

Round Table (Country) Reports

Larry Caffrey
ICA Editor

Good Afternoon. I'm Larry Caffrey the ICA Editor and it my task to facilitate this, the first of three Round Table or Country Reports sessions.

Now the ICA Round Table what is it? Well today I think as in any conference we have enjoyed a number of excellent presentations on the theme of the conference, Real-Time Government - collaboration at the next level. Now, just when you are preparing for a night on the town, its time for something different. For one hour each day during conference there will be an opportunity for each and every delegate to actively participate in a debate on what you as the members of ICA have identified as being of major interest to you. The round table in fact has been a major feature of ICA conference for well over twenty years. It somehow retains its popularity, its uniqueness and it is very unique because I know of no other conference where something like this actually takes place. Let me explain what I mean by unique. Every year every member country drafts for conference a country report on topical issues in other words the hot topics those that are either of major importance to the country at that time or are likely to emerge as major issues for the future. That way conference is not only able to tackle the theme of the conference but also any other burning issue that might occur or might be occurring at this time. We have even had study groups in the past and even future conferences that have been determined by the debate that's gone on during previous round tables.

All the country reports that I received by the beginning of September have in fact been available to all the ICA officers on our Home Page since the 1st September. One or two people may wish to raise topics on what other countries have written in their reports and there will be time and the opportunity to do this, particularly on Thursday. Over the next few days, however, I will raise topics that have caught my eye in the country reports. I will ask someone to open the debate by speaking to that item and then throw the question out to the floor. At this point anyone is able to contribute, they may be national representatives, they may be delegates, they may be guests, anyone at all may catch my eye. All I do ask anyone to do is to speak to the subject. If I happen to ask you to speak and it is not your subject or you want to pass to a colleague feel free to do so. On the other hand if you are asked to speak to a topic and you feel that you can't contribute any more than is in the report please say so. It is not my intention to embarrass anybody we'll just pass on to someone else. As I say anyone can talk.

Many people have played this game before and played it many times and so this year I will personally call upon very few people to speak. I will expect you to let me know that you want to speak on those subjects. Don't worry if you don't want to speak and you don't raise your hand because I'll call on you anyway so you might as well volunteer.

Now this year the amount of information in the reports is amazing I have received over 300 pages of information on what is going on in the individual countries and sixteen countries have given me their report. I would particularly urge the authors of the reports who have given me their report within the last two or three days to be prepared to speak to those reports because I have not had time to study them in any depth and I may have missed an important

topic or there is something you wish to raise. That's the end of the commercial so onto the topics that we will be talking about over the next three days I am going to give you just some idea of the way in which I am thinking.

I am expecting to raise for discussion among you second phase strategy plans; over the last few years we have visited time and time again the strategy plan that are moving towards e-Government. A number of you are now discussing and raising second phase strategy plans and that will be a topic for debate, however I would ask you not to bring up, and I will attempt to avoid anything that has been brought up within the theme of the conference, this will be new work that is not a direct conference issue. I will be raising the question of national portals, one stop shops and all the other ways in which we describe them but I will be asking you the question 'is there really a coherent infrastructure and architecture behind those one stop portals? From the theme and the tone of some of your reports I have a question as to whether there is actually something really substantive behind them and whether or not the department still retain their individuality and their independence.

I will be asking you the question 'is there a clear internet policy within your e-Gov strategy? It could be that the internet in one form or another is the major driving force in the way in which we do business in the future. I will be asking is it part of your policy, is it part of your strategy and if not, why not; there may be very good reasons. In almost every report people have mentioned to some degree the way in which they have contacted the public. I will be raising the question of whether you have really consulted with the public. If it is a country of fifty million and you have talked to one thousand people can you really say seventy percent of the population are doing it this way? So that is something that again we will be raising, not today, but over the next two days. Another topic; there are clear signs that everyone last year and the year before was saying 2005 is the year we will finish implementing e-Government and we had one or two people saying you must be joking, so I am going to ask you is 2005 to be another YK2000 and if it is should we be doing something about it. Today I plan only two topics, one a fairly short one which is a follow up to work we did last year and then one which I feel is the important topic for today and which will probably take the rest of the afternoon.

The ICA mission is to share information so I am going to ask our host first to comment on how they are sharing information with other countries. Arvo would you like to comment?

