

UNION INTERPARLEMENTAIRE

INTER-PARLIAMENTARY UNION

ASSOCIATION DES SECRETAIRES  
GENERAUX DES PARLEMENTS



ASSOCIATION OF SECRETARIES  
GENERAL OF PARLIAMENTS

**COMMUNICATION**

by

**Mr Daniel GUSPAN**

**Secretary General of the Chancellery of the National Council  
of Slovakia**

on

**“From Rules to Trust: Practical Innovations in Institutional Openness in  
Parliament”**

**Istanbul Session**

**April 2026**

Honourable Secretaries-General, my peers,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Let me anchor my remarks in a principle that, in my view, is central to parliamentary practice: **from Rules to Trust**.

Today, when we speak about innovation, we often think first about technology, especially artificial intelligence. I do not question that. Technology is a tool, and a tool can help. But our daily practice in the Chancellery of the National Council of the Slovak Republic leads to one key conclusion. What matters most is not the number of tools we deploy. What matters is whether parliament can keep public trust in a time of constant pressure on public institutions.

When I speak about trust, I do not mean only formal process quality or digitalisation. Trust is human. It is about professional conduct, integrity, and responsibility. It is also about one more thing: the ability of an institution to explain its decisions in clear language and in a way that can be checked.

So, in this speech, I use the word innovation in a practical sense. Innovation means changes that strengthen rules. Stronger rules build trust, and trust must move from words to daily practice.

I want to stress that, in an uncertain world; trust does not come from slogans. It is built through rules that are enforceable, stable, and traceable over time. That is why one of the most important innovations is not another app. It is the strategic opening of parliament to the public – especially to young people – together with stronger professional capacity that can sustain such openness without risk and without loss of authority.

If AI gradually takes over part of cognitive and analytical work, parliament must strengthen relational work, explanatory work, and participation. Otherwise, the economic gains of automation can turn into social distance and political tension.

In other words, parliament should not be only a technology hub measured by the number of tools. Parliament must also be a human hub, a centre of democratic activity focused on citizens – what IPU aptly calls a public engagement hub.

We need to prioritize methods that are verifiable, accountable, and transparent, while keeping the human factor at the core. Therefore, in Slovakia, we invest in building knowledge, while strengthening inter-institutional cooperation, information sharing, and the involvement of younger generations.

In this logic, I will offer **four examples** from the Slovak perspective – not as a “showcase of perfection,” but as practical elements that can be described and assessed.

The first priority is to further enhance the Parliament’s professional capacity, fostering greater openness and accountability. Parliamentary openness is not only about letting people enter the building. It is also about parliament’s ability to explain, in a responsible

way, why it adopts certain norms, what impact they will have, and how they will work in practice. Within the Chancellery of the National Council of the Slovak Republic, we have launched **a series of expert seminars, “New Trends in Legislative Practice.”** The first session, held in January of this year, explored the evolution of legislation and legal drafting skills from the previous regime through the transition to democracy. More importantly, we are currently preparing a follow-up event for April, which will focus on legislative impact assessment and the role of AI. The purpose is clear: to create a shared professional framework that reduces legislative risks and increases predictability.

Secondly, the Chancellery has established a unique cooperation model: **a roundtable discussion format organized together with the Ministry of Interior.** By engaging experts to review application problems and legislative aims even before draft laws are formally drafted and introduced, we aim to secure early feedback and resolve ambiguities, ensuring higher quality and more predictable legislation. Since last summer, we have organized already **five such discussions**, covering topics ranging from lobbying and electoral matters to crisis management, municipal oversight, and transport and parking policies. To support evidence-based decision-making, our research service, called the Parliamentary Institute, prepares studies and comparative analyses to inform and streamline these debates.

**My third example concerns cooperation with youth**, because if we speak about trust, we must also speak about intergenerational trust. The legislative process affects everyone, and young people therefore belong in these processes not as an audience, but as legitimate participants through regular forms of engagement. Trust does not arise from declarations. It arises when young people see that their ideas are heard, that they receive feedback, and that their participation leaves a visible mark in the work of the institution.

When parliament creates opportunities for participation, it strengthens people’s relationship with democratic institutions and reduces the motivation to seek professional fulfilment exclusively abroad. That is why the Chancellery of the National Council of the Slovak Republic sees youth civic participation as a strategic investment in democratic resilience. Therefore, we enhanced our existing programmes, such as the university internship scheme, by introducing new forms of interaction.

On 11 November 2025, the National Council, the Chancellery of the National Council, and the civic association Model Parliament of Slovakia signed a memorandum of cooperation. This agreement establishes a clear framework for organising model plenary sessions and committee meetings for high school students. In parallel, the Chancellery runs an annual internship programme for university students. It connects academic knowledge with practical parliamentary experience. The goal is simple: to give students a comprehensive understanding of the parliament’s day-to-day work. In academic year 2025/2026, the Chancellery will complete **the 28th edition of this internship programme**, which shows a long-term, tested, and robust practice.

Adding another vital piece to the mosaic of our youth engagement, we introduced a **specialized course on parliamentarism this February at Comenius University Bratislava**, which is Slovakia’s oldest and by far largest institution. This initiative offers

political science and law students a unique opportunity to explore the inner workings of the Slovak parliament through twelve interactive sessions hosted within the authentic venues of the National Council.

Lastly, our parliamentary research service – **the Parliamentary Institute** – has joined **the Council of Analytical Units of State Administration** as an observer member. This unique expert network and information hub allows central analytical units to share knowledge and experience, ensuring high-level cooperation while avoiding overlaps in the spirit of cost-effective performance.

Much is currently being said about parliaments opening to new technologies. But let me underline an often-overlooked dimension: continuity of a professional environment. If we want to move from rules to trust, enforceable rules alone are not enough. We also need a stable professional culture in which rules are followed naturally, not only under pressure or under coercion.

I will close by highlighting my vision. I see the Chancellery of the National Council as a steward of procedures, operations, and rules. Parliamentary openness and public engagement is a core part of this role.

In my view, innovation is not about what we procure. It is about how we build human capacity in a systematic way. For me, from rules to trust means this: setting clear standards of institutional conduct, protecting security, and strengthening analytical capacity.

If we reduce innovation only to new technologies, we may gain speed and efficiency. But we may lose what matters most: parliaments are made by people, and they serve people.

Thank you for your attention.