



Analytical Study of Parliamentary Mechanisms for MDGs

A report of the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) in collaboration with the UN Millennium Campaign
Draft Version, September 2010

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
Methodology and Operationalisation of the Study.....	4
Parliamentary mechanisms – rules do matter.....	4
THE ITALIAN PARLIAMENT - Sailing into a Head Wind.....	9
The Subcommittee for MDGs, and its relationship with the executive	
Keeping development aid in the public eye – a parliamentary duty	
Parliamentary dialogue with civil society	
Work still to be done	
THE PARLIAMENT OF SOUTH AFRICA - Modest involvement.....	13
Parliamentary engagement with the MDGs	
The fourth South African Parliament’s commitment to the MDG	
THE PARLIAMENT OF MOZAMBIQUE - A Long Road to Travel.....	15
Policy process	
Still a long way to go	
A ‘new house’ – an opportunity	
Executive organisation to support the MDGs	
Challenges ahead	
THE NIGERIAN NATIONAL ASSEMBLY - A model to consider for debt relief.....	23
Nigeria’s development status	
The MDGs in the state structure	
Parliament’s involvement with the MDGs	
INDONESIA	
Building Democracy, Peace and Development.....	26
Parliament’s engagement with the MDGs	
Challenges and the way forward	
INDIA	
From Human Rights to Legal Rights.....	28
From human rights to legal rights – the most important role of Parliament on the MDGs	
Executive-legislative relations and the MDGs	
Parliament and the MDGs	
The challenges ahead	
Conclusion and Recommendations.....	32

Introduction

This report seeks to examine the internal mechanisms of parliaments related to work on the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Based on investigations in the seven countries (Italy, India, Indonesia, South Africa, Mozambique, Kenya and Nigeria), this study concludes that the establishment and effectiveness of these mechanisms depends on several factors, including parliamentary committee systems and political contexts.

The seven countries studied have different practices in this regard: in some countries, parliament has established a working group that is not a standing committee but that has as its main aim enhancing awareness of the MDGs among parliamentarians, and promoting discussions on and acting as a focal point for work on the MDGs. An example is the parliamentary caucus in the Kenyan parliament – an informal group that brings together MPs from other standing committees related to work on the MDGs. The Kenyan caucus is also a platform for engaging civil society on issues around development and the MDGs.

A similar group is the task force within the international relations committee established in the Indonesian parliament. This task force aims to promote debate around the MDGs and to engage the executive with regard to its accountability to parliament on the MDGs. Simultaneously, the task force intends to increase awareness among MPs on MDG issues. The Indonesian task force is also working to bring its parliament into the international arena, where MDGs are often discussed without input from parliaments.

These parliamentary mechanisms in Indonesia and Kenya have been recently constituted and face the challenge of advancing MDG knowledge among MPs liaising with standing committees on activities that support the MDGs.

The Indian parliament has a similar structure, with an informal group of MPs who liaise with civil society organisations on work concerning the MDGs. However, in India, the committee system is well institutionalised and development

issues are covered by joint committees from both houses. A development agenda has been a national priority for some time, and there is therefore a well-established interaction between the executive and parliamentary committees on development issues.

Two of the countries in the study have created MDG committees – Italy and Nigeria. Italy is a donor country, and it is interesting that the Subcommittee on MDGs has been created within the Foreign Affairs Committee. This Committee was created with a specific fact-finding mission. The emphasis on this role confirms the Italian parliament's desire to investigate how the country is doing with regard to its commitment to the MDGs. It is known that the country is far from fulfilling its financial promises. The Subcommittee has put pressure on the Italian government to fulfill these commitments. It brings together MPs from all political parties and has ended up being a platform to assess international cooperation with regard to the MDGs. The subcommittee's decisions need to be taken to the plenary of the Foreign Affairs Committee, which enhances the prestige of the Subcommittee within Parliament.

The Nigerian Assembly is the only one in the study that has created a standing committee on MDGs. The decision was taken to establish this committee to oversee the executive's work on the MDGs and allocations from the special fund dedicated to MDG work. This fund was created by international agreement concerning the debt cancellation of the country in 2005. Nigeria negotiated the debt cancellation, and as part of the negotiation, promised to create a fund for the MDGs to the value of the debt. The Nigerian parliament responded by setting up a standing committee on MDGs. This committee has the same powers as any other standing committee.

Two countries do not have particular parliamentary mechanisms on the MDGs: Mozambique and South Africa. However, the national and parliamentary contexts of the two countries are significantly different. Most of the South African MDG targets have been achieved. For further development work, the South African parliament has a committee system that mirrors the executive government which has adapted during each electoral mandate, and

development issues are allocated to the standing committees; therefore, an informal structure focusing on MDGs was not seen as necessary.

In the case of Mozambique, parliamentary committees are responsible for the oversight of several ministries, and not all MPs are members of standing committees. The country is one of the poorest in the region, although it has shown consistent economic growth in the last few years. The country endured a long civil war prior to the introduction of a multiparty regime, and Parliament's objective in the first mandates has been to consolidate the political process and ensure peace. The development agenda has been secondary with regard to parliamentary goals. The executive has given priority to dialogue with civil society and donors, to the detriment of strengthening parliament. Now, after three mandates and with a new leadership in the house and in several committees, it seems that Parliament can move on to proactive engagement with development issues and with the MDGs in particular. There is at least the will to do so among Mozambican parliamentarians, and this is halfway to achieving the active participation of parliament in supporting the Development Goals.

Methodology and Operationalisation of the Study

This report results from working visits to seven parliaments: four in Africa – South Africa, Nigeria, Mozambique and Kenya; two in Asia – India and Indonesia; and one in Europe, in Italy.

The choice of countries was based on three criteria: the existence of a multiparty parliament, the need to include countries with different levels of income (the sample includes countries ranked high, medium and low in terms of human development), and the need to include both parliaments that have established a parliamentary mechanism devoted to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and those that have not established such mechanisms.

The study was coordinated by the IPU development officer, and in each country, national consultants were hired. The IPU development officer participated in the fieldwork in each country, alongside the national consultant in the interviews with MPs, parliamentary staff and representatives of civil society. This approach established a common link between the seven countries.

The visits were undertaken with the cooperation of the parliaments, which accepted being part of the study. This was crucial for the execution of the study. The assessments were carried out between May and August of 2010. The country studies included analyses of documentation, media reports and legislation. In each country, several interviews were conducted with members of parliament, parliamentary staff and members of civil society organisations. The choice of national consultants over international consultants was the result of these human resources being locally available. This helped to strengthen the knowledge of and research on the parliaments. It made sense to us that a study on MDGs should use locally available resources and not import these skills.

Parliamentary mechanisms – rules do matter

A parliamentary mechanism is understood as any form of parliamentary body. This can take the form of a parliamentary committee, a task force or a working group.

Parliaments organise themselves in different ways. It is common for parliaments to have portfolio committees – such as a budget committee or an education committee. These will be defined in the standing orders of each parliament. The same rules will also define the other types of mechanism allowed. In some parliaments, the portfolio committees can create subcommittees, and some parliaments permit the creation of working groups. Parliamentary committees have extensive powers, explicitly granted to them in the legislature's standing orders, and often also in

the constitution. Normally, a committee's powers include the power to summon any person to appear before it to give evidence under oath or to produce documents. Parliamentary committees are also empowered to require an institution or person to report to it, to compel any person or institution to comply with a summons or requirement, as well as to receive petitions, representations or submissions from any interested persons or institutions.

There are also a variety of parliamentary mechanisms established by specific procedures. In Italy, the Chamber of Deputies constitutes a subcommittee on the MDGs within the Committee on Foreign affairs. In Kenya, a parliamentary working group on MDGs has been formed. In Nigeria, a standing committee fully dedicated to MDG issues was created. The Indian parliament has an informal group on MDGs, and in Indonesia, a parliamentary task force on MDGs has been established. South Africa and Mozambique have not established any particular parliamentary mechanisms to deal with MDG work. Before embarking on a discussion on these particular mechanisms and on parliamentary work on the MDGs, it is important to clarify the rules of each country

that regulate the institutionalisation of committees or any other parliamentary structure.

It is therefore important that an analysis of parliamentary mechanisms relating to MDGs should include an appraisal of the parliamentary characteristics of the countries selected. An analysis of how parliaments structure their approaches to MDGs should be read in relation to the institutional differences that exist among the parliaments analysed.

As shown in the description below, there are significant differences among parliamentary rules, and as this report makes clear, rules do matter.

We suggest that to facilitate an understanding of the differences among parliaments with respect to what the procedures and the dynamics are that MPs go through regarding their participation on the committees, let us imagine that the reader is an elected MP in one of these countries, and that he or she will be guided by the tables below concerning the different institutional arrangements for operating in these parliaments.

Table 1 - Comparison of parliamentary procedures

IF I am an MP from ...	Indonesia	India	Nigeria	Italy	South Africa	Mozambique	Kenya
How will I be allocated to a committee¹?	My allocation will be made by the leadership of my faction ^[1] .	Since my committee will comprise members from both houses (Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha), I will be appointed by the respective speaker, following the suggestion of my political leadership ^[2] .	I will be appointed following the recommendation of my political party. However, the political decision will actually be taken by the presiding officers.	I will be nominated by my parliamentary group.	I will be appointed by my political party.	I will be appointed by my political party.	I will be appointed by my political party.
What is the period of my mandate?	My mandate will last as long as my tenure. ^[3] .	Committees are changed every year, but members can be substituted.	Membership of the committees is usually for the duration of the legislative session.	Committees are changed every two years, but members can be substituted.	MPs are appointed to committees for the duration of the parliamentary session (five years), but changes in between do happen		Committees are changed every two years, but members can be substituted.
Can I belong to more than one committee?	I cannot belong to more than one standing committee.	I can be a member of two committees and a member of one departmentally related standing committee.	In the House of Representatives, members belong to an average of four committees, while in the Senate they belong to an average of five committees.	I cannot belong to more than one standing committee.	I can be a member of more than one committee	I cannot belong to more than one standing committee. But I can also be a member of an ad-hoc committee ² .	I can be a member of more than one committee.

¹ All the appointments in the seven countries will be formally made by the speakers.

^[1] An expression used for political parties or coalitions.

^[2] For example, the Committee on the Welfare of Scheduled Castes and Tribes: 20 members elected from Lok Sabha and 10 members elected from Rajya Sabha.

^[3] However, my party could withdraw my mandate in the middle of my tenure. The faction as a party instrument in parliament could hold an annual evaluation of their members in committees, and have the authority to assign me to another committee.

² In the Mozambican parliament, almost half of the MPs are not allocated to any committee.

Starting with the first question ‘How I will be allocated to a committee?’, it is evident that in all seven countries my allocation will depend mainly on the will of the party leadership, with a degree of difference existing in Nigeria, where due to the party system, other factors are predominant. In all seven countries, it will be the speaker who will formally appoint me. In all countries, the committee seats are divided according to the strength of the political parties.

Regarding the second question ‘What is the period of my mandate?’, more substantial differences exist. In some parliaments, the MP stays in the committee for the duration of the

four or five years of the electoral mandate; in others, the committee's mandate will be one year, as in India. The mandate period is obviously an important determinant of how MPs conduct their work in the committees.

The third question helps us to understand another important difference – in some parliaments, the MP will be devoted to one committee, while in others, the MP will need to belong to several committees.

Continuing this exercise, the table below shows whether it is possible to create a new committee and how this is done.

Table 2 - Is it possible to create a committee?

Indonesia	India	Nigeria	Italy	South Africa	Mozambique	Kenya
The proposal to form a committee, other than an existing standing committee, such as a special committee or a specific team, must get approval from the plenary or be based on a decision of the Speaker and the leadership of the House ³ .	It is possible to create a committee. For this, the Rules Committees of the two Houses of Parliament would first consider the proposal, and may make recommendations for its constitution. The constitution of a new committee would entail an amendment to the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the two Houses of Parliament.	Little opportunity is given for the creation of a committee. The majority of the committees are already in place at the beginning of a new session, and as such, few additions (not reductions) are made from time to time – this applies to both ad-hoc and standing committees. (Most ad-hoc committees struggle to 'metamorphose' into standing committees.)	Not for permanent committees	To set up a new portfolio committee (of the National Assembly) or a new joint committee would require a decision by the Rules Committee (probably preceded by an agreement between the chief whips of the main parties) and confirmation by the House (or both houses if it is a joint committee).	If you are an MP, your proposal has to become a legislative proposal, and you need to have the support of your bench or a group of MPs to have the right to propose new legislation. The proposal has to be approved by the plenary. In sum, you need a coalition.	It is possible to create a committee.