Arvo Ott, Estonia. Thank you. Yes in Estonia we actually got the idea some five or six years ago, through the connection with ICA our department was on a training visit in Ireland, Larry helped us also to organise it, and we got one week very intensive training or meeting course between our colleagues and now we have a new initiative in Estonia here its name e-Government Academy, which is a sort of joint venture between three organisations or three parties, it is a united nations development project, an open society institute, and the Estonia government we are offering different one week training courses for talking about e-Government issues especially with these things what our department what we are doing taking about strategy planning budget planning including new projects, public private partnership information strategy equations and general coordination and it is a one week course. We have given it already to 10 countries, and over the next two years the course specialists will work and allow it to be focused on parts of the previous Soviet Union. Republics such as Romania, Georgia but also Sri Lanka and some other countries who have already been here. We have got a lot of knowledge from these countries and we hope to give the same to them and then it is also thanks to ICA where we got many of the contacts.
Thanks

Larry Caffrey, ICA. Thank you Arvo, there are many ways of sharing information and there are many ways of sharing systems. Fairly recently we completed a study group report on shared systems what I would like to do now is call on Canada and ask them the degree to which they have considered the shared systems approach and whether to any degree the study group report had helped them.

Helen MacDonald, Canada. If I want to describe our relative success in shared systems I would say that we were blooded but not discouraged yet. We completed a business case at the end of 2001 that we had shared through this group and benefited from seeing how others were approaching this I think helped strengthen ours unfortunately I do not think we prepared the ground well enough with the Heads of Ministries, Deputy Minister's Community who were concerned about loss of power and concerned about capacity across the system and so they turned down the idea of moving forward on shared systems despite a fairly robust business case. Since that time I think more and more of them are realising that the delivery of transactional administrative financial HR services are not core to their businesses and there is a renewed interest in the business case which we are trying to then bring up to date from 2001 to 2003 and its kind of tied with a broader view of why don't we look at our IT infrastructure our servers delivery infrastructure and our shared administrative services to see at management and expenditure level whether we have got the right approach or whether a greater degree of communality would help us.

Larry Caffrey. Thank you Helen, it appears to me there that you had the right topic but we were perhaps even slightly ahead of the game which of course we attend to be at times. Does anyone else have anything to comment on the shares systems approach, or how the study group might of assisted them in their work. Now to the US

Marty Wagner, USA. The observations I have seen from our own experience in trying to do doing shared systems in that we may be operating in a more programmatic level is that you can not use it as an information technology programme you have to get the senior management of an agency to buy in to doing something and that if anything we have been slowed down by a tendency of the people involved to get into discussions on XML and I am sorry but no senior management of any US Government agency wants to talk about XML as near as I can tell you need to work on the business case, the value proposition and work at it that level and then it moves down and that's how quite frankly I suspect that some of the difficulties Canada has had is that when you are working through the business justification its that level that you have to convince. Thank you.

Larry Caffrey. Thank you, anyone else. Finland

Olavi Kongas, Finland. In Finland we have something going on already in the field of back office, you know its administrative stuff we have been looking at what others have done and our first implementation which is now operational is what we call paperless which means we are moving in to paper less accounting in government and electronic invoicing and so on and there we have a system which agencies can use. In this last spring we have 16 agencies already using the system out of over100, if I remember correctly in the field of this general administrative system we try to continue in various ways to reduce the number of platforms used because currently we are running a very uneconomic way in the field of electronic service delivery we have a little bit of the same problem because of our small size it is difficult to reach sustainable economic levels in these services and therefore we have since 1997 an e-forms service which was upgraded about two years ago and that is offered as a general platform for the type of needs where you are handling forms and this service includes authentication services e-payments and such that's taken up now.

Larry Caffrey. Thank you Olavi, If there is nothing else I would like to move on to what I consider to be the main topic of discussion for today. These comments are not offered as a model of e-government; they are not offered as model for anything other than that in my reading of the country reports it has struck me that we have information strategy and its supporting architectures bearing down from the top down management perspective while we have the technologies and the standards by which those technologies many be used coming up from the bottom up and in the middle are the two-way facilitators, the budgets, the plans and the controls. I originally thought on reading your papers that I would have legislation at the

top but in fact of course legislation is in many ways just another control, so the subject that I wish discuss this afternoon is really the problem and the identity of the control features in the move towards e-government. Five or six years ago ICA undertook a study report at a time when there was a fear that the central controls that were exercised within organisations in each country were being lost and it was thought there was a very positive swing towards de-centralisation. We carried out a study group under the leadership of the US and found to everyone's horror they found that de-centralisation was moving at a far faster pace than anyone had ever imagined. On reading your country reports I had the idea last year that there was a swing back. I am now absolutely certain that there is a swing back and it may be an even stronger swing than before. I have some thoughts that it may be swinging out of control. If we are not careful we will not stop in the middle; we will go the other way, I want to ask you if you think that's true; is it something that you are involved in; are there political issues or economic issues that are the driving forces and in fact is there a swing back so that not only will the central authority once again become a mandatory installation, but will the centre eventually control the purse strings for all the various ministries and departments as they did many years ago. Finally, if that's the case, does it matter? Would anyone like to start.

