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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction and Importance of Study

In many countries there is a growing awareness and determination to make the state a more effective agent of economic and social change. The World Bank’s 1997 World Development Report (WDR), “The Changing Role of the State,” highlighted the changes that are taking place throughout the world regarding the role of the state. The WDR also detailed stronger pressures for the state to embrace its role as an agent of change, suggesting that the role of parliamentarians in implementing these changes will be of paramount importance. The importance of the separation of state power and, by implication, the critical role of parliaments are also highlighted in the WDR. Parliaments are important in helping to ensure open, accountable government, as well as effective oversight of the executive. They also serve as one of the vital bridges linking civil society and the state. Many of the responsibilities, then, for improving governments in particular and societies in general, can clearly start with parliamentarian groups making changes in their own countries.

This report, undertaken by the World Bank Institute’s (WBI) Evaluation Unit, is a strategic evaluation of WBI’s programs for parliamentarians. In this regard, it will examine programs which were exclusively planned for parliamentarians (MPs) and ones in which MPs were not the primary focus, but were still in attendance. The report will also analyze the importance of WBI’s work with parliamentarians and examine how effective that approach has been for the programs WBI has implemented over the past five years from 1994 through 1998.

Organization of the Study

This study is primarily arranged according to the central issues which surround programs for parliamentarians. These include: key strategies/best practices and pedagogy; logic of the programs; strategic importance of the programs; and utilization and impacts. These were grouped as common research themes and formulated into the primary evaluation questions asked of the task managers and parliamentarians during their interviews (as shown in Appendix A).

In this report, Part Two: “WBI’s Work With Parliamentarians,” briefly analyzes and summarizes WBI’s work with parliamentarians and its implications, including its importance to WBI. The evaluation design, methodology, and limitations are summarized in Part Three: “Evaluation Design and Methods.” Part Four: “Findings From Interviews and Consultations With Parliamentarians, Task Managers, and Resource Persons,” explores the major findings of this report through interviews with parliamentarians, task managers and other resource persons. Part Five: “An Assessment of WBI’s Past, Current, and Future Work With Parliamentarians” includes an assessment of WBI’s work with parliamentarians that is greater in depth than Part Two. Finally, the “Conclusions and Recommendations” from this study are listed in Part Six.
Importance of Study to WBI

There are three rationales for why this study is especially important to WBI:

1. Lower than average senior policy seminar (SPS) evaluation scores have been documented for past WBI courses. These seminars have or should have included parliamentarians.
2. Greater attention is being paid to the roles parliamentarians can play in governance and in initiating positive changes in their countries. The body of work performed through WBI and the World Bank is evidence of the Bank’s growing awareness of the importance of parliaments.
3. Interviews with task managers (TMs) and others involved with planning programs for MPs, in addition to WBI activity completion reports and evaluation data, have revealed that learning programs for parliamentarians require careful design and well executed pedagogical strategies. An analysis of WBI’s work with MPs in this study, with the addition of feedback from parliamentarians themselves, can offer insights on how to effectively approach and create learning opportunities for this group.

Activity Data on WBI Programs for Parliamentarians

Since 1994, WBI has initiated approximately 125 activities which included MPs. Between 20 and 25 activities were solely for MPs. This is an approximate number because many reports on activities within WBI have not been kept by task managers nor by their divisions. This study attempted to gather all documents and materials which could provide necessary background or baseline data. Each division in WBI was visited and all available materials were collected. Unfortunately, few extant data were to be found.

Evaluation Methodology and Objectives

The primary purpose of this study is to strategically evaluate WBI’s work with MPs across each division. This report does include a diverse representation of countries for the parliamentarians interviewed, and also contains interviews with at least one task manager from every division within WBI. The parliamentarians consulted for this study were from sixteen different countries.

A triangulation of methods was used to gather data for this report: semi-structured interviews were conducted with task managers and parliamentarians; WBI documents on programs which included parliamentarians were analyzed; observations from a WBI program for parliamentarians are included; and background data from external sources were sought.

Overall, thirty-one parliamentarians (representing 16 countries), eleven TMs, and three resource persons were interviewed and consulted for this study. They are listed in Appendix A.
Evaluation Limitations and Constraints

Most of the interviews scheduled with participants in Africa were not secured or finalized until the actual day due to the busy schedules of the parliamentarians as well as some logistical arrangements which the field offices found difficult to overcome. Additionally, some MPs declined to be interviewed or could not be reached. In Africa, for instance, several parliamentarians scheduled interviews and then never appeared. A few canceled at the last minute and could not be rescheduled. The same problems were also faced in interviews with MPs in Central and Latin America.

The ability to collect data in Kazakhstan was similarly difficult. Interviews with the MPs in Kazakhstan had to be conducted via telephone in Russian, with the use of an interpreter because this was the only means to reach them.

There were three task managers in WBI who did not respond to a request to be interviewed for this study.

The shortage of program records was another major constraint to this evaluation. It was difficult to assess the exact number of programs for parliamentarians, or even those to which MPs were invited, because many task managers and divisions did not keep records of their activities. Many records were incomplete and lacked critical data on: the objectives of the courses; data on the participants who attended them (making it more difficult to locate these participants for interviews); and little to no information on the budgets of the programs. Moreover, the lack of these types of reports on the MIS at WBI further hindered efforts to locate them. Additionally, there were very few (less than five) evaluations of these programs performed, which made judging their viability and effectiveness a near impossibility.

Findings From Interviews With Parliamentarians, Task Managers, and Resource Persons

The major findings from interviews with MPs, TMs, and resource persons are detailed in Part Four. Part Five includes an assessment of WBI’s work with MPs.

An analysis of the data presented in this study leads to several important conclusions and recommendations. These build on recommendations from task managers, parliamentarians, and resource persons. Other recommendations and conclusions have been gleaned from the data which were analyzed in this report. These findings can be grouped into the three central issues which surround programs for MPs: key strategies/best practices and pedagogy; logic and strategic importance of the programs; and utilization and impacts.

Key Strategies/Best Practices and Pedagogy

The MPs, TMs, and resource persons interviewed mentioned several strategic features of planning which worked best: small seminars rather than larger conferences; getting MPs away from their countries and workplaces; choosing the appropriate participants; having specific topics of interest for the course; a strong sense of strategic thinking and planning; and working with other partners and institutions in planning a course.

The response most often mentioned by all three groups of interviewees (MPs, TMs, and resource persons) was that small seminars which invite parliamentarians from different countries work best. This is because parliamentarians learn best through debates, discussions, and interactions with fellow MPs—especially those from other countries—with whom they can exchange ideas.
Parliamentarians do not like to be lectured to. They prefer an activity where they can role play on key topics of importance to them. This puts them in a similar environment to their work in the parliament and gives them the opportunity to debate key issues. Since they do not enjoy lectures, the most common activity arrangement which they preferred is described in Figure 1.

**Figure 1: Suggested Order and Arrangement of An Activity as Proposed by MPs, TMs, and Resource Persons**

As this figure shows, MPs prefer to interact with others during a plenary session where they also have opportunities to discuss topics of interest and ask questions. Afterwards, the larger plenary group can be broken into smaller groups where more informal and in-depth discussions can be concentrated on the key issues of concern to them which are being addressed at the program. Finally, the smaller groups would merge back into the plenary to report their findings and discuss them with the entire group. This is also another opportunity to ask questions, receive answers and insights, and to interact with their colleagues.

Choosing a course delivery method via a seminar, conference, or workshop is also an important option which task managers and other agencies have. According to the views of the MPs, TMs and resources persons interviewed for this study, seminars especially work best for parliamentarians because they allow for the exchange of ideas in a smaller environment.

Parliamentarians enjoy role playing. They like being placed into smaller sub-committees where one of them is elected to chair the group and where everyone has an opportunity to debate the issue at hand, just as they would in a regular parliament session.

**Logic and Strategic Importance of the Programs**

MPs have consistently expressed their dissatisfaction with listening to lectures during an activity, yet many WBI activities attended by the interviewed MPs were organized around lectures without opportunities for questions and interactions. The resource persons, as do
the TMs and MPs themselves, agree that lectures do not work unless there are opportunities for questions and debates.

The selection of topics of interest to MPs were also recommended as vital contributions to a successful activity. Specifically, the topics of corruption, transparency, and good governance have been of notably high interest for MPs.

Planning for activities with MPs should include a strong sense of strategic thinking and planning. The activity must be carefully planned and specifically meet the needs of all the MPs in attendance.

**Utilization and Impacts**

More regional and national (local) follow-up activities were requested by many of the MPs in this study. They were also mentioned by the TMs and resource persons. These activities are vital because many MPs may end up as future ministers and therefore become more significantly influential in creating positive changes in their governments. Additionally, these activities are important to maintain the efforts and changes which were set forth in the previous activities. Continually working with the host country where the activity is held as well as with international partners, was one suggestion made by TMs, MPs, and the resource persons to improve WBI's programs for MPs.

It was recommended by all three groups that literature such as handbooks, papers, and articles will be a good source of reference and follow-up for parliamentarians. In this regard, they can refer to these materials whenever needed and share them with their country members. WBI, then, should continue to develop and disseminate these valuable sources of information for MPs.

**Additional Recommendations**

It is evident from the views of the TMs and the data analyzed for this study that WBI does not have a systematic or integrated strategy for reaching parliamentarians, nor does it have a practical method of sharing “best practices.”

WBI should encourage efforts to develop a clear and legitimate strategy for engaging MPs in its work. Moreover, this should be a cross cutting, synergistic approach: it needs to be adopted by all divisions within WBI to be successful. One practical effort made at approaching this ideal is the creation of WBI’s Parliamentary Group. This Group can offer methods and strategic directions for working with MPs.

Many MPs view WBI activities as opportunities for them to learn. They can do so by exchanging ideas with MPs in other countries. When asked what they thought WBI wanted them to gain from the activity, they primarily believed that the main goals were learning and awareness-raising—in particular, making them more aware of the important issues of transparency, good governance, accountability, and corruption.

There were instances of positive responses for WBI’s work with MPs. The MPs did believe that many of the WBI activities which they attended were relevant to their country’s needs as well as to their own.

MPs also clearly stated that they would like WBI to continue to work with them. This is relevant evidence that WBI’s work is valued and desired by MPs. It also implies that WBI should continue to expand its work with parliamentarians, as it can make a difference it implementing positive and sustainable changes in MP member countries.
The demand for WBI’s parliamentary programs is evident. WBI now has an opportunity to rededicate its work with parliamentarians and deliver programs which can be of particular help to those countries undergoing profound political and economic changes.
Introduction and Importance of Study

This report, undertaken by the World Bank Institute’s (WBI) Evaluation Unit, is a strategic evaluation of WBI’s programs for parliamentarians. In this regard, it will examine programs which were exclusively planned for parliamentarians (MPs) and ones in which MPs were not the primary focus, but were still in attendance. The report will also analyze the importance of WBI’s work with parliamentarians and examine how effective that approach has been for the programs WBI has implemented from 1994 to the present. Since the report was undertaken before the recent merger of EDI (the Economic Development Institute) with LLC (the Learning and Leadership Center), it does not include any mention of LLC.¹

In many countries there is a growing awareness of the need, and determination, to make the state a more effective agent of economic and social change. The World Bank’s 1997 World Development Report (WDR), “The Changing Role of the State,” highlighted the changes that are taking place throughout the world regarding the role of the state. The WDR also detailed the stronger pressures for the state to embrace its role as an agent of change, suggesting that the role of parliamentarians in implementing these changes will be of paramount importance. The importance of the separation of state power and, by implication, the critical role of parliaments are also highlighted in the WDR. Parliaments are important in helping to ensure open, accountable government, as well as effective oversight of the executive. They also serve as one of the vital bridges linking civil society and the state. Many of the responsibilities and changes that will take place worldwide, then, can clearly start with parliamentarian groups making changes in their own countries.

