures.

While halting digitalization is neither practical nor desirable, there is room to establish boundaries to minimize the digital divide, especially from a human rights perspective. In this context, upper parliamentary chambers have begun to play a pivotal role. The study focuses on Czech Republic, where new parliamentary initiatives are emerging to address these challenges. Legal frameworks governing the digitalization of public administration aim to promote effective governance, though earlier expectations regarding inclusive tools, such as educational programs and support hubs for digitally disconnected individuals, have largely fallen short.

Parliaments are increasingly advocating for fundamental rights in the digital age, including the right to remain offline, the right to be forgotten, the right to use cash payments, and access to traditional public services. The study underscores the indispensable role of the Czech Parliament in shaping digital policies, with a particular emphasis on the contrasting approaches of lower and upper parliamentary chambers. Upper chamber, in particular, tends to be more attuned to the needs of excluded groups and quicker to recognize discriminatory practices in digital services.

Csaba Erdős (Széchenyi István University) – “The Role of e-parliament Tools in Augmenting Better Legislation”

My presentation gives an overview of the tools of the so-called e-parliament, starting from the premise that the use of information and communication technology (ICT) in the legislative process is not an aim in itself, but serves the concept of "better legislation". In order to support this thesis, the presentation defines the components of the concept of "better legislation" in the light of the different views in the literature. Similarly, the concept of e-Parliament is presented to define a common interpretative framework based on these two concepts. Its main components - transparency and openness, efficiency and efficacy/inclusiveness, and efficacy/clear wording - will be described through the Hungarian parliamentary law and practice.

Dimitris Koryzis (Hellenic Parliament) – “Digital Parliamentary Strategies in an emerging environment”

According to the last e-Parliament Report 2024, terms like digital technologies, digital transformation, digital strategy are used in a plethora of parliaments worldwide. Several terms have been used in the last years to justify the digital transition in the parliamentary environment. Concentrated research is needed on a clear definition of this term. Even though there were several attempts to identify the digital transformation framework (Koryzis, 2021), the guide for its achievement (ASGP, 2023), the creation of a digital parliament is still missing. The emerging disruptive technologies are also reported with an emphasis on AI but the term digital parliament is still far away. In recent years researchers tried to put on the same framework different scientific disciplines under the notion of a digital parliamentary workspaces, platforms, environments where digital strategy plays a central role in the use of suitable digital technologies and their digital tools in parliamentary operations. But there are still missing elements to enable a fully functional digital parliament. For this reason, the parliamentary operations need a broader framework for their digital transformation for the creation of a digital parliament with a smart digital strategy.

The current paper is trying to homogenise the results of the last IPU reports with the scientific research in the field of 'digital parliament'. Comprehensive digital strategies need clear vision to a successful digital transformation suitable to all. But there are several readings of a digital parliamentary environment, so concentrated research is needed on the clear definition of it, so the IPU recommendations should be assessed in the broader spectrum of digital parliamentary strategies in an emerging era.

Vasiliki Artemis Mitselou (University of Athens) – “Digital Ready Policy Making in Greece”

Digital society is transforming every aspect of people's lives. Some sectors adapt more easily to the technological advances, other such as Parliaments struggle to understand, decide and implement new technological prospects in the essence of the legislative procedure. It is because, parliaments run at the heart of the democratic constitution. Because of their historical routes they rely heavily on tradition. Tradition influences both the procedural way that a Parliament adopts new legislative initiatives, but also the substantive content of these initiatives. My analysis will focus not on the vast new technological procedural ways that can digitally transform the methods that these institutions work, but rather on the substantive content that the policy making process should inherently possess. Based on the Law, no. 4972/2022 (Government Gazette 181/A/23.09.2022), I will argue that the main aspect that decision making process of the

parliaments should possess is being Digital- Ready. By being Digital Ready, the legislation that is developed should be technology-neutral and aim to be flexible at implementing it, considering that the issues that will need to be resolved will be based on older, both chronically but also technologically. Taking into consideration, that technology transforms every core of our everyday activity, in such a speed, that legislative act that was passed just a year ago may be considered obsolete after only two years. If the legislation is not Digital – Ready, it will lead the parliaments to amend every month Acts that may date only one year of life. Therefore, by taking as a successful case study of Digital Ready Legislation, from the Law no. 4972/2022, the key elements of the Digital- Ready Policy will be examined, such as the technology neutrality, the adaptability and the flexibility of the proposed frameworks, the future- proofing through basic principles and values but also through the cross- sectoral coordination.

## SESSION 6 – Authoritarianism, Democracy, and Public Trust

Juan de Dios Cincunegui (Universidad Austral) – “Authoritarianism and Democracy. The role of parliaments in mitigating one of the greatest global risks of the 21st century”

The end of WWII gave rise to a new world order. Eighty years have passed since then. During the period of the so-called Cold War, the world was divided between a group of democratic countries, led by the United States of America, joined by other countries with different characteristics from the point of view of their political composition; and another group of non-democratic countries, led by the USSR. A third group of countries, regardless of their political regime - democratic or non-democratic - adopted a third position, seeking to distance themselves from the confrontation between these two large blocks. In 1991, the USSR was dissolved and a new period in human history began, characterized not only by the predominance of the US on the global stage, but also by the emergence of globalization, including the popularization of the Internet, multilateralism, regional integration and a progressive democratization of the planet. A little more than thirty years later, we are witnessing the exponential growth of the People's Republic of China and other regional powers. The Russian Federation, for its part, has reached such a level of empowerment that in February 2022 it invaded Ukraine, provoking a war that has already lasted three years and is reminiscent of the worst horrors of WWII. The world continues to differentiate between democratic and non-democratic countries. The former distinguish full democracies from flawed democracies, and the latter, electoral autocracies from closed autocracies. A series of phenomena favour the rise of authoritarianism in democratic countries. Six common plagues become visible: personalism; populism; polarization; post-truth; perversity and pendularism. In addition to the global risk of autocracies, there is also the global risk of authoritarian leadership in democracy. The paper will explore the role of parliaments in mitigating this scourge through the development of the “8P formula”, which places parliaments at the heart of the fight against the 6 plagues mentioned above and leads countries and their societies towards Democratic Prosperity.

Tsveta Petrova (Columbia University) – “Democracy and Its Competitors in Contemporary Europe: What Democracy Do European Citizens Prefer?”

Social movements and parties, from populist to radical, have eroded key liberal and representative democratic institutions in Europe, spearheading initiatives ranging from “illiberal democracy reforms” to “citizen assemblies”. We discuss democratic stability and rollback amid recent global changes, by presenting experimental evidence about the citizen preferences about democracy in three different European countries, a democratic (Poland), a semi-democratic (Hungary), and an autocratic one (Russia). We find that most voters in all three countries reject non-democratic candidates and proposals. We further find, however, that the less democratic the regime in a country, the more a majority of the voters gravitate towards candidates and proposals that emphasize majority rule, with authorities acting on its behalf, while being unconstrained by unelected institutions and ignoring the demands of minority social and political groups, especially the political opposition. We conclude that such preferences pose a non-trivial threat to the stability of liberal and representative institutions, if not to minimalist/majoritarian/electoral democracy itself.

Ioanna Christodoulaki (University of Wroclaw) – “Debates on Democracy and the Rule of Law in National Parliaments in the EU: Technical and Methodological Challenges”

In the past decade, the European Union has grappled with challenges to its core values, particularly witnessing backslides in the rule of law across member states. This research note sheds light on the critical role national parliaments play in safeguarding democracy and the rule of law within the EU context. By delving into the study of European national parliaments, it addresses the technical and methodological obstacles faced in researching parliamentary activities. Drawing from original findings, this research note illuminates the intricacies of democracy and the rule of law discourse within European national parliaments. The creation of a unique database on these parliaments forms the backbone of the analysis presented here. Key research questions explored include why the study of national parliaments is timely and crucial and how these institutions contribute to upholding democratic principles within the EU. Additionally, the note investigates the challenges associated with studying national parliaments and dissent surrounding democracy and the rule of law. By scrutinizing technical hurdles like data accessibility and reliability while examining parliamentary debates in selected EU countries, this note underscores the importance of methodological rigor in navigating diverse political landscapes. It ultimately aims to provide valuable insights for policymakers and scholars on enhancing democratic accountability and engagement, emphasizing the pivotal role of national parliaments in upholding democratic values within the EU. This research draws on an original RED-SPINEL dataset collected by the author focusing on national parliaments.

Katerina Lambrinou (Hellenic Parliament) – “Placing Parliaments at the forefront of the Future Generations agenda – how innovative and citizen-centric anticipatory governance can future-proof parliamentary practice”

In this era of deregulation, fragmentation and uncertainty, democracies worldwide suffer from public trust decline and urgently seek to reinstate the effectiveness and accountability of public institutions. At this critical juncture, where parliamentary institutions fundamentally face the growing challenges of the entangled democratic landscape, the quest to prioritize long-termism and intergenerational fairness in policy-making becomes imperative.

Building on the groundbreaking multilateral milestone of the Declaration on Future Generations adopted at the UN Summit of the Future, as well as the appointment of the first EU Commissioner dedicated to Intergenerational Fairness (September 2024); inspired by the outcome document of the Third World Summit of the Committees of the Future (January 2025); and drawing insights from ongoing proceedings of the Future Pioneers Community of the School of International Futures (SOIF), as well as the Network of Leaders and Institutions for Future Generations (NiFG), this paper will explore through a practitioner-oriented lens, innovative and inclusive strategies that parliamentary bodies can adopt to foster long-termism beyond the election cycles and ensure the interests of generations to come are embedded in the legislative process.