Nachman Oron, Israel. I recall this morning interesting lecture of Professor Aaviksoo who drew a curve and what I am seeing now is a double curve, a curve coming down and going back again. This is a real pendulum and I think Larry you are right it is a pendulum we are running back very fast to centralisation. Years ago the mainframes technologies practically forced us to centralisation and the CIOs were feeling very good about having control on everything in the organisation. I think it was the newer technologies that lead us to de-centralisation. We had an interesting debate in the coffee break whether or not this would re-centralise. We did decentralise the equipment; we did decentralise the use of doing the work; however, at least in the strong departments, centralisation was retained which means that central control was still going on and today it is legitimate again to recollect that centralisation enables us to have all the controls in one place running through very high wide band communications but there are some very good economic reasons to do. I can give you some examples from Israel; centralisation saves money and in times of budgets cuts this is the right way of doing it. We do save around 10 to 15 percent of the total budget for instance for procurement by having one central catalogue and one central procurement centre and by having a central portal which we will be talking about tomorrow or the day after. This portal save budget by having one system for control of the finance and human resource and logistics we save money by not reinventing the wheel in many different department agencies. The same with geographic systems; geographic systems that were very popular in recent years and were redeveloped in different agencies are now going back to centralisation and we can save on the investments. This is something very important with budget cuts and that's the way we are trying to hold back and I might say and many of my friends here will agree that probably the CIOs are happy again to have central control on what is going on.

Larry Caffrey. OK! Something positive there, any other view or any other contributions please.

Paul Waller, United Kingdom. We are in the middle of a what has almost taken me by surprise and I think many of my colleagues the shift of risk, the kind of change you describe Larry but I would characterise it slightly differently and slightly differently to the Israeli experience. Let me set briefly the context, in our Office of the e-Envoy the last two or three years we have been if you like acting as entrepreneurs taking a risk on developing some tools to support e-government and the first of those was the government 'Gateway' which we have described here a number of times in the past. More recently we have developed very large complex content management systems for the purpose of hosting government web sites which in the UK are absolutely massive and create huge content management problems. Recently we have entered into a contract for a secure hosting data centre service to host gateway and the content management system as well as any future systems that require that. So we have been building up our central infrastructure along those lines and we have done it entrepreneurally

almost setting our stall out to meet the needs of departments as they moved to e-government before they quite realised they had those needs and therefore they hadn't yet by and large done their own thing. These are not sort of HR finance systems where departments have clearly got their own already. The transition that is happening at the moment is very quickly to assumption that departments will use those common systems that we have developed as opposed to developing their own unless there is a very very very good reason which is approved by the finance minister to do otherwise.

I categorise the shift not towards centralisation because that does for me at least carry the cogitation that the old mainframe data processing department, with its own budget and management and everything else but in parallel with the adoption and presumption that our departments and agencies will use those shared systems is, and I use the word shared very carefully here, is that the governments around those systems will rapidly evolve to allow the directional decisions to be taken by the business user agencies on a collective basis they remaining the budget holders and paying on a usage basis. A lot of the details for the shared infrastructure are still to be worked out to be honest. We have quite a bit to do to work out exactly how that's happening but this is a shift which is driven politically; its driven financially and its happened primarily because of an attitude adopted by the head of the Civil Service himself and ministerial committees acting on behalf of the Cabinet of the United Kingdom and deciding that this is the way they wanted things to be.

Larry Caffrey. Thank you Paul. I am now going to ask our friends in Sweden to come in please.