One of the "pillars of integrity," parliaments can be at the core of the fight against corruption and their role is seen as three-fold: 1) as legislative bodies, they are responsible for passing laws enabling an effective policy against corruption; 2) as controllers of the state’s finances, they are preventing the executive power from infringing the law; 3) as citizens' representatives, they show the example which should be followed and, as such, participate in raising awareness in society about the costs of corruption and the ways to fight it. All too often, however, parliaments have been part of the problem. Political systems have been built on patronage and vote buying—powerful contributors to corruption.²

Parliaments can also play an important role in economic and social development. The past thirty years witnessed many legislators who were subordinated and sidelined by their executives which further impeded any progress for developmental reforms. The current

¹ The merger of EDI with LLC took place in the autumn of 1998 and was completed in March, 1999. As a result of the merger, the new name for EDI/LLC changed to the World Bank Institute (WBI).

trends toward increasing democratization in the Bank’s member countries, however, are drawing parliaments back as influential stakeholders in development.

Organization of the Study

This study is primarily arranged according to the central issues which surround programs for parliamentarians. These include: key strategies/best practices and pedagogy; logic and strategic importance of the programs; and utilization and impacts. These were grouped as common research themes and formulated into the primary evaluation questions asked of the task managers (TMs) and parliamentarians during their interviews (as shown in Appendix A). Additionally, Appendix B lists the names and countries of the parliamentarians (MPs) interviewed/consulted, while Appendix C details the TMs and Resource Persons interviewed/consulted for this study. Appendix D lists the sources cited within this report.

In this report, Part Two: “WBI’s Work With Parliamentarians,” briefly analyzes and summarizes WBI’s work with parliamentarians and its implications, including its importance to WBI. The evaluation design, methodology, and limitations are summarized in Part Three: “Evaluation Design and Methods.” Part Four: “Findings From Interviews and Consultations with Parliamentarians, Task Managers, and Resource Persons,” explores the major findings of this report through interviews with parliamentarians, task managers and other resource persons. Part Five: “An Assessment of WBI’s Past, Current, and Future Work With Parliamentarians” includes an assessment of WBI’s work with parliamentarians that is greater in depth than Part Two. Finally, the “Conclusions and Recommendations” from this study are listed in Part Six.
PART TWO
WBI's WORK WITH PARLIAMENTARIANS

Importance of Study to WBI

There are three rationales for why this study is especially important to WBI:

1. Lower than average senior policy seminars (SPS) evaluation scores have been documented for past WBI courses. These seminars have or should have included parliamentarians.

2. Greater attention is being paid to the roles parliamentarians can play in governance and in initiating positive changes in their countries. The body of work performed through WBI and the World Bank (reflected in this study, the establishment of a parliamentarian group in WBI, the World Development Report, and a consultant’s paper on WBI's work with parliamentarians) is evidence of the Bank’s growing awareness of the importance of parliaments.

3. Interviews with TMs and others involved with planning programs for MPs, in addition to WBI activity completion reports and evaluation data, have revealed that learning programs for parliamentarians require careful design and well executed pedagogical strategies. An analysis of WBI's work with MPs in this study, with the addition of feedback from parliamentarians themselves, can offer insights on how to effectively approach and create learning opportunities for this group.

Senior Policy Seminars

For at least the past five years, WBI has recognized parliamentarian groups as an important client group and has sought to serve their professional needs through a series of specialized seminars. Since 1994, WBI has organized or co-sponsored over 125 regional and national parliamentarian seminars, primarily through its work on Senior Policy Seminars (SPS). However, it has been suggested that WBI is not effectively reaching the varied needs of parliamentarians through its programs. A study performed by Soubbotina (1997) maintained that SPSs, which include parliamentarians and other senior officials, have consistently received lower than average ratings than other WBI programs for a number of reasons: their contents are of little relevance to the official functions of participants; they are too focused on academic teaching rather than policy dialogue; they are too short in duration and do not include follow-up programs; there are few inter-regional programs; and many are attended by lower-level officials rather than MPs themselves. In addition to these reasons, many SPSs were rated as notably weak by participants in two important regions where parliaments have become critical to establishing democratic governments—Africa and the Europe and Central Asia (ECA) region.

---

Greater Attention Being Paid to Parliamentarians

To address vital parliamentarian issues and to help overcome some of these dilemmas, a parliamentarian group consisting of task managers, project assistants, regional coordinators, and managers from several divisions within WBI was created in 1996. Currently, this group has proposed a program through which WBI's Divisions will approach parliamentarians in a systematic and coordinated strategy with two aims: to improve the functioning of parliaments (or legislatures); and to equip them to promote sound legislation and regulation for the various development sectors. The establishment of this group is one clear example of the increasingly important role which WBI forecasts parliamentarians will play in implementing changes in their states.

Another example of the growing importance in WBI to reach parliamentarian groups is a study which was commissioned by WBI's Knowledge, Products and Outreach group (WBIKP) in mid-1997. This study (still in draft) was a response to WBI's growing expertise with parliamentarians and was envisioned to provide a sample of these experiences. The study’s main objective was to evaluate and systematize any lessons to help elaborate professional guidelines for future success in parliamentarian forums. The study’s main conclusions were:

- WBI's focus on parliamentarian seminars would benefit from a clearer set of institutional goals and objectives from the task managers producing them;
- Parliamentarian seminars require a greater strategic planning effort than traditional seminars; and
- Successful design, content development, delivery, evaluation and follow-up of parliamentarian seminars requires additional research, coordination and analysis on the part of the production team.

Finally, the growing importance of parliamentarian groups and their vital roles in meeting the overarching goals of WBI and the World Bank warrant the undertaking of a sound strategic evaluation of the effectiveness of the programs which WBI has conducted over the past five years for parliamentarians.

MP Learning Opportunities Require Additional Planning and Attention

As parts four and five of this study will reveal, completed evaluations from previous WBI courses on parliamentarians, both internal and external studies, and interviews with TMs and other resource persons, suggest that parliamentarians require greater attention and more learning opportunities than most groups. This study examines the underlying issues of this theory and determines whether an analysis of these issues may provide insights on how effectively to develop programs for this group. Primarily, this information will be uncovered through an analysis of previous parliamentarian programs as well as from interviews and responses from both task managers and parliamentarians themselves.

---

Activity Data on WBI Programs for Parliamentarians

This report sought to gather all documents and materials which could provide necessary background or baseline data. Each division in WBI was visited to collect as many reports as were available. Unfortunately, few data were to be found. From the data that were collected and analyzed, it was determined that since 1994, WBI has initiated approximately 125 activities which included MPs, and about 20 to 25 activities were solely for MPs. This is an approximate number because many reports on activities within WBI have not been kept by task managers nor by their divisions. It was impossible to interview all the TMs for the 20 to 25 activities solely for MPs because many of the managers had left the World Bank.

Another reason for the apparent shortage of data for this report was the limited management information system (MIS) housed within WBI during the five-year period covered here. In brief, at the time of research for this study, the MIS in WBI contained virtually no data on its programs, and little information could be found on programs conducted for parliamentarians, even after an exhaustive search on the system. Additionally, the MIS did not allow for a distinction to be made between seminars for parliamentarians and other SPS seminars. Until recently, the participant registration forms in WBI did not include a check box to allow MPs to select their own institutional affiliation. Furthermore, no information on the costs of these programs could be located on the MIS; therefore it was impossible to produce a cost analysis.

WBI’s Role in Creating Learning Opportunities for Parliamentarians

As will be explored in this report, WBI has had little or no strategy to guide its attempt to create learning opportunities for MPs. Additionally, only a few divisions appeared to focus on work with parliamentarians, while others have had none at all during the past five years. For example:

WBIGF

Of the five divisions within WBI, WBIGF appears to have the greatest focus on reaching parliamentarians. This division has several task managers who are committed to working with parliamentarians and who have delivered a number of courses strictly for MPs or ones in which MPs were in attendance. These have included programs such as: regional and national seminars and conferences on good governance and corruption; parliamentary workshops; journalist programs; and integrity workshops. WBIGF continues to emphasize its work with MPs as part of its focus on programs for good governance and corruption. The division also has a number of planned programs for MPs in FY ’99. Additionally, the new Division Manager of WBIGF also appears to be committed to continuing the division’s work with members of parliament.

WBIEP

WBIEP should also be recognized for its previous work with parliamentarians since 1994. Programs such as “Macroeconomic Seminars for Parliamentarians,” “Public Expenditure Analysis and Management,” “Global Program in Support of Decentralization and Local Governance, Regulation and Finance group of WBI, formerly EDIRP.

Economic Policy and Poverty Reduction group of WBI, formerly EDIMP.
Governments,” all have included MPs in their programs, but today these programs either no longer exist or have been converted into other programs. Moreover, many of the task managers who previously ran these programs have left WBI or the Bank.

**WBIEN**

WBIEN has included parliamentarians in its courses as well since 1994. These courses include: “Mainstreaming Environmental Sustainability” (no longer in existence) and “Involuntary Resettlement and Rehabilitation Program” (which still exists). This division has begun to include more MPs in its courses recently, with several courses on the environment and macroeconomic reform in such regions as South Asia, Africa, and Central and Latin America.

**WBIHD**

The Social Policy Reform in Transition Economies (SPRITE) program was WBIHD’s largest program and the only one which focused on parliamentarians during the period of 1994 to the present. Although this program continues to this day, it is currently undergoing dramatic changes in its focus and leadership; therefore its future is still unclear.

**WBIKP**

WBIKP has had little to no work with MPs since 1994. To date, it appears that this trend will continue. One task manager, however, organized a regional conference in Eastern Europe in March 1999 on the role of parliaments in curbing corruption. This was managed in close collaboration with WBIGF.

Additional analysis of the data from each division’s work is examined collectively, rather than individually, in Part Five of this report.

---

7 Environment and Natural Resources group of WBI, formerly EDIEN.
8 Human Development group of WBI, formerly EDIHR.
9 Knowledge Products and Outreach group of WBI, formerly EDINP.
PART THREE
EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODS

Purpose of the Evaluation

The primary purpose of this evaluation was to strategically assess WBI’s work with parliamentarians. This analysis provides information which should be useful to WBI for planning future activities with MPs. The primary sources of data came from the TMs and from the MPs themselves who had attended past WBI activities. In addition, information was collected from task managers who planned many of these activities. A member of WBI’s Evaluation Unit managed the evaluation with the assistance of two colleagues who helped with the data collection process.

Methodology: Data Collection and Analysis

A triangulation of methods was used to both collect and analyze data for this report. These include:

1. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with parliamentarians, task managers, and resource persons. These were transcribed according to the responses of the individuals, content analyzed, and grouped (coded) into similar themes which emerged from the analysis;

2. WBI documents on programs which included parliamentarians were primarily analyzed through an examination of their objectives, invited participants, methods of delivery, and evaluation results (if any);

3. Observations from a WBI program for parliamentarians were considered; and

4. Background data from external sources were collected and analyzed, including World Bank and Parliamentary Centre of Canada documents and reports. These were used as supplemental information to support the data and conclusions of this report.

Additionally, observations and the evaluation results from the Laurentian Seminar on “Parliament and Good Governance: The Challenge of Controlling Corruption,” which was held in Canada in 1998 and attended by twenty-seven parliamentarians worldwide, are included.

Interviews

The interviews for this study were conducted in a semi-structured manner. All of the interviews were conducted face-to-face (except the ones in Kazakhstan which were conducted by phone), each lasting about one hour in length. The interview responses of each interviewee were reviewed and confirmed at the close of the interview to strengthen further the reliability of the data. The interview questions for both task managers and parliamentarians, as well as their responses, are included in Part Four of this report.
All of the interviews with TMs in Washington were arranged and conducted at the Bank’s headquarters in Washington, DC. The interviews were conducted with MPs either in their home countries, or while they were at the 1998 Laurentian Seminar in Canada. Each face-to-face, semi-structured interview with the MPs and TMs lasted for about 30-45 minutes. Interviews were transcribed, analyzed for their content, then grouped into similar themes which emerged from the responses. The themes were then reviewed by members of WBI’s Evaluation Unit and by TMs for their reliability and validity.