By examining case studies from various parliamentary systems where long-term governance systems have already been introduced, while acknowledging the growing momentum anticipatory governance is gaining within the executive branch across states and intergovernmental bodies, key insights will be drawn from existing communities of practices, featuring how innovative theories of change, tools and frameworks can be adopted by stakeholder institutions, ensuring optimal adaptability, feasibility and efficiency at systemic level.

Special reference will also be made on the expanding intersection of democracy and AI and the promising role of online participatory democracy tools in enhancing the transparency, inclusivity, accountability and future-fitness of parliamentary practices, leading plausibly to re-energized citizen engagement across generations and restored trust in public institutions and their actors.

[Elise Uberoi \(House of Commons Library\) – “Misinformation, trust and truth: the role of parliamentary research services”](#)

Representing constituents’ interests is a key part of the role of Members of Parliament (MPs) in the UK. MPs regularly spend time in their constituencies and deal with vast amounts of emails from constituents (supported by their office staff). When constituents ask MPs for their views on various policies, they are sometimes influenced by misinformation, including false claims spread via social media and potentially shaped by AI. This raises questions, especially if MPs ask the House of Commons Library for information to help them respond to constituents.

First, how might answering these requests affect trust in MPs and in Parliament? MPs have an interest in maintaining the trust of their constituents as potential future voters. Providing evidence is not always an effective way to counter misinformation, and MPs need to engage with these views sensitively. The interactions between MPs and constituents are also an important way in which citizens engage with Parliament, offering opportunities to build trust in parliamentary democracy more generally. Parliaments therefore have an interest in how MPs deal with these questions. The Commons Library offers MPs training and guidance on misinformation, and provides information on request to help them respond to constituents.

This raises a second question: how should parliamentary research services deal with false claims while staying impartial? These services usually uphold impartiality by upheld using strategies like reflecting different viewpoints and highlighting methodological limitations, but hesitate to explicitly denounce claims – which may be supported by some politicians – as false. Some argue that the (impartial) media should be more assertive in assessing truth claims by politicians; should this apply to impartial parliamentary research services, and what specific challenges would this raise for them?

This paper aims to draw out these questions in greater detail and outline their implications, as a first step towards answering them.

## SESSION 7 – Geopolitical Threats and Parliamentary Diplomacy

Peter Smuk (Széchenyi István University) – “Foreign agent legislation and protecting the electoral process – the Central European experience”

In the recent years several countries adopted laws that seek to protect domestic democratic processes from external influence by treating foreign financial support as foreign influence – and labelling the organizations that accept such support as agents of foreign interests. Donations from foreign entities are often proscribed on the grounds of sovereignty protection, with the objective of preventing external or foreign influence. The Venice Commission deems such a prohibition to be general, whereas the Council of Europe explicitly mandates its incorporation into legislation pertaining to political parties. The aim of this paper is to introduce and analyse the Hungarian and other laws on the associations that receive foreign funding and so qualify as foreign agents – in a broader context. The Hungarian Act of sovereignty protection of 2023, preceded by a legislative piece in 2017 pertaining to non-governmental organisations, sets acceptable goals by referring to transparency and protecting national sovereignty. However, the vague wording of its sanctions and procedures does not meet the requirements of the rule of law and may have a chilling effect on the free and democratic political discourses, also on the electoral process. Furthermore, EU legislation addresses the issue of combating Russian propaganda and hidden subsidies. It is important to consider the potential implications of foreign agent legislation on the democratic process in countries that exclude foreign financial contributions due to concerns about the threat to national sovereignty.

Meriem Naïli (Université Grenoble-Alpes) & Stelios Stavridis (ARAIID/Universidad de Zaragoza) – “The European Parliament as an international moral actor in the Mediterranean: comparing and contrasting the EP’s reactions to the war in Gaza and to the Western Sahara conflict”

Contrary to vast criticisms levelled at European Union (EU) states and between the Commission and the High Representative over their divided reactions to the war in Gaza, very little attention has been paid to the coherent stance taken by the European Parliament (EP) on that issue. This is particularly important as the EP is often considered to act as the EU’s international moral conscience.

However, regarding the Western Sahara conflict, there appears to be significantly less enthusiasm from the EP: despite passing resolutions supporting Sahrawi self-determination and raising concerns about human rights violations, its stance is often overshadowed by the more pragmatic policies of the European Commission and member states like France and Spain. Consequently, the Parliament's influence on shaping EU policy in that domain remains limited. Yet, on 4 October 2024, the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) annulled the EU-Morocco trade agreement, citing a breach of the right to self-determination for the Saharawi people.

This paper will contrast these two empirical cases in an effort to explain why MEPs are acting as an international moral tribunal in one instance but much less so in the other.

Vassilis Kessidis (Panteion University) & Emilio Mourad-Saber (Tulane University) – “European politics threatened by Russian influence and the risks to democracy”

The intensifying conflict between the West and the revisionist autocratic regimes of the East has placed democratic regimes under strain. The implicit support of Moscow to political parties within European countries has brought many of them either to political power or likely to political power. These political parties, apart from being supported by Russian interests, articulate anti-systemic speech, they highlight the distinction between European masses and European political and economic elites, with the latter working at the detriment of European peoples, and they attack many of the aspects of the liberal order. Many scholars express their concern about the dire implications of these political parties on democracy and democratic stability. We argue that even if these parties are elected to power, democratic resilience is dependent upon the robustness and the quality of democratic institutions and democratic norms within the polity. The variation in institutional resilience and effectiveness accounts for the variations in democratic stability or the emergence of non-democratic forces.

By institutional resilience, we define the existence of an emancipated from governmental pressure, an effective and independent branch of judicial power, the checks and balances on the executive power by the other branches of power, an active civil society, and part of the media that are independent and as impartial as possible. Nonetheless, this does not mean that all of these institutions are needed in order to protect democratic regimes. Nevertheless, at least some of them are needed to fortify democratic policies. The case we will investigate is Moldova, where the judicial power in 2024 managed to protect the rule of law in the country, against Russian influence. Therefore, the exogenous variable that affects democratic resilience is not the presence or absence of pro-Russian parties, but the existence or the lack of the aforementioned institutional framework.

Russian influence constitutes a considerable threat to the stability of European democracies; however, its efficacy is contingent upon the robustness of domestic institutions and the degree of popular support for pro-Russian factions. The case of Moldova exemplifies this dynamic, as the country successfully thwarted the ascendancy of a Russia-backed party, illustrating that institutional resilience can effectively safeguard democratic governance in the face of external interference. Nonetheless, the more profound threat to democratic integrity emanates from significant domestic support for Russia-aligned parties, which can facilitate the internal erosion of democratic norms through the legitimization of authoritarian practices.

This phenomenon is observable across various European contexts. In Hungary and Serbia, pronounced popular support for Russia-affiliated leadership has been concomitant with notable instances of democratic backsliding, underscoring the extent to which internal sociopolitical dynamics can amplify external malign influences. Conversely, in the Baltic states, persistent Russian pressures have been mitigated by strong institutional frameworks and minimal pro-Russian public sentiment, thereby preserving democratic resilience.

Consequently, Russian interference, in isolation, does not directly contribute to democratic erosion. Rather, it functions as an exacerbating factor when coupled with institutional fragility or extensive public endorsement of Russia-backed political entities. Our within-case analysis of Moldova highlights the critical role of institutional fortitude in mitigating the pernicious effects of foreign influence on democratic stability.

Alberto Atelli & Michail Kokkaliaris (LUISS Guido Carli) – “Democratic resilience through parliamentary cooperation: the European society perspective”

In the face of increasing external and internal threats to democratic stability, the role of parliaments as pillars of democratic governance becomes crucial. This paper explores the cooperative mechanisms between the European Parliament and national parliaments in reinforcing European democratic resilience. The analysis is grounded in Armin von Bogdandy’s theoretical framework on European society, particularly its function as both a foundational principle and an evolving objective of European integration, as outlined in Article 2 TEU.

By moving beyond a purely normative and institutional perspective, this study investigates how practices of inter-parliamentary cooperation contribute to safeguarding the fundamental values of the EU. It assesses institutionalized instruments, such as the Conference of Parliamentary Committees for Union Affairs (COSAC), the European Semester’s parliamentary involvement, and joint parliamentary scrutiny mechanisms, while also examining informal dialogues and evolving practices in the context of growing geopolitical instability and democratic backsliding.

The research aims to demonstrate that parliamentary cooperation is not merely a technical governance tool but an essential safeguard for the rule of law and democratic values. It argues that inter-parliamentary collaboration serves as a mechanism of democratic oversight, a guardian of European constitutionalism, and a vital counterbalance against both supranational centralization and nationalist retrenchment. By analyzing the interplay between law and practice, this paper sheds light on how parliaments can act as constructors of European society and as protectors of its foundational values, strengthening the EU’s democratic legitimacy in an era of profound transformations.

Umberto Lattanzi (Bocconi University) – “Parliaments and the international export of weapons: a comparative study on the relevance of international legal considerations in parliamentary deliberations”

A number of regimes of international law affect and condition the legality, under international law, of the export of arms: among them, the law of neutrality and humanitarian law. This paper addresses the question of whether and how considerations as to the legality under international law of the exports of arms are factored in the corresponding national decisions. Conversely, this paper does not address the legality – under national or international law – of said exports of arms.

Particularly, this analysis investigates the role Parliaments play in such determination, addressing, first, the parliamentary involvement in the decisions as to the export of weapons and, subsequently and more specifically, the parliamentary consideration of the international legal aspects of those decisions. In this perspective, this paper aims to provide a better understanding of whether a greater parameterisation of the law and the decision-making process on the export of arms favours an internationalisation thereof, mirroring what has been observed with regard to the “neighbouring” field of the use of military force abroad.