³ Special committees are usually established because of certain necessary conditions, such as to consider a bill, or for a fact-finding investigation.

Regarding the creation of a standing committee, the process in the countries concerned is not so easy. In all countries, a new committee needs to have the approval of the majority (which in some countries is not an easy achievement). Still, it is important to compare the number of committees with the size of the parliament, as in some ways, it is easier to create a committee

in a parliament like Nigeria, which has 85 committees, than in Mozambique, which has no more than 10 committees.

The next question looks to understand how difficult it is to change the rules that restrict the creation of a committee.

Table 3 - Is it easy to change the rules to allow for changes in committees?

Indonesia	India	Nigeria	Italy	South Africa	Mozambique	Kenya
Although it is not easy to change the rules to accommodate committee changes, it is possible to do so.	It is not easy to change the rules to accommodate committee changes. The last committee that was constituted in Parliament was the Committee on Empowerment of Women, in April 1997. Efforts towards instituting this committee started in March 1996, with the two Houses of Parliament passing two identical resolutions to constitute a Standing Committee of both the Houses, This was taken up for consideration by the Rules Committee of the Lok Sabha, which presented a report in Parliament in March 1997, recommending the constitution of the Committee on Empowerment of Women.	It is fairly easy to make these changes.	Although it is not easy to change the rules to accommodate committee changes, it is possible to do so.	This depends on the party majority: even where the rules require decisions by the Rules Committee or the House, as long as one party has majority rule, changes can be easily accommodated.	Although it is not easy to change the rules to accommodate committee changes, it is possible to do so. You need at least a majority of the minimum quorum (50%+ 1 MP) to make these changes.	It is fairly easy to make these changes.

Table 4 - After elections, does parliament change the existing committees?

Indonesia	India	Nigeria	Italy	South Africa	Mozambique	Kenya
It depends on political decisions among members. Members might want to change the rule for a procedure that could have an impact on the committee's constitution.	Since committees' functioning is governed by the Rules of Procedure, even after elections the procedures for the constitution and functioning of committees remain unchanged. After elections, new members are nominated/elected to these committees.	Committees do not really change (in structure and number) with every new electoral mandate, because the majority of committees are already in place. Only the membership and leadership of the committees may change.	Permanent committees cannot be changed with different mandates.	New committees can be constituted to mirror the new ministerial departments. ⁴	Yes, these can be changed, but to do so, it is necessary to change the standing orders.	New committees can be constituted to mirror the new ministerial departments. ⁵

⁴ After the 2009 elections, the names of various committees changed, and new committees were created to make sure the portfolio committees in the National Assembly would still mirror the new ministerial departments that the new administration created.

⁵ After the 2009 elections, the names of various committees changed, and new committees were created to make sure the portfolio committees in the National Assembly would still mirror the new ministerial departments that the new administration created.

The table above shows what happens to the committee structure after elections. Like the comparison of changes to the committee rules, in some parliaments, changes occur seldom, while in others, in spite of the large majority of committees' continuation, there is room for some new committees.

The tables above attempted to give an outline of how the membership of a committee works, and to compare the duration of mandates. The reader will need to consult the standing orders of the parliament and the constitution to have a more complete picture of how the parliamentary committee system operates. The seven countries included in this study have adopted different mechanisms on how to work relating to the MDGs. As shown in the following pages, the differences result from various factors, such as the level of development of the country, party dynamics, and the country's history with regard to development issues.

These characteristics influence parliaments' options. However, parliamentary rules pertaining to committees determine to a large extent the way parliaments work and what options exist for their work in the future.

THE ITALIAN PARLIAMENT

Sailing into a Head Wind

Achievement of the Millennium Development Goals will depend on the resources allocated to this task. Italy is one of the donor countries that has contributed less than promised. Italy's parliament has been united in a political effort to demand that its government respects the country's financial commitment to the MDGs. This is an example of how parliament can be a forum that sails into a head wind when necessary.

Italian funds for cooperation have been cut in the previous years' financial plans. According to the OECD⁶ report for 2009, Italy's net official

development assistance (ODA) was USD 4.85 billion in 2008, equivalent to an ODA/GNI ratio 0.19 to 0.22. Italy's past ODA performance – and aid cuts planned for 2009, 2010 and 2011 – mean that it will not meet its current ODA projection, suggesting that the country's aid amount will be USD 4.03 billion in 2010 (0.19% GNI). To meet the 2010 target, Italy would have to increase its aid by USD 6 billion (or 124% of the 2008 aid amount).

Italy's parliament has been trying to pressurise the executive to fulfill the country's MDG commitments. This effort has united parliamentarians from the various political parties. Parliament has been promoting various actions such as the constitution of a subcommittee on MDGs and the creation, within the Defence Standing Committee – on the initiative of the Hon. Federica Mogherini Rabesani (PD), of an inter-parliamentary group on development cooperation. These represent institutionalised attempts to pressurise the executive on development matters.

According to the Hon. Fabio Evangelisti (IDV), member of the Subcommittee on MDGs, MDGs are not among the government's priorities, especially in this time of international financial crisis. Most MPs agree with Evangelisti that there is a discrepancy between party commitment to achieving the MDGs and the effective response from the executive. Significant cuts in the aid budget will make it very difficult to reach the 0.7% GDP quota by 2015.

It was in this context that on July 2nd 2008, through unanimous consensus within the Standing Committee for Foreign Affairs of the Chamber of Deputies, a Subcommittee on Millennium Development Goals was created. This concern for the MDGs is highly unusual for donor countries, and can be attributed to the decision of the Standing Committee to set up an ad hoc subcommittee and to carry out a fact-finding survey on the MDGs to support the country's international action in this regard. Moreover, the said initiatives were taken in a year of special significance for Italy's international role, when the country was chairing the G8.

Chaired by the Hon. Enrico Pianetta (PdL), the Subcommittee is composed of 19 MPs

⁶ OECD, *Italy (2009) DAC Peer Review*, available at: http://www.oecd.org/document/60/0,3343,en_2649_34603_44387452_1_1_1_1,00.html

representing the seven parliamentary groups seated in the Assembly. According to the Hon. Pianetta, the subcommittee “is important to stimulate parliamentarians’ awareness on this delicate issue, as well as to witness Parliament’s proactive action on the government to consider such themes with the necessary attention”. According to the Hon. Verneti (*Alleanza per l’Italia*), indeed, “development cooperation is not only to be understood in terms of ethical responsibility, but it can also be effectively used as an instrument of intervention to reduce at least part of the causes determining massive emigration from developing countries towards Europe. Such a specific function can as well be understood as one of the reasons for the bilateral support that the Subcommittee generally receives from Parliament”.

The Subcommittee’s mandate includes monitoring cooperation aid funds. The Subcommittee in its consultative capacity defines the agenda of inquiries, holds hearings, which are open to participation by all the MPs, and submits reports to the plenary of the Committee. It is also in charge of preparing the report on the inquiry by the Committee. During its work on MDGs, the Subcommittee collected a considerable amount of information and political remarks at hearings of the representatives of the Italian government, ambassadors, directors general and the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, representatives of UN agencies, international financial institutions, NGOs, the media, and the private sector⁷. The Subcommittee also conducted an analysis of Italian contributions to multilateral banks and development funds, starting with an examination of a 2008 report of the Italian Ministry for Finances concerning contributions.

⁷ The inquiry included hearings of speakers such as Evelyn Herfkens, Executive Coordinator of the UN campaign for the MDGs, Jason Nardi, Coordinator of the Italian Coalition for Social Watch; and Cyril Muller, Special European Delegate for the World Bank, on the necessity of reaching the 0.7% GDP established quota for development aid and contextualising the need to increase aid effectiveness; Mario Zupi, Scientific Director at CESPI, on the importance of development aid quality and on the opportunity for renewing the norms now in force; Elisabetta Belloni, Director General at the Foreign Affairs Department for Development Cooperation, on the MDGs’ current advancement, maternal health; and on Goal no. 8; Helen Clark, UNDP Administrator, Nov. 12th 2009.

The Subcommittee for MDGs, and its relationship with the executive

According to a number of MPs, and especially to opposition representatives, it is not always easy to obtain information on the government, especially on aid administration, because of the number of multilateral channels of distribution in the Italian cooperation system. Relations between the legislative and executive branches are tense because of the repeated use of the confidence vote, resulting in a feeling of powerlessness by many MPs, in particular with regard to the relevant budgetary legislative initiatives. “The Subcommittee is doing well in terms of parliamentary work,” said the Hon. Mogherini Rebesani, “but this particular system doesn’t allow us to do more”. In such a scenario, public opinion plays a role in assisting parliament to be more effective in pressurising the government. Still, as the Hon. Barbi stressed, interaction with the government is not the prerogative of the Subcommittee, which mainly has a consulting function, whereas confrontation with the executive is intended to be mainly the task of the Standing Committee.

The Subcommittee on MDGs manages to play a relevant role in connection with reform of the Italian legislation on development cooperation, ruled by law No. 49 of 1987. This legislative instrument, which provides the legal and political foundations for Italian co-operation, has remained unchanged for over twenty years. However, the law no longer reflects contemporary developments, because procedures have changed. Nevertheless, strict application of the detailed articles in law No. 49 can also be an obstacle to the quick and flexible response necessary to respond to the fast-changing needs in partner countries. Also, new ways of delivering aid ought to be investigated, such as through partner-country systems⁸.

The Subcommittee’s initiative can indeed be considered a good starting point, but strong political drive and leadership on development cooperation continues to be necessary if Italy is

⁸ A long-standing debate continues over the possible reform of law No. 49, which was amended by the Chamber of Deputies only this year. The draft bill was approved by the Committee for Foreign Affairs and is currently undergoing Senate examination.

to effectively address the structural challenges in its aid program and if it intends to secure the financial resources indispensable to meeting international aid commitments.

Keeping development aid in the public eye – a parliamentary duty

Due to a number of scandals that shook the country in the early nineties, the theme of the effectiveness of cooperation aid is one of high sensitivity with regard to Italian public opinion and is therefore considered a key area for Parliament to supervise and for the Subcommittee to investigate. During the current mandate, various initiatives were promoted by MPs on this particular matter, once again with bipartisan participation. Among these were two motions, one requiring the government to honour its international commitments and the other expressing concern at beneficiary countries' compliance.⁹

"The Declaration of Paris ought to be considered our polar star", says the Hon. Pianetta, Chair of the Subcommittee on the MDGs. Again, the problem for Italy seems to be that of reaching an understanding at a parliamentary level on the question of development cooperation and on how dedicated aid is administered.

The Paris Declaration, as underlined by the Hon. Tempestini, is repeatedly questioned by the intervention in developing countries of new donor countries that do not observe the Paris standards. To enforce the Declaration and ensure better international aid cooperation, the European Union could have performed a stronger role; also in support of single countries' bilateral systems, "Europe is a big political challenge, and the first big actor in international cooperation, which ought to be considered of great importance for Europeans themselves."

⁹ Motion no. 1-00253, first subscriber: the Hon. Quartiani Emilio Angelo (PD), 14/10/2009, and motion 1-00254, first subscriber: the Hon. Boniver Margherita (PDL), 19/10/2009. Full text available at: <

Among new priorities, a need for Italy to create a broadly accepted national vision for development cooperation and to provide a common purpose for all institutions involved has emerged. "Italy needs a change of culture towards development cooperation, which is not seen as a part of Italian foreign policy, but is still perceived more in terms of charity," states Natalia Lupi of AIDOS and member of the GCAP (Italian Coalition Against Poverty). From this perspective, the work of the dedicated Subcommittee on the MDGs and that of individual MPs¹⁰ can be considered a useful instrument in securing long-term interest in effective development and in strengthening accountability. As for the predictability of aid, it could be suggested that the government seriously consider reflection on what the realistically reachable objectives are between now and 2015.

