



Indicator 2.2: Institutional integrity

About this indicator

In democratic systems of government, parliament is often seen as the nation's highest institution. It is therefore essential for parliament to lead by example on institutional integrity, and to uphold the highest standards and values in its operations.

This indicator concerns various aspects of the institutional integrity that parliaments should aspire to achieve. These include accountability for the expenditure of parliamentary funds, and transparent procurement procedures. It also includes parliament's responsibilities with regard to freedom of information legislation.

This indicator also concerns the career development and professionalism of parliamentary staff, who are expected to perform their duties in a non-partisan manner in a highly political environment, as well as parliament's responsibility for its own institutional development.

This indicator comprises the following dimensions:

- Dimension 2.2.1: Parliamentary expenditure
- Dimension 2.2.2: Public procurement
- Dimension 2.2.3: Freedom of information
- Dimension 2.2.4: Professionalism of the parliamentary administration
- Dimension 2.2.5: Institutional development of parliament

The Indicators for Democratic Parliaments are a multi-partner initiative coordinated by the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU), in partnership with the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association (CPA), Directorio Legislativo Foundation, Inter Pares / International IDEA, the National Democratic Institute (NDI), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), UN Women and the Westminster Foundation for Democracy (WFD).

The Indicators are published at www.parliamentaryindicators.org under the Creative Commons license [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

Dimension 2.2.1: Parliamentary expenditure

This dimension is part of:

- Indicator 2.2: Institutional integrity
- Target 2: Accountable parliament

About this dimension

Parliament's autonomy over the setting and spending of its own budget implies a need for transparency and accountability as to how these funds are spent. This dimension covers the rules, procedures and practices by which parliament ensures such transparency and accountability.

Parliament should adhere to clear rules and procedures on all parliamentary expenditure. Clear rules and procedures are especially important for the salaries and allowances paid to MPs and staff, as well as for spending related to parliamentary office holders and political groups, which are matters of considerable public interest.

Parliament is expected to report to the public on its expenditure in all areas of the budget, including on the activities, services and performance of the parliamentary administration, and the salaries and allowances paid to MPs and their staff. Such reports should include comparisons with previous cycles, with data presented in a way that is easy for the general public to understand.

The expenditure of parliamentary funds should also be subject to various levels of oversight, including regular, independent audits and scrutiny by one or more parliamentary committees. The findings and reports of such audits and committees should be made public.

See also *Dimension 1.1.3: Budgetary autonomy* and *Dimension 2.1.4: Parliamentary income and use of parliamentary resources*.

Aspiring goal

Based on a global comparative analysis, an aspiring goal for parliaments in the area of "parliamentary expenditure" is as follows:

Parliament has clear and transparent rules and procedures on the expenditure of parliamentary funds, including the remuneration and allowances paid to MPs and their staff, as well as spending related to parliamentary office holders and political parties and groups.

Parliament is required to report regularly to the public on its expenditure.

Parliamentary expenditure is subject to regular, independent audits. Audit reports are made public.

A parliamentary committee provides oversight, including by scrutinizing the reports of the parliamentary administration and the audits of expenditure. Committee findings and reports are made public.

Assessment

This dimension is assessed against several criteria, each of which should be evaluated separately. For each criterion, select one of the six descriptive grades (Non-existent, Rudimentary, Basic, Good, Very good and Excellent) that best reflects the situation in your parliament, and provide details of the evidence on which this assessment is based.

The evidence for assessment of this dimension could include the following:

- Provisions of the legal framework and/or parliament's rules of procedure relating to accountability for the expenditure of parliamentary funds
- Specific rules or procedures relating to the payment of remuneration and allowances to MPs and staff
- Parliamentary reports and information on expenditure published on the parliamentary website
- Audit reports on parliamentary expenditure and/or on the remuneration and allowances paid to MPs and staff
- Reports from one or more oversight committees on parliamentary expenditure

Where relevant, provide additional comments or examples that support the assessment.

Assessment criterion 1: Rules and procedures

Parliament has clear and transparent rules and procedures on the expenditure of parliamentary funds, including the remuneration and allowances paid to MPs and their staff, as well as spending related to parliamentary office holders and political parties and groups.

Non-existent <input type="checkbox"/>	Rudimentary <input type="checkbox"/>	Basic <input type="checkbox"/>	Good <input type="checkbox"/>	Very good <input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>
Evidence for this assessment criterion:					

Assessment criterion 2: Public reporting

Parliament is required to report regularly to the public on its expenditure.

