Indicator 6.2 – Participation in parliamentary process

It is fundamental to the success of the democratic process for the legislature to be transparent, accessible and for it to engage the public represented by legislators. This entails the participation of the public in key aspects of the work of the parliament, and as has been stated by the Organization of American States: “It is the right and responsibility of all citizens to participate in decisions relating to their own development. This is also a necessary condition for the full and effective exercise of democracy”. ¹

This indicator concerns the participation of citizens generally, and other specialist persons and groups (such as civil society actors, academia and experts), in the work of the legislature. The purpose of such participation is to influence the outcome of legislation, influence policy matters to be addressed by the legislature, have an impact on the legislature’s consideration of the budget, or contribute to parliamentary activities of oversight, such as the work of parliamentary bodies or committees.

New information and communication technologies have enabled the use of new tools for and means of public participation, which have proven effective during the COVID-19 pandemic. Parliaments should assess if and how working online has favoured access to information and has increased the participation of different actors in the decision-making processes during the period, and take into account this information in their future work and engagement with the public.

The indicator recognizes that participation is an active process that provides a genuine opportunity to influence, and not only be consulted or informed about, parliamentary work. Such participation should be reflected in constitutional, legislative and rules of procedure provisions of the legislature, as well as in its accepted practices.

The assessment of the indicator on participation in parliamentary process comprises the following dimensions:

- 6.2.1 Citizens’ legislative initiative
- 6.2.2 Participation in parliamentary bodies
- 6.2.3 Public consultation on draft legislation
- 6.2.4 Public participation in the budget cycle
- 6.2.5 Public participation in parliamentary oversight
- 6.2.6 Expert consultation
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Dimension 6.2.1 Citizens’ legislative initiative
Indicator: 6.2 Participation in parliamentary process
Sub-target: 6. Participatory parliament
Target: 16.7 Responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative parliament

About the dimension

This dimension focuses on the ability of citizens to directly participate in the legislative process of a parliament. Truly participatory legislatures should find ways in which their citizens can voice their legislative preferences in meaningful ways.

Citizen legislative initiatives can be defined as public participation methods that allow citizens to submit legislative proposals on a constitutional and/or legislative matter. Rules and regulations are usually in place which stipulate the requirements for an initiative to be considered valid (for example, a certain number of signatures or other process). In addition to initiating amendments to constitutions and changes in legislation, some initiatives may not necessarily lead to a change in law, but can be a mechanism for placing certain issues on the parliamentary agenda, for example for the initiation of a debate.

The representation of and participation by citizens go hand in hand, as members of parliament represent the people, and legislate in response to their needs, and in a dynamic and changing environment, space is provided for citizens to voice their concerns. Given the potential and often far-reaching impact of legislation, citizens’ initiatives give the public the opportunity to set the agenda for parliaments. This means that citizens not only can contribute to the programme of parliament as determined by MPs, but are able to influence matters placed on the agenda which may not have been identified by members. The openness of the legislative process to citizen participation can build trust and strengthen legitimacy in the democratic system.

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 citizens’ legislative initiative would encompass the following:

- There is a constitutional or other legal provision that allows for citizens’ legislative initiatives, and a clear enabling legislative framework detailing the types of initiatives permitted, their scope and requirements. Thresholds for legitimizing initiatives are also stipulated in the rules and procedures. Legislative and administrative processes are established to provide a clear guide for citizens who wish to raise initiatives.

- Where restrictions are placed on issues that can be identified for citizens' legislative initiatives, the restrictions are articulated in guidance detailing justifiable reasons for the restrictions on certain subjects, thus preventing the arbitrary exclusion of the public from matters of importance.

- Mechanisms are in place to monitor and track the administrative and legislative process for citizens’ legislative initiatives, including online tools for their submission. Citizens have direct access to information on the status of and decision-making about specific initiatives.