Overall, thirty-one parliamentarians (representing 16 countries), eleven TMs, and three resource persons were interviewed and consulted for this study.

Criteria for Selection of Interviewees

The task managers chosen for this study were selected because they had delivered courses which parliamentarians attended. All of the task managers were interviewed in Washington at the Bank’s headquarters. Other sources of information included project assistants in WBI, as well as the members of a parliamentary group headquartered in Canada.

Internal WBI activity and program reports in each division were reviewed for this study. Of the reports which were found, some elicited the objectives of the courses, a list of the task managers and the list of parliamentarians in attendance. Consultations with the country offices of the Bank were then made to assist in obtaining interview appointments with the MPs. Most of the interviews were conducted in the country parliament offices or in the respective Bank field offices of the participants. Additional interviews with MPs were also conducted at the 1998 Laurentian Seminar in Canada. As the report will show, the primary regions where WBI has focused its work on parliamentarians have been in those undergoing dramatic democratic changes: Africa, Central America, and the former Soviet Union. These three regions comprise the primary country sources for this report and are, therefore, its main focus.

Evaluation Limitations and Constraints

Most of the interviews scheduled with participants in Africa were not secured or finalized until the actual interview day due to the busy schedules of the parliamentarians as well as some logistical arrangements which the field offices found difficult to overcome. Additionally, some MPs declined to be interviewed or could not be reached. In Africa, for instance, several parliamentarians scheduled interviews and then never appeared. A few canceled at the last minute and could not be rescheduled. The same problems were also faced in interviews with MPs in Central and Latin America.

The ability to collect data in Kazakhstan was similarly difficult. Interviews with the MPs in Kazakhstan had to be conducted via telephone in Russian, with the use of an interpreter because this was the only means by which to reach them.

There were three task managers in WBI who did not respond to interview requests for this study. They did not return phone calls or e-mails and therefore did not consent to an interview.

The shortage of program records was another major constraint to this evaluation. It was difficult to assess the exact number of programs for parliamentarians, or even those to which MPs were invited, because many task managers and divisions did not keep records of their activities, especially prior to 1994, and even from 1995-96. The back-to-office
reports, activity briefs, programs briefs, progress reports, and participant lists which were found and analyzed for this study were difficult to obtain. Many were incomplete and lacked critical data on: the objectives of the courses; the participants who attended them (making it more difficult to locate these participants for interviews); and the budgets of the programs (little or no information was found on budgets). Moreover, the lack of these types of reports on the MIS at WBI further hindered efforts to locate them. Additionally, few evaluations of these programs were performed, which made judging their viability and effectiveness a near impossibility. In fact, no previous external evaluations had been conducted for parliamentarian programs until 1997 when the Pelerei paper was drafted by an external consultant. This draft still remains incomplete and offers only a few suggestions on how WBI could improve its programs for MPs.

Self-selection in answering is another evaluation constraint to weigh. The evaluator often cannot control the selection of participants for interviews, as this report attests: several TMs did not respond to requests to be interviewed, and a number of MPs never appeared even though scheduled interviews were made with them in advance. Moreover, self-selection may not offer as diverse a respondent pool as desired and this can lead to unsubstantiated inferences.
PART FOUR
FINDINGS FROM INTERVIEWS AND CONSULTATIONS WITH PARLIAMENTARIANS, TASK MANAGERS, AND RESOURCE PERSONS

Introduction
This section comprises the findings of the report from the interviews and consultations with parliamentarians, task managers, and resource persons. Summaries of the key themes which emerged from the content analysis of the interviews are discussed in this section according to each question and according to responses from parliamentarians, task managers, and resource persons.

Parliamentarians

Evaluation Question 1: Can you recall what WBI activity(ies) you attended?
This question was asked of the thirty-one MPs to ascertain whether they correctly remembered the WBI activity which they had attended. If they could not recall the activity, the interviewer helped to “jog” their memory by informing them that their name was listed in the participant list for a featured activity. Many of the MPs, however, did recall what activities they had attended, and therefore needed little coaching to do so. Those interviewed mentioned having attended one or more of the following WBI programs:

4. WBI Seminar on Good Governance and Accountability. New Delhi, India, April 1998.
5. Integrity Workshop in Uganda II, November 25-27, 1995
8. Regional Program of Seminars on Economic Globalization and Sustainable Development in Central America with the following activities:

**Evaluation Question 2: How would you characterize the way the content of the activity was delivered? For example, was it a study tour, seminar, workshop, or conference?**

This question was asked to determine the methods of delivery of the courses which MPs had attended. Its primary purpose was to elicit information on the variety of methods used in WBI activities and to determine, later on in the interview, whether or not these were effective.

The activities attended by the parliamentarians were primarily either seminars or workshops, or a combination of both. These sessions would include a workshop with presentations (plenaries) and small group discussions. This was summarized by one MP:

“We first had plenaries with facilitators and speakers, the discussions and debates in small groups. After that, we made agreements and came back into one large group to talk about our discussions. The groups centered on particular themes and we chose which one we could attend. We also chose the chairman of the group [during the smaller group sessions].”

**Evaluation Question 3: Do you recall any particulars of the activity? For example, did it contain speakers, plenary sessions, small group discussions?**

Again, all the MPs stated that the activities included opening plenary sessions with speakers, and then smaller group discussions which would finally converge into larger group discussions. The comments from MPs on these activities varied.

Two parliamentarians could not recall the particulars of the activity they attended. One said that the discussions were too long and only included lectures. Only one said that the activity did not include smaller groups.

**Evaluation Question 4: What kind of activity format would you most prefer?**

It became very evident from the parliamentarian’s responses that smaller groups were ideal for them. According to one MP:

“Smaller groups are essential. Around 30-35 people is ideal, unless it’s large and breaks down into smaller groups later on. Informal, small groups work best. We came from a large parliamentary session where not all voices or speakers were heard. Smaller groups allow for full contributions.”
Another positive feature of smaller groups is that they allow for active involvement and exchange of ideas among MPs. Several MPs also said that they take back to their countries what they learned in the activity, sharing it with their peers. One parliamentarian commented:

“Thirty people in an activity is optimal. Also, talking to many MPs from different countries is more beneficial than anything else. I get to bring back new ideas to my country and present them to our government. It is a great experience!”

According to several MPs who answered this question, the suggested order for an activity is to have a larger plenary session with speakers and participants, with the opportunity for discussions and questions; break-up into smaller groups where the discussion of the issues can occur and final recommendations and decisions are made; and report back to the plenary with the findings and recommendations made in the smaller groups.

Having experienced speakers was another important feature of an activity as mentioned by seven MPs. Some MPs also suggested that workshops worked very well because they were small and allowed for intense debating and discussions. One said that international conferences were far too large with too many speakers, attendees, and speeches. He noted that:

“We don’t like speeches and lectures! We like to exchange ideas in small working groups which are manageable.”

Yet another MP mentioned that workshops were good because they were excellent for governance and transparency issues—two key ideals for parliamentarians. She went further to say:

“Overall, I like an activity where issues are discussed in detail, the issues are analyzed in small groups of 10-20 people (policy-makers, academicians, and facilitators) and then get back together in a large group to discuss the results in a plenary.”

Evaluation Question 5: What do you think WBI wanted you to gain from this activity?
Sixteen MPs interviewed stated that WBI’s main goal in the activity was to make them more aware of the key issues of transparency, corruption, good governance, and accountability. These are vital features of establishing an effective and ethical parliament. Learning was another key feature which one MP mentioned:

“[WBI] wanted us to be aware of good governance processes and ideas. To see what we have learned as members of parliament—has it changed our integrity, our attitudes? Are they adaptable to the changes which were discussed? Adaptability is key.”

Parliamentarians from two developed countries said that they could learn from their peers in developing countries, especially about the challenges which they face and how a developed country can help them. One MP from a developed country stated:
“The value for me was to learn about the difficulties that other countries have in parliament, especially the one’s we lecture where corruption is prevalent. What drives me is poverty alleviation and sustainable development. Achieving good governance is essential to achieving these.”

One MP said that the focus of the seminar was not as refined as it should have been and that it also coincided with another WBI activity in his country. He warned that simultaneous events often get confused. Specifically he mentioned an activity in Uganda, stating that:

“It was not as successful as it should have been—it was aimed at the whole of parliament. The number of parliamentarians at the beginning was very good, but it tailed off at the end. Moreover, this workshop got confused with another WBI seminar on the environment which was running at the same time in our country. I would advise not to do this again.”

Another MP mentioned that the objectives of the activity which he attended were unclear. He found it difficult to remember what he had learned in this activity.

One objective which was clear to four MPs was WBI’s purpose to explain how to make the parliament more effective as an institution. This was especially important for new parliament members to help them understand from the outset how they could be influential in their roles as MPs.

**Evaluation Question 6: Was the activity relevant to your responsibilities as a member of parliament? Why or why not?**

Each parliamentarian interviewed affirmatively stated that the WBI activity that they attended was relevant in one manner or another to their responsibilities. The most resounding and common response was that the activity provided them with opportunities to share their experiences with other MPs and to also learn from the experiences which other MPs faced in their countries through an open forum. One parliamentarian stated:

“It was like a spark in certain areas, especially on the issue of corruption.”

There were other similar revelations from two MPs who believed in the relevance of the activity which they attended:

“It opened my eyes to the fact that we turn a blind eye to corruption. There is far too little awareness and little appreciation of the importance of corruption in society today.”

“It gave me a greater interest in my job.”
One of the speakers interviewed claimed that the activity was beneficial because it helped to educate fellow MPs:

“As a speaker, I need an educated parliament which understands its role. The seminar helped to enlighten us about good governance.”

One MP stated that he was able to see and understand how parliaments in other countries work. Another MP commented that the most positive aspect of the workshop that he attended was the variety of speakers and their backgrounds. In another workshop an MP said that it offered her ideas on establishing practical and sustainable aspects of government. It also showed how NGOs can help to act as intermediary agents to help with the distribution of money to rural people. One MP said that he was somewhat restricted from fully participating in a seminar in New Delhi, India because it was too crowded.

**Evaluation Question 7: Was the activity relevant to your country’s needs? Why or why not?**

All but two respondents stated that the activity was relevant to their country’s needs. The positive responses were that the activity made the parliamentarians more aware of good governance and transparency issues. Additionally, three MPs stated that the activity already had an impact in their countries:

“It has helped us to gain the perspectives of more village areas within Uganda whose voices are important as well.”

“The Inspector General of Government (IGG) in my country often comes up with reports that are different than parliament’s and we decided that we needed more organization between the committees of parliament and the IGG.”

“The seminars I attended were complementary to my needs and my country’s needs. We are now in the process of democratization and institution building in Uganda and the parliament is key to these.”

One MP stated a particular impact which was attributed to the seminar he attended. He believes this impact will last for a long period of time:

“The context was very useful. There was too much disagreement in our government on the issues. The issue of accountability was brought to the front and I know it’s still being discussed in our parliament as a result of the seminar.”
Evaluation Question 8: Did the activity you attend meet your expectations? Why or why not?
Nine of the MPs said that the activity met their expectations. One parliamentarian stated that it gave him a better conceptual role of parliament and what his role was. He continued to say that:

“It allowed me to define my role and the individual role of the parliament.”

Another African MP who had attended two different seminars said that he had mixed views of each. He stated that one seminar which dealt with democratization was lacking in its discussion of ethnic differences. He did, however, remember another seminar on corruption very well, saying that the interchanges with one MP were particularly useful:

“The Russian presentation was very interesting. I remember being actively engaged in conversation with one parliament member from Russia. I learned a great deal from that exchange of ideas with him.”