Non-existent <input type="checkbox"/>	Rudimentary <input type="checkbox"/>	Basic <input type="checkbox"/>	Good <input type="checkbox"/>	Very good <input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>
Evidence for this assessment criterion:					

Assessment criterion 3: Independent audits

Parliamentary expenditure is subject to regular, independent audits. Audit reports are made public.

Non-existent <input type="checkbox"/>	Rudimentary <input type="checkbox"/>	Basic <input type="checkbox"/>	Good <input type="checkbox"/>	Very good <input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>
Evidence for this assessment criterion:					

Assessment criterion 4: Oversight

A parliamentary committee provides oversight, including by scrutinizing the reports of the parliamentary administration and the audits of expenditure. Committee findings and reports are made public.

Non-existent <input type="checkbox"/>	Rudimentary <input type="checkbox"/>	Basic <input type="checkbox"/>	Good <input type="checkbox"/>	Very good <input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>
Evidence for this assessment criterion:					

Recommendations for change

Use this space to note down recommendations and ideas for strengthening rules and practice in this area.

Sources and further reading

- David Beetham, [Parliament and democracy in the twenty-first century: A guide to good practice](#) (2006).
- Commonwealth Parliamentary Association (CPA), [Recommended Benchmarks for Democratic Legislators](#), revised edition (2018).
- National Democratic Institute (NDI), [Toward the Development of International Standards for Democratic Legislatures](#) (2007).

Dimension 2.2.2: Public procurement

This dimension is part of:

- Indicator 2.2: Institutional integrity
- Target 2: Accountable parliament

About this dimension

This dimension covers public procurement by parliament, which should follow a proper process that is transparent and competitive.

In some cases, this procurement process may be governed by a legal framework applicable to all publicly funded agencies. However, some parliaments have enacted a separate legal framework for parliamentary procurement, which meets the institution's specific needs. In either case, these provisions should mandate clear and comprehensive procurement guidelines, based on the following key principles:

- Value for money
- Fairness, transparency, openness and clarity
- Ethical conduct
- Competition and efficiency

Procurement is a specialized task requiring particular knowledge and skills. Parliament should therefore have staff with expertise in undertaking procurement, managing contracts, achieving value for money and communicating about complex procurement procedures. Mandatory training for all staff involved in the public procurement process should be provided regularly.

Parliament's public procurement process and decisions should be subject to internal and/or external audits or other reviews to provide assurances regarding compliance with the legal framework and procurement guidelines. In some countries, this task is entrusted to an independent body.

Aspiring goal

Based on a global comparative analysis, an aspiring goal for parliaments in the area of "public procurement" is as follows:

Parliament's procurement process is governed by a legal framework. Parliament has clear and comprehensive procurement guidelines that are in line with national and international obligations and best practice.

Parliament has staff with expertise in undertaking procurement, managing contracts, achieving value for money and communicating about complex procurement procedures.

All stages of the procurement process are completely transparent and open. All information on procurement is made publicly available.

Internal and/or external audits or other reviews provide assurances regarding compliance with the legal framework and procurement guidelines. The reports and findings of such audits or reviews are made publicly available.

Assessment

This dimension is assessed against several criteria, each of which should be evaluated separately. For each criterion, select one of the six descriptive grades (Non-existent, Rudimentary, Basic, Good, Very

good and Excellent) that best reflects the situation in your parliament, and provide details of the evidence on which this assessment is based.

The evidence for assessment of this dimension could include the following:

- Provisions of the legal framework relating to public procurement by parliament
- Guidelines on the public procurement process in parliament
- Public information about all stages of the procurement process
- Reports of internal and/or external audits or other reviews of particular procurement exercises or the procurement process as a whole
- Data on possible non-compliance of public procurement with the law

Where relevant, provide additional comments or examples that support the assessment.

Assessment criterion 1: Legal framework

Parliament's procurement process is governed by a legal framework. Parliament has clear and comprehensive procurement guidelines that are in line with national and international obligations and best practice.

Non-existent <input type="checkbox"/>	Rudimentary <input type="checkbox"/>	Basic <input type="checkbox"/>	Good <input type="checkbox"/>	Very good <input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>
Evidence for this assessment criterion:					

Assessment criterion 2: Expertise

Parliament has staff with expertise in undertaking procurement, managing contracts, achieving value for money and communicating about complex procurement procedures.