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.
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The evidence for assessment of this dimension might include:

- Constitutional or other provision establishing the use of citizens’ legislative initiatives
- Rules and procedures detailing the process for citizens’ legislative initiatives
- Provisions stipulating the reasons for the exclusion/protection of specific subjects from citizens’ legislative initiatives, for example, a restriction on initiatives that impair the state’s ability to raise taxes can be supported by justifiable reasons
- Updated website information informing citizens of all citizens’ current and past legislative initiatives, and other reports and documents detailing the content and status of and decisions on citizens’ legislative initiatives

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: Constitutional or other provision**

There is a constitutional or other provision for a citizens’ legislative initiative that grant the authority to conduct citizens’ legislative initiatives.

<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: Legislative framework**

There is a legislative framework, including rules of procedure that clearly outlines the legislative and administrative requirements, scope and processes for citizens’ legislative initiatives. The framework provides a clear guide for citizens to follow, and specifies the threshold for legitimizing initiatives, if one exists. The framework enables different means for the submission of initiatives, including online submission.

<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: Clear criteria concerning justifiable reasons for subject restrictions**

Where there are restrictions to the areas/issues that can be subject to a citizens’ legislative initiative, these restrictions must be accompanied by clear criteria on justifiable reasons, and be communicated to the public.
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<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: Monitoring, evaluation and feedback

There are open mechanisms in place for citizens to monitor the processing of citizens' legislative initiatives both in parliamentary programming as well as the administration. Parliament evaluates and keeps a record of the concrete impact and outcomes of the initiatives with regard to changes in laws and policies, and makes this record publicly available. Feedback is provided to those who submit an initiative.

<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 6.2.2 Participation in parliamentary bodies

Indicator: 6.2 Participation in parliamentary process
Sub-target: 6. Participatory parliament
Target: 16.7 Responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative parliament

About the dimension

The dimension on participation in parliamentary bodies focuses on the involvement of the public in the activities and/or processes of parliamentary committees as well as other bodies that parliaments might establish, such as bodies with civil society actors and similar.

In many parliaments, ordinary committees are likely to have established public participation processes. However, specialized bodies may differ in their composition and, as such, have varying political and administrative procedures that would result in different processes for public participation.

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 participation in parliamentary bodies would encompass the following:

- There are legal or rules of procedure provisions enabling participation in parliamentary bodies.
- Whether through petitions, submissions or direct presentation, mechanisms for participation in such bodies are outlined in laws, rules and/or standing orders.
- Information about activities of parliamentary bodies, together with the content of discussions, a list of decisions and feedback on previous participation efforts, are published publicly and widely.
- Mechanisms exist to assess the level of public awareness of the means of participation in the activities and processes of parliamentary bodies.

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 in the constitution, legislation or rules of procedure for participation in parliamentary bodies
- Evidence of mechanisms for participation in the form of guidelines and/or other documents detailing the means of participation
- Evidence of published information related to parliamentary bodies

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: Constitutional, legislative rules or of procedure provisions
There are constitutional, legislative or rules of procedure provisions for the public’s participation in parliamentary bodies.
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<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. 2: Mechanisms for participation**

Laws, standing orders and rules support the obligation to facilitate public participation within parliamentary bodies, by providing details of the mechanisms for participation.

<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: Information on the activities of parliamentary bodies is published and communicated widely**

All information related to the activities of parliamentary bodies is published in advance, thus ensuring sufficient time for the interested public to prepare for participation. Information includes the programme, content and feedback on previous inputs, which is provided in an easy-to-use format.

<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: Mechanisms for assessing citizen awareness**

Mechanisms are in place to assess the awareness levels of citizens regarding participation in the decision-making processes of parliamentary bodies.

<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 6.2.3 Public consultation on draft legislation
Indicator: 6.2 Participation in parliamentary process
Sub-target: 6. Participatory parliament
Target: 16.7 Responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative parliament

About the dimension

This dimension covers consultation with citizens in the legislative process. While it is the role of MPs to represent the public in parliamentary processes, providing citizens with direct access to processes keeps the legislature abreast of key developments in different sectors and among different groups of people.