Six MPs said that they had no expectations going into the activity. One MP said:

“I had no expectations per se, but I was impressed with the quality and caliber of debate. The seriousness of the issue [good governance and corruption] was made more evident.”

Evaluation Question 9: Have you been able in your work as a parliamentarian to utilize any strategies or lessons which you learned through the activity? Can you provide some examples?
This question was aimed at measuring any possible impacts on the respondents which arose from the activity and also to examine the effectiveness of WBI’s program for MPs. Many of the MPs had attended recent activities, so measurable impacts were difficult for them to assess at the time of the interviews. In fact, one stated that:

“I’m starting to use the knowledge I gained there now, but I’m also waiting for the seminar report to come out before I start to say that I’ve used anything.”

Of the ten parliamentarians who could attest that impacts were developed through the course, their reactions were mainly positive. One MP said that his parliament had implemented a workshop in his country which was similar to the WBI one he attended. He further remarked that the workshop created greater awareness of the work which parliament members in the upper and lower houses perform. Another parliamentarian acknowledged that as a direct result of the knowledge he had acquired at an WBI seminar, he was able to incorporate an environmental impact assessment study into a particular bill concerning the environment.
One MP said that the handbook which came out of his seminar has been very useful in a number of important ways:

“We created our own handbook for other members of my parliament which was drafted for the seminar I attended. It has been good in my meetings with other members of parliament as I travel to meet them.”

Other changes in parliament were evident as well in some member countries. One MP said that a small committee was formed to examine sensitive classified accounts in his country. This committee primarily discusses parliamentary resolutions.

The issue of transparency became more evident to another parliamentarian as a result of attending an WBI seminar. She stated that her parliament now looks more closely at this issue, especially at the local levels:

“One thing came out quite clear: that we should look at the views of not only the government, but also the community and their opinions on leadership.”

A fairer sense of gender balance was another issue of interest which arose from one WBI workshop. According to one participant in this workshop, female representation in government was very low in her country, but was changing for the better. She found the workshop useful in a number of ways:

“The issues of gender and gender balance were addressed. The knowledge I gained from this workshop helped me in my work as a member of parliament as well as in my work with other women’s groups.”

**Evaluation Question 10: Do you think that WBI should continue its work with parliamentarians in your country? Why or why not?**

All of the parliamentarians interviewed affirmed that WBI should continue to work with them and their countries to implement sustainable changes. All but a few of the MPs also offered firm reasons on how WBI could help them with these changes. One MP said that WBI was helpful in facilitating workshops, but that it can also let other countries organize the content so that it is most relevant to their particular needs. Other MPs offered advice on how WBI could expand their work with parliaments:

“You should expand areas of concern such as anti-corruption and democracy. When organizing international workshops, make certain that country-specific workshops are available.”

Other MPs also echoed this view stating that WBI should plan more regional and country-specific activities for parliamentarians:

“Bring us more courses to share ideas among parliamentarians. Help us to acquire expertise in global issues, development and common concerns. More regional conferences and workshops would be useful.”
One MP went further in his diagnosis of the issue, saying that corruption must be impeded:

“WBI can raise consciousness and visibility of the issues. We need to make changes at the very top of government. You should deny funds to those countries that are corrupt and other international organizations should follow this lead. However, you should not walk away from those countries (Kenya, for example), but instead work with them at the grassroots level and get things going at the street level.”

The idea of exposure was another key issue with which one MP said WBI can help:

“WBI has not done enough with politicians, but it’s starting to now. WBI can make politicians more aware of the key issues and this can help. Exposure is key—it can ensure a better government.”

One MP suggested that WBI’s work with new democracies is vital. He also emphasized the importance of WBI’s work in facilitating partnerships with other organizations:

“I think WBI’s work is essential. It could, however, widen its focus to countries that are now becoming democracies. WBI’s work is essential to helping the process of democratization and to facilitate partnerships.”

**Evaluation Question 11: Do you have any suggestions on how WBI can improve its services to parliamentarians?**

Twenty-one MPs stated that follow-ups or additional activities were needed in their countries. Prime examples of these would include more regional conferences or workshops expressly for parliamentarians, so that they could exchange ideas with other MPs and gain insights about common regional issues. One MP said that regional workshops would be helpful in more ways than one:

“More regional workshops would be helpful to discuss the issues in depth. These would help us to know what other countries are thinking on government issues and allow for exchange of ideas. We would like to group members of parliament and exchange visits with other regions of Africa as well. We need to visit each other’s countries to know what’s actually going on there to understand the differences that separate us.”

The issue of follow-up workshops which are timely was also a concern of one MP:

“We need more follow-up workshops that are timely—notably, within a few months (three months would be ideal) of the first workshop to discuss the issues again.”

Another MP said that follow-up workshops and seminars every 1-2 years to readdress the issues would be most useful for him and his country.
Part of the follow-up process should include a greater understanding and awareness of local councils. The follow-up activities, according to several parliamentarians, should be planned with their parliaments and local councils in their countries, with the assistance of other partners such as WBI. A stronger relationship between parliament and civil society was a concern of one MP:

“The inter-relationship between national parliament and local councils is vital to strengthening our parliament. Local councils need to know what we do and vice versa.”

Another MP went on to say that WBI could assist his country in identifying other key knowledge requirements for members of his parliament, such as learning about how to assess budgets and patterns of resource allocation. WBI could help to develop these resources through programs for parliamentarians and their staffs. Part of this process would include capacity building, which, as one MP said, could help countries to better understand their needs and functions. It was also suggested by the MPs in this study that many parliamentarians are not well trained and that they have little understanding of policy issues and how governments work. This fact makes WBI training more urgent for improving parliaments.

Providing MPs with more useful publications was another topic raised by the parliamentarians who were interviewed. Examples of these would include handbooks and reports which some MPs could use as a reference tool for all members. Several MPs had mentioned that they had utilized the reports from the activities they attended and often shared them with their colleagues. Additionally, MPs said that their resource materials on governance, trade, and legal issues were inadequate. A need exists, then, for publications on these topics so that MPs can strengthen their understanding and knowledge.

A practical idea was offered by several MPs—offer programs during parliamentary recesses. This would minimize the distractions which MPs face while attending programs in their countries. Parliamentarians often get distracted by the most current and pressing issues of concern in their countries and feel obligated to address them properly, even if it means leaving the seminar. For these reasons, it was suggested that the recess periods offer MPs greater opportunities for attention and for interactions with their colleagues. Due to these distractions in their counties, other MPs suggested holding activities in countries other than theirs or in cities other than the capitals, so that the distractions would be less pressing. One MP also suggested having the activity on a weekend when MPs have more free time.

Five MPs suggested that WBI should focus its activities on the core issues of corruption, transparency, and good governance. Implicit in this notion is that most MPs need a clearer understanding of what these issues imply. According to one MP:

“In the Spanish language there is not the equivalent of the Anglo-Saxon concept of accountability: parliamentarians are detached from their constituencies and don’t feel accountable to them.”
It is this lack of familiarization and experience with the legislative process and parliamentary functions which often restricts parliaments from implementing necessary changes in their governments. This is occurring in many of the Bank’s regions which are experiencing democratic processes (particularly in Africa, Central America and the former Soviet Union), which are new and complex to them. WBI’s role here, again, would be to better educate MPs in transitional economies and new governments regarding key issues of organization and to overcome challenges which are inherent to newly created democracies.

Task Managers

*Evaluation Question 1: What pedagogical strategies have you used in your activities that included parliamentarians?*

*Evaluation Question 2: Can you make any assessment as to which among the strategies you have used work best with parliamentarians?*

For nine of the eleven task managers, the most utilized methods of delivering their courses were seminars (with plenaries) and workshops. Only two TMs used study tours as a method of delivery. Seminars and workshops were viewed as favorable pedagogical strategies because they allowed for smaller working groups of parliamentarians where they could discuss and debate issues in an open environment. These smaller groups also allowed more interactions between MPs which, as was previously discussed, are most highly regarded. Many of these small groups were assisted with the help of facilitators who helped moderate and keep an orderly discussion flow.

Another task manager emphasized that the international perspective is quite important for courses with parliamentarians. Inherent to this view was inviting a diverse number of participants whereby country experiences could be exchanged among MPs. As many TMs stated, parliamentarians love to talk and want to be heard. But it was emphasized by all task managers that inviting the appropriate participants was vital to a successful activity and that the key resource persons in the country were essential in assisting them with the selection of the participants. Moreover, inviting the right participants early on with the help of country resource persons, as one TM said, helped to mobilize the participants, giving them ownership to address their concerns. This also helped to prevent participant drop-out.

Almost all of the TMs interviewed also mentioned the need to work with the host country in facilitating the workshop or seminar. This was a key objective to establishing a successful program due to the fact that countries have different values, needs, and traditions; partnerships with those country members would help to make the logistics of the courses easier to plan and deliver. A task manager stated that the most effective resource persons were former parliamentarians because they “speak the same language” and have dealt with MPs before. These key resource persons were extremely beneficial to the task managers.

One task manager stated that traditional lectures are not appropriate for parliamentarians for two important reasons: MPs are not interested in hearing lectures and they have a short attention span. While these issues are not unique to MPs, they are worthy of consideration. As was explained in the interviews with MPs in the previous section, their dislike of lectures is quite strong.
Another view stated by one task manager was that plenaries will work well with MPs if they are allowed to debate the issues at hand. This approach must be considered carefully, however—if the plenaries do not offer the opportunity for parliamentarians to ask questions and debate, then the plenaries become a lecture session which quickly becomes less interesting to these officials. This is consistent with the view that MPs do not enjoy lectures, but instead react more favorably to interactions.

In an WBI seminar, a TM grouped MPs with all other participants. According to her, this approach was effective because they wanted to hear the views of their constituencies.

The two task managers who utilized study tours in their work with parliamentarians stated that this method of delivery was very powerful if well-prepared. One TM’s belief in study tours stemmed from his view that they help to change the learning paradigm because seminars are overly analytical. Study tours, conversely, have a rationale, practicality and experience which he viewed as leading to new discoveries and new methods which work. However, he emphasized that a study tour preceded by a seminar can allow the key players to be involved and offer them fruitful discussions. Key to this strategy was the view that study tours offer many opportunities for synergies, especially if the flow of the tour was ordered accordingly: presentation of experiences; presentation of theoretical concepts; and discussion combing experiences and theoretical concepts.

Two task managers emphasized that follow-up courses were also vital for attaining sustainable changes in the countries of the MPs who attended the activities. Additionally, follow-ups allow for a sound assessment of impacts.

In planning activities for parliamentarians, seven task managers also considered the topic as a critical means of achieving a worthwhile course. MPs want to discuss issues that are vital to their own interests, which makes the planning of the course critical to its future success. The topics of highest concern for MPs according to the TMs interviewed were issues of corruption, transparency, and good governance.

**Evaluation Question 3: Did you take into account any special considerations in designing your activities when you knew parliamentarians were involved? Can you describe them?**

Five of the TMs interviewed indicated that choosing special topics and inviting an appropriate audience were special considerations that had been taken into account for their courses with MPs. One TM stated that MPs will listen to Deputy Ministers and high government officials, but they do not care for lectures where speakers discuss issues that are not relevant to their own needs or their country’s needs. Therefore, it is important to assess the needs of each individual MP and his/her country, and to make certain in the course’s planning stages that the topics address the needs of all the MPs invited.

Another popular consideration by five task managers was the need to work with partner institutions in obtaining key resource people to assist in the planning and delivery of the course. Such key people would be journalists, institutes, translators, and trainers. These key resource people, moreover, can help to assess the environment of the political structure and its implications for the course or activity. Additionally, resource persons are particularly useful for follow-up activities in the countries where they are delivered.