"Development cooperation could be a uniting instrument, contributing to enhancing the EU's international role. There is a strong need for major coordination, and perhaps Europe could contribute in that direction," affirmed the Hon. Pianetta.

On the themes of the Paris Declaration, and in relation to the 2015 deadlines, as well as that of the New York UN Summit scheduled for September 2010, on the 29th of July, the Third Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs approved a resolution recalling the government to its international commitments and to its duty to support and engage with the Millennium Goals.

Parliamentary dialogue with civil society

The dedicated Subcommittee for the first time provides a direct institutional counterpart to civil society, increasing cooperation among all actors. Yet, most civil society delegates lament how the frequent application of the confidence

¹⁰ On this particular point, see individually presented parliamentary questions. One example was the urgent parliamentary question presented by the Hon. Mogherini Rabesani, on the financing of dyke Gibe III on the Omo river in Ethiopia (Urgent Parliamentary Question 2-00786, presented by Federica Mogherini Rabesani, July 6th, 2010. Seating no. 348).

vote on the part of the government has limited Parliament's power and weakened the Subcommittee. Civil society groups see the Subcommittee from a long-term perspective and are positive about its role in raising awareness among MPs over the issue of development cooperation.

The Subcommittee has been highly appreciated by representatives of Italian civil society who are concerned about reforming aid administration. Particular attention has been drawn to the issue of civil funds being used to finance military missions, which creates many problems for NGOs and civil operators who risk being perceived as 'occupiers' by some local populations, and thus have their work seriously compromised. There is little know-how on the issue of aid supervision, and the prevalent multilateral administration makes it much harder to intervene in processes.

The overall attitude towards the Subcommittee's activity has been positive, as Farida Bena (Ucodep-Oxfam and member of the GCAP) states, "We are always on a level of working based on raising awareness; for the moment, that's all you can do, but there is going to be a need for more practical results in the future."

Work still to be done

With the institution in 2008 of the Subcommittee on the Millennium Development Goals, the Italian Parliament made an explicit commitment to achieving the MDGs, undertaking the challenge in a year of special significance for Italy's international role, when the country was chairing the G8.

Like other nations, Italy adopted the UN Millennium Goals as guidelines for its development cooperation policy, distinguishing itself in the sector of healthcare within the framework of Target no. 6, being active in work around sub-Saharan Africa and providing substantial resources for the Global Fund for the Fight against AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. Another focus in Italian cooperation policy has concerned education and gender issues, with specific attention being given to those contexts

characterised by fragility and the aftermath of conflicts.

Although the creation of the Subcommittee for MDGs shows the Italian Parliament's interest in cooperation issues, a persistent problem is cuts in cooperation budget funds, which today is at an all-time low of about 400 million Euros. With such restricted resources, Italy can promote only a very small number of bilateral projects, and in any event, is very far from reaching the minimum input of 0.7% GDP established for 2015.

The implementation of bilateral projects is extremely important for the traceability of development aid as well as for the prevention of aid fragmentation, which is one of the Subcommittee on MDGs' possible future areas of investigation. There is a specific need to ensure the consolidation of the Paris Declaration, and MPs have shown an interest in supervising aid effectiveness once the inquiry on MDGs is completed.

As the Subcommittee faces the possibility of playing a more active role in the legislative function, it is important that the question of international cooperation be dealt with more widely to ensure an understanding of this activity within Italian foreign policy. It is on this point that the role of the media is important for the Subcommittee's work. The UN's MDG Campaign, for example, provided an occasion for the Subcommittee to publish its work through a series of conferences and press releases. Moreover, the involvement of the public, together with input from already active civil society organisations, can lead to greater pressure on the government and on less committed MPs to lobby the executive for effective aid expenditure to support the MDGs.

As some of our interviewees have suggested, the Subcommittee for MDGs has been effective with regard to its informing role, but stronger governmental action and a new understanding of development cooperation as a whole are needed in order to ensure that Italy respects its international commitments.

Despite the limitations created by national contingences and the lack of funds, made worse by the current international financial crisis, the

institution of a dedicated Subcommittee for MDGs in the Italian Parliament has proven to be an effective development instrument.

THE PARLIAMENT OF SOUTH AFRICA

Modest involvement

As the MDG report for South Africa¹¹ states, achievements since the end of apartheid have occurred in parallel with the democratisation of the country and its institutions. South Africa's parliament is now in its 4th truly multiparty mandate and still assumes a proactive voice in the international arena, while performing its vital functions in the national context. Parliament opted for working on development issues using standing committees, whose structure, as shown below, is a mirror of the governmental organogram. As some of the MPs and staff interviewed stated, in the South African parliamentary institutional context, it is not clear if a committee on MDGs will add any value to the holistic approach of dealing with development issues in the standing committees, which seem to enjoy general support. However, it seems that there is a risk that Parliament will be hampered by the country's success with the MDG targets, and that the MDGs will be absent from the scrutiny of Parliament as a whole. It will still be important to ensure that Parliament be a forum for a national discussion involving civil society and all political parties, for example, through the tabling of MDG country reports, which up to this point has not happened in the South African Parliament.

As is evident from this report, the intervention of the Parliament of South Africa with regard to the MDGs has been modest. This is due mainly to the fact that the development goals

¹¹ South Africa's 2005 Millennium Development Goals Country Report indicated that the country had already met some of the MDG targets and was confident of achieving the remaining goals. The report noted that South Africa's good performance "may be related to the fact that when the new democratic government came into being, in 1994, it set itself many targets similar to those articulated in the Millennium Declaration."

stipulated by the country go beyond the country's commitments to the MDGs, and the country targets related to the MDGs have been achieved or exceeded¹². The development accomplishments of the country removed the urgency for the MDGs taking a central place in parliamentary politics. On the national stage, Parliament has therefore followed national targets articulated in various national policy documents instead the MDG targets. However, for the international targets, Parliament is discussing the way forward for the MDGs as a whole, for the continent and for South Africa.

The fourth parliament, under the leadership of Speaker Max Sisulu, seems determined to increase its engagement with the MDGs. Parliament has apparently incorporated the MDGs into its new strategic plans for both houses and their committees (see Committee News, Volume 1, 2010). Moreover, it seems that this may change when the new ministers in the presidency are tasked with planning, monitoring and evaluating taking over political responsibility for the MDG project. Tabling the next country report in Parliament would certainly be in line with Statistics South Africa's stated objective of sufficient stakeholder participation in the 2010 Country Report.

Parliamentary engagement with the MDGs

The Millennium Development Goals are at the core of many government policies, but thus far, Parliament's engagement with the MDGs seems

¹² South Africa can be classified as a middle-income country with well-developed mining, manufacturing, agricultural, financial, legal and communications sectors. Despite having the most advanced economy in Africa, South Africa is plagued by socio-economic inequalities resulting from the apartheid era. These continue to be manifest in the form of widespread poverty, a high unemployment rate and high levels of crime. In addition, South Africa is one of the countries most severely affected by the AIDS epidemic, with the largest number of HIV infections in the world. Unemployment remains high, and although access to housing, drinking water and sanitation has improved for large proportions of the population, the current government is facing growing pressure to improve delivery of basic services to low-income areas, to improve healthcare and education systems and to increase job growth. More than one-quarter of South Africa's population currently receives social grants.

to have been comparatively modest. From interviews conducted for this report, it has become clear that, initially, the MDGs were mainly regarded as an issue of international relations, itself seen as an executive-driven area in which Parliament's role has traditionally been underemphasised.

As far as we could establish, the MDG Country Reports of 2005 and 2007 have not been tabled in the plenary or have been referred to the relevant parliamentary committees for consideration. In fact, since 2000, there has been only one plenary debate in which MDGs were explicitly mentioned as the topic of debate. According to the Minutes of the Proceedings of 16 March 2005, the National Assembly held a debate about "the role of parliaments in establishing innovative international financing and trading mechanisms to address the problem of debt and to achieve the millennium development goals".

The MDGs have also not been central in the work of the committees of the second and third parliaments. Although most members seem to have been aware of the MDG project, the MDGs have not served as a main point of discussion between committee members and the executive. There seems to be a number of additional reasons for the minimal parliamentary engagement with the MDGs. First, South Africa is not as aid dependent as many other countries on the continent, and its policy formulation has been less driven by external commitments like the MDGs. Second, in the context of South Africa's relatively well-developed state capacity, the government in many areas has set policy goals that are both more specific and more ambitious than the MDGs. The indicators that have been used by both the executive and Parliament to measure policy implementation and progress are therefore geared to the government's own policy goals and overlap only to a certain degree with the MDG indicators. Third, in certain policy areas, most notably primary education and gender equality, South Africa has already reached the targets set in the MDGs and has moved on to other policy targets. Finally, the mandates of both government and MPs as well as the timeframes of the South African policy-making cycle do not run parallel with the timeframes of the MDGs, thus making it difficult

to fully incorporate the MDGs in the work of Parliament.

Despite the lack of direct engagement with the MDGs by members in plenary and committee meetings, Parliament as an institution has paid attention to the MDGs and their potential to serve as a tool for parliamentary oversight. In 2006, the Research Unit of Parliament organised a workshop for its staff members dedicated to Parliament's role in overseeing the MDGs. Various papers presented at the workshop assessed South Africa's progress in meeting the MDGs and identified challenges for oversight by Parliament. The workshop resulted in a so-called MDG Fact Sheet, distributed to MPs, in which recommendations were made with regard to each MDG. Given the cross-sectoral nature of the MDGs, it remains unclear as to what extent these recommendations for parliamentary action have subsequently informed the work of members and parliamentary committees, especially in the absence of specific MDG items on committee agendas.

Parliament's Research Unit has also produced a number of reports for various international organisations in which it participates, such as the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association (CPA) and the Southern African Development Community (SADC) Parliamentary Forum (PF), in which the MDGs were specifically addressed. These reports reinforce the earlier impression that the MDGs are primarily dealt with in the context of international relations.

The fourth South African Parliament's commitment to the MDGs

One of the obvious consequences of a functional democracy is turnover of the elected members. Multiparty elected parliaments are the primary stages for these changes. Sixty percent of the members of the new South African parliament are new MPs, including many new committee chairpersons and a new Speaker, Mr Max Sisulu. The current leadership had defined as a clear objective strengthening the role of Parliament with regard to the MDGs. Parliament shows signs of a newly found assertiveness in this regard. The current Parliament has indeed made an effort to incorporate the MDGs into the

strategic plans of its committees. The indicators for various MDG targets could certainly assist in encouraging meaningful debate between portfolio committees and ministerial departments about government's performance in relation to pressing social issues. This fresh approach will definitely boost Parliament's engagement with the MDGs.

As stated previously, South Africa's parliament did not establish a committee to deal specifically with the MDGs and oversee government's progress in this regard. Given the cross-sectoral nature of the MDGs, however, such a dedicated committee could be a good way to ensure a greater parliamentary oversight role in relation to them. However, in the opinion of some interviewed, it also holds the danger of being restricted to a mere advisory role because specialised portfolio committees, such as the committees on health and education, are likely to remain the preferred platforms to oversee government departments and address any problems in reaching government targets.

New budget amendment procedures in the fourth Parliament might further strengthen its oversight role. They provide an opportunity for Parliament to directly influence policy choices and corresponding budget allocations. Success in this regard would not only depend on political conditions but also require experienced and financially literate MPs as well as a well-resourced parliamentary budget office, conditions and requirements which are not yet in place.

There are signs that South Africa's fourth Parliament is prepared to use the MDGs as a tool in its oversight role. As promising as this might be, it can help counter the lack of citizen ownership and public participation in South Africa's MDG reporting process. One way to remedy this situation would be to table South Africa's country reports in Parliament, but this would limit parliamentary involvement to a rather late stage of the process. Another way to address the situation would be to give Parliament a greater role in overseeing the process of compiling South Africa's country reports.