For this dimension, public consultation can be defined as the formal process through which parliament collects the views and opinions of citizens, whether in groups or as individuals, on a proposed or existing law or policy decision. As the representative body of the people, effective law-making requires parliament to proactively engage with citizens in order for MPs to have a deeper insight into the potential impact of legislation on citizens’ lives. Meaningful consultation helps to identify potential unintended effects of legislation, and its absence can be costly. Inadequate consultation can result in an inaccurate assessment of the potential benefits or drawbacks of new legislation, which can lead to further costs in terms of amending the legislation and renewing public consultation efforts. Consultations can either be general or targeted at a specific audience and, therefore, the specific social groups affected by legislation, as well as the general public have an equal opportunity to participate in the law-making process.

Involving the public in the law-making process contributes to building trust in parliament, its representatives and the democratic system. In addition, when legislation is drafted collaboratively with the public, it can improve compliance with the law once it is implemented. Thus, truly effective public consultation can improve the rule of law.

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 public consultation on draft legislation would encompass the following:

- Constitutional, legal or rules of procedure provisions are in place outlining the parliamentary obligation to adequately involve citizens in the legislative process.
- A legislative or rules of procedure framework outlines the scope of consultation required in the legislative process.
- There are established mechanisms and processes for consultation in place, including but not limited to public hearings, submissions and presentations by citizens.
- Simple language is used in draft legislation, and copies are made available ahead of engagements, including all versions of the draft legislation. Enough time is allocated for adequate engagement, especially regarding complex topics.
- Local languages are used to encourage consultation, and additional measures such as pre-consultation engagements are used to further broaden consultation.
- Feedback is provided to citizens on their consultation within the legislative process.

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:
- A constitutional or other provision for public consultation on the drafting of legislation
- Legislation, rules or standing orders outlining the public consultation framework with regards to law-making
- A record of processes or mechanisms for participation, such as public hearing minutes
- Samples of plain language legislation, and digital copies of draft legislation at each stage of consultation
- Samples of draft legislation in different languages, and the time allocations/considerations for legislative consultations
- Minutes or reports of feedback sessions, or published updates

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: Constitutional or other provisions**

There is a constitutional or other provision that stipulates the role of public consultation in law-making.

<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: Legislative or rules of procedure framework**

There is a legislative or rules of procedure framework that details the requirements for public consultation in the law-making process. There are clear standards for consultation, as well as criteria for what constitutes adequate consultation.

<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: Mechanisms and processes**

There are established mechanisms and processes to facilitate both general and targeted consultation on legislation.

<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. 4: Accessibility**
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Public engagements on legislation should be accessible to relevant stakeholders. Simple and plain language is used in the draft legislation, and drafts are made available in a timely manner at every stage of the drafting process to a wide range of stakeholders.

<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. 5: Inclusivity

All stakeholders impacted by the draft legislation are consulted and involved in the consideration of legislation. Draft legislation is translated into local languages to facilitate the inclusion of all relevant stakeholders. The time and place for engagement is conducive to maximum consultation with relevant stakeholders, taking into account the complexity of legislation.

<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. 6: Feedback

Parliament provides feedback to citizens on decisions taken after public engagements.

<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:

Recommendations for change
**Dimension 6.2.4 Public participation in the budget cycle**

Indicator: 6.2 Participation in parliamentary process  
Sub-target: 6. Participatory parliament  
Target: 16.7 Responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative parliament

**About the dimension**

This dimension considers public participation within the budget cycle. A national budget represents citizen interests and priorities, which makes its oversight one of the most important and critical responsibilities of a parliament. While mechanisms for public engagement in the budget cycle are similar to public engagement in law-making, fiscal transparency is especially significant as the allocation of resources is a clear indication of government priorities.

It is not enough for there to be participation in the budget process. Access must be provided for and inputs sought from all groups, especially vulnerable and marginalized communities in society. How the budget is allocated has implications for agenda-setting, and ultimately, for outcomes and impacts. With scarce resources and ever-increasing and urgent social needs, direct participation by citizens helps to highlight to policy-makers the services that citizens value most, and can give insights into efforts to prioritize.

Ultimately, a more transparent budget cycle can cultivate buy-in with regard to government programmes, and can provide an avenue for novel insights required by MPs to better hold the executive accountable. Public involvement can also create better alignment between government priorities and the allocation of resources, thereby improving service delivery and instilling trust in parliament and other public institutions (note that the transparency of budgetary information in the passage of the budget through the legislature is covered in dimension 3.1.3).

