Indicator 1.2 – Members of parliament

MPs are the cornerstone of the parliamentary institution in democratic systems. It is MPs who undertake the core parliamentary responsibilities of legislating, exercising oversight of the executive and representing their communities. The effectiveness of parliament is strongly dependent on the effective performance by MPs of their duties.

This indicator relates to a number of elements that can assist MPs in being effective. It includes the formal arrangements for MPs to take up office, relinquish office, and be able to complete their parliamentary term or mandate. The potential conflict in roles and how such conflict is resolved formally for MPs is also encompassed in this dimension. To contribute effectively to their legislatures, MPs need to be free to participate fully in the proceedings of the parliament and its committees without fear of legal consequences. Thus, legal immunity for ‘freedom of speech’ is essential, as is some degree of protection from unwarranted detention or arrest in particular circumstances. But with free speech comes the responsibility to protect others who may be unduly affected (natural justice protection). MPs also need remuneration, support and resources so that they can fully perform their duties. Although MPs come to their roles with life experience and political skills, they will benefit from professional development to become more effective parliamentarians and representatives of their constituencies.

As noted in the IPU study of the concept of the parliamentary mandate, conferring special rights on MPs does not mean that they are above the law, “Rather, it is a recognition of the fact that, given the importance and magnitude of the mandate entrusted to them by the sovereign people, they require some minimum guarantees to be able to discharge this mandate in an independent and unhindered fashion”. ¹

For more sources on this subject, please see the footnote. ²

The assessment of the members of parliament indicator comprises the following dimensions:

- 1.2.1 Status of MPs
- 1.2.2 Inviolability and immunity (including natural justice)
- 1.2.3 Incompatibility of office
- 1.2.4 Access to resources
- 1.2.5 Professional development

Dimension 1.2.1 Status of MPs

Indicator: 1.2 Members of parliament
Sub-target: 1 Effective parliament
Target: 16.6 Effective, accountable and transparent parliament

About the dimension

This dimension outlines the provisions and processes under which MPs may formally enter or leave office. These formal provisions are reflected in constitutional, legislative and/or rules of procedure provisions. They should be clear and not unreasonably impede a duly elected (or appointed) MP from taking up, and continuing in office, until the completion of their term or, in the instance of committing an offence for which resignation would be required (see below), being required to resign.

Once properly elected (or appointed if applicable), MPs should be free to take up their roles without impediment or undue delay. The process by which MPs are able to participate in the proceedings of the legislature is by taking an oath or affirmation of office (being sworn in). No restrictions exist that discriminate against MPs with regard to the taking of an oath of office (for example, being required to take a religious oath against their conscience), which would prevent them from participating in proceedings.

A recognized process or procedure should be provided for MPs to voluntarily resign from office. It is also reasonable for formal provisions to be made in the event that MPs lose office involuntarily (for example, in the event of a serious ethics violation or conflict of interest, or a serious crime). Except for in instances of infraction, such provisions must be specific and equitably implemented to ensure that MPs may freely exercise their mandate, and avoid being exposed to arbitrary political persecution. MPs should expect that, once they have taken up office, they will continue for a full term and will not be subject to political attempts to remove them from office.

The issue of ownership of an MP’s mandate is relevant to this dimension. The rules and practices concerning mandate ownership differ across legislatures. In many, if not most legislatures, mandates are considered to belong to MPs personally, as they have been duly elected by their constituency. However, in some legislatures, mandates are considered to be owned by the political party to which MPs belong. This is particularly the case where an MP has been elected on a ‘party ticket’ or ‘party list’ rather than personally. In some jurisdictions, a mandate is designated as belonging to a political party where it is intended to prevent defection from a party (party hopping) by MPs, which is seen to increase instability in government and parliament.

On the basis of a global comparative analysis of parliamentary practices and models in parliamentary development, an aspiring goal for parliaments in the domain of status of MPs would encompass the following:

There are clearly defined provisions for the commencement and cessation of the holding of office by MPs.

---

3 In some of the literature, the term of office of an MP is referred to as the ‘duration of the parliamentary mandate’ of an MP. See Marc Van der Hulst, *The Parliamentary Mandate: A Global Comparative Study* (Geneva: IPU, 2000).
4 In some legislatures, members of parliament are appointed to, rather than elected, to their roles, and so this would include members of parliament who have been duly appointed.
Duly elected (or appointed) MPs are entitled to participate fully in the proceedings of the legislature. Therefore, it should be possible for MPs to take a non-discriminatory oath or allegiance of office for MPs to enable them to participate in proceedings.