The latter remedy would be in line with the more general recommendation that was made

in the recent Report of the Independent Panel Assessment of Parliament. The independent panel recommended that "Parliament should establish mechanisms to monitor South Africa's reporting obligations resulting from international agreements, to ensure timely reporting" (pages 77-79). Unfortunately, the report is silent about the kind of mechanisms required.

In the case of the MDGs, some of our interviewees suggested that it might be appropriate to set up an ad hoc committee tasked with overseeing the compilation of the 2010 and subsequent country reports. Others pointed to the proposal to establish a portfolio committee to oversee the new ministers in the presidency. If this proposal is accepted, overseeing MDG reporting could fall under the new committee. Either way, given Parliament's position in the international environment and its own constitutional mandate to ensure public participation, it clearly has a role to play, not only in using the MDGs to oversee the work of government, but also in ensuring that reporting on progress towards achieving the MDGs is an inclusive process.

THE PARLIAMENT OF MOZAMBIQUE

A Long Road to Travel

In Mozambique, the MDGs have been informing the main government policies and programmes since 2000, and forming the basis of the annual plans and budgets. The government of Mozambique refers partially to the MDGs in its regular reporting to Parliament. Specific and consolidated MDG reports, however, are not submitted to Parliament. Knowledge of and concern for the MDGs in the Assembly of the Republic of Mozambique has resided with individual MPs, rather than with the legislature as a decision-making institution. This is also due to the Assembly's feeble technical policy capacity. Civil society organisations (CSOs) are involved in MDG monitoring, and some of them work with Parliament, but the result of this work has not been used to improve the legislature's involvement and role. However, there are

positive signs emerging from a legislative leadership that is increasingly concerned and aware about the importance of involving the Assembly of the Republic in the policy process linked to the MDGs.

Policy process

The Mozambican policy process comprises a set of long-term, medium-term and short-term planning and budgeting instruments that define the framework for government policies. The long-term planning instrument is the 2025 Agenda, which was approved in 2003, and sets the country's vision for a period of 20 years. The 2025 Agenda was prepared through a highly participatory and inclusive process, involving government, political parties and CSOs. It was presented to Parliament, though not formally approved by it.

Broad policy goals are defined in the government's Five-year Programme, which is approved by Parliament at the beginning of its mandate, during the first session following its inauguration. The government's programme is the policy version of the electoral manifesto of the winning party or candidate, and once it is approved, no legislation or policy that runs counter to its main elements can be approved. Regarding budgeting, the main policy instrument is the Mid-term Expenditure Framework, which indicates the revenues and expenditure projections for a three-year period and is updated annually. The government also has a multi-annual poverty reduction strategy that was not approved by Parliament.

The government's programme and the poverty reduction strategy are translated into national and sector-wide annual action plans – called Economic and Social Plans (PES) – and budgets prepared by the line ministries (at the central level), provincial and district governments (at the local level) and consolidated by the Ministries of Planning and Development and of Finance, at the central level.

According to the standing orders, standing committees are responsible for analysing in detail legislative proposals concerning their policy or jurisdictional areas and for reporting their technical analyses to the plenary. Normally, the Rules and Planning and Budget

Committees, due to their cross-cutting mandate (budgetary impact and compliance with the Constitution, the already approved government programme, and existing legislation), analyse all the proposals presented to the Assembly. In performing their mandate, committees can hold public hearings, summon cabinet members and request opinions from specialists outside the legislature or from CSOs involved in specific policy areas.

Government presents bi-annual and annual reports on the implementation of its plans, and quarterly reports on budget execution. The Assembly holds two ordinary sessions per year, at which the government reports on the implementation of its plans and programmes. In between sessions, legislators and committee members perform their regular oversight and representation roles, visiting public institutions and constituencies to gauge the implementation of government programmes and to hear citizens' grievances and demands. This oversight and constituency work also informs the analysis of government plans and budgets. According to some interviewees, these activities have been severely constrained by budgetary limitations and the relative opacity of public institutions, which regularly refuse to provide the required information, even to ruling party MPs.¹³ Reporting on these visits occurs more at the party than at the plenary level, and the quality of this process depends on the level of internal party organisation.¹⁴

Since 2000, the MDGs have been referred to in the government's programmes and in the Poverty Reduction Action Plan. Recently, the Government of Mozambique decided to include reporting on the MDGs in its annual plan reports ("Balanço do PES"). The government has also presented an analysis of the status of achievement of the MDGs in its mid-term report on the 2005-2009 Five-year Plan (República de Moçambique, 2008). However, only a few sectors have the requisite capacity to gather and systematise data on the MDGs on an annual basis. This is the case for the education, roads,

¹³ Interview with Lutero Simango (6 May 2010) and Maria Inês Martins, Chairperson of the International Relations Committee (7 May 2010).

¹⁴ Interview with Francisco Mucanheia, Chairperson of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Economic Activities and Services Committee, 6 May 2010.

agriculture and health sectors, which have reasonable capacity, mechanisms and a track record of data gathering and monitoring. Consequently, reporting on the MDGs in the annual plans is hazy and partial, probably reflecting national policy priorities, which are not strictly expressed in the language of the MDGs. Extracting information on indicators relevant to monitoring the MDGs from the ordinary reporting mechanisms and tools would require specific expertise and knowledge, which neither legislative staff nor MPs possess. Only a few parliamentarians have participated in training on the MDGs, either through the legislature's networking or as a result of local non-governmental organisations' (NGOs') networking. For example, ABIODES, a local NGO, through the regional chapter of the United Nations Millennium Campaign, has facilitated the inclusion of two MPs in training activities aimed at strengthening a network of African MPs involved in monitoring the MDGs.¹⁵ The Association of European Parliamentarians with Africa (AWEPA), one of the main donors to the Assembly, is supporting capacity-development activities linked to some MDGs, namely HIV/AIDS, gender, children's rights, climate change, water and sanitation. Some MPs have also tried to promote training activities on the MDGs, and have considered inviting former ministers from other countries, but these initiatives were not successfully accomplished.¹⁶ Other MPs individually contacted CSOs to get information on the MDGs.¹⁷ Interestingly, MPs with previous experience in the executive branch tend to be more familiar with the MDGs.¹⁸

¹⁵ Interview with Mr Erasmo Mabunda, ABIODES, 18 May 2010.

¹⁶ Interview with Mr Lutero Simango, MP and former chairperson of the Economic Activities and Services Committee (5 May 2010).

¹⁷ Interview with Fernando Menete, Mozambican Debt Group, 21 May 2010.

¹⁸ This was evident in interviews with two committee chairpersons, a former minister, mayor and governor of the Central Bank (Mr. Eneas Comiche, Chairperson of the Planning and Budget Committee); Ms Telmira Pereira, a former deputy minister and provincial governor, currently chairing the Social, Gender and Environmental Affairs Committee; and Mr Francisco Mucanheia, former Provincial Secretary and current Chairperson of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Economic Activities and Services Committee.

Parliament's lack of knowledge about the MDGs ends up turning this exercise into a simple monitoring of government's plans, without specific concern for the targets to be met. But there are also questions of ownership. Two interviewees – one from a CSO and a former MP¹⁹ – mentioned that to some extent the MDGs reflect an external agenda, because they have been approved elsewhere and almost imposed on the developing countries. This is seen as contributing to the relative lack of interest from parliamentarians in monitoring the MDGs.

Specific reporting on the MDGs has been undertaken through two reports prepared in 2005 and 2008. Currently, reporting on the MDGs is based on the same information used to report on the implementation of government's plans and programmes to parliament. There are temporal gaps in data used to assess some of the MDG indicators, because they depend on studies and research normally carried out occasionally. For example, the analysis of some indicators of the 2008 national MDG report relies on data for the most recent household and demographic surveys, dating back to 2003.²⁰ From the government's side, the Ministry of Planning and Development is responsible for gathering information from sectors to prepare a consolidated report. According to one source, this Ministry works regularly with the Planning and Budget Committee, but on regular planning issues, dialogue on the MDGs has been almost absent.²¹ MDG reports produced so far have not been presented to parliament.

Some CSOs, such as the Mozambican Debt Group (GMD), ABIODES and the G20 platform, have also been involved in the qualitative monitoring of the MDGs.²² However, this alternative source of information has not been used by MPs to enhance their capacities in

¹⁹ Fernando Menete (GMD) and Abel Mabunda (former Rapporteur of the Planning and Budget Committee), interviewed on 26 May 2010.

²⁰ Interview with Alfredo Mutombene, Ministry of Planning and Development, 3 June 2010.

²¹ Alfredo Mutombene, Ministry of Planning and Development, 3 June 2010.

²² A network of civil society organisations participating in the Development Observatory, a forum comprising government, civil society organisations and donors aimed at monitoring the implementation of the Poverty Reduction Strategy and proposing policy changes.

monitoring the MDGs. In fact, collaboration between civil society and Parliament on the MDGs is rare. Only recently has GMD agreed to sign a Memorandum of Understanding with the Planning and Budget Committee, but on issues related exclusively to debt and public financial management (MDG 8: Global Partnership for Development).

Apart from the Constitution and legislative process rules, key documents in the policy process related to the MDGs are the government's Five-year Programme, the annual plans and budgets, their respective progress and execution reports ('Balanço do PES') and the specific MDG reports. Joint annual review reports (see next section) are also important tools in the policy process, due to their influence on government plans and budgets.

Some of the poverty monitoring indicators (40 of over 200 indicators) are included in the performance appraisal framework – the main tool for assessing government performance in the annual joint reviews – under general budget support. These indicators are by far the best monitored, although there are concerns about the quality of information provided by the government in some indicators. In some areas, annual review reports refer to the situation of the country in its achievement of the MDGs, which show that from government's plans, it is possible to monitor these objectives, depending on the incentive to do so and existing analytical and technical skills. Parliamentarians do not participate in the annual joint reviews, and the reports of this exercise are not presented to the Assembly, despite their importance in defining budget ceilings and prioritising the annual plans that are submitted to the legislative branch for final approval.

Parliament also does not participate in the Development Observatories, where government discusses implementing the poverty strategy with civil society and donors, and shares ideas about progress and the way forward. Government reporting on poverty reduction and indirectly on the MDGs is seen as very quantitative or activity-based. That is why CSOs, under the G20 platform, decided to elaborate their own qualitative studies on the impact of the poverty reduction strategy. So far, three reports have been produced (2004, 2005 and

2008 [still unpublished]). CSOs have networks intervening up to the local level that allow them to gather relevant information on the implementation of poverty reduction policies, which are not properly captured by government monitoring systems. The Mozambican Debt Group (GMD), a CSO, using its local networks, organises annual initiatives for parliamentary work in the provinces to promote dialogue between citizens and MPs. Nevertheless, as in ordinary committee work, the results of this exercise are not reported to Parliament. Moreover, according to one interviewee, civil society reports and the information gathered on government pro-poor policies should be used by Parliament to inform its oversight role or for advocacy purposes. CSOs, too, are not using this information for advocacy or to inform or influence the legislature's decisions. In fact, as confirmed in interviews with MPs and civil society representatives, interaction between Parliament and civil society is still very weak, despite the potential for complementarities in their work.

In sum, Parliament has not been proactive in monitoring the MDGs and interacts poorly with those dealing with this matter. Government, parliament and civil society are not adequately equipped to deal with the MDGs. According to some interviewees, apart from not being presented to Parliament, MDG reports are normally prepared by the government alone and are shared with civil society only after being presented to international forums. Therefore, the more consistent and consolidated instrument for MDG monitoring is focused on international rather than national constituencies.

Still a long way to go

The MDGs are referred to in the relevant government policy and planning documents. However, systematic monitoring is unclear. There is no reporting system from the executive to Parliament, the Assembly faces resource constraints, and within the Assembly, there is a lack of institutionalised concern for the MDGs. This has been a concern of government in proactively presenting some information in its regular reports to Parliament and mainly in responding to international actors and individual MPs who have come across the MDGs

in their individual work, not while performing their functions as legislators. Therefore, concern for the legislature's monitoring of the MDGs in the near future will depend on the interest and commitment of its leadership in embracing this cause.