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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 public participation in the budget cycle would encompass the following:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is a constitutional or other provision for parliament’s oversight of the budget, fiscal transparency, and the engagement of the public in the budget cycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A legislative framework supports the provisions facilitating fiscal transparency to assist with the engagement of the public in the budget process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are clear mechanisms and processes for participation in the budget process. These can be documented in guidance that outlines the ways in which citizens can participate in the budget process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes for participation are accessible and inclusive, insofar as public engagements are announced ahead of time, enough time is allocated for deliberations, the time and place for deliberations is convenient to all relevant stakeholders, and the content and material used to inform citizens is written in simple language, and is in a language/s understood by locals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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:
- A constitutional provision for participation
- Acts, rules or standing orders supporting public participation in the budget cycle
- A guide, model or other form of documentation detailing mechanisms and processes for participation
- Programmes, schedules, information pamphlets and other supporting documents

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: A constitutional or other provision**

There is a provision in the country's constitution or another provision for the participation of citizens in the budget cycle, which is facilitated by a requirement for fiscal transparency.

<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: Clear mechanisms and processes for participation**

Mechanisms and processes for participation, in the form of a model or guide, are in place. A particular emphasis should be placed on participation in parliamentary committees or other parliamentary bodies responsible for the oversight of the budget.

<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: Accessible and inclusive processes**

Ways in which the public can participate in the budget process are announced well ahead of time, sufficient time is allocated for effective participation, the time and place for engagement are suitable for all sectors of the public, and local language is used to communicate about the budget.

<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>
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Evidence for this assessment criterion:

Recommendations for change
Dimension 6.2.5 Public participation in parliamentary oversight

Indicator: 6.2 Participation in parliamentary process
Sub-target: 6. Participatory parliament
Target: 16.7 Responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative parliament

About the dimension

This dimension describes public participation in parliamentary oversight, which plays a vital role in holding the government accountable on behalf of citizens. Involving the public directly or indirectly in holding the executive to account can greatly enhance the quality of accountability. Oversight activities in the chamber(s), by committees and by constituencies can provide a platform to inform, consult and collaborate with the public.

Much of the public participation with parliament is likely to occur in the work of parliamentary committees as their processes lend themselves well to public involvement. Committee processes, such as the acceptance of submissions, the holding of public hearings, and the use of other consultation processes, such as public meetings and on-the-ground inspections, are tailored to encourage public participation. Parliaments should have robust procedures and well-developed processes to encourage public involvement and participation in all aspects of the work of their committees. There should be monitoring and evaluation of public participation in oversight, preferably with the inclusion of civil society actors, followed by the provision of feedback to the actors involved.

MPs should also develop approaches to the participation of their constituents in their work as parliamentarians. MPs should engage with, inform and consult their constituents or electorate on matters that are to be dealt with by the legislature, their work on committees, and debates on matters of significance and oversight responsibilities in relation to the executive.

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 public participation in parliamentary oversight would encompass the following:

- Parliament has the legal authority to facilitate public participation in all aspects of its oversight function, with an indication of the scope for participation.
- Statutes, rules or procedure and/or acts provide the framework for public participation in all aspects of parliamentary oversight by the legislature and its MPs.
- Tools for public participation in oversight are in existence, including approaches such as citizen advisors, an ombudsperson, social contracts and integrity pacts. Particular attention is paid to the establishment of robust procedures and processes for the public to participate in the work of parliamentary committees.
- There are mechanisms by which the public both receives and is able to provide feedback on the outcome of their participation.
- Public participation processes and activities are published widely.

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:

- Legal provisions on parliament’s obligation to ensure public participation in oversight
- Legislation or rules of procedure on tools for involving the public in the full range of oversight activities
- Guidance documents detailing how the public can participate in parliamentary oversight processes such as the work of the legislature, committees and MPs
- Website information, pamphlets including distribution information or any other publication of the public’s involvement in oversight activities

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: Legal mandate**

There is a legal provision establishing the obligation of parliament to facilitate public participation in the full range of oversight processes and activities.