Training and knowledge are two other key considerations addressed by two TMs. MPs desire to expand their knowledge through learning from the experiences and solutions which other parliamentarians have utilized. In this sense, it is important for them to enhance their understanding of key issues by discussing and debating them with fellow colleagues.
Time constraints are also an important consideration. MPs are busy officials and have little time to attend activities; therefore courses have to be planned around their time schedules. One TM stated that study tours were one favorable way of getting MPs away from their countries and focusing more on the issues. This leaves MPs fewer distractions, which they usually face when a course is given in their home country.

Two task managers said that they did not take any special considerations when planning their activities for MPs. This was due to the fact that the courses were demand driven and asked for by country government officials.

**Evaluation Question 4: How would you characterize WBI’s strategy(ies) for reaching parliamentarians?**

All TMs interviewed agreed that WBI does not have a strategy for reaching MPs, or if it does, then they do not know of it nor consider it to be coherent. Each TM stated emphatically that WBI needs a way to share best practices and strategies. In this matter, the Parliamentary Group in WBI or the creation of other ad hoc groups may be one such way to share best practices.

According to one TM, WBI took too long to form a useful group to share lessons learned. She suggested that a committee be created to overcome this dilemma. Another TM stated that:

> “WBI’s weakness is that we don’t have a strategy for parliamentarians. There is a lack of synergy among different programs and task managers, because many managers are too headstrong. There is a willingness to share information among us, but no encouragement to do so.”

One other TM stated:

> “When I first arrived at WBI a few years ago, it was emphasized in the WBI’s front office that we would focus more on government officials, such as MPs, but I’ve never seen that develop any further than just discussion. There’s been no action on this.”

The one manager who stated that WBI does have a strategy for MPs said that it was “Okay, but could still be better.”

All of these responses suggest that WBI should consider developing a strategy for engaging parliamentarians. The responses from the interviews with TMs indicated that WBI should consider MPs as an important group which should not be overlooked.
Evaluation Question 5: Do you believe that WBI has emphasized reaching parliamentarians in its overall strategy? Why or why not?
This question was similar to the previous one, but it differed in asking TMs if WBI has at least emphasized reaching parliamentarians in its work, rather than asking them if WBI had a strategy at all. All TMs interviewed stated that WBI had not emphasized reaching parliamentarians in their work. One TM mentioned that some people within the Bank think it is politically wrong to engage MPs in our work. Another said that:

“I don’t get the sense that parliamentarians are being targeted. There’s no concerted effort to include them in our work...If you want large numbers of MPs, you need the help of their superiors.”

The lack of synergy between divisions and between TMs was again mentioned by one task manager who said that WBI has mentioned reaching MPs, but he has seen little implementation of this idea. He concluded that, “the message hasn’t gotten to me yet.” A few believe that given this situation, that WBI is simply giving “lip service” to the idea of MPs, while not taking any action.

Ten task managers stated that MPs were worthy of consideration and that their needs are very much related to WBI’s work. As such, the TMs interviewed believe that this is an oversight on WBI’s part which should be resolved. A task manager emphasized that, “We need to reach parliamentarians wherever we work,” while another expressed the view that:

“We should go after key opinion leaders in our member countries...Our convening power is our comparative advantage (not just our knowledge and resources) and is key to influence participants...we can organize key people and arrange for them to discuss important issues. I don’t think we focus enough on parliamentarians.”

It is apparent that the task managers interviewed agree that WBI needs to address parliamentarians in its work as one way of changing opinions and initiating changes in member countries. WBI does have the ability to do this, but so far it has largely overlooked MPs as one source for implementing these vital changes worldwide.

Evaluation Question 6: How would you characterize the reactions you received from the parliamentarians in your activities?
All TMs interviewed stated that the reactions they received from MPs were very positive and enthusiastic. One said that he had reached two types of MPs; those interested in substantive issues and those who are not. But the ones who worked with him best were the younger parliamentarians, who showed particular interest in WBI’s work and who were intent on learning from others.

One difficulty which a task manager experienced in her course was that she encountered a great amount of fighting among MPs because some did not allow others to speak. Yet, the parliamentarians she encountered said that they realized how important it was for them to work with other governments as well as with members of their own governments. At the end of her course, there was a consensus among many MPs that their views may have been wrong and that they truly did have common interests with local governments. This is one example of the special needs that MPs impose upon the task managers and it also shows the importance which parliamentarians attach to debates and discussions. It also demonstrated that MPs can learn from each other, even if placed in a
difficult environment such as this—they simply need the opportunity to be among their peers and to express their opinions.

Other task managers had similar positive stories in their accounts of working with MPs. In one course, a task manager noticed that MPs were sitting on the edges of their seats and actively listening and speaking in her seminar. She also received a letter from the committee head thanking her for the program.

**Evaluation Question 7: Is there any evidence which suggests learning and impacts occurred in the activities that were directly or indirectly aimed at parliamentarians?**

Four of the task managers interviewed stated that MPs had conveyed to them their increase in knowledge because of the activity. These were the only evidences of learning which the TMs mentioned in the interviews—there was no other concrete evidence of participant learning in their courses.

Three task managers said that the MPs which they trained in their activities had assisted with the creation of a new committee or commission to resolve important issues in their countries. New committees on environment and corruption were two such examples offered by the task managers. These are some of the clearest evidences of impacts which were the result of WBI training.

New reforms, laws, or codes were also initiated in some countries, according to the views of the participants, as conveyed by the task managers. Many of these new reforms led to changes in member countries such as urban development renewals and reforms in public finance.

One positive outcome from a WBI course was that MPs had informed TMs that they had shared their binders and handbooks with colleagues upon their return; however, they did not specify what information was particularly shared nor what their colleagues did with this new information.

Overcoming the issue of corruption is another importance facet of WBI’s programs for parliamentarians. As such, TMs looked at evidences of how their participants dealt with this issue. One TM stated that a corrupt MP was thrown out of parliament due to parliamentarians’ increasing awareness of corruption which was given to them by WBI training. Another TM said that Africa (the region in which he worked most) had gained a greater awareness of corruption and was beginning to implement positive changes.

Two task managers stated that it was difficult to tell whether impacts or learning had occurred in their courses, mainly because the courses were too new or had just recently been completed.

**Evaluation Question 8: What were some of the lessons you learned in your strategies for reaching and engaging parliamentarians?**

Four task managers mentioned that MPs were busy persons, so planning ahead of time is very important for a successful activity. One TM said that the activities should be offered during parliamentary recesses, so that the MPs could dedicate more time and be less distracted (this was also suggested by an MP). If possible, it was also suggested that MPs should be taken away from their countries to minimize their distractions and time constraints. Another component of good planning would be to offer shorter courses, so that an inordinate amount of time is not taken up by the activity. One task manager suggested that WBI’s activities for MPs should be a series of events and not just one long one.

In course planning, eight task managers also mentioned that, again, MPs do not like lectures. They prefer to be engaged and to interact with MPs from other countries so that experiences can be shared. MPs like to be informed of the major issues first, then
have a chance to debate them, and finally have the opportunity to hear and offer recommendations. Key to this idea is that the issues which are dealt with must be of interest to the MPs and relevant to both their needs and to their country’s needs. One task manager had a helpful solution for discovering what MPs most liked in their courses:

“Finding out from MPs what kind of set-backs they had in moving forward in their agenda in their countries and using these ideas for designing future workshops for them was helpful for me.”

Five task managers learned that another means for successfully engaging MPs was securing the assistance of local organizations in the country in which the course is being delivered. Partner institutions which are helpful could be local development agencies, NGOs, or government agencies. Several task managers stated that these institutions are vital for help and essential for long-term sustainability.

Since MPs like to interact with other MPs, many task managers have planned their courses to allow for smaller groups of MPs to discuss and debate issues. The preferred method of delivery which many TMs used was to first have a plenary session, then to break the MPs into smaller groups to discuss the issues raised during the plenary, and finally to have all the MPs reconvene and discuss their findings and conclusions. One TM elaborated on this strategy:

“We had large plenary sessions in which parliamentarians learned how others perceived them and how MPs interacted with others such as government officials, media, civil society and ministers. The larger sessions worked well for me when we started with the plenaries and then broke up into smaller, special sector groups. This seemed to work best.”

Another TM stated that activities for MPs need more precision and better planning in comparison with other groups which WBI trains. She summed up the views of many of the task managers above by saying:

“MPs require better planning and more strategizing. They think they are an important group. You certainly need local help within the country where you are conducting the activity to accomplish your goals.”

**Evaluation Question 9: Do you have any sense of whether within WBI there is some collective understanding of what are the “best practice” strategies for parliamentarians?**

All task managers interviewed stated that they did not think that, or did not know if, WBI has a collective understanding of what the “best practice” strategies are for parliamentarians. They also believed it was regrettable that WBI task managers do not share best practice strategies among themselves in a proper manner. What is commonly learned through experiences in the field in WBI, then, typically goes unshared, and that does not solely include programs for parliamentarians. One task manager said WBI needs more coordination in its programs for MPs:

*It would be a good thing to coordinate parliamentary strategies with sectors in countries. We need a central coordinator in WBI to work with MPs and review the proposals for our strategies in reaching MPs.*
One TM believed that WBI's approach was lacking, but in the process of moving in the proper direction:

“It's slowly gelling. The Parliamentary Group here in WBI is one example. We could use more examples of “best practice” strategies for MPs and do more activities for them. I strongly believe that this is a field that we are under-rating.”

These responses indicate a clear consensus that WBI's sharing of “best practice” strategies (not just for MPs) is lacking. The task managers view this as a shortcoming for WBI and something which needs to be addressed and improved. Since courses for MPs require better planning according to TMs, a sharing of strategies and “best practices” appears to be clearly warranted.

**Interviews with Key Resource Persons**

Semi-structured interviews with three key resource persons of the Parliamentary Centre in Ottawa, Canada were conducted for this study. Two interviews were conducted during the 1998 Laurentian Seminar in Canada, while one was conducted by phone in October. The purpose of these interviews was to gain pertinent data on how best to engage parliamentarians. Primarily, the interviews consisted of two central open-ended questions: 1) What strategies have you used in your activities with MPs?; and 2) Which strategies/approaches have worked best, in your opinion?

The responses of the three resource persons fell into two primary categories related to programs with MPs: planning and delivery, and follow-up. Several of their responses echoed those of the task managers and parliamentarians, which offers reinforcement to the consistency and relevance to the suggestions made by the respondents in this study. Each category will be addressed separately in this section.

**Planning and Delivery**

In the area of planning, the resource persons indicated that there were six planning strategies that worked best for them: getting MPs away from their work environment; choosing the appropriate participants; having specific topics of interest for the course; having a strong sense of strategic thinking and planning; working with other partners and institutions in planning a course; and recognizing that seminars work better than conferences.

Getting MPs away from their countries or out of their places of work (usually the capital) to attend an activity was one reportedly effective strategy used by a resource person, and which was also mentioned by several MPs and TMs. It is evident that the vast array of problems which MPs face in their own countries becomes a distraction to them if an activity (seminar, conference, workshop) is taking place in their country. For this reason, it was suggested that an effective course for MPs should take place outside of the MP's country, if possible, or away from the capital. Therefore, the selection of an appropriate facility is very important. All of these choices will help to minimize distractions.

The choice of the appropriate participants has always been a key feature of planning any program. It is also a vital feature of a sound needs assessment. The resource persons indicated the selection of the appropriate participants is often a difficult task, but a very important one. It is especially important since MPs consistently expressed their
desire to interact with MPs of other countries in these programs. This will maintain the interest of MPs during the activity and keep them actively engaged.