Non-existent <input type="checkbox"/>	Rudimentary <input type="checkbox"/>	Basic <input type="checkbox"/>	Good <input type="checkbox"/>	Very good <input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>
Evidence for this assessment criterion:					

Assessment criterion 3: Transparency

All stages of the procurement process are completely transparent and open. All information on procurement is made publicly available in a timely manner.

Non-existent <input type="checkbox"/>	Rudimentary <input type="checkbox"/>	Basic <input type="checkbox"/>	Good <input type="checkbox"/>	Very good <input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>
Evidence for this assessment criterion:					

Assessment criterion 4: Audits

Internal and/or external audits or other reviews provide assurances regarding compliance with the legal framework and procurement guidelines. The reports and findings of such audits or reviews are made publicly available.

Non-existent <input type="checkbox"/>	Rudimentary <input type="checkbox"/>	Basic <input type="checkbox"/>	Good <input type="checkbox"/>	Very good <input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>
Evidence for this assessment criterion:					

Recommendations for change

Use this space to note down recommendations and ideas for strengthening rules and practice in this area.

Sources and further reading

- Australian Government, [Commonwealth Procurement Rules](#) (2023).
- David Beetham, [Parliament and democracy in the twenty-first century: A guide to good practice](#) (2006).
- Commonwealth Parliamentary Association (CPA), [Recommended Benchmarks for Democratic Legislators](#), revised edition (2018).
- Government of Belize, [Public Procurement Procedures Handbook. Volume 1: Standardised Procurement Procedures](#) (2013).
- National Democratic Institute (NDI), [Toward the Development of International Standards for Democratic Legislatures](#) (2007).
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), [OECD Recommendation of the Council on Public Procurement](#) (2015).

Dimension 2.2.3: Freedom of information

This dimension is part of:

- Indicator 2.2: Institutional integrity
- Target 2: Accountable parliament

About this dimension

This dimension concerns legislation on the right to information as it applies to parliament. Commonly known as freedom of information (FOI) legislation, this type of legislation has been enacted in many countries. FOI legislation recognizes that, since public-sector agencies receive public funds, citizens and organizations should expect to be able to request access to specific information regarding their activities and operations.

This same expectation applies to parliament, which should proactively publish information about its work and should also be required to provide specific information on request. This can be achieved either by making parliament part of a general FOI regime, or by establishing specific provisions for parliament, on the basis that parliament is different and separate from executive agencies.

FOI provisions, including those applicable to parliament, should follow a number of general principles. These include the following:

- Proactive publishing of predetermined categories of information
- Publishing of open data
- Maximum disclosure
- Limited exceptions
- Facilitated access to information
- A right to appeal to an independent body

Parliamentary FOI provisions should mandate maximum disclosure of information, including on parliament's procedures and processes and on the parliamentary administration. Any exceptions should be narrowly defined. Parliamentary FOI requirements should take account of the parliamentary privilege enjoyed by individual MPs, particularly in their relationship with constituents, which may limit access to information in very specific circumstances that are defined by law or in other regulations.

Parliament should follow detailed FOI guidelines covering, among other things, the following aspects:

- Who can request access and how they can do so
- The deadlines for providing information
- The possibility of choosing the information format (hard copy, digital, etc.)
- The fact that access is free of charge by default, including access to information in an online, machine-readable format (if fees are applied, they should not be higher than the actual cost of retrieving and providing the information)
- The right to complain, and the appeal procedure if information is not provided, only partially provided or not provided in a timely manner
- The storing of data on the requests received and responses provided

See also *Indicator 3.1: Transparency of parliamentary processes*.

Aspiring goal

Based on a global comparative analysis, an aspiring goal for parliaments in the area of "freedom of information" is as follows:

The legal framework establishes a parliamentary FOI regime, which is in line with national and international obligations and best practice. Any citizen or organization can request information under the parliamentary FOI regime.

Parliament follows detailed FOI guidelines, which require maximum disclosure of information, including information relating to parliament’s procedures and processes and to the parliamentary administration.

Any exceptions are clearly and narrowly defined by law, with a strong “public interest” test for disclosure. Parliamentary privilege may limit access to information in very specific and clearly defined circumstances.

The parliamentary FOI regime sets standards for the proactive publishing of predetermined categories of information, including in open and machine-readable formats.

Information is provided in response to parliamentary FOI requests in a consistent and timely manner. Refusals to disclose information, or failures to disclose full information, are reviewed by an independent external body, whose decisions are binding.