Knut Rexed, Sweden. The Swedish Public Administration is probably the most decentralised and delegated you can find anywhere in the world. My answer to the question here is a straight no. Let me qualify that from going the Swedish cabinet, the government have never released power over the central government administration they have almost full powers the question is how they choose to use it which is the most rational way of governing the central government administration. There are no discussions of changes in the constitutional setup in the budget delegation in the human resource delegations in operation of independence. We are discussing, the first talks we have had for a long time, the central coordination for my agency of procurement of IT equipment and services but it is not mandatory. We are signing framework agreements with all suppliers but then it is voluntary for all parts of the public sector that is so chooses to purchase under our framework agreements or to go through the formalised rule of the European and Public Procurement on their own. We have basically about 95 percent fidelity to our framework agreements. We have turnover framework agreements of about \$800 million a year which means that we have a voluntary coordination of ICT equipment achieving the same types of savings which we heard of from Israel.

Second we are discussing signing agreements with private software companies for the supply of back office functions and shared services. This is always done on the question of voluntary acceptance by agencies. We are arguing that if our common back office functions are not better and more cost efficient than the agencies can achieve on their own we should re-access whether it's a good idea to purchase them centrally. We believe that by setting up common agency independent back office functions we can create cost efficient solutions for agencies and in that situation they will be used, anyway that is our assumption and what we work on. We have taken a step now to set up a government board, we are discussing how to translate it but I would call it the e-government interoperability board with mandatory powers to lay down certain standards. I would still describe this development as needs driven. The proposal was made after consultations with all other major actors in the government sector and is supported by all government agencies as a way of solving the need in achieving interoperability between the ICT systems of different government agencies. It is not something this agency can do on its own. They all need a framework and they need a government board to determine that framework but it is still basically a part of a co-operative strategy, although it would have mandatory rules, it is also not unique for our system. We

already have one agency - The National Accounts Agency laying down that type of mandatory standard for the financial reporting of agencies into the central government budget, so its not really a new aspect to our system. I'll analysis this still further in that the delegated system that we have has served us well up till now in the first three phases. I would say of e-government development and we still trust that it will be a value to us in the future. Let me add that the present minister of public administration is one of the strongest supporters of the present model of delegated responsibilities, so that I do not think that anything will change as long as he is holding office.

Larry Caffrey. Thank you very much, I know a number of countries have looked with some jealousy at the strength of Statskontoret in the past, perhaps even more so in the future because you do appear to be going from strength to strength. Anyone else - yes Mexico, welcome,

Claudio Interdonato Giumarra, Mexico. Thank you, I'll try and talk a little bit about Mexico. To answer your first question, I do not think that the e-government for Mexico means more central control because it's a really a very strong central control already, but I think it's allowed Mexico to align all the agencies together to one vision of the central control that we need to get a less expensive better government and we need to give a better citizen service, so in that way we have different kind of e-government initiatives. The most principal one is e-Mexico that is run by the central communication and corporate agency and is responsible for giving all the information to the citizens and that's something very new to Mexico. You know that governments really willing to give information like that build different communities; they have information for a student, information for women, like a women portal, information for an elderly people, they've all got communities like that and try to get information to them. The other thing that is in Mexico is it is very difficult to get the information to all the population, so they are building community centres around the little villages to try and get this kind of information to them. Apart from that another initiative brings information in portals of e-government but at the local level and with a new transparency information law that enables the citizens and enterprises to get information about what is happening in the locality. So this for me sounds more like a decentralisation of control. At the same time inside the government they are building a public functionary internet and they are planning that the public sector provides more customer service. The service culture is not very known in Mexico especially in the public sector, so this is really a big effort for the whole of the government together to try to get closer to the enterprise like for the private sector.

The economic agencies are working very hard in building the economic agency together with the local private sector companies. So we allowed the private sector to become more contactable and more competitive, especially for those companies who are exporting their goods. So this most of all, I would say for your second question is more an economic driving force. Thank you very much

Larry Caffrey. Thank you Mexico and now to Canada.

John Riddle, Canada. I think it is fascinating to ask why, I believe it is becoming more centralised and I am going to add several more reasons. Canada was the first country to identify a CIO (Chief Information Officer) and national focus. The Treasury Board I worked in 10 years ago contained about 40 people, concerning themselves with information management and technology, today it is 200. Let me add, it was successful on Y2K. Our Y2k initiatives were run largely out of our central agency. And we demonstrated together that working together in a comprehensive way that we could prove, we could do better. As clearly the economic argument that several people have made, but I think when you put a government wide focus you cannot expect someone to just not move on an agenda. I think the e-Government agenda was given again to our national CIO, so e-Government itself is not the reason alone, there are several reasons. Another one would be transparency of information.