This paper adopts a comparative methodology, focusing on the parliamentary deliberations as to the export of arms in Italy, Germany, and the UK, at the occasion of the war in Ukraine and the military conflict in Gaza after October 8, 2024. The selection of the is justified in that all of the States considered are important exporters of weapons and robust parliamentary democracies. Furthermore, picking two prototypical cases of open constitutional states (Italy and Germany) and one which clearly is not (the UK) allows for the discussion of the impact, if any, of the

constitutional principle of openness on the parliamentary engagement with the relevant international legal issues.

## SESSION 8 – AI Analytics on Parliamentary Corpora

George Mikros (Hamad Bin Khalifa University) – “Stylometric Fingerprints in the Greek Parliament: Cross-Party Discourse Analysis Through Computational Stylometry”

This study presents a comprehensive stylometric analysis of parliamentary discourse in the Greek Parliament during the critical period of economic crisis in late 2012. Using a corpus of speeches from 24 politicians representing seven political parties across the Greece’s ideological spectrum (ΑΝΕΛ, ΔΗΜΑΡ, ΚΚΕ, ΝΔ, ΠΑΣΟΚ, ΣΥΡΙΖΑ, and ΧΡΥΣΗ ΑΥΓΗ), we apply advanced text mining and natural language processing techniques to create linguistic profiles of these parliamentarians. Unlike traditional diachronic approaches, our research focuses on a synchronic cross-sectional analysis during a condensed time frame (August-November 2012) when crucial economic and social issues were being debated.

Our methodology combines quantitative stylometric markers with qualitative discourse analysis to identify distinctive linguistic patterns, rhetorical strategies, and thematic preferences that characterize each politician and their respective political affiliation. We extract and analyze a range of lexical, syntactic, and semantic features to create stylometric "fingerprints" that reveal both individual speaking styles and party-specific communication patterns. The corpus includes diverse demographic variables such as gender, age, and electoral district, allowing for multidimensional comparison of linguistic attributes.

The findings reveal significant correlations between linguistic features and political positioning, with clear stylistic differences emerging between government and opposition parties and between traditional and anti-establishment movements. We demonstrate how computational author profiling techniques can provide objective insights into political discourse, revealing subtle patterns of influence, ideological markers, and communication strategies that might escape traditional forms of analysis. This research contributes to both computational linguistics and political communication studies by providing a methodological framework for parliamentary discourse analysis applicable to other legislative bodies and political contexts.

Angeliki Skoura (Hellenic OCR Team) – “Analyzing documents of the legislation procedure of the Artificial Intelligence Act in terms of ethical principles”

The Artificial Intelligence Act (AI Act) represents a landmark regulatory framework for AI governance in the European Union. The legislative procedure of the AI Act unfolded numerous documents, however, assessing these documents in relation to fundamental AI principles is challenging. This study presents methodology for comparing legislative documents from the legislative procedure of the AI Act against the seven AI ethical principles: transparency, accountability, fairness, privacy, safety, human oversight and societal well-being.

More specifically, this study focuses on three documents of the legislative procedure, namely the proposal by the European Commission (April 2021), the landmark agreement composed by the European Parliament’s Committees (February 2024) and the finally adopted text of the act published in the Official Journal of the European Union (July 2024). The fundamental AI ethical principles are derived by the document entitled "Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy AI" written by the High-Level Expert Group on AI set up by the European Commission (April 2019).

Our methodology starts with the preprocessing of the texts to eliminate common words and to perform lemmatization. Following, the TF-IDF (Term Frequency-Inverse Document Frequency)

technique is employed to assign a weight of significance to each term presented in the set of documents. The similarity between each legislative document and each fundamental AI principles is quantified using the cosine similarity metric. The similarity results reveal variations in how different institutions prioritize AI principles, with some principles receiving more attention. In addition, the weights of terms representing the AI principles are analyzed and the most representative terms for each principle are presented.

The methodology facilitates a comparative analysis of legislative evolution, highlighting shifts in emphasis on specific AI principles across different stages of the legislative process. By systematically evaluating the AI Act's legislative documents, this study contributes to a deeper understanding of regulatory debates and informs policymakers about inconsistencies in AI governance.

**Rudolf Berkes (HUN-REN Centre for Social Science) – “Risks and limitations of integrating automated speech recognition into parliamentary operations”**

As parliaments embrace digital transformation, emerging technologies like artificial intelligence (AI) are opening new possibilities to enhance operational efficiency while making parliamentary proceedings more accessible and transparent. Automatic Speech Recognition (ASR) systems stand out among digital innovations for their potential to perform real-time transcription tasks and to provide multilingual access to parliamentary debates and records. However, in high-stakes parliamentary environments, ASR systems face several critical challenges and limitations. On the technical side, transcription accuracy remains a challenge for ASR systems when they process various accents and dialects together with intricate legal and political terminology. Additionally, issues like background noise or overlapping speech can further compromise their reliability. Beyond technical challenges, data privacy, cybersecurity and misuse of sensitive information create ethical concerns which intensify when discussions include national security or classified information. Potential lack of accountability for errors in official records could also undermine trust in parliamentary services. This presentation will explore these technical, ethical, legal, and security risks in detail, focusing on their implications for parliamentary operations. The examination of these limitations intends to support a broader discussion on how emerging technologies can be deployed responsibly to strengthen - rather than weakened - democratic institutions in the 21st century.

**Giuseppe Mobilio (University of Florence) – “LLMs in Parliaments: Fostering Technological Innovation, Cooperation and Democratic Principles”**

Generative AI (GenAI) and Large Language Models (LLMs) are gaining considerable momentum worldwide, including in parliaments. According to the Inter-Parliamentary Union, experimentation with GenAI in these institutions has increased from 10% in 2020 to 29% in 2024. Drafting legislation, managing amendments, transcribing and translating, summarising texts are all within the reach of LLMs. However, these tasks greatly impact democracy and people's lives, and the use of LLMs is not neutral.

From both the legal and technological perspectives, a common problem when using LLMs to analyse parliamentary activities is properly exploiting external knowledge bases. This issue is usually called Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) and is a hot LLM research topic. Combining external information sources (e.g. document collections, ontologies, databases) with the reasoning power of LLMs is of the utmost importance within this context.

Firstly, the paper will analyse how the reference to external knowledge bases has a direct impact on some of the most disputed issues around LLMs, that are: (a) their explainability, considering also the transparency of systems and processes and how to ensure humans-in-the-loop; (b) their reliability, considering also the issues of bias, hallucinations and accuracy of outputs.

Secondly, the paper will reconstruct the main regulation in force relevant to these two pillars, which applies to using LLMs in parliamentary activity, reflecting on whether using external knowledge bases straightens compliance with the regulation.

Thirdly, based on these findings, the paper will address the implications of LLMs developed by parliaments and (i) made available to citizens, to assess the impact on their capacity to democratically control their representatives; (ii) used by parliamentary administrations, to discuss the implications for their impartiality; (iii) used by parliamentarians, to assess the implications for political accountability. The paper will result from the joint efforts of public law scholars and computer engineers.

## SESSION 9 – Inclusive Governance and Remote Procedures

Danny Schindler (Institute for Parliamentary Research) – “What drives the selection of young candidates? Evidence from Germany’s mixed-member proportional systems”

Young adults are descriptively underrepresented in parliaments worldwide — a fact that has attracted increasing scholarly and institutional attention in recent years. While most research has focused on institutional and contextual factors that explain cross-national variation in descriptive youth representation, less attention has been paid to the role of political parties as “gatekeepers” to elected office. This gap persists despite a growing body of literature on supply-side explanations and voter evaluations of candidate age. In this paper, we study candidate selection as an indicator of parties’ descriptive inclusiveness and a crucial stage for shaping legislative composition. We focus on the case of Germany, a particularly valuable context given its mixed-member proportional electoral system, strong party-centered candidate selection processes, and notable variation in parliamentary youth representation across parties and regions. Our core questions are: What drives the nomination of young candidates (conceptualized as being under 31 years old), and what factors influence their selection for promising list and district positions?

Empirically, we draw on a novel dataset of over 50,000 candidacies for both federal and state-level elections since 2013. More specifically, we investigate whether the share of young nominees is related to the parties’ organizational cultures and membership sizes, electoral performance and institutional factors like the availability of open lists. The analysis comes in two parts: We first look at the share of young persons among the parties’ candidate menus. Second, we apply a weighted candidacy measure that takes into account the young candidates’ chances to enter parliament, i.e. whether they get promising list and district nominations.

Federico Musso (Università degli Studi di Roma “Tor Vergata”) – “From emergency to permanence? A comparative analysis between Italy, the UK and Spain on the evolution of remote parliamentary procedures”

During the COVID-19 pandemic, Parliaments adopted remote working methods to ensure the continuity of their functions. Four years later, to what extent have these measures persisted and become structural features of parliamentary practice?

This presentation examines three case studies: the Italian Parliament, traditionally resistant to the digitalization of parliamentary activities; the Spanish Cortes Generales, which had already introduced remote voting before 2020, and the UK Parliament, which implemented a “hybrid Parliament” model during the pandemic.

By comparing the use of remote parliamentary procedures in both emergency context and ordinary circumstances, this analysis seeks to assess their implications for democratic representation. Since parliamentary procedure is designed to uphold popular representation—the cornerstone of democratic regime—the final part of the study will explore whether remote or in-person parliamentary activity better ensures the effective exercise of the representative mandate.

Stefano Bargiacchi (Università di Firenze) – “Parliaments and disability: strengthening democratic institutions through inclusive policies and technological innovation”

The principle of "Nothing About Us Without Us," enshrined in the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), underscores the necessity of involving persons with disabilities in policymaking through their own representative associations.

This study will analyze how organizations of persons with disabilities (OPDs) interact with parliamentary bodies, focusing on the Spanish and Italian cases within the broader framework of the European Union. The paper begins by situating disability policymaking within the framework of the CRPD, particularly its emphasis on participatory democracy and the principle of "Nothing About Us Without Us." It then examines how these parliaments incorporate disability perspectives through legislative initiatives, consultative bodies, and engagement with OPDs. Special attention is given to technological advancements —such as digital accessibility, online consultations, and AI-driven decision-making— and their dual potential to enhance representation or create new barriers to inclusion.