Specific topics of interest to MPs were also recommended as vital contributions to planning a successful activity. Specifically, topics such as corruption, transparency, and good governance have notably been keen topics for MPs. One resource person said that templates for working polices are necessary—that you must “push MPs into concepts on specific topics to attract and maintain their interests during an activity.” Another resource person said that:

“The vast majority of MPs are interested in issues that are important to their own people (their own constituencies). You must think of ways that their roles can deal with the important issues at hand.”

A strong sense of strategic thinking and planning is also a key strategy for engaging MPs. According to one resource person:

“You must explain the developmental purposes of the institution of parliament and think strategically about them. Specific discussions about what their actual needs are for sound democratic institutions is one example.”

Working with other partner institutions is a key planning strategy which has worked well for the resource persons. One said that:

“Good communication with your partners is essential. You must understand the needs of your partners and work together on collaborations. Part of this is also having good inter-cultural and good international communications about learning and exchange of information including written materials.”

Choosing a course delivery method via a seminar, conference, or workshop is also an important option which task managers and other agencies have. According to one interviewee, seminars work best for parliamentarians because it allows for exchange of ideas in a smaller environment:

“Conferences are for senior people to provide direction and information for junior people. There’s little debate and all note-taking. Seminars, however, put information out there, make presentations, and provide opportunities for exchange, debate, and reflection. Sub-committee meetings and breakout sessions work very well within seminars. Good discussion and good communication go hand-in-hand.”

In order to have a successful seminar, there should also be an allowable time for MPs to relax and to get to know each other. Casual events such as socials or a group visit to some historic landmarks in the city where the seminar is held (or a city close by) can help to put the MPs at ease and allow them to learn more about their colleagues:

“You cannot have discussions and debates in a few days. There should be some time to relax a bit, to build personal relationships, and then involve them [MPs] in personal discussions. This will lead to better conversations and partnerships.”
The activity order and plan which worked best for the resource persons was the one mentioned by most MPs and TMs in this study. Taking into account the majority of the three group’s opinions, Figure 1 shows the suggested order and arrangement of an activity:

**Figure 1: Suggested Order and Arrangement of An Activity as Proposed by MPs, TMs, and Resource Persons**

This method seems especially appropriate for MPs because it has all the key characteristics of an activity which they enjoy: small groups, discussions, debates, and exchanges of ideas.

**Delivery**
The method of delivery is another feature to consider when planning an activity for parliamentarians. All of the following methods of delivery mentioned by the resource persons were also mentioned by several MPs and TMs. The first suggestion was to have a small group of parliamentarians in the activity. MPs like to work in small groups where they can exchange ideas and debate issues.

Parliamentarians also like to role play. During an activity they enjoy being placed into smaller sub-committees where one of them is elected to chair the group and the others have opportunities to debate the issue at hand, just as they would in a regular parliament session. This was a finding mentioned by MPs, TMs, and resource persons alike.

Many MPs, some communicating their views through task managers, have expressed their dissatisfaction with listening to lectures during an activity. The resource persons, as do the TMs and MPs themselves, agree that lectures do not work unless there are opportunities for questions and debates. Placing MPs in smaller sub-committees gives them the chance to exchange ideas and interact with other MPs, which is what they most desire.

Lastly, training of MPs should also include training for their staff. This was an idea also raised by a few MPs and TMs in this study. These training events should include policy seminars.

**Follow-Up**
An integral feature of an activity will be to assess the long term impacts and sustainability of what was discussed and learned during the event, and ultimately how the participants put this knowledge to use. This is part of the follow-up process, which the MPs in this study urged WBI to consider—especially regional follow-ups.

The use of publications is one way to assure follow-up with MPs. Literature such as handbooks, papers, and articles will be a good source of reference for parliamentarians for the future. They can refer to these materials whenever needed and share them with their country members.

The resource persons suggested several ways to follow-up and maintain communications with MPs. One example would be the creation of a quarterly newsletter which is reported to alumni who attended the activity. To further attract their interest in a newsletter, they can have opportunities to contribute articles for each issue. Additionally, alumni can be useful for many other purposes according to one resource person:

“We utilize alumni in follow-up activities when we visit countries and seek their advice in planning future seminars. We also have them make presentations at future seminars.”

Overall, then, this section showed that many MPs, TMs, and resource persons are generally in agreement as to how to effectively provide learning opportunities for parliamentarians. The recommendations given by these three groups offer ideas to strengthen WBI’s programs for MPs in the planning, delivery, and follow-up stages. The next section of this report will build on the findings of this section by assessing WBI’s past, current, and future work with MPs.
PART FIVE
AN ASSESSMENT OF WBI’s PAST, CURRENT, AND FUTURE WORK WITH PARLIAMENTARIANS

Introduction

This section of the report will explore and assess several examples of WBI’s work with parliamentarians and examine their individual strengths, weaknesses, recommendations and conclusions. These examples include:

1. WBI’s past work with MPs: roll-out program commitments; WBI’s Parliamentary Group; observations and results of the Laurentian Seminar; a feasibility study; and an anti-corruption report.
2. WBI’s current work with MPs: A review of WBI divisional reports for FY ’99.
3. Future directions for WBI’s work with MPs.

Also, the views of the managers and coordinators within WBI, with regard to parliamentarians, are presented through prior reports, conversations, and meetings. Overall, this assessment will provide a better understanding of WBI’s previous, current, and anticipated work with MPs and will clarify which direction WBI is headed in its parliamentary activities. It will also offer ideas that WBI should consider for its work with MPs.

Roll-Out Program Commitments

In a January 1995 WBI Review interview, one of the most pressing goals for WBI as explained by its Director was “to bring more coherence and focus to the currently wide range of training activities that WBI carries out in the direction of helping country policy makers in managing change” and to become “a major worldwide center for dissemination of best practices in policy-making.” Although it seems apparent that parliamentarians would be included in this policy-maker role, it remains unclear whether MPs were actually addressed further in WBI programs since that year. There seems to be little or no emphasis on, nor an importance attached to, a clear strategy for engaging parliamentarians in WBI programs to this day. WBI could expand its concept of policy-makers to include parliamentarians. Essentially, WBI should re-examine its definition of who policy-makers are and then decide if MPs are to be a part of those activities for policy-makers or perhaps for another group.

When WBI received an increase in its budget by the Bank’s Board during FYs ’96-’98, the Bank’s President resolved that WBI should prove its worth. In response, WBI initiated a series of roll-out programs, some of which eventually evolved into the core courses, as they are now known. These programs seemed to have emphasized the need to involve more policy makers such as parliamentarians, but since that time, many parliamentarians have not actually been reached via these programs. To date, the roll-out program on parliamentary training has not evolved into a core course.
WBI’s Parliamentary Group

In 1996, a group of WBI task managers realized that parliamentarians constituted an important client segment and joined efforts across divisions to respond to their professional needs. This became an informal, cross-divisional consultative group with about eleven members of WBI. The creation of this Parliamentary Group in WBI was a clear attempt to establish a working group to address the varied needs of parliamentarians. The group also addresses many of the same issues elicited in this study to assess the best practices for engaging parliamentarians.

WBI’s Parliamentary Group has met a number of times since its creation to decide on the best course of action for receiving recognition for its work and to maintain its viability as a group within WBI. One such collaborative effort was created by the group and drafted to WBI’s director—a strategic draft framework for programming. This document argued that WBI should recognize the importance of parliamentarians in influencing development policy, civic education and good governance by transforming existing informal inter-divisional discussions into a more formal WBI-wide initiative. Three programming options were considered in this draft: to continue the current ad hoc cross divisional consultation; to continue the ad hoc consultation but at an enhanced level where managers of parliamentarian programs would remain with existing divisional structures but with active encouragement of cross-divisional collaboration; and an elaborate initiative which would be managed by a cross-divisional task group with terms of reference and resources to develop key strategies and programs. After reviewing this document, it was recommended by WBI’s front office that the first option should be maintained—that the group would continue as is— independent, ad hoc, with no funding, and no recognition as a formal group within WBI.

To date, the Parliamentary Group remains in tact, but has received diminishing support from both the front office and task managers. It meets sporadically and its meetings are not well-attended. This is an indication of the group’s ad hoc role within WBI—it appears that it will not advance further without the support and collaborations of those within WBI. However, the group has made significant accomplishments in its short existence, notably: increased professionalism; strengthened links with Operations and Networks in the Bank; and established links with professional parliamentarians, NGOs, international parliamentarian networks, and national parliaments and committees. In support of this evidence, it was noted that WBI’s parliamentary program in FY ’98 had been conducted across three divisions (EN, EP, and GF) with a total activity budget of $595,000, of which “other BB” (bank budget) is $170,000 and total staff weeks are estimated at 22. Preliminary work plans for FY ’99 call for an expansion in the program to about $930,000 (of which $326,000 is “other BB”) and a staff allocation of 33 weeks.

While the Parliamentary Group has facilitated exchange of views and lessons learned, considerable synergy has been lost by lack of a WBI-wide strategic approach to parliamentary seminars. In this regard, the group’s work is perceived to have been ineffectual, even though it continually strides to receive greater recognition and support within WBI. The resulting effect is that the group’s position remains in a status quo as an ad hoc group with limited power and assistance, with no formal recognition by the division management team (DMT).

10 Figures are from the “Draft Framework for Programming” office memorandum submitted to Vinod Thomas in April, 1998.
Observations and Evaluation Results of the Laurentian Seminar

WBIGF, along with the Parliamentary Center of Canada, conducted a seminar on "Parliament and Good Governance: The Challenge of Controlling Corruption" in Ontario, Canada in July and August of 1998. This was the second seminar offered since the initial Laurentian Seminar on "Parliament and the Challenges of Good Governance" which took place in Montebello, Canada in July of 1997. The eight-day program, the "flagship" of WBI-CIDA (Canadian International Development Agency) collaboration, was designed to help parliamentarians address critical, contemporary issues within a good governance framework that stresses principles of accountability, participation and openness. The seminar had clearly stated objectives which were outlined in an activity brief and sought to address the issues of corruption and good governance through case studies of successful anti-corruption policies. In all, the seminar brought together 27 parliamentarians from 21 countries (all but 2 parliamentarians were from developing countries) to discuss how they and their parliaments can tackle the problem of corruption. Also in attendance were six observers from international agencies.

The evaluation results from the seminar were generally high. The highest overall mean score attained (4.8/5.0) was for how the seminar raised awareness on the importance of holding the government financially and legally accountable and promoting accountability, openness, and participation for parliamentarians. Similarly, the seminar was highly rated (a mean of 4.5/5.0) for presenting findings of studies on the factors associated with corruption and for strengthening parliamentarians’ understanding of corruption. The respondents’ rating of how much they learned about practical solutions which they had not previously considered had a mean score of 3.7 out of 5.0, the lowest rating of the course performance indicators. This suggested that respondents may need more practical answers to their problems on corruption. It also suggests that there may have been other seminar topics which were not new to them or relevant to their concerns.

Overall, however, respondents in the evaluation rated the seminar highly and thought it was relevant to their needs. The seminar also achieved a better than average rating for 3 out of 4 of its primary objectives:

1. The highest overall mean score attained (4.8/5.0) was for how the seminar raised awareness on the importance of holding the government financially and legally accountable and promoting accountability, openness, and participation for parliamentarians.
2. It was highly rated (4.5/5.0) for presenting findings of studies on the factors associated with corruption and for strengthening parliamentarians’ understanding of corruption.
3. A mean of 4.2/5.0 was given to how the seminar identified concrete and effective means of improving parliamentary performance in controlling corruption.
4. However, the seminar’s objective of discussing case studies of successful anti-corruption policies highlighting the role of parliament in controlling corruption received a mean score of 3.8/5.0, the lowest for any of the four primary objectives.

Overall, however, the seminar was considered by the respondents as successful in creating partnerships with fellow parliamentarians in attendance.