MPs can reasonably expect to serve a full term of office. However, should they wish to voluntarily resign from office, there are formal provisions for them to do so. Involuntary removal of MPs from office should be limited and specific, and not be influenced by political matters.

Mandate ownership usually belongs to MPs personally, as they have been elected by their constituency. This can vary when MPs have been elected explicitly on a party ticket or list. However, anti-defection laws aimed at preventing party defection should be avoided.

Assessment

The dimension is evaluated on the basis of several criteria that should be assessed separately. For each criterion, select one of the six descriptive grades (Non-existent, Poor, Basic, Good, Very good and Excellent) that corresponds best to your parliament, and provide details of the evidence on which the assessment is based.

The evidence for assessment of this dimension might include:

- Constitutional, legislative and/or rules of procedure provisions concerning the commencement and cessation of the term of office of MPs
- Constitutional, legislative and/or rules of procedure provisions relating to the swearing-in of MPs
- Constitutional, legislative and/or rules of procedure provisions relating to the process by which an MP ceases to hold office
- Any practices relating to the taking-up or cessation of office of MPs, or to assessments of independent and credible organizations

If relevant, additional comments or examples that support the assessment (such as references to external national, regional or international surveys and reports) can be provided.

Assessment criterion No. 1: Term of office

There is evidence of constitutional, legislative and/or rules of procedure provisions that clearly define when MPs, whether duly elected or appointed, take up and cease to hold office.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-existent</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidence for this assessment criterion:

Assessment criterion No. 2: Swearing-in of MPs

There are constitutional, legislative and/or rules of procedures provisions that provide for the swearing-in of MPs, so that they can fully participate in the proceedings of the legislature. The provisions are not discriminatory (for example, they do not require MPs to take a religious oath against their conscience).
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Evidence for this assessment criterion:

Assessment criterion No. 3: Process for the cessation of office

There are constitutional, legislative and/or rules of procedure provisions that establish the process by which MPs cease to hold office. These provisions include a clearly defined process for MPs to voluntarily resign. Where there are provisions for involuntary cessation of office (for example, expulsion by the legislature, incompatibility of office or automatic disqualification for specific reasons), these provisions are exceptional and clearly specified and implemented in accordance with a defined and proper process.

Evidence for this assessment criterion:

Assessment criterion No. 4: Ownership of mandate

There are constitutional, legislative and/or rules of procedure provisions concerning ownership of MPs’ mandates which establish that the mandates are owned by the MPs personally. Anti-defection laws are not in evidence.

Evidence for this assessment criterion:

Recommendations for change

Evidence for this assessment criterion:
**Dimension 1.2.2 Inviolability and immunity**

**Indicator: 1.2 Members of parliament**  
**Sub-target: 1 Effective parliament**  
**Target: 16.6 Effective, accountable and transparent parliament**

**About the dimension**

This dimension concerns arrangements that provide protection to MPs when they participate in parliamentary proceedings and processes, so that they can do so freely without concern about possible legal action. As protection from possible legal action (for example, for making defamatory statements during proceedings) can have adverse consequences for individuals, provisions on natural justice also need to be considered to give those who may be accused the opportunity to respond.

The ability of MPs to raise matters freely in the core proceedings of legislatures without interference, is fundamental to the ability of parliament to perform its oversight, legislative and representational roles. This fundamental protection is often referred to as ‘the freedom of speech privilege’. Members of parliament should have the right not to testify about facts disclosed to them in their capacity as MPs. This protection should extend to former MPs in respect of their former participation in parliamentary proceedings. It should be noted that members of parliament can be held to account for their actions by their peers through processes such as codes of conduct or ethics committees (see dimension 2.1.2).

Only the legislature should be empowered to remove this protection from individual MPs. Limits are reasonably imposed on the free expression of views by MPs often to maintain order and decorum in the chamber (therefore accusations against other MPs may be prohibited), and to recognize the separation of powers (therefore adverse remarks about the head of state or the judiciary may be prohibited, unless there are special circumstances such as impeachment). Such restrictions should be limited, and restrictions on references to matters such as national security or sovereignty are less justified.

Some jurisdictions also provide varying degrees of protection from detention and arrest for MPs (known as inviolability). Constitutional or other regulations often impose restrictions on the arrest or detention of members of parliament, or on searches of their person and their personal/working space without parliamentary consent. In this regard, a careful balance is required between the protection of MPs to enable them to freely perform their duties and the recognition of the principle that all people should be treated equally before the law.