The research will examine how these institutions implement participatory mechanisms to ensure meaningful consultation and influence in disability policy implementation. Comparative analysis of European, Spanish, and Italian approaches will highlight best practices and structural challenges to promote a more consistent approach to mainstreaming disability issues and other policy areas. Special attention will be given to case studies where OPDs have successfully influenced legislation. From this perspective, the study will investigate whether, and if so, how, the regulation of lobbying activity— also considering the role of new technologies —has had a specific impact on the role of OPDs in the decision-making process.

In the conclusions, I will argue that ensuring the participation of OPDs in the decision-making process, particularly in parliamentary activities, is essential for the full implementation of a disability rights agenda in line with the obligations of the CRPD.

## SESSION 10 – AI, Creativity and Legislative Innovation

Mattia Angeleri (LUISS Guido Carli) & Sofia Ranchordas (Tilburg Law School / Luiss Guido Carli) – “AI for the legislative process: authentic participation or participation washing?”

While scholarly interest in AI regulation is growing, the deployment of AI in lawmaking and regulation—and its potential to reshape legislative and regulatory processes, for better or worse—has received insufficient attention. Nevertheless, various AI systems are being developed to optimize these processes and enhance their participatory dimensions, offering a potential solution to the longstanding issue of limited citizen involvement. This paper examines how some of the most representative AI systems are transforming legislative and regulatory decision-making by strengthening citizen engagement. It distinguishes between ex ante applications — such as legislative tracking, text simplification, data processing, and AI - assisted consultations — and ex post uses, including policy monitoring and citizen-led legislative and regulatory oversight. Drawing on an interdisciplinary literature review and informal expert interviews, the paper highlights the participatory aspects of these AI systems. It argues for an iterative and experimental approach to AI governance in legislative and regulatory decision-making—one that remains compatible with rule of law safeguards and other constitutional protections.

Aglaia-Maria (Mirela) Pachou (University of Athens) & Maria Biliri (Lawyer) – “Reframing creativity: Legal challenges of generative Artificial Intelligence in the cultural landscape”

Artistic creation has always played a significant role in promoting human rights and fostering democratic values in society. In the contemporary Artificial Intelligence (AI) -dominated era, the emergence of generative AI (GenAI) – characterized by its ability to create original content based on training data- is reshaping the creative landscape and sparking an ongoing dialogue regarding the role of AI in art and content creation.

On the one hand, generative AI has the potential to democratize artistic expression, by reducing entry barriers, enabling new forms of creativity and empowering individuals to express themselves in innovative ways. On the other hand, AI-generated outputs raise critical philosophical and ethical questions challenging traditional notions of authorship and emphasizing the need for transparency to protect democratic values. Furthermore, GenAI introduces legal challenges, particularly concerning intellectual property (IP) protection for AI-generated content and the unauthorized use of creators’ works and personal data in AI training.

As AI systems like DALL-E, MidJourney and ChatGPT generate artistic content, courts worldwide find themselves at crossroads. A notable example is the decision of the Municipal Court in Prague (No. 10 C 13/2023-1, 11.10 2023), which determined that a graphic generated by DALL-E, without human input, does not qualify for copyright protection. On the contrary, on November 2023, the Beijing Internet Court, following a similar logic, determined that AI-generated images are protectable works, and the AI user is recognized as the author.

This paper explores the intersection of GenAI and artistic creation within a democratic society, specifically examining the arising legal challenges in intellectual property. Focusing on the recent Czech court decision addressing AI’s role in artistic production and its broader implications, this study seeks to illuminate how legal systems are adapting to the challenges posed by AI-driven images, texts, music, or any type of cultural creation.

Pier Francesco Bresciani (University of Bologna) – “Rethinking Parliamentary Autonomy in the Age of AI: A Study of Digital Constitutional Theory”

The principle of parliamentary autonomy is a cornerstone of representative democracy. Constitutions require parliaments to make political decisions independently of any other power (Barber, *The Principles of Constitutionalism*, 2018). Traditionally, constitutional scholarship has conceptualized parliamentary autonomy in relation to the risk of undue influence by other branches of the state, particularly the judiciary (Albanesi in *International Journal Parliamentary Studies* 2022). However, within the emerging field of digital constitutionalism, scholars have highlighted that such influences have become more subtle and increasingly linked to private powers (De Gregorio, *Digital Constitutionalism in Europe*, 2022; Golia, *The Critique of Digital Constitutionalism*, 2023).

Building on this, the paper discusses how the use of AI in parliaments may impact their autonomy. On the one hand, AI presents new threats due to the proprietary nature of emerging AI-based technologies, the opacity of their functioning, the risk of hidden bias, and the possibility of public decision-makers becoming overly reliant on them. On the other hand, AI seems also to offer opportunities to enhance parliamentary autonomy—an aspect that remains largely unexplored in legal scholarship. In particular, AI could mitigate the information asymmetry that parliaments face, both in relation to other branches of the state (notably the executive) and to private actors (such as epistemic communities and the media). In this regard, AI technologies might enable more direct access to information relevant to public decision-making, potentially strengthening parliamentary assemblies under certain conditions.

By examining these hypotheses in relation to current and foreseeable AI applications in parliaments, the paper seeks to provide a renewed conceptualization of parliamentary autonomy in the age of AI. Ultimately, this framework aims to support democratic institutions in navigating digital transformation while staying true to the fundamental values of constitutionalism.

Martin Montes (Universidad Austral) – “Bringing AI to parliament in Argentina: the role of Universidad Austral in supporting legislative innovation”

In this presentation, I share how we at Universidad Austral—through the School of Government and our Center for Parliamentary Studies and Foresight (CIDEIPP)—are helping to bring the global conversation about artificial intelligence into Argentina’s legislative system. We first introduced the Guidelines for the Use of AI in Parliaments at the Argentine Senate, and soon after launched the Spanish version in the Province of Mendoza, in cooperation with international partners focused on innovation and democracy.

As a federal country with 23 provinces and the Autonomous City of Buenos Aires, Argentina needs local engagement for real impact. That’s why we see ourselves as bridges—helping bring international standards into provincial contexts through concrete actions. This talk reflects on that experience and discusses how AI can support more open, transparent, and effective legislatures in today’s world.

We also work closely with parliamentary leaders, researchers, and civil society organizations to ensure the process is inclusive and adaptable. Our approach emphasizes both ethical considerations and institutional capacity-building, aiming for long-term, sustainable innovation. Other subnational legislatures—such as Neuquén and Entre Ríos—have expressed interest in replicating the Mendoza experience, highlighting a growing momentum for AI integration across Argentina’s federal landscape.

Charalampos Alexopoulos (University of the Aegean) – “NLP and RuleAsACode in Action: Automated Rule Extraction in legal drafting procedures”

The research contrasts two key chatbot architectures: a state-of-the-art Large Language Model (LLM)-based system and a traditional rule-based system. Through a comparative analysis, it evaluates their performance, user satisfaction, and adherence to public sector values such as transparency, accountability, and legal compliance. Special attention is given to the balance between adaptability and safety, examining how these technologies align with the EU AI Act and other regulatory frameworks. The key results of the study include the legal and safety implications and architecture selection guidelines. Also, it includes case studies demonstration, where we explore the automatic creation of BLOLD - Big, Linked, Open Legal Data and its connection to LEOS under the RuleAsACode framework. Finally, it introduces a new method for rule extraction from legal texts, showcasing how existing laws can be transformed into structured, machine-readable rules (NLP in legal informatics and semantic annotation of legal elements).

## SESSION 11 – Digital Engagement and Media Accountability

**Caoímhe O'Rourke (Irish Parliament) – “Broadcasting Parliament from an Offshore Island – An Innovation in Parliamentary Communications”**

On 22nd September 2023, a pioneering live national parliamentary broadcast was conducted from Oileán Árann Mhór (Arranmore Island) off the Northwest coast of Ireland. This event, potentially the first of its kind globally, marked a significant departure from the traditional setting of the Irish Parliament, which has convened in Dublin City since 1922. The broadcast was enabled by the island's advanced broadband infrastructure, allowing seamless streaming and interaction with the mainland.

This initiative symbolised the Irish parliament's commitment to inclusivity and decentralisation, making parliamentary activities more accessible to diverse populations. The event demonstrated how technological advancements can democratise access to parliamentary proceedings, offering valuable lessons for other parliaments worldwide.

The session on Arranmore focused on critical issues such as climate neutrality, biodiversity, community sustainability, and eHealth, informed by current academic research. These topics were significantly informed by current academic research, highlighting the parliament's commitment to grounding legislative discussions in scientific evidence and inquiry.

However, the emphasis was not on discussing academic research but exploring the practical application of that research and its deployment to meet real-world challenges in communities, particularly island and rural communities. This was achieved by primarily focusing on direct evidence from the islanders themselves, who are working with the researchers, outlining the impact of academic work on island communities, supplemented with evidence from the academics themselves.

The live broadcast from Arranmore Island represents a landmark achievement in parliamentary history, showcasing a strategic move towards more inclusive and research-driven parliamentary engagement. This approach underscores the importance of technology and research in enhancing democratic processes and addressing unique challenges in various communities.

**Geraldine Castel (Grenoble Alpes University) – “Online Petitioning in the Scottish and British Parliaments: a New Look at its Democratic Potential”**

In the English and Scottish parliaments, petitioning can be dated back to the 14th century. In 1707, as one single parliament for the United Kingdom emerged, the right of every commoner to present petitions to the House of Commons recognized in 1669 was transferred to the new body. Petition usage soared in the 19th century in support of prominent causes such as Chartism or anti-slavery but then declined as the franchise was progressively extended.