The new composition²³ of the Assembly and consequently in the committees' leadership signals a promising shift towards a greater concern for the MDGs. The committee chairpersons who were interviewed during the mission showed some concern for and interest in helping make Parliament more active in monitoring achievement of the MDGs. However, effective monitoring will depend also on the existence of more consolidated reporting mechanisms, geared towards the formal political accountability system, with more consolidated information featuring than does in the current reports presented to parliament. This poses challenges to the legislature and to the government. The Assembly will need to enhance its policy analysis capacity as well as its knowledge of the MDGs, while the government will have to refine its reporting and monitoring system, to provide timely, sufficient and accurate information on the MDGs. It also needs to be more accountable to Parliament on implementing its international commitments.

However, the absence of strict monitoring of the MDGs, apart from being a consequence of the legislature's weak capacities, should not be seen as a mere deficit in the oversight of government programmes, which are to some extent linked to the main tenets of the MDGs. It may also be a result of the lack of information on the MDGs themselves, stemming from their problems of ownership and also of the legislature's weak policy analysis capacity, which hinders it from establishing linkages between what the government does and what is set forth in its international commitments. As some interviewees pointed out, it seems most MPs do not understand that the concerns of their constituencies, which they continuously voice in their ordinary work, are included in the MDGs. As mentioned above, government programmes, plans and reports refer to the MDGs, albeit in a selective way, depending on the availability of information. Hence, MPs' failure to adequately

monitor the MDGs has a direct impact on their ability to pursue their constituencies' concerns and demands. As a consequence of the above-mentioned problems, specific reporting on the MDGs has been more targeted toward external audiences, with national actors being involved only marginally. Among these actors, CSOs have been more proactive, but the results of their work have not been effectively integrated into legislative decision-making. Nevertheless, there are some positive signs of enhanced cooperation between CSOs and Parliament. This, combined with the fact that some MPs have considerable experience in the MDGs, as a result of their background in the executive branch (some of them chairing committees), and their experience of parliamentary offices dealing with issues related to the MDGs, can be a good starting point for a more effective role for the Assembly in this area.

A 'new house' – an opportunity

The substantial turnover in the legislature and consequently in the committees' leadership signals a promising shift towards a greater concern for the MDGs. The chairs of the committees who were interviewed during the mission showed some concern and interest in contributing to making Parliament more active in monitoring achievement of the MDGs. However, effective monitoring will depend also on the existence of more consolidated reporting mechanisms, geared towards the formal political accountability system, with more consolidated information than in the current reports presented to Parliament. This poses challenges to the legislature and to the government as well. The Assembly will need to enhance its policy analysis capacity as well as its knowledge about the MDGs. On the other hand, government has to refine its reporting and monitoring system, to provide timely, sufficient and accurate information on the MDGs. It also needs to be more accountable to Parliament in implementing its international commitments.

However, lack of strict monitoring of the MDGs, apart from being a consequence of the legislature's weak capacities, should not be seen as a mere deficit in the oversight of government programmes, to some extent linked to the main tenets of the MDGs. It can also be a result of

²³ Due to the significant turnover in the last election.

lack of information on the MDGs, stemming from their problems of ownership, as well as from the legislature's weak policy analysis capacity, which hinders it from establishing linkages between what the government does and what is intended in its international commitments. As some interviewees pointed out, it seems most MPs do not understand that the concerns of their constituencies, which they continually voice in their ordinary work, are included in the MDGs.

Government programmes, plans and reports refer to the MDGs, although in a selective way, depending on the availability of information. Hence, MPs' failure to monitor the MDGs has implications for the pursuance of their constituencies' concerns and demands. As a consequence of these problems, specific reporting on the MDGs has been targeted more towards external audiences, and national actors are involved only marginally. Among these, civil society organisations have been more proactive, but the results of their work have not given effective input into legislative decision-making. Nevertheless, there are some positive signals of enhanced cooperation between civil society organisations and Parliament. This, combined with the existence of MPs with considerable experience in the MDGs, stemming from their background in the executive branch (some of them chairing committees) and the experience of parliamentary offices dealing with issues related to the MDGs, can be a good starting point for a more effective role of the Assembly in this area.

THE KENYAN PARLIAMENT

A Parliamentary Caucus Cross-Committee Option

The world witnessed the violence in Kenya as a result of the presidential and parliamentary election outcomes in 2007 and 2008. The country's development in recent years includes positive policies shared with a degree of political instability. Still, in the last seven years, the Kenyan government has promoted a development programme organised under the

framework of two bold development strategies. The first is the Economic Recovery Strategy Plan (ERSP), formally launched in 2003, which outlined broad policies to help jumpstart the economy after a long spell of economic decline, partly occasioned by bad governance and endemic corruption.

This policy was designed to stimulate economic growth and reduce poverty in the country through the specific guidance of government policy. It was designed to run from 2003 to 2007 based on an anti-corruption and pro-growth agenda and built upon the lessons learned from the preceding poverty reduction plan articulated in the 2001-2004 Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP). In addition to a direct focus on reviving key sectors of the Kenyan economy, the ERSP was designed to address aspects of Kenya's socio-economic situation directly related to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGS). The ERSP therefore targeted not just economic revival but also poverty reduction, wealth creation, increased provision of quality education and health services, to name but a few.

Closely following the implementation of the ERSP, the government opened up the planning horizon for development. It launched Vision 2030, an economic development blueprint intended to help Kenya achieve middle income status by 2030. This plan, designed to cover the period 2008 to 2030, was developed through an inclusive process to build on the gains of the successful implementation of the Economic Recovery Strategy for Wealth and Employment Creation.

As a symbol of national collaboration on efforts to reduce poverty across the country, Parliament enacted the Constituencies Development Fund Act to institute a system of sharing at least 2.5% of development funds directly with constituencies in Kenya. Through the CDF framework, upwards of Ksh 2 billion has gone directly into development projects in the constituencies. The projects range from digging boreholes to constructing additional classrooms and health centres in areas where such facilities are limited.

In 2009, the Kenyan parliament established the Parliamentary Caucus on Poverty and MDGs.

The Caucus is composed of 18 members of parliament. The Caucus' objective is to oversee the achievements of the MDGs by improving government accountability for policy formulation and implementation, through oversight and legislation. The caucus does not enjoy the status of a standing committee; it is an informal group approved by all parties and by the leadership of the house. The caucus draws in MPs from all portfolio committees related to MDG work and aims to coordinate and uphold parliament's role in achieving the MDGs.

Executive organisation to support the MDGs

The Ministry of State for Planning, National Development and Vision 2030 has been coordinating the mainstreaming of the MDGs into national policies, planning processes and budgeting since 2002.

Some of the activities undertaken by the Ministry include carrying out an MDG needs assessment in the country, including publishing the 2005 Needs Assessment and Costing Report, and publishing the 2003, 2005 and 2007 MDG Status Reports.

The Parliamentary Caucus on Poverty and the Millennium Development Goals

The Parliamentary MDG Caucus cuts across all the ministries and provides the National Assembly with an opportunity to monitor achievement of the MDGs. The caucus is currently beginning its work, and its chair, the Hon. Ntoitha M'Mithiaru, explained in an interview that the Caucus intends to reinforce the role of parliamentarians in holding the government accountable for its commitments to and progress on achieving the MDGs. The Caucus also hopes to build MPs' understanding of the MDGs and to encourage them to pressurise the government to deliver on the MDGs by 2015, as well as to advocate for the mainstreaming of the MDGs in local and national development plans and budgets.

Besides the interview with the chair of the MDG Caucus, the MP members of the Caucus were

optimistic about the creation of this structure. They were clear that the Caucus does not intend to replace the roles of the portfolio committees. They explained that the Caucus instead aims to work vis-à-vis the other committees, which is why its membership includes two MPs from each portfolio committee related to MDG work. Its membership is also regionally distributed.

The Caucus aims to play a watchdog role, providing a platform for interested MPs to monitor and evaluate government anti-poverty programmes and initiatives. It therefore provides a space for MPs to critique and suggest practical ideas for ensuring that the MDGs are met by 2015. Members are expected to be knowledgeable about various MDG-related government commitments, especially related development programmes, and to hold the government to account for commitments made.

This approach involves raising questions on government development policies and projects, tracking budget allocations and utilisation, commending good performance by government and identifying areas where significant improvement is required if the MDGs are to be met.

This is achieved through the floor of the house in the form of questions to the respective ministries – especially the Ministry for Planning, National Development and Vision 2030 – and through workshops and stakeholder forums where bureaucrats in the executive are taken to task on implementing the policies geared towards achieving the MDGs.

Additionally, the caucus pretends to be an advocate for localising the MDGs and linking their attainment with the performance of constituencies. The MDGs cannot be achieved at the national level alone but also need to be localised and met at constituency and grass-roots level. The overall goal of the localisation initiative is to ensure that the MDGs are taken into consideration during planning processes and are translated into strategies for action at the local level. MPs are a critical driving force in attaining the MDGs at the local level, because they are the drivers of the local policy-making

agenda and influence budget allocations in their constituencies.

The Caucus plans to monitor the progress of attaining the MDGs at the constituency level and demands corrective action by government officials in areas of unsatisfactory performance. This adds to an increase in the accountability of government officials and creates healthy competition at the local level.

The Caucus also provides an opportunity for MPs to share experiences and best practices, highlighting poverty reduction strategies that are working at the national and local levels. Caucus members are also able to share successful development approaches being adopted at the national and local levels, as well as challenges being faced.

Members of the Caucus also expressed an additional aim for it – to be a voice of the developing countries. Inappropriate aid, trade and debt policies of the Northern countries also contribute to high poverty levels in Africa. The Parliamentary Caucus on Poverty and the MDGs informs members and provides a platform to campaign against such policies and to demand that Northern nations adopt policies that benefit poor people.

It is important to note that it is clear from the procedures (listed above) for establishing a parliamentary committee that support from the speaker is crucial in establishing a caucus and ensuring its work is accepted as a 'house' project. This belief was shared by MPs across parties, who reiterated that the political will and support of the Speaker and the Clerk of the National Assembly were crucial to achieving the MDGs. Their assistance meant that on the concurrence of the Speaker, registration by interested members was done expeditiously. The Caucus has a cadre of dedicated members and leaders who help it to function effectively.

Challenges ahead

The Kenyan Parliamentary Caucus on Poverty and MDGs is relatively young and still has some way to go in achieving its stated objectives. However, it has managed in its relatively short life to achieve some recognition, through

advocacy and promoting debate on poverty reduction, and through attaining the MDGs, which is commendable and encouraging, especially in view of the challenges enumerated above. However, looking forward, a number of ways of strengthening the Caucus have arisen from the several meetings held in Nairobi with parliamentary staff, MPs and civil society. These are the following:

Training and exposure of MPs and Staff – The achievements made by the MDG Caucus should be enhanced by strengthening the capacity of its members and staff. Of great significance is the need to expose its members and staff to more active and successful committees or caucuses in other parliaments.

Bridging the information gap – The MDG Caucus in Parliament is an informal institution, and therefore is not entitled to the committee resources that the portfolio or formal committees are in the House. Besides this, the research capacity of Parliament itself is not strong enough to support the information needs of the Caucus. It is therefore necessary for the Caucus to build links with information sites such as the UNDP and civil society institutions, which could provide MPs with useful analytical data to aid their interrogation of the national budget and development policies in achieving the MDGs.

Establishment of a secretariat – The MDG Caucus in Parliament operates in an ad hoc manner. It struggles to keep track of all international and national actions relevant to its MDG and poverty reduction focus. Efforts should be made to put in place a regular secretariat to support the work of the Caucus.

Development of an MDG implementation toolkit – The MDG caucus in Parliament would be more effective if, in conjunction with civil society and government agencies overseeing the realisation of the MDGs, it developed an implementation toolkit. This would assist MPs particularly to regularly gauge the pace of implementing policy and programmes geared towards achieving the MDGs, and to trigger the relevant and effective legislative intervention to facilitate this.