Two aspects of the Laurentian Seminar were particularly appealing and could serve as models for future WBI seminars for parliamentarians. One was the sub-committee hearings in which each member of the seminar was assigned to a smaller group and...
allowed the opportunity to explore and debate a real-life topical issue (such as the causes, best approaches, parliamentary role, and actions to take on the issue of corruption) with fellow MPs. After a consensus was reached on these issues, the sub-committees would then reorganize back into the larger committee (with all participants) to report their conclusions.

Another prominent output of the seminar was the creation of a parliamentary handbook entitled “Controlling Corruption: A Parliamentarians Handbook,” which was recently published and sent to more than thirty parliaments. It is also being used as a principle sourcebook for a series of regional seminars in Africa, South Asia, and Southeast Asia. At the 1998 Laurentian Seminar, the handbook was reviewed by participants with the objective of sharing their evaluations, recommendations and experiences regarding the subject matter of controlling corruption. This handbook should become a useful and valuable reference for those parliamentarians and their colleagues in solving the problematic issues of corruption in their countries.

Feasibility Study

A feasibility study was commissioned in 1997 by WBI to explore whether each division of the Institute was targeting parliamentarians in its work. The study also explored the feasibility of conducting an evaluation of WBI’s past work with MPs, which it emphatically concluded was worthwhile—lending more credence to this study. In its final pages, the study concluded that:

Given the difficulties that task managers expressed concerning evaluation, and potential payoffs for inclusion of parliamentarians in WBI seminars, an in-depth evaluation of the issues is warranted. This observation rests on the following reasons:

1. Parliamentarians are a critical group in countries undergoing market transformations or democratization...their inclusion in programs will increase project ownership and decrease information deficiencies. Their centrality to reforms cannot be dismissed. An in-depth evaluation will explore possibilities for WBI seminars to approach parliamentarian audiences in a systematic fashion.
2. The political changes beginning in Africa, already underway in Latin America, Eastern Europe, and Asia...will be an increasingly important audience for WBI programs. An in-depth evaluation can assess those areas in which current WBI programs have been strong or weak.
3. Practically all the task managers interviewed expressed frustration with the evaluation forms used for parliamentarians. They noted that legislators had quite different agendas from senior policy makers and the seminar often brought out conflicts internal to the given country’s parliament. The reason for an in-depth evaluation is that a method of evaluation may then be analyzed and different approaches tested (p. 15).

Each of these key points needs to be addressed. The inclusion of parliamentarians in WBI’s programs can help information dissemination of the reform process to their constituencies and could also improve their understanding of the World Bank’s role in doing so. Many MPs vote on budgetary allocations which are central to the
Bank's mission as a facilitator for disseminating knowledge and for achieving sustainable developments. In his foreword to WBI's 1996 annual report, World Bank President James Wolfensohn alluded to the importance of WBI's work with officials by declaring that:

In a global economy that increasingly relies on knowledge and information the ability of nations and people to learn, to adapt the lessons to their own context quickly, and to translate learning into action are critical components of success. WBI plays a central role in achieving these goals. It has promoted development by sharing the World Bank's expertise on key development issues with over 40,000 officials—officials well-placed to reiterate what they have learned within their own countries, creating a multiplier effect (p.5).

As the democratization of Africa, Eastern Europe, Latin America, Central America and Asia continues, WBI can play a vital role in assisting these regions with sustainable government reforms. One way of doing so would be by engaging parliamentarians and training them in the fundamentals of good governance and democracy (much of which has been performed solely by WBIGF). WBI's number of programs in these regions has increased over the years, but many still do not include MPs in their target audiences.

The Evaluation Unit of WBI has now begun to work more closely with task managers in designing evaluations which meet the needs of MPs and which can more effectively assess the strengths and weaknesses of each program. For instance, the author has worked extensively with WBIGF task managers to develop effective evaluations for their parliamentary programs. One such program was the 1998 Laurentian Seminar in Canada which was attended by twenty-seven MPs and organized in collaboration with the Parliamentary Centre of Ottawa. A customized evaluation questionnaire was created for the seminar by the Evaluation Unit (the results of which are included in this report) and was an effective instrument in gauging the participants' views of the course.

Anti-Corruption Report

In 1998, the Evaluation Unit of WBI commissioned a review of WBI's anti-corruption initiatives in Uganda and Tanzania. Many of these programs included parliamentarians and therefore are important to address in this report. The study had the following major findings:

1. The issue of causal linkages (that increased knowledge motivates action) is at the core of this program. However, there is not enough evidence to discern if that is really happening. WBI still needs to know how best to translate knowledge into action.
2. At the sub-national level there is evidence of increased awareness in media and other sources, but the issue of how this trickles-down to country members is key due to the limited communication infrastructure. The next step would be to take the program to the regional and local levels.
3. Sustainability is another key issues. There is no real exit strategy at this stage. A dilemma exists in how WBI can continue to go back to assess whether sustainability has been achieved, but it must be determined how and when to do so.
4. The money and time that has been spent on Service Delivery Surveys (SDS) is arbitrary. The evidence is not clear on what the SDSs have actually
accomplished given the time and money spent on them. The evaluation team found that the SDS was the most problematic tool in the toolkit as questions of thoroughness and accuracy of the data were evident.

There were also several important lesson learned through both the anti-corruption programs and the anti-corruption report. When WBI began the program in 1994, corruption was not an issue, as it was deemed to be too political by the Bank. Additionally, there were several stakeholder groups that were often pulled in opposite directions. The programs focused on Uganda and Tanzania because their governments expressed an interest in having them. Changes were slow at first in Uganda, but now there is government support to move to the district level. This focus on the local level should be on building capacity, which will ultimately have an impact on sustainability and on the exit strategy. Inherent in this strategy is the empowerment of media and the NGOs to play a watchdog role on corruption within these countries.

Corruption and politics are closely entwined. The experiences from WBI's initiatives in Tanzania and Uganda should be communicated and shared with other countries. One solution that these programs elicited is that a manageable way to control corruption is to make it an election issue. WBI can play a role in this by coming in at the time of an election when there will be a change of government. At a recent ex-post review meeting on this program, it was suggested that this would be a perfect opportunity for an WBI-wide approach. The issue of corruption requires a broader strategy across WBI, as anti-corruption issues should be integrated into all programs. This will hold especially true in those programs for parliamentarians. It was also suggested at this review meeting that an inter-divisional anti-corruption team be created. Perhaps, then, the Parliamentary Group of WBI can be of assistance in this effort. This would be one viable way of utilizing this group's experience and knowledge on the issues of corruption, good governance, civil society, and participatory efforts and how they can affect changes in governments. The usefulness of this collaboratory approach between the Parliamentary Group and the rest of WBI could be applied to many WBI programs.

The report again stressed the need for several topics of importance which were mentioned by the MPs in this study: more programs at the regional and local levels, more seminars focused on the issues of corruption and transparency, and the continued sustainability of the programs (follow-ups). Clearly, this report heightens the awareness of the importance of these issues to MPs.

A Review of WBI Divisional Reports: Current Directions

As mentioned previously, attempts were made by the Evaluation Unit to obtain as many reports and briefs from each division as possible in which parliamentarians were included. Since many documents were not found (those found contained a paucity of valuable information), an analysis of only several are made in this report; therefore an assessment of the written work which was documented for WBI's work which included parliamentarians is the preferred approach used here.

For the current fiscal year (FY '99), an analysis of WBI's program reports from the database shows that only about forty activities have already invited or plan to invite MPs. Only eight programs (20%) were mainly intended for MPs, while the remaining thirty-two (80%) had invited a few MPs and additional participants. In percentage terms, these forty programs represent only ten percent of the 400 or more activities which WBI delivers annually—clearly not a representative number for parliamentarians.
Of the forty activities which included MPs, thirty-seven (92%) were seminars, while two (5%) were conferences and one (3%) was a study tour. In this regard, WBI appears to be adhering to the recommendations from TMs, MP, and resource persons in this study who suggested that seminars work best for parliamentarians. However, the few reports which were found were non-specific about the activities included—so it is impossible to determine whether or not all of the thirty-six seminars included small working groups and opportunities for discussions as these three groups had recommended.

An examination of the FY '99 programs revealed that there is an inequitable distribution of planned programs for parliamentarians among each of WBI's divisions. With a total of twenty activities planned or completed for MPs during FY '99, WBIGF by far delivers more activities for MPs than any other division. It also has eight activities specifically for MPs alone. WBIEP has ten programs already completed or planned for FY '99, while WBIEN has five, WBIHD has four, and WBIKP has one. A more equitable distribution of activities for MPs among WBI divisions seems warranted and could produce a sharing of best practice strategies and a synergy which might make WBI's programs stronger.

WBI faces a set of issues if it is to move forward in its work with parliamentarians. From the suggestions made by the MPs, TMs, and resource persons in this study, it is clear that MPs are happy with WBI's work and would like to attend more training courses. An analysis of WBI activities, however, shows that MPs are not a primary target in WBI's work. This implies that WBI should re-examine its primary goals to determine whether its work will focus more on MPs, or whether it is content with the number of activities currently given for MPs. The suggestions of the MPs, TMs, and resource persons, as well as the data analyzed for this report, offer strong evidence that MPs are a worthwhile audience to acquire learning and that parliamentarians and their countries could benefit from additional WBI training.

**Future Directions**

Which direction WBI will now take in its work with MPs still remains unclear. It appears from the current FY '99 data that WBI still does not have a representative number of programs and activities for MPs. This indicates a less important commitment to this type of work.

There is no measurable or prima facie evidence to explain why WBI has let its work with MPs slip. If for any reason, it appears that WBI has overlooked parliamentarians in its activities for policy-makers, even though this might be a logical group in which to place them. So even though WBI continues to explore the importance of programs for policy-makers, it still tends to overlook MPs in this role.

The benefits of partnerships with other institutions such as the Parliamentary Centre of Canada, appear to far outweigh their costs. For example, the Laurentian Seminar is a joint program between WBI and the Parliamentary Centre, yet the seminar received funding support through the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) and other organizations in Africa and the Netherlands. WBI will likely strengthen its programs for MPs through additional partnerships with this and other international organizations which also have similar interests and experience in working with MPs. In addition, WBI may be able to further curtail costs by wholesaling its programs for MPs. A 1998 WBI report by Azumi, Baker, and Russell has already brought to light how WBI can recover many of its costs through fee-based services and by wholesaling its programs. It must be recognized,
however, that the operating budgets of many parliaments limit their abilities to directly pay for training courses.

WBI may need to examine which approach might work best for MPs: regional activities or country activities. It appears that WBIGF is the one division of WBI which focuses on delivering its courses to particular countries (e.g., Ghana, Uganda, Tanzania, Mauritius) as well as to other regions. It was suggested by the MPs in this study, however, that more regional programs are needed since these programs allow MPs to interact with colleagues in different countries. To date, there is no evidence to support whether a regional or country-specific activity works better than the other. But if parliamentarians seem to prefer more regional programs, this might be one direction for WBI to consider.

Now that the Distance Learning Unit of WBI is established, more courses for MPs may be delivered via new technologies. WBI is now able to reach a larger number of its participants simultaneously. This implies that MPs in the regions where WBI has focused its work (Africa, Latin America, and the Former Soviet Union) may be linked and, therefore, may be able to establish new partnerships and networks with other MPs in different countries. One example of this is the potential support for the Network of “African Parliamentarians Against Corruption,” which is itself an outcome of one of WBIGF’s regional seminars; here the Parliamentary Centre is acting as the Network’s secretariat and a series of quarterly video conferences are planned to enhance the role of the network.

Lastly, women parliamentarians are often a minority in many male-dominated parliaments throughout the world. At the 1998 Laurentian Seminar, only one woman MP attended. At one point in the seminar she expressly mentioned that women MPs are underrepresented in many countries, including her own (Palestine). She also stated that she was acutely aware of being the only woman MP present and therefore a minority. African countries such as Uganda have made progress in electing more women to parliament, but other African countries are still far behind. Many Asian countries also appear to be progressing in this area as well. The challenge for WBI, then, is how to better represent more women MPs in its activities. It is evident that women MPs are a minority in many parliaments, and therefore may have very different needs than their male counterparts.