In 1999 however, as the Scottish parliament reconvened, it was the first to launch an online petition platform as an embodiment of its newly defined priorities, i.e accountability, participation, power-sharing and equal opportunities. Westminster followed suit in 2011 with the deliberate goal of reaching out to a public increasingly disenchanted with political institutions.

Academic debate was fierce at the time to determine whether such initiatives kept their promises and in particular if they did help achieve meaningful engagement and democratic revival or were mere examples of digital 'slacktivism' or low effort, low impact mobilisation. Yet, in the last decade, research on such issues has dried up.

The current paper thus means to present the work of the E-Petitions UK project carried out at the Grenoble Alpes University, and more particularly its attempt to document anew the various debates on the democratic potential of online petition systems thanks to the release of rich digital data on petitions by parliamentary services both in Scotland and the UK as a whole and the emergence of new tools to deal with such voluminous data.

After a quick overview of the project and e-petitioning in the UK, it will offer preliminary conclusions born from automated mining and visualisation of the data as well as case studies from both contexts and conclude with remarks on methodological and technical challenges and opportunities.

[Áron Ósze \(Széchenyi István University\) – “The role of the media in the dissemination of scientific results and possible legislative responses”](#)

With the rapid development of science, scientists are also faced with the challenge of society's trust in science. Dialogues on this are becoming increasingly frequent. For examples, see the Trust in Science-Informed Public Policy workshop in September 2024 or the World Science Forum's conference in November 2024. One of the indispensable elements of the issues related to trust in science is the role of the media in the dissemination of scientific results, which is also often highlighted in different forums.

In my presentation I am dealing with the above question. Freedom of science is a fundamental right derived from freedom of expression, and it belongs exclusively to scientists. At the same time, in the 21st century, information (including scientific knowledge) has become accessible to everyone. Not only scientific works, but also the media have become a means of disseminating scientific results, allowing them to be known and, where appropriate, commented on by the widest possible range of society.

Combining the above, we can ask several questions: What is the relationship between science and media? Do different digital platforms increase or decrease trust in science? Where is the line between freedom of expression and the dissemination or refutation of scientific knowledge? What impact can disinformation have on trust in science?

There is no doubt that the main protagonists in the fight to strengthen trust in science are the scientists. However, the role of the legislator cannot be neglected. In the second part of my presentation, I will examine the Hungarian regulatory environment, in the context of which I will provide a detailed analysis of the Hungarian legal system. I am looking for the answer to the question: Does a politically motivated legislator have a role in strengthening trust in science in Hungary? And if so, is it appropriate?

[Michał Jabłoński \(University of Warsaw\) – “Parliamentary privilege and social media activity of members of parliament: a comparative study on parliamentary freedom of speech in time of disinformation”](#)

In many legislatures parliamentary privilege is an important pillar of democracy, enabling members of parliaments to speak freely, especially when presenting their views or political

statements. Usually there is a kind of absolute or sometimes relative protection of members of parliament against criminal prosecution and civil law actions (like libel suits) for their statements, even if such statements are of defamatory character or can be considered as criminal offence. Although there are differences in scope of that part of parliamentary privilege between domestic laws, undoubtedly there is something always in common: protection of a free parliamentary speech and debates as a condition for effective parliamentary proceedings and fulfillment of their roles by members of parliament. However, nowadays this matter has become not so obvious when it comes to increased activity of members of parliament in digital sphere, especially in social media. Traditionally parliamentary privilege was about their speeches in parliament, i.e. during plenary sessions, committee meetings, parliamentary questions, etc. as it was always the main way how members of parliament fulfill their mandate. So far, also citizens interested in activities of politicians usually followed their actions and statements during parliamentary debates. But the time has changed and now we are observing that gravity of political activity has shifted to social media as new 'agora', and so has happened in case of majority of political (including parliamentary) speeches and debates. Interestingly, in many jurisdictions there are different views regarding the nature of such activity and whether it is also covered by parliamentary privilege, and if it is, under which circumstances. The purpose of the study is to compare different approaches in domestic regulations, as well as in case law, regarding potentially defamatory statements of members of parliament or spreading disinformation in social media, and the extent of protection of such activities.

## SESSION 12 – Oversight and Legislative Challenges

Ariadne – Maria Angelopoulou (Hellenic OCR Team) & Haralambis Kyrkos (Hellenic Parliament)  
– “Parliamentary Oversight in Greece in the early Post Dictatorship Period”

The oversight of those in power has been a fundamental issue since the formation of early state structures. In today's modern parliamentary democracy of the Western world, this oversight is exercised by Parliament, the direct representative body of the electorate. One of its key responsibilities is the careful examination of government activity, known as "Parliamentary Oversight." The primary aim of this institution is to record and assess societal needs through the development of public political discourse and the supervision of state power. Therefore, parliamentary oversight consists of the institutionalized critique of the government's intentions and actions.

In the 1975 Constitution, the exercise of Parliamentary Oversight was explicitly provided for in Article 70, paragraph 6. This study seeks to highlight the role of Parliamentary Oversight during the early post-dictatorship period (1975–1977) that followed the military junta. The main objective of this oversight was to restore confidence in parliamentary functions and reinforce democratic stability. The research examined original paper documents which included parliamentary questions and there were preserved in the Hellenic Parliament. Additionally, the analysis of these documents aimed to highlight both the historical-political and constitutional context, as well as the significance of these aspects for the public interest. Through these mechanisms, direct and effective oversight of political power was made possible during this critical period.

Giuliano Vosa (University of Catania) – “Parliamentary control on European military issues: a matter of constitutional law”

Since the establishment of absolute monarchies, waging war has regularly been the province of utmost governmental discretion, the boundaries of which are jealously defended against the parliaments' burse power. Nevertheless, pioneers of contemporary constitutionalism highlighted the need for an enhanced parliamentary control as such discretion is the highest, and elucidated the ties between 'war' and the feudal-like social relations lying at the roots of pre-modern times.

Nowadays, the case arises at a European level, as the US-Russia agreement on Ukraine leaves the Union with a 'tragic' choice: whether to exist as a military power, too, or to cease to exist altogether.

The constitutional nature of this issue, which embraces both national and Union law, points to the following research question: which room is left to parliamentary control as acts of European military relevance are envisaged at the intergovernmental level – particularly, as regards the construction and deployment of a military force defending the Ukrainian borders.

This work contends that a specially reinforced parliamentary scrutiny is due insofar as acts of military relevance – such as the deployment of a Euro-national military mission – are adopted at national and Euro-national level. It does so by means of a fourfold passage. First, a survey of war powers under modern constitutionalism is drawn to cast light on the controversial link between pluralist democracy and war. Secondly, the Italian case on the delivery of weapon in support to Ukraine is analysed in a comparative perspective, which looks at the discipline applied in Member States such as Spain and Germany. Third, it considers the state of Union law as regards military

issues. Eventually, it wonders whether acts of military relevance could be deployed under current national/Union law, and what parliamentary control would be required should the need arise.

**Peter Vaczi (Széchenyi István University) – “The legislative anomalies of the Electronic Real Estate Registry in Hungary”**

The significant social and economic changes of the 21st century is placing new demands on legal regulation and electronic administration. The Hungarian Government has therefore decided to implement the "E-Real Estate Registry" project (E-ING Project), which aims to develop the Real Estate Registry into an electronic database, thus reducing the lead time and costs of land procedures and reducing the burden of public administration. In parallel with the technical development along these lines, it is necessary to create an appropriate legal regulatory basis, which can be achieved through the legal regulatory reform. The digitization of the land register and the related regulatory reform will, inter alia, allow for the replacement of paper-based administration by more efficient and faster electronic administration, the interconnection of the land register with other public electronic registers of the state, from which the data of the land register can be automatically updated and the electronic flow of information and communication, in many cases automated communication, will be ensured, thus making the land register transparent, complete and up-to-date.

The legislative process started already in 2021, with the adoption of the Land Registry Act by the Parliament in that year, and several dates for its entry into force have been set since then, but always postponed. The legislator set 15.01.2025 as the final deadline, but due to the shortcomings of the electronic system, the entry into force of the legislation was questionable even the day before, even though a wide range of legal practitioners were concerned about how to conclude real estate contracts and deal with real estate matters from that date. What could have been the problem with the legislation? What legal certainty concerns does this case raise and what lessons can be learned for the future?

**Zuzanna Żurawska (University of Miskolc / Central European Academy) – “Legal status of the President of the Chamber of Deputies of Romania”**

Romania has a specific model of bicameralism in which the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate play non-equivalent but complementary roles in the legislative process. In this field, the system adopted in Romania definitely stands out from other countries with a bicameral parliamentary structure in the Central European region. In this context, the position of the Speakers of the Chambers can play an important role in shaping the political dynamics, the organization of the work of the parliament and the process of implementing new legislation into the legal order.

The purpose of this article is to compare competences between the Speaker of the Chamber of Deputies and the Speaker of the Senate. The study covers both the formal powers of the Speakers under the constitution and parliamentary bylaws and their actual position in political practice. The article also seeks to address issues of cooperation and rivalry between the chambers and the influence of the Speakers on the legislative process. The analysis is based on a dogmatic-legal method, a comparative method and case studies of key political moments in recent Romanian history. The findings provide a better understanding of the peculiarities of Romanian bicameral parliamentarism and the role that the Speakers of both chambers play in the legislative process and the state's political system.

Weronika Pietras (University of Miskolc / Central European Academy) – “Legal Status of Deputy President in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania”

The stability of the political system of each country depends to a large extent on effective mechanisms for the replacement of the most important authorities. The regulations concerning the replacement of the president play a special role in this respect, as they are crucial for the continuity of power and the functioning of the state in emergency situations.