Practical and regular engagement at grassroots level – Parliament, among its other roles, is an

oversight institution. Parliamentary institutions like the MDG Caucus are critical in ensuring that the executive branch of government stays focused on achieving the MDGs. To play this oversight role more effectively, the Caucus should regularly engage directly with the population through grassroots-based networks like farmers' and women's groups, to obtain a realistic perspective on the work required to achieve the MDGs.

THE NIGERIAN NATIONAL ASSEMBLY

A model to consider for debt relief

The MDGs in Nigeria received a boost after its release from the Paris Club debt obligations and the agreement that its portion of N110 billion in repaid debt would in future be converted into funding for MDG projects. As a result of this agreement, the government established a secretariat²⁴ that reports to the President in managing the funds allocated to the MDGs and therefore in supervising all Nigerian activities pertaining to the MDGs. As a result, Parliament (Lower House) decided that it should create a standing committee devoted to the MDGs that would not just oversee achievement of the Goals, but also oversee the funds allocated to the MDGs. Therefore, the Nigerian Lower House established a standing committee side alongside with all the other standing committees (for example, Education, Health, Budget). The committee on the MDGs enjoys the same institutional rights and powers that any standing committee on the House enjoys.

Nigeria's development status

Nigeria's development status has been a product of several development plans since

²⁴ An office was created within the executive (SSAP-MDGs) that, apart from serving as Secretariat to the Presidential Committee constituted to supervise the MDGs, is also responsible for the Virtual Poverty Fund (VPF) that houses the debt relief gains for MDG-related expenditure.

independence in 1960. All the plans were meant to achieve the national objectives of an increase in real income, the equal distribution of income, a reduction in unemployment, an increase in the supply of a skilled work force, the promotion of indigenous business ownership and the utilisation of local resources for development. However, since the year 2000, the development paradigm has been a mix of several economic programs such as Vision 2010, the National Economic Emergency Development Strategy (NEEDS), Vision 2020 and, currently, the Seven-Point Agenda.

The Seven-Point agenda was launched by President Umaru Yar'adua at the onset of the current administration, in 2007, and is designed to build on the strength of previous reforms such as NEEDS. The Agenda is a comprehensive socio-economic reform program with the MDGs as the central theme. It has the goal of double-digit growth rates and other aims, including turning Nigeria into one of the 20 largest economies in the world by the year 2020. It is also a comprehensive national framework for the sustainable growth of the real economy. The Seven-Point Agenda has seven components, namely, physical infrastructure, Niger Delta, food security, human capital development, wealth creation, internal security, and land reform.

The MDGs in the state structure

Besides the merit of the Nigerian Parliament following the executive in their restructuring relating to the MDGs, It is also noteworthy that the Nigerian executive has conceded space and a role to Parliament in the overall framework of the MDGs. At the federal level, it is clear that the the MDG process is co-ordinated by the SSAP-MDGs on the executive side and is controlled by the MDG committee on the legislature side.

The openness of the executive on the special role of the legislature is visible, for example, in the composition of the presidential committee on the Assessment and Monitoring of the Millennium Development Goals, which includes the chairperson of the MDG committee in the National Assembly. The chair of the parliamentary committee sits side by side several members of the executive, being the

president, the vice-president, the secretary to the government, the head of the civil service of the federation, the ministers of the 13 ministries (MDGs), three agencies, six state governors, two private-sector agencies, four civil society organisations, nine international partners, a special adviser to the president on projects and programs, and a senior special assistant to the president on the MDGs.

The MDG committee of the National Assembly engages at the level of both the chambers of the legislature and liaises with the office of the SSAP-MDGs in various forums and for different programs.

The MDG office in the presidency

The office of the SSA-MDGs – which is also the Secretariat of the Presidential Steering committee – has been vibrant, given its forthrightness and dutifulness, very necessary qualities in effectively coordinating a large body such as the Presidential Committee. This has no doubt been helpful in its much-needed collaboration with and monitoring by stakeholders.

The federal government is in the process of adjusting the recently passed budget through reducing all capital and recurring expenses in the budget across the board by 40% and 10% respectively. The report further says, “... only projects with direct relevance or benefit to the people will be embarked on, barring political considerations and manoeuvrings.” (*The Nation Newspaper*, May 30, 2010)

The aforementioned attest to the readiness of the government to pursue, headlong, the MDG project, provided other complementary processes are fully integrated.

Special Fund

The special fund created by Nigeria for the MDGs as a result of its successfully negotiating debt relief, which resulted in savings of \$1 billion (N110b) annually, has served to advance the MDG agenda in no small measure. However, beyond the mere allocation of special funds, the challenges are the specific uses to

which the funds are put, including the techniques of implementation.

Parliament's involvement with the MDGs

The Nigerian parliament is bicameral, being composed of the House of Representatives and the Senate. Regarding the MDGs, the House of Representatives established a standing committee, and the Senate created an ad hoc Committee on the MDGs. As discussed in the committees' rules in the beginning of this report, the creation of a committee will depend on the rules existent in the House. In the Nigerian case, there was the necessary political will to establish a standing committee within the House of Representatives; this was facilitated by the existence of a separate executive structure dedicated only to the MDGs and to the existence of a particular budget allocated only to the MDGs. The leadership of the MDGs' parliamentary committee has succeeded in consolidating the role of the legislature on the MDGs. The committee benefits from the resources that any other parliamentary committee in the House would, and more important, it enjoys institutional legitimacy, not only within the House but also when facing the different executive actors (federal, provincial or local).

The committees in the Nigerian legislative system are quite strong and influential, and will certainly have an impact in the MDG agenda, which could bring development to all the targeted areas.

On the other hand, from the Senate's perspective, since the Committee on the MDGs carries ad-hoc status and is not a standing committee, it is regarded as having much less legitimacy and, more importantly, it has fewer internal resources to allow the execution of its role. The lack of powers of a standing committee makes this ad hoc committee powerless.

It is important to note that besides the committees on the MDGs, the House also established a Committee on Donor Funds. This committee is a recent creation and still needs to

assert its relevance and role within the MDG program, in line with its mandate.

From the interviews, there was a sense of concern that the lack of current data to guide and track the MDG agenda is a cause for concern, considering this is a country with various problems that require the attention of government.

Challenges to the MDGs – Generally, all the MPs interviewed were of the view that much has to be done between now and 2015 to achieve the MDGs. Efforts recommended cut across many areas, such as funding by government and multi-lateral international agencies; voting of bulk money into specific projects, rather than ‘hand-outs’; closing the gap between research units and legislators; better monitoring and management of ‘quick wins’; and constituency projects, including the evolution of management styles to deal with issues related to culture, tradition and religion.

The house committee on MDGs faces the challenges of institutionalisation of any new structure in the House. Still, in its short existence, it has set a good example of what could be the role of a committee such as this in the Nigeria context. One of the main achievements of the Committee relates to expenditure by the government. In 2007, about N38.8b was returned to the coffers of government, which the MDG Committee traced to the inefficiencies of the government, resulting in ministries, departments and agencies (MDAs) being unable to access funds. For this, the Committee lambasted the government and criticised its lack of seriousness towards the MDG agenda. Consequently, the Committee has moved to strengthen its oversight responsibilities.

To date, the government of at least one state – Lagos State – has been sanctioned by the committee for its lack of visible MDG projects on the ground.

Resulting from the committee’s advocacy, the oversight reports are now on the government’s website, including a monitoring tool and a form to show expenditure and activity profiles, as well as an input-output-outcome analysis.

The reports arising from the above have strengthened the conditional grant to states (CGS), which between 2007 and 2009 signalled to the states that the Committee was watching and well aware of its responsibilities.

The Committee has established a capacity-building resource by creating an MDG resource centre in the National Assembly, through collaboration with the Planned Parenthood Federation of Nigeria (PPFN) and the International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF). The centre has Internet facilities and a small library for students and academics to undertake research on the MDGs and to also access other countries’ MDG efforts.

The Committee is engaged in mobilisation work at the level of the state Houses of Assembly to establish MDG committees, in order to monitor and measure human development. So far, only one state – Abia State – has achieved the established targets.

The Committee is also at the forefront of mobilisation – initiated at the Italy meeting for parliamentary mobilisation – at the regional level in Africa. Nigeria is host for the African network, being the only parliament with an MDG committee. Through the efforts of the Committee, Nigeria is in the process of producing books on the MDGs, to strengthen the information drive on the subject.

Finally, it is important to note that in the spirit of including all the parliamentary committees working on the MDGs, the Committee on MDGs has a membership of 32, made up of the chairpersons of other committees. This decision to incorporate all the chairs of the committees was possible because the rules state that an MP can belong to more than one standing committee, which is not the case in many other parliaments. In Nigeria, since the rules do allow this practice, the other committees see this as a methodology that guarantees that the MDGs remain the concern of all; it also guarantees that the committees do not overlap in their functions of legislation and oversight relating to MDGs.

An important achievement of the Committee is that in 2010 the national report on the MDGs will be sent to Parliament for the first time for

debate before being forwarded to the United Nations.

In spite its achievements, much more needs to be done; in this regard, the Committee has made provision in the budget to strengthen and expand the scope of its work in 2010 and beyond.

INDONESIA

Building Democracy, Peace and Development

Indonesia has made substantial progress towards the full restoration of democracy, transparency and the rule of law. The first direct parliamentary and presidential elections took place in 2004. Both were peaceful and transparent and represented a significant step towards the consolidation of democracy.

Indonesia is a lower-middle income country with a population of about 240 million. The country's economic growth and employment levels have largely recovered from the 1998 economic crisis. In 2009, economic growth reached 4.5%, with a per capita income of USD 2,590.10 compared to USD 2,269.90 in 2008.

Indonesia's national development strategies can be found in its National, Medium-term, and Long-Term Development Plan, which focus on fulfilling the agenda of creating a safe and peaceful nation. This agenda aims at ensuring the people's welfare, as one of the main objectives of the country's development targets. A welfare state is a peaceful and prosperous state, not only in its physical or material dimension, but also in its spiritual dimension.

Parliament's engagement with the MDGs

The MDGs are used as the basis for the formulation of poverty eradication strategies both at national and local levels. President Yudhoyono put forward an initiative in 2010, issuing Presidential Instruction No. 1/2010, accelerating the Implementation of National

Development Priorities, and Presidential Instruction No. 3/2010, the Fair Development Program, which instruct all governors and mayors throughout Indonesia relating to the MDGs. The coordination of MDGs within the executive is entrusted to Vice-President Budiono.

Pointed to by some of those interviewed as a concrete example of how the executive can work side by side Parliament, the Health Law²⁵ was emended in 2009 by cooperation between the Ministry of Health and the House. The previous law allocated five percent of GDP to health, while the new one allocated 10 percent of the budget of local government at provincial and district levels to health.

Regarding education, it was decided that at least 20 percent of the state budget should be allocated education.

Currently, Parliament is working on a bill on poverty that aims to accelerate poverty eradication. The bill, initiated by a commission, has been passed by Commission VIII and has been sent to the Legislation Council for harmonisation and synchronisation. Commission VIII is also preparing the research paper and bill on gender mainstreaming. While Commission IX is preparing the Social Protection Service Agent bill, the plenary has accepted it as having been initiated by the DPR²⁶. The bill was implemented as the National Social Protection Law, which was passed by the DPR in the previous mandate. As expected, the budgetary function lies with the DPR members as the representatives of the people. In this regard, for instance, the budget for the education sector is discussed first by the Ministry of National Education and then by the Parliamentary Commission on Education. Together, they decide on the budget for the

²⁵ Law No. 23/1992 on health was emended to Law No. 36/2009.

²⁶ Since the political reform process in Indonesia that was started in 1999, the Indonesian constitutional system has undergone some structural changes through a series of amendments to the 1945 Constitution, with the last one being in 2004. Previously, the Indonesian Parliament comprised only the People's Consultative Assembly (MPR) and the House of Representatives (DPR). It now consists of three institutions, namely, the People's Consultative Assembly (MPR), the House of Representatives (DPR) and the House of Regional Representatives (DPD).

education sector, which amounts to no more than 20% of the total National State Budget, as mandated by law. The outcome of this discussion is brought by members of the Education Commission, who also serve on the Budget Committee, to a joint meeting with the Minister of Finance.