Y2k and some of the work we have been doing on, I'll call the security agency, has made transparent some things that do not make sense. In other words a reasonable person looking at some of the things we are doing would say, I think we need more directive, and more insistence centre. Some these are some of the contextual issues that I think are causing this centralisation, greater centralisation. I want to, and this is my own view, I want to postulate that the pendulum is not simply swinging between decentralised to centralise, but it is swinging in the direction that Claudio and Paul referenced, swinging out potentially towards a greater use of the private sector. So centralisation may also mean a bundling in a way where we would look at our relationships with the private sector. This is purely speculation on my part.

Larry Caffrey. Thank you very much. Another thought that has occurred to me is that a number of countries had said yes that's the way it's going, but there appears to be the money to do it, or is this some political force. Perhaps it is different, I wonder if in the US, where you may be in the position of having been decentralised, but with a federal versus state authority find it difficult to get it back.

Barry West, USA. Yes, we agree with Canada as far as the contracting out because as we move forward, we are contracting more and more of other services out, which is basically causing us to approach that from a government centralised approach, a government oversight after those projects. With a centralised approach we are working to centralised approach we are working to centralise the service delivery, transform the processes and provide e-services to citizens all at the same time, but working against us is our funding model, where funding is still not centralised is coming from individual agencies, so becomes, that is one of our major challenges because of that.

Luis Vidigal, Portugal. I almost decided not to speak about our experience because it is so recent, because everything was published, or rebuilt last August, so there are three lessons, driving forces that I can mention. The first one is political, real political, and private sector linked together. This is one of the driving forces that are really essential. They are linked to the Prime Minister himself. So it is part of 9 tons of paper have been published related to what will not happen till 2006. It is related to the political lifecycle and its problem with centralisation. It's a coincidence between the political lifecycle and the plan because implementation is not usual; it is not coincidental with the political lifecycle. The second and third came from Ministers that moved from the Prime Minister's Office in the past to the Minister of Finance and also the internal control system that is more financial oriented. You can see the areas related with the information society and e-government on Prime Minister and economic reform and internal control systems, financial and internal control system in Ministry of Finance. We can say that it was published in last August. There are lots of new references; two action plans, one relating to the information society and the other related to the government; two national initiatives, one about broadband and the other about citizens with special needs. The last one is the National Programme for Procurement, which is now already in place in six different ministries as pilots.

Just to give an idea about the e-Government action plan, it is planned for example to abolish or replace the system that everybody in ICA knows. It is twelve years old, it's an old system, an old portal, it is going to be replaced by the portal of citizens supported by a new architecture framework that is being built until the end of this year, and also special portal for public servants that will be related with a security with authenticity that will be possible. I suppose that all the public servants with a single sign-on enter on different faces of the value chain of processes. So it is part of the entire framework. And also, of course, a gateway, similar to what is planned with, or is being implemented in the UK and all of the these supported with e-Government training that is being developed on our national portal of public administration. Lot of training courses about e-Government are being put in place. So it is something perhaps to remember, in the ICA from 1997 when we approved our green paper about information society perhaps from 1997 until 2003 it is a new cycle. I hope that it is not

a new cycle for the 2006 because that is the end of this new government and because you have to think in a different way and that public administration will go on after 2006.

Larry Caffrey. Thank you Luis. Just one point to that and that is when you said your portal was to be replaced, I hope your portal has been honourably retired, because you actually had the portal up and working before many people here had even thought of the idea. I think many of us have watched with admiration the way in which you were able to develop it, and implement it over that period. Now, once again to the USA.

Dave Molchany, USA. Just a comment because, in the USA we have three distinct levels of government, there are trends towards centralisation at each one, Barry West talked a bit about the Federal governments and they have business plan development now that they are looked at centrally, funding is still with the agencies, but there is an overall central thought process as to how they are investing in technology. The State level you will see a bit more centralisation, the States are moving more towards, all of them have CIO's, and they are moving a bit more towards central administration of IT and some are more centralised than others. California would be the example of one that sort of imploded and is actually now slowly moving back towards the central concept again, but there are others that are quite centralised in the USA. At the local level I think you are seeing the greatest move back towards centralisation. Local governments, I think are looking for any possible way to be more efficient and cost effective and I think you are seeing a lot of movement to CIO's with central authority with what is going on in the city or county. We are seeing a lot more cities and counties doing studies of the role of the CIO, most with the idea in mind that they will end up with a centralised, highly centralised solution. One reason I know that is cause they are calling Fairfax. We have a very centralised solution with a lot of collaboration and we are involved in several of the studies in what they should be doing in cities and counties. A good example of a state that is re-centralised is Virginia, which has literally taken all infrastructures out of every department and centralised it under a new CIO with enduring control between the governor and the legislator. So, I guess in short, across all levels of government, I think you are seeing a move back towards centralisation in the US. Thank you.