This presentation aims to analyze the constitutional framework for presidential deputies in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania and assess its effectiveness in maintaining constitutional stability. The study examines both constitutional and statutory provisions on presidential replacement, as well as the practical aspects of their implementation. It explores the circumstances under which the office of the president may become temporarily or permanently vacant and the mechanisms in place for transferring presidential duties. Special attention will be given to the role of interim presidents, specifically the speakers of parliament, and the scope of their powers.

The research will employ a comparative analysis method to identify similarities and differences in how each country approaches presidential replacement. Particular focus will be placed on practical instances where these mechanisms have been applied, if any. Additionally, the study will examine current legal provisions, highlighting potential constitutional loopholes that could lead to political instability.

A comparison of the solutions adopted in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania will make it possible to assess the extent to which these mechanisms ensure the smooth functioning of the state in crisis situations.

## SESSION 13 - Constitutional Resilience in the AI Era

Gianmario Demuro (University of Cagliari) – “The crisis of political constitutionalism and a new parliamentary constitutionalism”

In Europe all constitutions come from the Ideal Constitutionalism written 1789 Declaration of rights at article 16. A society in which the observance of the law is not assured, nor the separation of powers defined, has no constitution at all. This is the ideal concept of Rule of law and the Judicial review of legislation. In a common ground if you don't build bridges for diversity and intercultural relationships that brings to a Constitutional crisis of pluralism. Rule of law and European values became a benchmark to evaluate global economy and the growth of nationalism and populism. For a new parliamentary constitutionalism, we must limit that pluralism is “captured” by extremes and to increase pluralism even in fragmented society. What we can do when pluralism is captured by an autocratic society? Constitutional Identity can be protected by the European dimension of values inside a parliamentary constitutionalism. Rule of law and European values can become a benchmark to the European society that is the common ground described by article 2 of the European Treaties. A new parliamentary constitutionalism should be able to build bridges to discuss the issues that are part of the rising of illiberal democracies. This paper will discuss all the issues that a parliament can use to fulfill a open society of ideas. First to increase the participation of the people for dialogue and free speech. Second to increase the respect of pluralism. In summary a new role for parliament that can't be captured by illiberal parties.

Piero Gambale (Italian Chamber of Deputies / Luiss Guido Carli) – “The constitutional reform of article 9 and the future generations in Italy: towards a generational impact assessment of laws in Parliament?”

The paper deals with the recent constitutional reform of art. 9 in Italy (that explicitly referred to the future generations) and the provision of the generational impact assessment of government bills. Should Italian Parliament take into consideration the introduction of instruments (policy papers and VIG) to assess the impact of parliamentary laws? The article aims to describe some recent trends in Italian Parliament (mainly Chamber of Deputies).

Sofia Caporiccio (University of Pavia) – “Constitutional challenges of AI in the Italian law-making process”

The integration of artificial intelligence in the parliamentary field represents an issue of crucial interest. The importance of an analysis of this phenomenon emerges in the structural characteristics of the Italian legislative process. Indeed, in Italy, with a legal system deeply rooted in a complex and stratified tradition, the introduction of AI into the legislative process would raise issues of considerable importance. In fact, AI models offer innovative tools for the preliminary drafting of legislative texts, exploiting their ability to collect and synthesize vast amounts of information, as well as simplify the language so as to make it immediately comprehensible to citizens. While the aim is certainly to have a tool that helps legislators, avoiding contrasts between regulations, it cannot be overlooked that AI raises fundamental ethical problems. In fact, strong criticisms emerge concerning the possibility of algorithmic discrimination, the transparency of these processes, the possible loss of decision-making autonomy of the legislature and the need to guarantee the protection of citizens' fundamental rights.

Moreover, laws reflect a particular legal sensibility of the legislator; hence the need for a model that is able to crystallize a complex legal system characterised by values, social norms and a state's own culture. In Italy, there have been experiments in this direction. For example, during the period between April 2023 and January 2024, the Chamber of Deputies conducted an investigation with the primary aim of examining the possible applications for supporting decision-making and also the legal challenges associated with the use of AI. Critical issues identified included the phenomenon of algorithmic-generated hallucinations and the risk of manipulation. In this context, the use of AI to support decision-making is still in its early experimental stages. For these reasons, it is important to delineate an appropriate legal framework.

[Giulia Sulpizi \(Ca' Foscari University – Université Sorbonne Paris Nord\) – “Parliamentary immunities dealing with new tools of political communication”](#)

One of the main tasks of contemporary institutions concerns the link between parliamentary uncensurability and new technological tools. This means that social media and innovative ways of political communication are vital for understanding the role of members of Parliament's immunities. After the whole election process, there is the proclamation as member of the Houses, that gives specific prerogatives. In particular, according to art. 68 of the Italian Constitution, these subjects cannot answer for votes, political opinions and beliefs expressed in connection with their functions. There are, in some cases, jurisdictional issues that have to define the boundaries between the MPS' rights and the possibility to start civil or criminal proceedings.

The above-mentioned element became even more central in the case of Italian deputy Carlo Fidanza, who posted on Facebook a video against the space “Santeria Toscana 31” that held the exposition “Porno per bambini”, thinking that pedo-pornography was the object of the exposition itself. He was then accused of defamation, but eventually it became evident that there was a misunderstanding. The name of the exposition was misleading: therefore, there were reasons for starting a criminal proceeding against the deputy. On the other hand, he opposed his uncensurability, saying that he only wanted to fight pedo-pornography phenomenon.

In order to solve this problem, the Italian Constitutional Court, with its decision n. 104/2024, analyzed the complex relationship between parliamentary immunities and new ways of political communication, such as the ones expressed through social medias' immediateness and promptness. Therefore, the present work wants to underline the innovative approach defined by the Italian constitutional justices dealing with parliamentary matters.

[Angelo Schillizzi \(University of Ferrara\) – “Which Legal Norms Govern the Procurement and Development of AI Systems for Legislative Activity? Short Notes on a Contemporary Problem Starting from the Principle of Parliamentary Autonomy”](#)

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into legislative procedures is gaining momentum among national parliaments in Europe, promising to enhance legislative drafting, improve the quality of laws, and streamline legal systems. This is particularly relevant in states with complex, multi-level governance structures, such as federal or regional systems.

Italy has already begun experimenting with AI in legislation. The Emilia-Romagna region recently launched a sandbox initiative introducing the SAVIA algorithm into its legislative processes, while the national parliament has funded research projects on the topic. However, the legal debate has

largely overlooked a crucial issue: the methods for acquiring and developing AI algorithms for legislative use and the jurisdictional competence over related disputes.

Given that parliaments cannot develop these algorithms independently, they must rely on market operators to procure or commission AI tools. Currently, few ready-made solutions exist, as the limited demand has not incentivized their independent development. This raises significant legal questions regarding contracting processes and regulatory frameworks for AI procurement in legislative settings.

European parliaments operate under the principle of self-regulation (“autodichia”), allowing them to establish their own rules, including in public procurement, and to resolve disputes internally rather than through ordinary courts. However, parliamentary regulations currently lack a normative framework to address AI procurement adequately. As the European Commission encourages public administrations to adopt procurement models that foster digitalization, it is crucial to identify suitable contractual frameworks for AI in legislative processes.

This study, focusing on Italy, Spain, and France, aims to:

1. Identify the most appropriate contractual model for AI procurement in parliaments.
2. Define contractual clauses regulating AI development and usage.
3. Determine the jurisdictional competence over AI-related disputes.

By exploring these issues, this research contributes to the broader debate on AI's role in legislative processes while ensuring adherence to democratic and legal principles.

## SESSION 14 – Innovations in Parliamentary Practices

Antonios Kasotakis (European Parliament) – “Effective Project Management in the European Parliament: The ENGAGE Methodology”

The ENGAGE Methodology is a project management approach designed to enhance project management within the European Parliament. It addresses the need for a unified approach in a complex environment, continuous improvement, program and portfolio management, data protection, IT security and other compliance domains. The methodology has evolved, throughout the last 20 years, from an IT project management focus to a broader approach that extends beyond simply project management.

The ENGAGE Methodology offers a range of components, including training and certification, publications, tools, and a community of practice. It aims to enable continuous improvement and excellence in project management and provides a suite of resources to support this goal. The methodology is supported by a website that offers access to publications, templates, and support services.

Overall, the ENGAGE Methodology is a comprehensive approach to project management that is designed to improve project management capabilities within the European Parliament. It provides a structured approach to project management and offers a range of resources and support services to help users achieve their project management goals.

Maria Kamilaki (Hellenic Parliament) – “Engaging with Parliamentarism through the Hellenic Parliament Library Repository”

For Parliamentary Libraries, citizen engagement, as a basic pillar of their mission, is inextricably linked to central values of Parliamentarism, such as democratisation of knowledge and information, transparency and social inclusion, especially where users who are traditionally underserved are concerned (e.g. financially vulnerable citizens, older adults, people with disabilities, members of geographically isolated communities, ethnically diverse people etc.). In this light, digital tools (online information and reference resources, virtual tours and exhibitions, educational activities and serious games etc.) function as an alternative way of engaging with users and providing equitable delivery of library services; within this virtual space, new opportunities arise to make parliamentary libraries more meaningful and visible.

This paper focuses on the Hellenic Parliament Library’s most recent leap into the digital era, i.e. the program “Digitization of the Hellenic Parliament Library’s Holdings”, co-financed by the European Union (NSRF) and national resources, and involving large-scale digitization, multi-layered digital processing, documentation, and the creation of a repository based on open-source software. More specifically, through specific examples, emphasis will be placed on engaging remote users of different categories in various forms of interaction, collaboration and networking, thus creating cohesive bonds between the Hellenic Parliament and versatile audiences (e.g. the educational and academic community, special groups of interest etc.). In addition, we will highlight the multifaceted future challenges, pertinent to the use of Artificial Intelligence, in order to further enhance civic participation.