<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: Legislative or other provisions**

There are statutes, rules of procedure or acts stipulating the establishment of tools for involving the public in all aspects of the parliamentary oversight function by the legislature and its 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>
<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: Existence of tools for public participation in oversight**

Parliament has established tools for the public to participate in oversight. In particular, there are robust procedures and processes to encourage public involvement and participation in all aspects of the work of parliamentary committees. MPs also have developed tools for engaging with constituents.
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<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: Mechanisms for feedback

There are mechanisms in place for requesting feedback from and providing feedback to the public on the adequacy and possible impact of their participation in the parliamentary oversight function. The use and effectiveness of these mechanisms are regularly evaluated, and the mechanisms are adapted accordingly to make them even more effective.

<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. 5: Accessibility, availability and inclusivity

Information on available mechanisms and on public participation in oversight processes and activities is published widely by the legislature. Reference material that allows a citizen to know how to exercise influence over parliamentary oversight is also made available by parliaments.

<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 6.2.6 Expert consultation
Indicator: 6.2 Participation in parliamentary process
Sub-target: 6. Participatory parliament
Target: 16.7 Responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative parliament

About the dimension

This dimension addresses parliamentary capacity and performance in consulting experts in decision-making processes. Effective consultation that contributes to better laws and public policies requires legal authority, clear and transparent procedures for gathering and processing expert input, and well-defined mechanisms for taking into account this input and for tracking its impact.

For the purpose of this dimension, the impact of expert involvement might include, for example, amendments to a law as a result of the expertise provided, a better understanding of a specific issue by MPs resulting in more informed decision-making or more informed deliberation of a law or policy.

The dimension on expert consultation considers both parliament as a whole and parliamentary committees. Committees may be expected to draw more on the use of experts. The expert community, in this case, refers to individual experts, professional associations, academia, experts from businesses and other organizations. The types of expert consultation may include various types of involvement, such as:

- Participation in committee meetings
- Consultations and debates on specific issues
- Making submissions
- Hiring experts to provide research papers, recommendations or other expertise on specific subjects
- Inviting experts to provide information and views to parliament

The dimension assesses the legal power, procedures and practices in a parliament related to expert consultation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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 expert consultation would encompass the following:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parliament and its committees have the legal authority and sufficient resources to consult and/or employ experts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear, transparent and user-friendly procedures for various forms of expert consultation are in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert input on draft legislation and on public policies is systematically sought and received through different means and from a broad range of experts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert inputs are systematically collected, processed, considered and taken into account. Records are kept of expert involvement and its impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
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The evidence for assessment of this dimension might include:

- Specific rules or procedures that provide for the involvement of experts in parliamentary business
- Other rules, procedures and parliamentary and committees’ provisions that set out the specific issues on which expert consultations can be held
- Parliamentary records with data on expert involvement (such as the number of experts and the number of and data on expert organizations)
- Excerpts from parliamentary and committees’ reports containing information based on expert consultation and its impact

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: Legal power

Parliament has the legal power to consult with and/or to employ experts to obtain expert support, opinion or information on relevant issues in parliamentary work. This authority is also delegated to committees and, if applicable, to 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: Financial resources

Parliament has sufficient resources, allocated in the budget, to hire experts when needed. Appropriate parliamentary provisions define financial terms for hiring experts in a clear and consistent manner.

<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: Procedures

Clear, transparent and user-friendly procedures for various forms of expert consultation are in place. The requirements for an expert to be hired are strictly defined (for example, in terms of expertise, experience, involvement in projects and publications), as well as the types of consultation. A process for the selection of experts, and expected deliverables, are clearly specified and transparent.

<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>
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Evidence for this assessment criterion:

**Assessment criterion No. 4: Implementation in practice**

Expert input on draft legislation and public policies is systematically sought and received through different means and from a broad range of experts. Expert inputs are systematically collected, processed, considered and taken into account.

<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. 5: Transparency**

All parliamentary rules and regulations related to the hiring of experts, information on the process of their selection and their work, as well as expert inputs and the records kept, are available to the public. This includes detailed data on the fees paid to experts.

<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:

**Recommendations for change**