Assessment

This dimension is assessed against several criteria, each of which should be evaluated separately. For each criterion, select one of the six descriptive grades (Non-existent, Rudimentary, Basic, Good, Very good and Excellent) that best reflects the situation in your parliament, and provide details of the evidence on which this assessment is based.

The evidence for assessment of this dimension could include the following:

- Provisions of the legal framework relating to parliamentary FOI
- Parliamentary FOI guidelines
- Categories of proactively published information
- Statistics about FOI requests, including the number of requests received and approved, timeliness, cost, and any appeals and their outcomes

Where relevant, provide additional comments or examples that support the assessment.

Assessment criterion 1: Parliamentary FOI regime

The legal framework establishes a parliamentary FOI regime, which is in line with national and international obligations and best practice. Any citizen or organization can request information under the parliamentary FOI regime.

Non-existent <input type="checkbox"/>	Rudimentary <input type="checkbox"/>	Basic <input type="checkbox"/>	Good <input type="checkbox"/>	Very good <input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>
--	---	-----------------------------------	----------------------------------	---------------------------------------	---------------------------------------

Evidence for this assessment criterion:

Assessment criterion 2: Guidelines

Parliament follows detailed FOI guidelines, which require maximum disclosure of information, including information relating to parliament’s procedures and processes and to the parliamentary administration.

Non-existent <input type="checkbox"/>	Rudimentary <input type="checkbox"/>	Basic <input type="checkbox"/>	Good <input type="checkbox"/>	Very good <input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>
Evidence for this assessment criterion:					

Assessment criterion 3: Exceptions

Any exceptions are clearly and narrowly defined by law, with a strong “public interest” test for disclosure. Parliamentary privilege may limit access to information in very specific and clearly defined circumstances.

Non-existent <input type="checkbox"/>	Rudimentary <input type="checkbox"/>	Basic <input type="checkbox"/>	Good <input type="checkbox"/>	Very good <input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>
Evidence for this assessment criterion:					

Assessment criterion 4: Proactive publishing

The parliamentary FOI regime sets standards for the proactive publishing of predetermined categories of information, including in open and machine-readable formats.

Non-existent <input type="checkbox"/>	Rudimentary <input type="checkbox"/>	Basic <input type="checkbox"/>	Good <input type="checkbox"/>	Very good <input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>
Evidence for this assessment criterion:					

Assessment criterion 5: Compliance

Information is provided in response to parliamentary FOI requests in a consistent and timely manner. Refusals to disclose information, or failures to disclose full information, are reviewed by an independent external body, whose decisions are binding.

Non-existent <input type="checkbox"/>	Rudimentary <input type="checkbox"/>	Basic <input type="checkbox"/>	Good <input type="checkbox"/>	Very good <input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>
Evidence for this assessment criterion:					

Recommendations for change

Use this space to note down recommendations and ideas for strengthening rules and practice in this area.

Sources and further reading

- ARTICLE 19, [*The Public's Right to Know: Principles on Freedom of Information Legislation*](#) (1999).
- David Beetham, [*Parliament and democracy in the twenty-first century: A guide to good practice*](#) (2006).
- Commonwealth Parliamentary Association (CPA), [*Recommended Benchmarks for Democratic Legislators*](#), revised edition (2018).
- National Democratic Institute (NDI), [*Toward the Development of International Standards for Democratic Legislatures*](#) (2007).

Dimension 2.2.4: Professionalism of the parliamentary administration

This dimension is part of:

- Indicator 2.2: Institutional integrity
- Target 2: Accountable parliament

About this dimension

This dimension concerns various aspects of the professionalism of the parliamentary administration, including professional and ethical standards of conduct, complaints procedures and career management of parliamentary staff.

Parliaments generally either follow the code(s) of ethics, standards and conduct applicable to the civil service in general, or have developed separate code(s) specifically for parliamentary staff. In either case, the code(s) should set out clear expectations on professionalism and ethical conduct, on respect for parliament, its staff and the people they serve, and on integrity, accountability and impartiality.

The code(s) may cover a number of matters, including those listed below:

- Providing neutral and non-partisan support to parliament and MPs
- Behaving honestly, lawfully and with integrity
- Treating everyone with respect and courtesy, and without harassment (especially women and minority groups)
- Avoiding conflicts of interest or the improper use of a position for personal gain
- Upholding the good reputation of parliament and of the nation as a whole

There should be a clearly defined and robust process for the filing and independent investigation of complaints concerning alleged breaches of the code(s), with sanctions applied where such complaints are upheld.