Larry Caffrey. Australia?

John Grant, Australia. Thank you Larry, I want to try and be a bit provocative here and perhaps this arises from the fact that, I think Australia at this moment, albeit my friend next to me is also in the same position, we're the only Southern Hemisphere member and when I look at our experience, I suppose I say bah!! Humbug!! Centralisation, or not centralisation is political. I think that you have to fit within what the government expects and how the government expects to act. But Australia has had quite a significant experience in centralisation and decentralisation. We've had centralised ICT Procurement, where we paid the price on the panel contract which is about twice what you would pay if you went into the local computer store and were all very pleased to be able to support those companies who got twice the price. We have had the share system suite for human resources and financial resources, which the objective was in fact to have common accounting infrastructure that allowed us to put our money, our accounting outcomes into a central framework. Well we used SAP and Finance One and assorted one other which I cannot remember, and I think our accounting is probably worse that it ever has been. It has cost us a mint and we are still recovering for how we actually get a national account that makes sense. We have had outsourcing across the Board, based on clusters, where the central agency, the department of finance said this cluster of agencies who have nothing in common, will in fact now have an IT outsourcer in common, who by the way the central agency will choose and once we have done that you can then manage it. Well that has been an absolute abomination. We've got many private organisations and a range of other salesmen running around saying you must have a central CIO. You must have central funds and you must have central rule. Well, sorry they are also the people who told us we'd save 30% by outsourcing, wrong. We'd save 30% by having electronic procurement systems, well we've got a bunch of states and the Federal

government who have spent anything up to 20million dollars each on e-Procurement systems, we didn't get 30% savings. In fact we didn't get a return on our investments, at least to date. They are the people who are telling us we will save 30% by utility computing, will save 30% by actually centralising, all their data storage, well sorry we just don't actually believe that. Someone has got to make money somewhere and it's going to be the private sector not the government.

When I look at the question here, Who is in fact the central authority? What is central control? Can I suggest to you that in fact the central authority or central control is the citizen. If we have been listening to anything that we have talked about earlier today and in past meetings. The citizen is in fact the focus of e-Government and I think that we are in fact moving to more central control, but that central control is a citizen. The citizen is in fact demanding much more control of their inclination and the way they deal with government.

Transparencies coming through government so the citizen knows what government is doing. The citizen is choosing how he or she wishes to deal with government, which channel they will use? We have a basic view that if we centralise, we've learned that we lose innovation, we in fact do not save money, we spend a hell of a lot more and the agencies who are subject to the centralisation because there will always be a centralisation, spend most of their time trying to work out they don't have to accommodate the centralisation rather than on their business. In Australia, we actually think that what we are moving towards is what could be called network-enabled government not dissimilar to network centric warfare. What this actually means is that we will set standards which we expect agencies to follow, but by the way the lead agencies to challenge. That the standards allow information to be shared by having better information which can be brought together, we hope will take better decisions which in fact create a much more stronger government.

Does e-Government need more central control – absolutely not for government. Probably and we hope for the citizen. Should we be taken in by organisations, I hope not, but I'm sick of those who keep running to our politicians saying centralise, centralise and I mean, I'm the one who is going to benefit out of this. Our problem is that every time we centralise, we've lost. So empower the agencies by providing the basic infrastructure, and create the opportunity for innovation and the use of a huge asset that we don't use very well, which is information, put the power in the citizen and we actually do have centralisation, but I don't think it is what we are talking about here.

Larry Caffrey. Right thank you. I knew I'd picked the right subject this afternoon. I mean to get 10 countries speaking to the same subject within 45 minutes is pretty good going. I am going to stop the discussion at the moment. I am quite happy to continue it tomorrow or start a different theme. We have no strict protocols here, if people wish to discuss it outside please do so. If you wish to discuss it on this floor tomorrow, please do so, otherwise I'll move on to another topic. But as far as this afternoon goes, thank you all for your contribution, I have thoroughly enjoyed it, and I am sure most of you have and we'll see you all in the morning. Thank you and Good Night.