This process also applies to other development programs, such as those in the health sector. The Health Law stipulates a minimum allocation of 5% of GDP at the national level and 7% of GDP at the local level for the health sector. But in reality, these allocation percentages cannot be implemented yet. In the budget proposed by the government and approved by the DPR, only around 3% of the agreed total budget for this has been allocated to health. The parliamentary Commission on Health is trying hard to ensure that the state budget has a better gender balance, aimed at achieving gender equality and reducing the maternal mortality rate.

Establishment of the MDG Task Force within the Inter-Parliamentary Cooperation Committee
The Inter-Parliamentary Cooperation Committee (BKSAP) has established an MDG Task Force. This Task Force aims to promote awareness concerning the MDGs and to pressurize peers and the executive to achieve the MDGs. It is housed within the committee responsible for international cooperation, which reveals that it is important for the Task Force to represent Parliament's perspective in the international forums where the MDGs are discussed, but where often parliaments are excluded.

Institutionally, the Task Force on the MDGs is not equipped to perform conventional parliamentary activities relating to the MDGs (for example, budget and oversight). Therefore, the Task Force aims to collaborate with colleagues from the portfolio committees who execute these functions.

Due to the recent constitution and the nature of the MDG Task Force²⁷, there is still a need to

²⁷ The working group or task force is tasked with a specific mission for a specific time period that is set by the DPR organ that formed the working group or task force. The decisions on whether to and how to follow up the findings or results produced by the working group or task force will be determined by the formative DPR organ. The working period of the working group or task force is set by the formative DPR organ, so the working

provide information on the Task Force and to disseminate it within the House. This can be seen from the fact that commissions relevant to the achievement of the MDGs are not aware of the existence of the Task Force, neither do they understand the activities carried out by the Task Force. However, this is understandable, since the scope of work of the Task Force, as regulated by the DPR's standing orders, is limited to issues under the jurisdiction of the organ in its formative stage. Since it was formed by the Inter-Parliamentary Cooperation Committee, its scope will probably be limited to achieving Goal No. 8, developing a global partnership for development.

Challenges and the way forward

Since the Millennium Declaration, the DPR's engagement with the MDGs has been minimal. There is no plenary debate directly related to the MDGs. Country reports have not been tabled in the plenary or referred to in the relevant parliamentary committees, and members have not proactively used the MDGs as a tool for overseeing the work of government departments.

Due to this, for the Task Force to be more effective, it would be wise for it to expand its membership with a team formed by the DPR leadership. According to the DPR's standing orders, the leadership can form a team whose membership should reflect the distribution of seats among the factions²⁸. The team should be announced in the plenary session and be led by the Speaker or Deputy Speaker. If a working group or task force reports only to the formative organ, the team established by the DPR leadership should report to the plenary. The membership of this team is not limited to one commission or organ but can consist of multiple commissions or organs.

Due to institutional limitations, the MDG Task Force will have difficulty playing a direct role in achieving the MDGs (for example, oversight and budget). But it could definitely work as a

group or task force can be dissolved by the respective organ after their working period expires or when their task has been completed.

²⁸ Political parties.

pressure group and a tool for mobilisation and awareness on the MDGs among peers. There is a lack of awareness and understanding about the MDGs, mainly because the recent elections resulted in a very high turnover of MPs.

One of the MPs interviewed stated that probably only 20% of members understand the MDGs, but other MPs were more optimistic, and said that half of the members understand the MDGs. Notwithstanding the differing levels of optimism, both agreed that it is crucial to raise awareness among MPs.

As with the other parliaments studied in this report, the details of the MDGs are not specifically discussed in every commission. However, efforts to eradicate poverty and improve the quality of education and health conditions are being discussed.

It is important to point out that the Women's Caucus is also initiating an awareness program on the MDGs, mainly focusing on MDGs 4 and 5.

An additional challenge is the domination of members of parliament by their political parties. The political parties have an authoritative say on what issues MPs will be dealing with; therefore, it would be difficult for members to support the implementation of the MDGs if this is not in line with the policy of their political party. For this reason, besides the need to win over the will and commitment of individual MPs, it is equally important to win over the will of the leadership of the political parties.

INDIA

From Human Rights to Legal Rights

The focus on human development and efforts to ensure the necessities for all is not new and has its origins in the provisions of the Indian Constitution. In many respects, such as with education, employment and food security, what was earlier expressed as a vision to ensure basic human rights in the last decade has been increasingly transformed into legal rights that can be justiciable in the courts. While these

have implications for the country's development, being India the democracy²⁹, there are also strong political incentives for politicians to champion their causes, because not only are the poor many in number, but they also exercise their franchise in significantly.

The country has integrated the goals of the Millennium Development Programme incorporated its established planning process, which comprises a series of five-year plans. The 11th five-year plan, which is currently underway, has sector plans with specific targets for poverty, education, health, water and sanitation, gender equality and environmental stability.

The 2009 MDG Country Report presents India's progress in achieving 12 of the 18 MDG targets considered relevant to it. In six of the indicators, India seems to be on track or nearly on track, but it is reported to be considerably off track on the indicator for halving the number of people who suffer from hunger.

An analysis of poverty in the country and two health indicators suggest that it may not meet the respective MDG targets. The MDG target for universal primary education seems achievable, with high current enrolment rates, provided dropouts are brought under control. The Eleventh Plan targets have been set higher than the current achievement levels, and meeting them would ensure that the country achieves the MDGs.

From human rights to legal rights – the most important role of Parliament on the MDGs

In recent times, there has been a significant shift in efforts to transform what were initially

²⁹ The role of the predominantly free and aggressive media in India's parliamentary system cannot be underestimated. With about 5 English, 18 Hindi, numerous regional languages, and 24-hour television with news channels, activities in Parliament are always on the radar. Press articles and coverage serve as the primary source for issues that members raise in Parliament – Parliament's Secretariat has a press clippings section, which organises print media reports on issues.

considered basic human rights to legally justiciable rights. By way of example, the country's efforts towards the universalisation of education, a vision of the Constitution, evolved into a National Policy on Education in 1986. By 1999, this had developed into a programme for the universalisation of education, the Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (Programme to Educate All). And in 2009, the two Houses of Parliament passed the Right to Free and Compulsory Education bill, which provides the said right to all children between 6 and 14 years of age. This illustrates the development path that the country has followed from the expression of a vision in 1950 to advancing its capability to enforce this as legal rights. A law has also been passed to guarantee a minimum level of employment (National Rural Employment Guarantee Act – NREGA), and currently, there are national-level considerations for the introduction of 'a Right to Food' legislation.

While these measures have huge implications for development, they are also strong political incentives for parties and individual politicians to champion their cause. The poor, in India, are not only many, but they also exercise their franchise significantly during elections. Providing basic facilities for all is thus the focus of the political campaigns of all political parties.

National development targets are more ambitious and achieved than the MDGs, and are 'ours'

Interactions with members of Parliament, officials of the Parliamentary Secretariat, and government give the impression that the social sector targets of the five-year plans are, in general, perceived to be more aggressive than the MDG targets³⁰. With no exception, all respondents believe that in India there is a real 'domestication' of the development goals. The national targets are the result of an inclusive national process and not of the imposition of an international agenda.

³⁰ Reference to this is also made in the Mid-Term appraisal report of the 10th five-year plan, which states "the Tenth Plan specifies monitorable targets for certain indicators of social development in health, education and gender equality. These targets are not identical to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) but it is believed that if these targets are met, then the other MDGs are also likely to be achieved."

Generally, therefore, there is a perception that tracking the planning commission indicators is sufficient to assess whether the country is meeting the MDGs. This stems from a couple of beliefs. Firstly, the plans' targets are set taking into consideration the need to meet the MDGs, and secondly, the plans' targets are considered more aggressive than the MDG targets. Possibly, due to this thinking, many interviewees felt that tabling an MDG appraisal report in Parliament may not be necessary, but it is desirable to increase awareness of the MDGs among members.

The interrelationship between the Millennium Development Programme and the government's policies was well summarised by a senior member of Parliament from the ruling party as, "We consider the MDGs to be our goals, our commitments, our programmes; they have not been forced on us externally." This is a reflection that achievement of the MDGs is the country's commitment to its own people, rather than it being driven by external commitments. This position can be better understood when one considers that aid dependence for India has dropped considerably and now stands at about 3.1% of the country's budget³¹.

Executive-legislative relations and the MDGs

India's policies are led by a well-established planning process comprising a long-term plan, a five-year plan and annual plans. These are documented in a series of plan documents called the 'Five-Year Plans'. Currently, India is within the ambit of its 11th five-year plan. The institution responsible for the preparation of the five-year plans is the Planning Commission, which works under the leadership of the Prime Minister and the purview of the National Development Council (NDC), comprising Planning Commission members and chief ministers from all the States of India.

The five-year plans are constructed based on recommendations made by a large number of working groups that deal with the major sectors of economic activity. These working groups have

³¹ Union Budget 2010-11: Estimates of External Loans over Total Receipts.

significant representation from sector experts and civil society organisations. The plans are developed and discussed by the NDC in two stages: the first is the 'Approach Paper', where general principles are laid out, and the second is the 'Sectoral Papers', which outlines strategies, objectives and targets.

Once the five-year plan is approved by the NDC, it is tabled in both the Houses of Parliament. For each of the plans, the targets and fund allocations are broken down into five annual plans. It is notable that when the budget for every year is approved by Parliament, it approves both the planned expenditure, derived from the annual plans, along with the non-planned expenditure.

The major national plan targets are broken down into state targets. This enables state-level monitoring of achievement of the plan's objectives. The government seeks to attain social-sector goals with the support of a large number of central and state-initiated schemes. Some of the significant central government programmes are the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Programme, Sarva Siksha Abhiyan (Education for All), the Total Literacy Campaign of the National Literacy Mission, the 73rd and 74th Constitution Amendments reserving seats for women in local bodies, the National Policy for the empowerment of Women, the National Rural Health Mission, the Total Sanitation Campaign and the Bharat Nirman (Rural development) programme.

Parliament and the MDGs

In the Indian Parliament, there is no specific institutional structure such as a committee that monitors achievement of the MDGs. However, those we interviewed gave the impression that progress towards the MDG targets was being regularly monitored by the relevant standing committees on human resource development, urban and rural development, water resources, social justice and empowerment.

In 2005, a new parliamentary structure called the Parliamentary Forum was created to enable Parliament to persistently engage with some essential subjects. There is, at present, a parliamentary forum each on (a) Water,

Conservation and Management (b) the Youth (c) Children (d) Population and Public Health, and (e) Global Warming and Climate Change. These forums have enabled cross-sectoral issues on the subjects, which normally come under the purview of different ministries, to be discussed on a single platform. They are also believed to be sensitising the members of Parliament about the key areas of concern with regard to water management, children, public health and the environment, sectors that hold a significant bearing on the country's ability to meet the MDGs. While the potential benefits from these forums can be immense, it is felt that substantiating them would require active participation from members of Parliament.

In October 2008, a group of parliamentarians supported by resources from the civil society organisation Centre for Legislative Resource and Advocacy (CLRA) brought together the Parliamentarian's Group on the Millennium Development Goals (PG-MDGs). The group, which started with 20 members of Parliament, issued a joint statement on achieving the MDGs that acknowledges the challenges faced by the country but calls on "fellow parliamentarians, legislators and the people of India to stand unified in their resolve to put the country on track to meet and exceed the Millennium Development Goals."

One of the early initiatives taken by the PG-MDG was to publish a 'Handbook for Parliamentarians on the MDGs: Political Support and Action', which outlines what parliamentarians can do about the MDGs. This was circulated to members of both Houses of Parliament. Later, in July 2009, when the 15th Lok Sabha was constituted, the PG-MDG organised a Welcome Kit Fair for Parliamentarians. The Welcome Kit, which was presented to newly elected members, had been put together in the form of a series of policy booklets and policy briefs on the MDGs, maternal health, the right to education, assisted reproductive technologies, climate change, tobacco control, etc.