The existence of immunities for MPs, which exclude them from the operation of the ordinary law, creates the potential for unfairness to others, such as those who may be falsely accused of matters under the protection of parliamentary privilege. This can be balanced by having appropriate natural justice provisions that enable those adversely affected by the removal of their usual rights to have some means of redress. Natural justice arrangements can extend to situations where MPs or others are charged with offences against a legislature (such as contempt).

---

On the basis of a global comparative analysis of parliamentary practices and models in parliamentary development, an aspiring goal for parliaments in the domain of inviolability and immunity (including natural justice) would encompass the following:

---
There are clearly defined constitutional or other similar provisions to provide MPs with protection from arbitrary arrest or criminal charges, as well as with the immunity of freedom of speech (which also apply to former MPs) in the exercise, at a minimum, of their core responsibilities in the legislature.

This immunity can only be removed from an MP by the legislature. Lifting immunity shall take place strictly in compliance with constitutional regulations. Legislators are able to carry out their legislative and constitutional functions in accordance with the constitution, free from interference.

Members of parliament cannot be held liable for the views expressed inside or outside parliament while performing their duties. The conditions for the unhindered exercise of powers by a member of parliament are ensured. It is reasonable that restrictions be applied to freedom of speech, to ensure proper order and decorum in the house and to recognize matters such as the separation of powers, but such restrictions should be limited and not be used as a means of silencing MPs. Inviolability arrangements for MPs (if in place) ensure that the protection does not place MPs above the proper operation of the law.

There are provisions and processes in place to enable natural justice for those who may seek redress from the application of the protections (or immunities) that are put in place for MPs. There are also natural justice provisions for MPs or others charged with an offence against a legislature.

Assessment

The dimension is evaluated on the basis of several criteria that should be assessed separately. For each criterion, select one of the six descriptive grades (Non-existent, Poor, Basic, Good, Very good and Excellent) that corresponds best to your parliament, and provide details of the evidence on which the assessment is based.

The evidence for assessment of this dimension might include:
- Provisions concerning ‘freedom of speech’ protection for MPs
- Any provisions that limit the freedom of speech of MPs
- Provisions that provide for restrictions on the detention and arrest of MPs
- Natural justice processes and procedures put in place by the legislature

If relevant, additional comments or examples that support the assessment (such as references to external national, regional or international surveys and reports) can be provided.

Assessment criterion No. 1: Protection from arbitrary detention

There is evidence of strongly entrenched provisions restricting the arrest or detention of members of parliament, or searches of their person and their personal/working space without parliamentary consent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-existent</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidence for this assessment criterion:

Assessment criterion No. 2: ‘Freedom of speech’ protection
There is evidence of strongly entrenched provisions that enable ‘freedom of speech’ protection for MPs (and former MPs) in respect of participation in the core processes of the parliament. Only the legislature can withdraw an MP’s freedom of speech protection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-existent</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Evidence for this assessment criterion:

**Assessment criterion No. 3: Limits on freedom of speech and inviolability protection**

Provisions that impose restrictions on the exercise of freedom of speech of MPs generally are limited to matters such as the preservation of order and recognition of the separation of powers. Inviolability arrangements for MPs (if in place) do not unduly restrict the operation of the law.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-existent</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Evidence for this assessment criterion:

**Assessment criterion No. 4: Natural justice processes and procedures**

There are natural justice provisions and suitable processes and procedures to support them and ensure that they provide for means of redress for those adversely affected by the special immunities given to MPs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-existent</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Evidence for this assessment criterion:

**Recommendations for change**
Dimension 1.2.3 Incompatibility of office

Indicator: 1.2 Members of parliament
Sub-target: 1 Effective parliament
Target: 16.6 Effective, accountable and transparent parliament

About the dimension

This dimension relates to the constitutional, legislative or other provisions that parliaments have in place to limit the additional offices or roles that an MP can occupy whilst holding office. The limitations (called incompatibilities of office) are primarily aimed at preventing MPs from breaching the principle of the separation of powers, thus guaranteeing the independence of the legislature. They also are designed to ensure that MPs are in a position to devote their time and effort principally to the performance of their responsibilities as MPs, and to reduce the opportunity for conflicts of interest.