Franklin De Vrieze (Westminster Foundation for Democracy) – “Parliamentary innovation through Post-Legislative Scrutiny and Technology”

As parliaments start to pay more attention to their responsibility to monitor the extent to which the laws they have passed are implemented as intended and have the expected impact, Post-Legislative Scrutiny (PLS) is emerging as a new dimension within the oversight role of parliament. To the extent that parliaments seek to assess whether legislation is achieving its intended outcomes, PLS facilitates improvement of the law itself and of policy implementation.

Based on our understanding of how emerging structures, procedures and methodologies are shaping parliaments’ ability to conduct PLS, this paper will focus specifically on how technology and AI can contribute to upscaling PLS practices in each of the 11 methodological steps for organizing PLS in parliament, as identified by Westminster Foundation for Democracy.

This paper will analyse how tech and AI systems can facilitate legislative evaluation by tracking the real-world effects of enacted laws, and by gathering and analysing comprehensive data from diverse sources, such as judicial rulings, administrative reports, and public sentiment analysis. The paper will describe how tech and AI can be used for reviewing judicial interpretations of legislation, soliciting citizens views, organising online surveys, and conducting comparative legislative analysis across different jurisdictions.

The paper on the contribution of tech and AI to PLS will be informed by the application of tech systems throughout the legislative cycle, for instance by ex-ante assessing the impact of bills, mapping amendments on a bill, applying tech and AI in parliamentary research services and in the process of transformation of legislative drafting.

Data and information for this paper will be sourced through websites of parliaments, assessment reports on the use of the Parliamentary and Legislative Indicators for PLS, key-informant interviews and through the Global Community of Practice on PLS. The paper will conclude by reviewing and updating WFD’s evaluation framework on the results of PLS activities by parliaments.

Addie Erwin (Inter-Parliamentary Union) – “Parline Today: Enhancing Access, Transparency, and Insights into Global Parliamentary Data”

Parline (data.ipu.org) is the Inter-Parliamentary Union’s global database on national legislatures, covering 274 chambers across 193 countries. With over 600 fields—spanning elections, law-making, oversight, administration, and more—it is an authoritative resource for comparative research, built on data provided directly by parliaments.

The platform has undergone continuous enhancements to improve data quality, transparency, accessibility, and usability—culminating in major updates launched in May 2024. Nearly all fields are now available as time series, thanks to a restructured data model that enables new ways to track trends and detect institutional change. Data can be explored through the new, user-friendly Data Explorer or accessed programmatically via a rebuilt API. Together, these tools allow users to view, export, and cross-reference any combination of fields at the global, regional, sub-regional, or national level—opening wide-ranging possibilities for analysis. A comprehensive Data Dictionary provides metadata for each field, while a new Data Catalogue gives access to additional IPU datasets.

Parline contributes to the monitoring of SDG indicators 5.5.1(a) and 16.7.1(a) and is widely used by parliaments, researchers, civil society, the media, and international organizations. To realize

the platform's full research potential, the IPU welcomes deeper engagement with the academic community—inviting collaboration, use cases, and feedback to help strengthen the database and shape its future.

## SESSION 15 - AI's Role in Future Parliaments

Aleksandra Jovanovic (National Assembly of the Republic of Serbia) – “Artificial Intelligence in the National Assembly of the Republic of Serbia and Assembly of Montenegro: opportunities and challenges in legislative processes, parliamentary diplomacy and EU accession”

As parliaments around the world face mounting demands for transparency, efficiency, and international engagement, artificial intelligence (AI) emerges as a transformative force in their daily operations. This paper explores the potential integration of AI technologies into the National Assembly of the Republic of Serbia and the Assembly of Montenegro, with particular focus on their implications for parliamentary diplomacy and the ongoing EU accession. Drawing from international best practices and emerging strategies, the study provides a comparative analysis of the digital readiness, institutional capacities, and strategic frameworks of the two parliaments. The paper identifies practical use cases where AI could augment parliamentary diplomacy, such as through AI-generated briefings and policy impact simulations. It also assesses the normative and technical requirements for the successful AI integration, including ethical guidelines and infrastructure development. Despite Serbia's relative digital advancement and strategic positioning, and Montenegro's increasing advancement in EU accession, both parliaments face similar structural and educational challenges that hinder AI adoption. The study proposes concrete recommendations for institutional reform, training, and regional collaboration to support responsible, transparent, and impactful use of AI in legislative diplomacy. By addressing the interplay between digital innovation and traditional parliamentary work, this research contributes to the emerging discourse on AI-driven governance and focuses on the critical role of parliaments in shaping democratic resilience in the digital era.

Boldizsár Szentgáli-Tóth & Klára Szalay (HUN-REN Centre for Social Sciences) – “Generative AI in parliaments: at the beginning of a new era”

Generative AI, a manifest of a new generation of deep learning, is now able to create high-quality textual, visual, or audio content with the help of generative models. In their research, Fotis Fitsilis and Jörn von Lucke have already pointed out that among the potential parliamentary applications of AI-based tools, special weight should be devoted to generative AI, as a technology raising additional opportunities and risks for parliamentary staff.

The most recent guidelines focusing on parliamentary AI ethics issued by the Interparliamentary Union, by the Westminster Foundation for Democracy, by the European Parliament and by the UK Parliament lay down some fundamental principles of involving generative AI into parliamentary work, however, the elaboration of detailed standards as well as the regulatory surrounding means work still ahead of us.

In parallel, several parliaments have conducted promising experiments with generative AI tools, underlining the growing importance of this matter. In addition, the Argentinian Chamber of Deputies, the Estonian Riigikogu, and the Italian Parliament have already gained their first experience in how bills could be drafted by generative AI. On the other hand, the European Parliament and both chambers of the Italian legislation have developed generative chatbots that are able to respond to the inquiries of parliamentarians or citizens related to parliamentary work.

Our presentation focuses on providing a contextual analysis based on currently available parliamentary guidelines on the use of generative AI and on discussing already available

experiences of practical applications. Based on this assessment, policy recommendations will be put forward on how parliamentary staff could implement generative AI into their work in a feasible manner. The significance of reliable data management will enhance taking into account the primordial role of parliaments as the main representative institutions of democratic societies. Thus, we are convinced that the effective but prudent implementation of generative AI tools could mean a significant competitive advantage for parliamentary staff amid the proliferation of big data.

**Kevin Wayne Settles (Institute for Parliamentary Research) – “From Pixels to Parliament: How AI is Reshaping Legislative Governance”**

Artificial intelligence (AI) is transforming legislative institutions, streamlining procedures, and influencing decision-making. While its potential to enhance efficiency and accessibility is clear, concerns around transparency, accountability, and institutional power persist. This study introduces a six-dimensional analytical framework to assess AI's role in legislative governance, moving beyond traditional e-participation models.

This framework categorizes AI adoption across 1) demand groups (e.g., citizens, public institutions), 2) implementation strategies (isolated, integrated, or fully coordinated models), 3) levels of implementation, 4) technological applications (basic automation to AI-driven decision-making), 5) strategic implementation models (augmented, participatory, automated AI), and 6) mediation of parliamentary functions (e.g., legislation, communication, oversight). Globally, AI is implemented in varied ways. Estonia's HANS system automates legislative transcription, Italy's Asimov AI streamlines legal drafting, and Brazil's Ulysses AI analyzes public sentiment. In the UK, Parlex predicts parliamentary responses, while LEX structures legislative data. These cases illustrate AI's diverse applications in governance.

This study examines three key cases: KamerRaad (Belgium), an AI tool for parliamentary debate summaries; Digital Sansad (India), an AI-driven translation system; and Parlex/LEX (UK), a predictive legislative model. These cases provide insights into AI's influence across different political systems. Beyond effectiveness, this study further aims to explore whether AI enhances transparency or reinforces institutional barriers. By assessing AI governance frameworks on transparency, accountability, and bias mitigation, this research aims to identify key regulatory challenges and policy recommendations for integrating AI into legislative institutions democratically.

**Ioannis Gianniadis (Hellenic OCR Team) – “Potential Operational Risks – Preliminary Analysis of the Standing Orders of the Hellenic Parliament”**

The presentation "Operational Risk in Parliament" outlines the key aspects of operational risk management within parliaments. It defines operational risk and identifies its primary sources, including human factors (e.g., staff errors, insufficient training), internal processes (e.g., missing controls), system vulnerabilities (e.g., outdated IT infrastructure), and external events (e.g., natural disasters, cyber-attacks). The impacts of these risks are categorized into financial (e.g., asset damage, recovery costs) and qualitative (e.g., loss of public trust, reduced institutional efficiency). To address these risks, the presentation proposes four methods: mitigation (preventive, detective, corrective controls), acceptance, transfer (e.g., insurance), and avoidance. Additionally, it highlights the importance of an Internal Control System (ICS) and the "Three Lines of Defense" framework for robust risk management. The content serves as a foundational guide

for parliamentary training, emphasizing proactive risk assessment and control measures to safeguard institutional integrity and public confidence.