The parliamentary administration has an important responsibility for the training and professional development of parliamentary staff, and for the development of an ethos of parliamentary service. Through its human-resources policies and practices, the parliamentary administration should ensure that staff have the skills and knowledge to support the institutional continuity of parliament.

See also *Dimension 2.1.4: Parliamentary income and use of parliamentary resources* and *Dimension 5.2.3: Combating sexism, harassment and violence*.

Aspiring goal

Based on a global comparative analysis, an aspiring goal for parliaments in the area of "professionalism of the parliamentary administration" is as follows:

The legal framework requires the development of code(s) of ethics, standards and conduct for parliamentary staff.

Such code(s) exist in practice, apply to all parliamentary staff, and set out clear expectations on professionalism and ethical conduct, on respect for parliament, its staff and the people they serve, and on integrity, accountability and impartiality.

There is a clearly defined and robust process for the filing and independent investigation of complaints concerning alleged breaches of the code(s), with sanctions applied where such complaints are upheld.

The parliamentary administration has a professional development framework that promotes an ethos of parliamentary service and ensures that staff have the skills and knowledge to support the institutional continuity of parliament.

Assessment

This dimension is assessed against several criteria, each of which should be evaluated separately. For each criterion, select one of the six descriptive grades (Non-existent, Rudimentary, Basic, Good, Very good and Excellent) that best reflects the situation in your parliament, and provide details of the evidence on which this assessment is based.

The evidence for assessment of this dimension could include the following:

- Provisions of the legal framework relating to code(s) of ethics, standards and conduct for parliamentary staff
- Code(s) of ethics, standards and conduct for parliamentary staff
- Statistics relating to complaints concerning alleged breaches of the code(s) and the outcomes of the related investigations
- Human-resources policies and practices relating to professional development and the development of an ethos of parliamentary service

Where relevant, provide additional comments or examples that support the assessment.

Assessment criterion 1: Code(s) of ethics, standards and conduct

The legal framework requires the development of code(s) of ethics, standards and conduct for parliamentary staff.

Non-existent	Rudimentary	Basic	Good	Very good	Excellent
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Evidence for this assessment criterion:					

Assessment criterion 2: Scope

Code(s) of ethics, standards and conduct for parliamentary staff exist in practice, apply to all parliamentary staff, and set out clear expectations on professionalism and ethical conduct, on respect for parliament, its staff and the people they serve, and on integrity, accountability and impartiality.

Non-existent	Rudimentary	Basic	Good	Very good	Excellent
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Evidence for this assessment criterion:					

Assessment criterion 3: Complaints

There is a clearly defined and robust process for the filing and independent investigation of complaints concerning alleged breaches of the code(s), with sanctions applied where such complaints are upheld.

Non-existent <input type="checkbox"/>	Rudimentary <input type="checkbox"/>	Basic <input type="checkbox"/>	Good <input type="checkbox"/>	Very good <input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>
Evidence for this assessment criterion:					

Assessment criterion 4: Professional development

The parliamentary administration has a professional development framework that promotes an ethos of parliamentary service and ensures that staff have the skills and knowledge to support the institutional continuity of parliament.

Non-existent <input type="checkbox"/>	Rudimentary <input type="checkbox"/>	Basic <input type="checkbox"/>	Good <input type="checkbox"/>	Very good <input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>
Evidence for this assessment criterion:					

Recommendations for change

Use this space to note down recommendations and ideas for strengthening rules and practice in this area.

Sources and further reading

- Association of Secretaries General of Parliaments (ASGP) [Principles for recruitment and career management of staff of the parliamentary administration](#) (2014).
- David Beetham, [Parliament and democracy in the twenty-first century: A guide to good practice](#) (2006).
- Commonwealth Parliamentary Association (CPA), [Recommended Benchmarks for Democratic Legislators](#), revised edition (2018).
- Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU), [Guidelines for the elimination of sexism, harassment and violence against women in parliament](#) (2019).
- IPU, [Comparative research paper on parliamentary administration](#) (2020).
- National Democratic Institute (NDI), [Toward the Development of International Standards for Democratic Legislatures](#) (2007).

Dimension 2.2.5: Institutional development of parliament

This dimension is part of:

- Indicator 2.2: Institutional integrity
- Target 2: Accountable parliament

About this dimension

This dimension concerns processes for the institutional development of parliament, including strategic planning, and the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of parliamentary performance.