The following are the restrictions usually imposed on MPs in many jurisdictions to prevent incompatibility of office:

- In a bicameral system, being unable to hold office in both houses
- Being unable to hold office as a member of the judiciary
- Being unable to hold office in the civil service of the executive branch and, in some jurisdictions with a very clear separation of powers, being unable to hold ministerial office

Private sector employment or roles are generally seen as compatible and are permitted. However, there are restrictions in some parliaments relating to private contracts with the government, or roles with foreign companies or international organizations, in addition to service on boards or representation of special interests. Care would need to be taken also to ensure that MPs were not unduly diverted from their core responsibilities.

It is expected that where incompatibility arises, an MP would seek to resolve such incompatibility as soon as possible (by resigning from the incompatible office). The holding of an incompatible office in some jurisdictions can lead to (automatic) disqualification as an MP or from the incompatible office. In some jurisdictions, there is some flexibility for MPs to continue to hold office in the civil service, and to be recognized as being on ‘leave’ when performing their duties as an MP. Such exceptions should be limited.

On the basis of a global comparative analysis of parliamentary practices and models in parliamentary development, an aspiring goal for parliaments in the domain of incompatibility of office would encompass the following:

There are constitutional, legislative or other provisions to provide for limits on MPs holding offices that are incompatible with their roles as MPs. These generally concern possible separation of powers matters such as being a member of both houses in a bicameral parliament, holding judicial office or holding office in the civil service.

Where incompatibilities of office arise, there are provisions, and a process, for them to be resolved quickly either by resignation from the incompatible office, or by disqualification from the office or as an MP.

The occupation of private sector roles may give rise to incompatibilities of office. Both regulations and parliamentary practices effectively protect against the possibility of conflict of interest or corruption arising.
from incompatibility of office or any unnecessary diversion of MPs from their duties. Data on the occupation of other roles by MPs are available.

Assessment

The dimension is evaluated on the basis of several criteria that should be assessed separately. For each criterion, select one of the six descriptive grades (Non-existent, Poor, Basic, Good, Very good and Excellent) that corresponds best to your parliament, and provide details of the evidence on which the assessment is based.

The evidence for assessment of this dimension might include:
- Constitutional, legislative or other provisions concerning the holding of incompatible offices
- Constitutional, legislative or other provisions, and the supporting processes, to enable MPs to resolve incompatibility of office issues quickly
- Provisions that limit the occupation of private sector roles by MPs to prevent conflicts of interest and diversion from responsibilities as an MP
- Data on MPs occupying other roles

If relevant, additional comments or examples that support the assessment (such as references to external national, regional or international surveys and reports) can be provided.

Assessment criterion No. 1: Incompatibility of office provisions

There are constitutional, legislative or other provisions which specify incompatibilities of office for MPs and which cover the key areas of conflict concerning separation of powers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-existent</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidence for this assessment criterion:

Assessment criterion No. 2: Resolution of incompatibilities of office

There are constitutional, legislative or other provisions, and the necessary supporting processes, to enable MPs to quickly resolve incompatibility of office issues when they arise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-existent</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidence for this assessment criterion:

Assessment criterion No. 3: Private sector roles and incompatibility of office
While the occupation of private sector roles may be compatible with the role of an MP, there are regulations and parliamentary practices that protect against the possibility of conflict of interest or corruption arising from incompatibility of office or any unnecessary diversion of MPs from their duties.

Evidence for this assessment criterion:

Recommendations for change
**Dimension 1.2.4 Access to resources**

Indicator: 1.2 Members of parliament  
Sub-target: 1 Effective parliament  
Target: 16.6 Effective, accountable and transparent parliament

**About the dimension**

This dimension is concerned with the remuneration and other resources available to MPs to enable them to perform their duties. It includes salary and any parliamentary allowances, as well as access to staff, facilities and resources to support the work of an effective MP.

The reasons for MPs to have access to an adequate level of remuneration and resources are:

- To ensure that all citizens, regardless of their means, can participate in the parliamentary system as an MP
- To protect MPs from possible corruption
- To ensure that MPs have sufficient means of livelihood to be able to focus on their parliamentary and representative responsibilities
- To ensure that MPs have adequate support to carry out quality work and undertake their responsibilities effectively

Jurisdictions have widely differing levels of and approaches to the remuneration and allowances of MPs. Such remuneration and allowances are likely to include a salary of office, additional parliamentary allowances depending on the office held, subsistence and travel allowances and pension arrangements. While the level of these provisions will differ according to the capacity of the legislature and government service regulations under national law (specifically with regard to pensions), they should be adequate for their purpose, be made available fairly to all MPs and be determined independently of both MPs and the legislature.