The next section of this report will summarize the findings which emerged in this report and make some final recommendations for future work with parliamentarians.
PART SIX
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The goal of this report is to evaluate WBI’s work with parliamentarians strategically, through both an assessment of WBI’s work with MPs and various background information relevant to this subject.

An analysis of the data presented in this study leads to some important conclusions and recommendations. Many of these recommendations are shared by task managers, parliamentarians, and resource persons alike. Other recommendations and conclusions have been gleaned from the data which were analyzed for this report. These findings can be grouped into the central issues which surround programs for parliamentarians, which include: key strategies/best practices and pedagogy; logic and strategic importance of the programs; and utilization and impacts.

Key Strategies/Best Practices and Pedagogy

Key planning strategies are perhaps the most vital stage for improving programs and activities for parliamentarians. A poorly planned activity can quickly go awry, while a well-planned one is usually successful and can have long-term sustainability.

The MPs, TMs, and resource persons interviewed mentioned several strategic features of planning which worked best for them: small seminars work better than conferences; getting MPs away from their work environment; choosing the appropriate participants; having specific topics of interest for the course; a strong sense of strategic thinking and planning; and working with other partners and institutions in planning a course.

The response most often mentioned by all three groups of interviewees (MPs, TMs, and resource persons) was that small seminars which invite parliamentarians from different countries often work best. This is because parliamentarians learn best through debates, discussions, and interactions with fellow MPs—especially those from other countries—with whom they can exchange ideas. Moreover, MPs do not like to be placed in an activity where they have to interact with senior officials or others officials with whom they believe they have very little in common.

Parliamentarians do not like to be lectured to. They prefer an activity where they can role play on key topics of importance to them. This puts them in a similar environment to their work in the parliament and gives them the opportunity to debate key issues. Since they do not enjoy lectures, the most common activity arrangement which they preferred was one which worked well with TMs and the resource persons. Simply put, this is: have a plenary session with speakers and discussions, then break into smaller group discussions, and finally report back to the larger group with plenary.

Distractions and time constraints are a frequent concern for MPs as well as for TMs and the resource persons. Getting MPs away from their work environment (their country’s parliament), therefore, is a sound idea. Too often, MPs are distracted by important events which are taking place in their countries. If an activity is held in their
homeland, they often get distracted by these events and therefore cannot fully focus on the activity. It was suggested by the three groups that an activity should be held in a country other than the parliamentarian’s home or offered during a period of parliamentary recess.

Choosing the appropriate participants is another important planning and key strategic feature. It is also a vital feature of a sound needs assessment. Parliamentarians expressed their interest to interact with other MPs. Placing invitees other than MPs in activities is often viewed with skepticism by most MPs.

Logic and Strategic Importance of the Programs

The selection of specific topics of interest to MPs were also recommended as vital contributions to a successful activity. Specifically, the topics of corruption, transparency, and good governance have notably been of high interest for MPs. Moreover, the MPs perceived these three topics as ones which they believed WBI wanted them to learn more about by attending the activity.

MPs have consistently expressed their dissatisfaction with listening to lectures during an activity, yet many WBI activities attended by the interviewed MPs were organized around lectures without opportunities for questions and interactions. The resource persons, as do the TMAs and MPs themselves, agree that lectures do not work unless there are opportunities for questions and debates.

Planning for activities with MPs should include a clear understanding of the issues they face.

Utilization and Impacts

WBI and the Bank have sought the assistance of worldwide partners in planning and delivering their activities. The TMAs and resource persons advocated the idea that WBI should continue to work with partners such as the Parliamentary Centre in Canada, as well as journalists, institutes, and trainers to improve its programs for MPs. The shared experiences among these partners for planning effective courses would be incomparable.

More regional and national (local) follow-up activities were requested by many of the MPs in this study. They were also mentioned by the TMAs and resource persons. These activities are vital because many MPs may end up as future ministers and therefore become more significantly influential in creating positive changes in their governments. Additionally, these activities are important to maintain the efforts and changes which were set forth in the previous activities. A country undergoing democratic reforms, for instance, would want to ensure that what they learned in a previous WBI seminar would still be useful for them. It is vital for MPs to keep abreast of the most recent information and political changes which affect their work. Continually working with the host country where the activity is held as well as with international partners was one suggestion made by TMAs, MPs, and the resource persons to improve WBI’s programs for MPs.

All three groups in this study recommended that literature such as handbooks, papers, and articles, will be a good source of reference and follow-up for parliamentarians. In this regard, they can refer to these materials whenever needed and share them with their country members. WBI, then, should continue to develop and disseminate these valuable sources of information for MPs.
A few resource persons suggested several ways to follow-up and maintain communications with MPs. TMs could broaden their focus and invite more MPs to their activities, especially when MPs can benefit from them (particularly in the areas of political and economic reform). Additionally, it was suggested by the resource persons that MPs could work with the alumni of WBI’s programs and seek their guidance for future activities. A quarterly newsletter for MPs who have attended WBI’s programs is a practical idea because it can keep them updated on new findings and allow them to know what other participants in the program have accomplished since the activity ended. This would also serve as a valuable networking tool for the participants which may lead to more sustainable impacts and increased utilization.

Additional Recommendations

There are mixed views of WBI’s work with parliamentarians, as evidenced by the responses of the MPs, TMs, and resource persons in this report.

On the negative side, many of the quotes from TMs in this report attest that WBI lacks a clear strategy for MPs and for sharing “best practices.” WBI could encourage efforts to develop a clear and legitimate strategy for engaging MPs in its work. Moreover, this may be a cross cutting, synergistic approach—it needs to be adopted by all divisions within WBI to be successful. One practical effort made at approaching this ideal is the creation of WBI’s Parliamentary Group. This Group can offer methods and strategic directions for working with MPs. It can also continue to develop synergies among different task managers across all divisions of WBI.

At a recent meeting of the Parliamentary Group, discussions focused on how it could become a more effective, cross-cutting task force. Of concern, however, is that new managers may not be aware of cross-cutting activities within WBI and that the Group may not be aware of new task managers working with parliamentarians. It was suggested at this meeting that the DMT be apprised of the Group’s activities, seek to update its membership, and look for guidance from the DMT regarding how to develop a more cohesive, cross divisional approach to parliamentary seminars. In particular, it was thought the program summary and recommendations, which were sent to and reviewed by Vinod Thomas, should be circulated to the DMT. Further, it was suggested that the Group develop a “Parliamentary module” for inclusion in the Development Course that is currently being developed by WBI.

Many MPs view WBI activities as opportunities for them to learn. They can do so by exchanging ideas with MPs in other countries. When asked what they thought WBI wanted them to gain from the activity they primarily believed that the main goals were learning and awareness-raising—in particular, making them more aware of the important issues of transparency, good governance, accountability, and corruption.

There were also positive responses for WBI’s work with MPs. The MPs did believe that many of the WBI activities which they attended were relevant to their country’s needs as well as to their own. They also offered some responses which suggested that the activities had had some measurable outcomes in their countries, but many also believed it was too soon to discern any impacts from the activities.

MPs also clearly stated that they would like WBI to continue to work with them, suggesting that the WBI’s role in parliamentarian affairs is still needed. This is relevant evidence that WBI’s work is valued and desired by MPs. It also implies that WBI should continue to expand its work with parliamentarians, as it can make a difference by implementing positive and sustainable changes in MP member countries.
The demand for WBI’s parliamentary programs is evident. WBI now has an opportunity to rededicate its work with parliamentarians and deliver programs which can be of particular help to those countries undergoing profound political and economic changes.
APPENDIX A

KEY RESEARCH THEMES FORMULATED INTO INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR PARLIAMENTARIANS AND TASK MANAGERS

For parliamentarians:

1. Key Strategies/Best Practices and Pedagogy
   a) Was the method of delivery effective for the course(s) which you attended in your opinion?
   b) In recalling the WBI course(s) on parliamentarians which you attended, what do you remember most positively? What do you remember most negatively?
   c) Was the course timely for you?
   d) What prompted you to attend the course: direct invitation, your own decision, other?
   e) Looking back again on the course you attended, do you have a better appreciation of it now? Why or why not?

2. Logic of Programs
   a) What was your perception of the intent of the course (its objectives)?
   b) What do you think that WBI wanted you to get out of this course?

3. Strategic Importance
   a) Do you think that WBI has appropriately communicated the importance of working with parliamentarians in its courses?

4. Utilization and Impacts
   a) Have you used any methods or strategies which you learned at this course in your own country? (evidence of impacts and learning).
   b) How do you think that WBI can improve its training courses for Parliamentarians? (recommendations).

For task managers:

1. Key Strategies/Best Practices and Pedagogy
   a) Do you think that WBI has an overall strategy for parliamentarians?
   b) Has one method of delivering these courses (study tours, seminars, workshops, etc.) to parliamentarians worked better than others from what you have seen in your programs? What evidence do you have to support that this (these) strategy(ies) work(s) better than others?
   c) Was a needs assessment performed prior to the program?
2. Logic of Programs
   a) What was the program logic? (Why did you hold the program at the time you did? Why did you invite the participants that you did?).
   b) Do you feel that the intended course objectives were met?
   c) What were some of the lessons you learned in delivering these courses? Were there any pitfalls?
   d) Have there been any follow-ups to these courses?

3. Strategic Importance
   a) Are parliamentarians a difficult group to reach?
   b) Why are parliamentarian programs becoming more important in WBI and worldwide?

4. Utilization and Impacts
   a) Do you feel that your parliamentarian audience appreciated the programs you implemented? Why/Why not, do you think?
   b) Do you believe that there has been evidence of impacts and learning as a result of your parliamentarian courses?
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PARLIAMENTARIANS INTERVIEWED/CONSULTED AND THEIR COUNTRIES

Bangladesh
S.M. Akram

Canada
John Williams
Steve Langdon (former MP; Senior Associate, Parliamentary Centre of Canada)
John Bosley (former MP; Associate, Parliamentary Centre of Canada)

Chile
Ignacio Walker

El Salvador
Jose Rafael Machuca
Norman Noel Quijano Gonzalez

Ethiopia
Pedros Olango, Deputy Speaker
Dawit Yohannes, Speaker
Kiffe Wodajo

Ghana
Richard Anane

Guatemala
Jorge Mendez Herbruger
Victor Manuel Ruano

Indonesia
Eki Syachruddin

Kazakhstan
4 parliamentarians who requested anonymity

Mauritius
Yesdev S. Jeelal

Mexico
Jorge Lopez Vergara

Pakistan
M. Hamza

Uganda
Augustine Ruzindana, Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee
Steven Barnwanga
Waswa Lule
James Mwandha
Margaret Zziwa
Betty Okir, Deputy Speaker
James Wapakhabulo, Speaker

Ukraine
Serhiy Holovaty

United Kingdom
Jim Lester

Viet Nam
Nguyen Ngoc Hien
WBI's Work With Parliamentarians
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WBI TASK MANAGERS AND RESOURCE PERSONS INTERVIEWED/CONSULTED

WBI Persons Interviewed

WBIKP
Tim Carrington

WBIEN
Veit Burger
Adriana Bianchi
Patrice Harou
Jose Furtado

WBIEP
Marianna Todorova

WBIGF
Rick Stapenhurst
Petter Langseth

WBIHD
Stephanie Litvak
Elca Rosenberg
Tatyana Bogomolova

Resource Persons Interviewed

Bob Miller, Director of the Parliamentary Centre of Canada (Ottawa, Canada)
Steve Langdon (former MP; Senior Associate, Parliamentary Centre of Canada)
John Bosley (former MP; Senior Associate, Parliamentary Centre of Canada)
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