Like many other institutions, parliaments have increasingly started to take a strategic approach to planning their development, which involves setting long-term goals for the organization, diagnosing gaps in capacity or processes, and deciding on actions to achieve the goals. M&E systems, meanwhile, help to track progress and identify where adjustments are needed.

Practices vary as to who is responsible for institutional development within parliament. Many parliaments have a modernization or similar committee entrusted with this role, while in others, this may be part of the responsibilities of the parliamentary leadership. Within the parliamentary administration, there may be dedicated units for strategic planning, M&E and/or innovation.

Many parliaments benefit from external support for their institutional development from sources such as the United Nations system, specialized parliamentary development organizations, twinning arrangements with other parliaments, and national partnerships with civil society organizations and academia. Institutional development is often backed by funding from multilateral or bilateral partners. Whatever the particular arrangements, the *Common Principles for Support to Parliaments* firmly establish the need for parliament to be in the driving seat of its own institutional development.

Aspiring goal

Based on a global comparative analysis, an aspiring goal for parliaments in the area of “institutional development of parliament” is as follows:

Parliament has a strategic plan for its institutional development, which sets out a long-term vision and goals and actions to achieve them. Strategic planning is an inclusive process and the plan is regularly reviewed and updated.

Responsibility for institutional development is clearly allocated within parliament, and the parliamentary administration has established teams to support institutional development.

Parliament has endorsed the *Common Principles for Support to Parliaments*, which are used in practice by parliament and its partners.

Parliament has an M&E system to track progress and identify where adjustments are needed.

Parliament encourages a culture of innovation that allows new processes to be tested and, where appropriate, incorporated into its work.

Assessment

This dimension is assessed against several criteria, each of which should be evaluated separately. For each criterion, select one of the six descriptive grades (Non-existent, Rudimentary, Basic, Good, Very good and Excellent) that best reflects the situation in your parliament, and provide details of the evidence on which this assessment is based.

The evidence for assessment of this dimension could include the following:

- Strategies and plans relating to institutional development
- Reports on the implementation of such strategies and plans
- Evidence of an established M&E system
- Reports of self-assessment exercises, including findings and results
- Terms of reference, minutes and reports of the parliamentary body (or bodies) responsible for institutional development
- Evidence of innovative practices

Where relevant, provide additional comments or examples that support the assessment.

Assessment criterion 1: Strategic planning

Parliament has a strategic plan for its institutional development, which sets out a long-term vision and goals and actions to achieve them. Strategic planning is an inclusive process and the plan is regularly reviewed and updated.

Non-existent <input type="checkbox"/>	Rudimentary <input type="checkbox"/>	Basic <input type="checkbox"/>	Good <input type="checkbox"/>	Very good <input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>
Evidence for this assessment criterion:					

Assessment criterion 2: Responsibility for institutional development

Responsibility for institutional development is clearly allocated within parliament, and the parliamentary administration has established teams to support institutional development.

Non-existent <input type="checkbox"/>	Rudimentary <input type="checkbox"/>	Basic <input type="checkbox"/>	Good <input type="checkbox"/>	Very good <input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>
Evidence for this assessment criterion:					

Assessment criterion 3: Common Principles for Support to Parliaments

Parliament has endorsed the *Common Principles for Support to Parliaments*, which are used in practice by parliament and its partners.

Non-existent <input type="checkbox"/>	Rudimentary <input type="checkbox"/>	Basic <input type="checkbox"/>	Good <input type="checkbox"/>	Very good <input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>
Evidence for this assessment criterion:					

Assessment criterion 4: M&E

Parliament has an M&E system to track progress and identify where adjustments are needed.

Non-existent <input type="checkbox"/>	Rudimentary <input type="checkbox"/>	Basic <input type="checkbox"/>	Good <input type="checkbox"/>	Very good <input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>
Evidence for this assessment criterion:					

Assessment criterion 5: Innovation

Parliament encourages a culture of innovation that allows new processes to be tested and, where appropriate, incorporated into its work.

Non-existent <input type="checkbox"/>	Rudimentary <input type="checkbox"/>	Basic <input type="checkbox"/>	Good <input type="checkbox"/>	Very good <input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent <input type="checkbox"/>
Evidence for this assessment criterion:					

Recommendations for change

Use this space to note down recommendations and ideas for strengthening rules and practice in this area.

Sources and further reading

- Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), National Democratic Institute (NDI), European Parliament and National Assembly of France, [Common Principles for Support to Parliaments](#) (2014).