In almost all parliaments, MPs have access to facilities and resources in addition to their salaries and any allowances of office. These might be seen as ‘tools of the trade’ that enable MPs to properly perform their duties. They could include ICT and other equipment, communication allowances, official transport, support staff and parliamentary and constituency offices (see dimension 1.5.3 in relation to facilities available to MPs in the parliament). In legislatures with parliamentary research services and independent budget offices, equal access for all MPs to their services shall be ensured. The level of access to resources will vary according to the capacity and approach of the legislature. It is important that, regardless of the level of resources, access is granted fairly, with due regard for an MP’s role (for example, the MP may occupy a leadership position such as committee chair), and in a non-partisan way, and is determined independently of MPs and the legislature.

On the basis of a global comparative analysis of parliamentary practices and models in parliamentary development, an aspiring goal for parliaments in the domain of access to resources would encompass the following:

There are clear rules and procedures in place in relation to access to resources for MPs which include remuneration and other benefits.
There is an adequate level of remuneration and resources provided for MPs, in accordance with the capacity of the legislature. At a minimum, remuneration and benefits provide the basis for MPs to have a decent standard of living and enable them to focus on their responsibilities.

MPs are treated fairly and in a non-partisan way in terms of the remuneration and benefits that they receive, which could include having an independent body or process to determine them. In particular, opposition and independent MPs have access to a fair and adequate level of resources, which is proportionate to their numbers in the legislature.

MPs are provided with the necessary staff and other resources, as their tools of the trade, to enable them to perform their duties effectively.

**Assessment**

The dimension is evaluated on the basis of several criteria that should be assessed separately. For each criterion, select one of the six descriptive grades (Non-existent, Poor, Basic, Good, Very good and Excellent) that corresponds best to your parliament, and provide details of the evidence on which the assessment is based.

The evidence for assessment of this dimension might include:

- Rules and procedures relating to access to resources for MPs
- Feedback from MPs about the adequacy of remuneration, benefits, staff and resources
- Independent reports or evidence of the adequacy of the remuneration, benefits, staff and resources provided to MPs
- Independent reports and evidence regarding the fair and non-partisan provision of remuneration, benefits, staff and resources to MPs

If relevant, additional comments or examples that support the assessment (such as references to external national, regional or international surveys and reports) can be provided.

**Assessment criterion No. 1: Rules and procedures concerning access to resources**

There are clear rules and procedures (which may be legislated) in place concerning access to resources for MPs, which includes rights to remuneration and benefits, their determination and corresponding requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-existent</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evidence for this assessment criterion:**

**Assessment criterion No. 2: Adequacy of remuneration and benefits**

Sufficient remuneration and other resources are provided for MPs to ensure any citizen can stand as an MP and to enable them to perform their duties effectively as MPs.
Evidence for this assessment criterion:

Assessment criterion No. 3: Fair and non-partisan provision of remuneration and benefits to MPs

There is a proper process to ensure that MPs are treated fairly and without partisan considerations in the provision of remuneration and benefits, which could include having an independent body or process to determine them. This should include ensuring that opposition and independent MPs have access to adequate levels of resources, which are proportionate to their numbers in the legislature.

Evidence for this assessment criterion:

Assessment criterion No. 4: Access to staff and resources

MPs have access to the staff and other resources proportionate to a country’s circumstances and to the particular role of the MP, to enable them to perform their duties effectively.

Evidence for this assessment criterion:

Recommendations for change

Indicators for democratic parliaments, based on SDG targets 16.6 and 16.7
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**Dimension 1.2.5 Professional development**

Indicator: 1.2 Members of parliament  
Sub-target: 1 Effective parliament  
Target: 16.6 Effective, accountable and transparent parliament

**About the dimension**

This dimension concerns the provision of professional development to MPs to assist them in performing their core roles of law-making, oversight of the executive, and representation of their constituencies. It encompasses the programmes and resources offered at the institutional level and run by, or under the auspices of, the parliamentary administration. In some jurisdictions, this work is carried out with assistance from development partners or NGOs. It does not include programmes offered by the political parties or the development that may be provided informally by experienced MPs, although these programmes can play an important role in the professional development of MPs.5

MPs usually come to their roles with considerable and varied life experience and well-developed political skills. However, the task of being an MP requires different sorts of skills and knowledge, some of which are quite specialized, such as a knowledge of parliamentary practice and procedure, or the operation of parliamentary structures such as committees. MPs also have responsibility for their constituency, which can include managing a busy constituency office. The legislature has an important responsibility, which is undertaken by, or under the auspices of, the parliamentary administration, to assist MPs in gaining an understanding of their core responsibilities, including the specialized knowledge that is needed to operate effectively.