## SESSION 16 – Privacy, Defense, and Regional Cooperation

Mónica Velasco-Pufleau (European Institute of International Studies / University of Luxembourg) & Laura Gil-Besada (University of Luxembourg / Complutense University of Madrid) – “Who is who in Privacy and Personal Data Protection: A Case-based Analysis of the Parliamentary Diplomacy of National Delegations to the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe”

The rapid digital transformation of our world poses substantial challenges to parliamentary institutions, including international assemblies, which are often regarded as guardians of democratic principles, human rights and the rule of law within and beyond the borders of their memberships. Among others, these challenges include effectively promoting and defending the rights to privacy and to personal data protection, which are enshrined in major regional and international human rights instruments, in an increasingly contested human rights-based international order. Based on in-depth case-study research, the paper examines the efforts of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe to uphold these rights. It focuses on the parliamentary diplomacy of national delegations at both committee and plenary levels since the adoption of the 1981 Council of Europe Convention for the Protection of Individuals with regard to Automatic Processing of Personal Data (known as ‘Convention 108’), which was amended in 2018. Being the first legally binding international instrument in the field of data protection, this Convention is crucial due to its significant influence on privacy and data protection laws around the globe. The paper asks: How have national delegations to the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe promoted and defended the rights to privacy and personal data protection to address the challenges posed by digital transformation since the entry into force of Convention 108? The aim is to identify and compare the strategies used by these delegations, contributing to the academic and policy debate on the role of international parliamentary institutions in upholding human rights and democratic norms in the digital age.

Ludovica Tripodi (Università di Parma) & Paolo Pensabene (Sapienza, University of Rome) – “Old questions and possible perspectives for the establishment of a Common European Defence System in the light of the Italian constitutional framework”

The complex geopolitical scenario, particularly characterized by events related to the Russian Federation's aggression against Ukraine on February 24 2022, the strong tensions in the Middle East due to the Israeli-Palestinian crisis, the growing Chinese influence in the Indo-Pacific region, immigration issues from North Africa, the relations between the (new) President of the United States, Donald Trump, and NATO, and the ever-present threat of international terrorism, imposes on the European Union a series of legal reflections on the institutional architecture of its foreign policy and defence system. These reflections stem from the assumption, often emphasized by the President of the European Commission, Ursula von der Leyen, that such global challenges require a common and cohesive response from the European Union itself.

From a methodological perspective, the analysis will explore both the European dimension and the Italian constitutional framework, particularly focusing on the inevitable impact on the form of government. Firstly, the study will examine the evolution of the European legal framework concerning the Union's foreign and defense policy, focusing on the "ancient issues" related to the possibility of establishing a true common defense system. The analysis will start from the provisions of the 1952 Treaty establishing the European Defense Community (EDC), which failed due to the lack of approval by France and Italy, to the present day, to understand which Treaty provisions the European legislator should focus on.

Secondly, the study will investigate whether there is a 'constitutionally possible' perimeter, i.e. a legal space within which member states - particularly Italy - can consider participating in the creation of a European defence system without violating their constitutional provisions.

Finally, after analyzing the provisions that regulate the relationship between the national and EU legal systems, the study will assess the impact that establishing a common defense system would have not only on the European system but also on the Italian system, particularly in terms of the relationship between the Government and Parliament.

[Jordi Xuclà \(Ramon Lull University\) – “The Spanish presidency of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Union for the Mediterranean \(2024-2025\): analysis of contents and achievements”](#)

The Parliamentary Assembly of the Union for the Mediterranean is the parliamentary forum for the representatives of the parliaments of the 42 states that make up the Union for the Mediterranean. Since the creation of the Union for the Mediterranean (2008), this alliance between the member states of the European Union and 16 States on the southern and eastern shores of the Mediterranean works for a parliamentary dimension. Delegates from the EP and the national parliaments of the EU Members and Southern Mediterranean partners attended this parliamentarian forum.

On February 16, 2024, the Speaker of the Spanish Parliament (Cortes Generales) assumed the rotating presidency of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Union for the Mediterranean (PAUFM) for a period of one year and three months.

The research aims to study the contents and achievements of the Spanish presidency of the PAUFM in the period February 2024-April 2025. The investigation also aims to analyze the program of the Spanish rotating presidency of the PAUFM and its level of compliance and the contents of the agenda of the Parliamentary Assembly to be held next April in Granada (Spain). In this context, the study will analyze if the Spanish chairmanship contributes to responding to contemporary regional crises and promoting democratic standards, human rights and the rule of law in the member states of the organization. Likewise, its potential structural limitations as a promoter of democracy, human rights and regional cooperation are studied.

The methodology of this research is both quantitative and qualitative. It combines techniques of analysis of content and interviews with civil servants, parliamentarians and former parliamentarians of PAUFM.

## List of Contributors

### A

Alexopoulos, Charalampos [University of the Aegean]

Angelopoulou, Ariadne-Maria [Hellenic OCR Team]

Angeleri, Mattia [LUISS Guido Carli]

Artemis Mitselou, Vasiliki [University of Athens]

Asimakopoulos, Dimosthenis [Advisor to the Speaker of the Hellenic Parliament, former Rector of the University of Athens]

Atelli, Alberto [LUISS Guido Carli]

### B

Bargiacchi, Stefano [Università di Firenze]

Berkes, Rudolf [HUN-REN Centre for Social Science]

Biliri, Maria [Lawyer]

Bosits, Dorina [Széchenyi István University]

Bresciani, Pier Francesco [University of Bologna]

### C

Caporiccio, Sofia [University of Pavia]

Castel, Geraldine [Grenoble Alpes University]

Christodoulaki, Ioanna [University of Wroclaw]

Cincunegui, Juan de Dios [Universidad Austral]

Citino, Ylenia [LUISS Guido Carli]

### D

Demuro, Gianmario [University of Cagliari]

De Vrieze, Franklin [Westminster Foundation for Democracy]

### E

Erdős, Csaba [Széchenyi István University]

Erwin, Addie [Inter-Parliamentary Union]

## **F**

Fitsilis, Fotis [Hellenic Parliament]

Fuentes García, Josefa [Senate of Spain / IFLAPARL member]

## **G**

Gagnon, Stéphane [University of Quebec]

Gambale, Piero [Italian Chamber of Deputies / Luiss Guido Carli]

Gianniadi, Olga [Innovative Tech for the Next Generation] (Moderator)

Gianniadis, Ioannis [Hellenic OCR Team]

Gil-Besada, Laura [University of Luxembourg / Complutense University of Madrid]

## **H**

Harris, Marci [POPVOX Foundation]

Hernández Ramos, Mario [Complutense University of Madrid]

Horváth, Attila [Ludovika University of Public Service]

## **J**

Jabłoński, Michał [University of Warsaw]

Jovanovic, Aleksandra [National Assembly of the Republic of Serbia]

## **K**

Kamilaki, Maria [Hellenic Parliament]

Karácsony, Gergely G. [Széchenyi István University]

Kasotakis, Antonios [European Parliament]

Kelemen, Roland [Széchenyi István University]

Kessidis, Vassilis [Panteion University]

Kokkaliaris, Michail [LUISS Guido Carli]

Koryzis, Dimitris [Hellenic Parliament]

Kouroutakis, Antonios [IE University]

Kyrkos, Haralambis [Hellenic Parliament]

## **L**

Lambrinou, Katerina [Hellenic Parliament]

Lamprianou, Iasonas [University of Cyprus]

Lattanzi, Umberto [Bocconi University]

Leventis, Sotiris [Qognity]

Litwin, Tomasz [Ignatianum University in Cracow]

Lupo, Nicola [LUISS Guido Carli]

## **M**

Maddah, Meray [University of Konstanz]

Maatsch, Aleksandra [University of Wroclaw]

Mikros, George [Hamad Bin Khalifa University]

Mobilio, Giuseppe [University of Florence]

Montes, Martin [Universidad Austral]

Mourad-Saber, Emilio [Tulane University]

Musso, Federico [Università degli Studi di Roma "Tor Vergata"]

## **N**

Naïli, Meriem [Université Grenoble-Alpes]

## **O**

Orero, Lilian Olivia [University of Bristol]

O'Rourke, Caoímhe [Irish Parliament]

Ősze, Áron [Széchenyi István University]

## **P**

Pachou, Aglaia-Maria (Mirela) [University of Athens]

Pensabene, Paolo [Sapienza, University of Rome]

Petrova, Tsveta [Columbia University]

Pietras, Weronika [University of Miskolc / Central European Academy]

## **R**

Ranchordas, Sofia [Tilburg Law School / Luiss Guido Carli]

Réti, Zsófia [Széchenyi István University]

Rizzoni, Giovanni [Italian Chamber of Deputies / LUISS Guido Carli]

## **S**

Schillizzi, Angelo [University of Ferrara]

Schindler, Danny [Institute for Parliamentary Research]

Settles, Kevin Wayne [Institute for Parliamentary Research]

Skoura, Angeliki [Hellenic OCR Team]

Smuk, Peter [Széchenyi István University]

Stavridis, Stelios [ARAID/Universidad de Zaragoza]

Sulpizi, Giulia [Ca' Foscari University – Université Sorbonne Paris Nord]

Syllová, Jindřiška [Parliament of the Czech Republic & Charles University]

Szabó, Zsolt [Széchenyi István University, Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church in Hungary]

Szentgáli-Tóth, Boldizsár [HUN-REN Centre for Social Sciences]

Szalay, Klára [HUN-REN Centre for Social Sciences]

## **T**

Theodosi, Lila [Hellenic Parliament / IFLAPARL Information Coordinator]

Thomaidis, Nikos [Vice President of the Administration Council, University of Athens]

Tripodi, Ludovica [Università di Parma]

## **U**

Uberoi, Elise [House of Commons Library]

## **V**

Vaczi, Peter [Széchenyi István University]

Velasco-Pufleau, Mónica [European Institute of International Studies / University of Luxembourg]

Vlachopoulos, Spyridon [University of Athens]

Von Lucke, Jörn [Zeppelin University]

Vosa, Giuliano [University of Catania]

**X**

Xuclà, Jordi [Ramon Lull University]

**Z**

Żurawska, Zuzanna [University of Miskolc / Central European Academy]

Sponsors and Supporters

4. GLOBAL CONFERENCE ON PARLIAMENTARY STUDIES  
FRIDAY, 13 JUNE 2025  
ATHENS





SPONSORS







SUPPORTERS





ORGANIZERS