Induction training for new MPs is particularly critical. New MPs can be quite overwhelmed in their early days in office by the range of responsibilities that they are taking on. Providing them with specific knowledge and insight at the initial stage can assist them in making the transition to becoming effective MPs. In particular, induction programmes should address the basics of how the legislature works, procedures and practices, expert resources or offices available, the responsibilities of MPs and practical information about their rights and access to resources.

Continuing the development of MPs can assist them in further developing their understanding of their core parliamentary responsibilities, thus building on the work done during induction. Ideally a professional development programme would be put together to provide regular opportunities for all MPs to further enhance their knowledge and understanding of their roles. The training courses offered to MPs should be relevant to their needs and should ideally be designed and offered after researching the particular interests and expectations of MPs. Taking into account the busy agenda of MPs, offering online training modules and self-guided courses, which could be accessed at any time from any location, could be a useful alternative to face-to-face training.

The development of guides, manuals and handbooks to assist MPs in understanding the various roles that they have to undertake can be an important part of the approach to professional development. Such guides and manuals provide the documentation to support and reinforce the induction and ongoing professional development programmes and ready references for MPs to use in their everyday work.

---

5 These elements of the professional development of MPs are not included, as they do not relate to the systematic work of the legislature, as undertaken by, or under the auspices of, the parliamentary administration, and would be difficult to measure since there may not be strong knowledge of what is done.
On the basis of a global comparative analysis of parliamentary practices and models in parliamentary development, an aspiring goal for parliaments in the domain of professional development of MPs would encompass the following:

Induction programmes are provided for all new MPs by the legislature and its parliamentary administration, which cover the specific knowledge and skills to assist MPs to perform their immediate work as MPs.

A programme on ongoing professional development is offered by the legislature and its parliamentary administration, and delivered on a regular basis to all MPs, focusing on their core responsibilities as MPs. As a matter of best practice, this also includes access to online training modules and self-guided courses tailored to the needs and expectations of MPs.

Guides, manuals and handbooks covering the core areas of MP responsibilities exist to provide supporting materials and resources for the professional development of MPs and ready reference material for MPs to use in their work.

Assessment

The dimension is evaluated on the basis of several criteria that should be assessed separately. For each criterion, select one of the six descriptive grades (Non-existent, Poor, Basic, Good, Very good and Excellent) that corresponds best to your parliament, and provide details of the evidence on which the assessment is based.

The evidence for assessment of this dimension might include:

- Induction programmes that are developed and delivered to all new MPs
- Ongoing professional development programmes that are developed and delivered regularly to all MPs
- Feedback from MPs about induction or ongoing development programmes
- The existence of guides, manuals and handbooks designed specifically for MPs to cover their core areas of responsibilities

If relevant, additional comments or examples that support the assessment (such as references to external national, regional or international surveys and reports) can be provided.

**Assessment criterion No. 1: Induction programme for MPs**

The existence of an induction programme tailored to and attended by all new MPs, which covers the core responsibilities of MPs and helps them to become effective in their immediate work, and which is delivered under the auspices of the parliamentary administration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-existent</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evidence for this assessment criterion:**

**Assessment criterion No. 2: Continuing the professional development of MPs**
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The existence of an ongoing professional development programme, which is developed in consultation with MPs to meet their needs and delivered regularly to all MPs, in the core areas of their responsibilities, and which is delivered under the auspices of the parliamentary administration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-existent ☐</th>
<th>Poor ☐</th>
<th>Basic ☐</th>
<th>Good ☐</th>
<th>Very good ☐</th>
<th>Excellent ☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Evidence for this assessment criterion:

Assessment criterion No. 3: Guides, handbooks and manuals for MPs

The existence of guides, manuals or handbooks specifically aimed at MPs and covering the core areas of their responsibilities as MPs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-existent ☐</th>
<th>Poor ☐</th>
<th>Basic ☐</th>
<th>Good ☐</th>
<th>Very good ☐</th>
<th>Excellent ☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Evidence for this assessment criterion:

Recommendations for change