The PG-MDG seeks to perform specific functions in each session of Parliament by way of raising questions, using parliamentary instruments to initiate debates and organising regular

interactions with civil society organisations on issues of topical importance.

Currently, the PG-MDG comprises about 60 members from both Houses of Parliament. It has constituted two internal focus groups: one on education and health, and the other on climate change. It is important to note that in the context of the Indian Parliament, Question Hour is the programme most actively participated in and widely viewed by citizens on the Lok Sabha TV Channel. Last year, after the constitution of the 15th Lok Sabha, there were four questions directly referring to the 'MDG' on the Lok Sabha programme.

On the role of the executive, the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation published MDG statistical appraisal reports in 2005, 2007 and 2009, based on the 2003 United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) guidelines. The report represents progress on 12 of the 18 targets (excluding 6 of the targets of Goal 8) of the framework that are relevant to India.

The 2009 MDG report acknowledged some difficulties in comparing global targets with the country's indicators, as "the national images mirrored in global and regional frame of outcome indicators are fraught with factors of comparability adjustments made on country data sets Thus, this report attempts to statistically track the movement of outcomes on the basis of the pattern of change." The findings, referred to as the Mid-Term appraisal, show that in six of the indicators, the country is on-track or nearly on track. But in the indicator on halving the proportion of people who suffer from hunger, the country seems to be off track. The MDG reports are not tabled in Parliament, but we learned from the interviews that they are sent

to and possibly discussed in standing committee meetings.

The challenges ahead

While the extensiveness of policy discussions and the passing of empowering legislation has been the strength of Parliament, its weakness lies in it not being able to ensure these are converted into development outcomes. Over the decades, there have been steps taken to improve implementation, such as the evolution of a monitoring framework to focus on outcomes and measures to decentralise administration and institutionalise community involvement in monitoring. However, even after these developments, it is believed that the country has substantial distance to cover before it can be said to be effectively translating its plans into reality.

MDG-related questions posed during the Lok Sabha programme.

15th Jul 2009: (a) "whether as per the Report 'The Countdown to 2015: Maternal, Newborn and Child Survival', India has to strive hard to achieve Millennium Development Goals".

18th Dec 2009: (a) "the targets set and achievements made so far in terms of maternal health under the Millennium Development Goals (MDG)". (Starred Question)

3rd Mar 2010: (a) "whether the Government would be able to achieve many of the goals and targets set out in the UN Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) by 2015".

10th Mar 2010: (a) "the steps taken for improving India's ranking on the Millennium Development Goal Index".

India has a vibrant political party system with a multiplicity of national as well as regional political parties. At last count, there were about 1,000 registered state and national political parties³². The current Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha together have representation from 44 different political parties. The large number of political parties is reflective of the diversity of political views and social identities in the country. The spread of representation across the parties in Parliament shows that many parties have a strong support base

among certain sections of the population. Parliament brings together the diversity of the country, but to achieve national development goals, the country needs to ensure that the national agenda is shared and has the commitment of the major sectors of society, and that parliament can promote them.

³² Election Commission of India, Notification in March 2009

Conclusion and Recommendations

With regard to the establishment of specialised committees on the MDGs, this study reveals that parliaments have chosen to operate in different modalities regarding the Millennium Development Goals. However, all seven parliaments examined in the study operate through portfolio committees on the MDGs.

The report does not intend to provide recommendations, although the authors believe that from the seven cases it is possible to make

observations. The first observation is that it is up to each parliament to reflect on its committee system and rules, and based in its circumstances (political situation, development level, party system, parliamentary resources), to reflect on whether or not there is a need for a group or specialised committee on the MDGs. However, there are some observations that may help in the suggested reflection:

- A parliamentary group on MDGs can help to increase awareness of the MDGs among MPs;
- Electoral circles bring new ideas and a fresh will to parliaments, while the elections provide MPs with renewed energy. At the same time, these create a need for continuity with regard to efforts at creating an awareness of the MDGs;
- In all countries, even those where there is an MDG structure, the portfolio committees (for example, health, education, budget) play a crucial role. Any program to strengthen the role of parliaments with regard to the MDGs needs to include these committees;
- In the countries in the study that do have MDG structures, these work as an entrance point for civil society organisations and multilateral agencies that want to work with the parliament on the MDGs;
- If a parliament does create a mechanism on MDGs, there is a need to explain to members the objectives of this mechanism, and to ensure that MPs

understand how these may be used by them and their constituencies;

- MPs from opposition parties believe that having a structure on the MDGs facilitates access to information from the executive, which is often difficult for them to access;
- Some MPs also indicated that there is a risk that the creation of a committee devoted to the MDGs would result in a kind of MDG ghetto, instead an issue that should be addressed by the entire house. This was not visible in any of the countries visited, but all structures are relatively new, so this effect may not yet have manifested;
- Parliamentary structures do need sufficient resources to be able to perform their role. Some of the parliaments included in this study have in recent years been through democratic reforms that now see them as the houses of more than one political party, and with ambitious agendas such as expected of the guardians of national policy and actions of executives, demand more capacity, more technical assistance, larger premises, and generally greater resources. If a parliament wishes to establish one or more additional committees, it is crucial that an assessment be made of what resources will be available to allocate to this new structure. It will be equally important to assess the existing resources that are available to committees such as those for education or health.

Besides the discussion on whether parliament should have a particular mechanism for the MDGs, it is important to point out that in all the parliaments studied, the MDGs were 'nationalised' in national targets and were integrated into the national documents on development presented to the parliaments. A less positive finding is that the country MDG reports have not been tabled in these parliaments, and there have been no discussions in these parliaments on the targets to which the countries have committed themselves. The mutual international accountability of the MDGs is definitely a plus point, but only if the executive respects the need for a prior national

exercise in mutual accountability, before reaching the international arena. There is only one institution where this is possible – parliament. Tabling an MDG report or national commitments to the MDGs could be an opportunity to enhance the inclusiveness of the process, and therefore, not doing so could be a missed opportunity. ■

About the Contributors

Abel Ochigbo (Ph.D) is a management scientist and has worked within the private and public sectors in Nigeria. Ochigbo has received a broad training in and outside of Nigeria, on legislative and management/ leadership development topics. He is an alumnus of the International Visitors Leadership Program 2009. His research interests include proactive, result-oriented and effective management/leadership and legislative research. Currently, he is an assistant director with the National Assembly in Nigeria.

Ajit Phadnis has been one of five fellows selected from all over India to pursue the Lok Sabha Internship Programme in 2009-10. His research paper 'Democratic Quotient of the Indian Parliament', an attempt at a self-appraisal of the Indian Parliament, gathered views of Parliament's functioning from 100 members of Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha. The study was modelled on an IPU toolkit on 'Evaluating parliaments'. Ajit has previously been a consultant with the Government Reforms and Institutional Development (GRID) division of PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC). He has delivered lectures on the Indian Parliament at the Rotary Club, Bangalore and at IIM Bangalore.

Fred Matiangi (Ph.D) currently serves as the Chief of Party (COP) for the Kenya Parliamentary Strengthening Program. He has more than 12 years experience in democratic development, the last six years of which have been with the Kenya Parliamentary Strengthening Project funded by USAID and DFID, and implemented by the State University of New York's Centre for International Development (SUNY). He has extensive experience in governance-related research, civil society advocacy work, and the direction of donor-funded democracy and governance projects. Before joining SUNY, Dr Matiangi held prominent positions in civil society and briefly in the public sector in Kenya. He worked before as Head of Research and Deputy Director of the Institute for Education in Democracy (IED).

Elisabete Azevedo (Ph.D) is the Programme Officer for Development for the Inter-Parliamentary Union and Assistant Professor in

Democratisation Studies at the Portuguese Catholic University. Her recent publications include "Do political legacies affect people's trust in political institutions?", Working paper CSSR, Dec. 2005; *Semi-Presidentialism in Guinea Bissau: The Lesser of Two Evils*, 2007; and *Parliaments in Africa: Context and Constitutional Design*. She also contributed to the Special Issue of *The Journal of Legislative Studies*, published in 2006. Her forthcoming publications include "Parliaments in the land of Big Man", *The Journal of Legislative Studies*, March 2011, and "De Inimigos a Adversários Públicos? O Parlamento e os parlamentares em Moçambique", *Texto Editora*, Moçambique, 2011.

José Jaime Macuane (Ph.D) is an Assistant Professor of Political Science and Public Administration at the University Eduardo Mondlane (Mozambique) and a consultant in governance and public management. His areas of interest include democratisation, legislative studies, public sector reform and institutional development, political institutions, and decentralisation and public management, in which he has a considerable record of publications and assignments.

Lia Nijzink is a senior researcher with the Department of Public Law, University of Cape Town. She co-edited *Electoral Politics in South Africa: Assessing the First Democratic Decade* (Palgrave 2005) and is co-author of *Building Representative Democracy* (2002), a review of the South African national and provincial legislatures. Nijzink has conducted training sessions for members of the South African National Assembly and National Council of Provinces; has consulted with the Gauteng Provincial Legislature to codify procedures and revise rules; and was the course convener of a series of courses aimed at skills development for the committee and research staff of the National Assembly of Nigeria.

Maria Vicari graduated from the University of Roma Tre with a degree in Modern Languages and International Communication. She also has an MA in North American Studies at the University of Turin and has enrolled in the Journalism School Program of the Lelio Basso Foundation of Rome, from which she will graduate in September 2010. At the School of

Journalism she has mostly focused on the field of institutional communication.

Ujianto Singgih Prayitno (Ph.D) is a researcher in social studies at the Urban Sociology Centre for Research, Data Analysis and Information Services Secretariat General of the House of Representatives of The Republic of Indonesia. His professional interests are in research on social studies and urban sociology, economic sociology, social capital, family issues, poverty elevation, capacity building and people empowerment, civil society, and human resources development. ■

India

List of Interviewees

Committee Chairpersons

Mr Oscar Fernandes
Honourable Member of Parliament and
Chairperson, Committee on Human
Resources and Development

Other MPs

Ms Supriya Sule
Honourable Member of Parliament and
Chairperson, Parliamentarians Group on
MDGs

Research Unit

Dr Vinay Bhatnagar – Director, LARRDIS,
Lok Sabha Secretariat
Ms Kalpana Sharma – Director,
LARRDIS, Lok Sabha Secretariat
Ms. Samita Bhowmick – Joint Director,
Lok Sabha Secretariat

Government representatives

Mr Piyush Srivastava
Director, Ministry of Finance
Mr Vikram Sahay
Director, Department of School
Education
Mr. S Chakrabart
Deputy Director General, Ministry of
Statistics and Programme
Implementation

Civil society representatives

Mr. Deepak Xavier
OXFAM India
Mr. C.V.Madhukar
PRS Legislative Research
Mr. Vinod Bhanu
Centre for Legislative Research and
Advocacy (CLRA)

List of Relevant Documents

Country Reports

Government of India, Planning
Commission, “Eleventh Five Year Plan
Volume II”

Mid-Term Appraisals of the 10th and
11th Five Year Plans

Ministry of Statistics and Programme
Implementation, “Millennium
Development Goals: India Country
Report 2005, 2007 and 2009”

World Bank, Jun 2004, “Attaining the
Millennium Development Goals in India:
Role of Public Policy and Service
Delivery”

Ministry of Finance, “Economic Survey
of India 2009-10”

Other Reports

Wada Na Todo Abhiyan, Aug 2010, “A
Response to the India Country Report
on Millennium Development Goals”

Wada Na Todo Abhiyan, Dec 2007,
“Measuring India’s progress on the
Millennium

Development Goals: A Citizen’s Report”
Parliamentarian’s Group on the MDGs,
“Joint Statement on Achieving the
MDGs in India”

Centre for Legislative Research and
Advocacy, 2008, “Handbook for
Parliamentarians on the MDGs: Political
support and Action”

Deolalikar A, “Attaining the Millennium
Development Goals in India:
How Likely and What Will It Take?”

Indonesia

List of Interviewees

Deputy Speaker of the DPR

H.E. Ir. Taufik Kurniawan, MM
National Mandate Party Faction

Members of Parliament

MDGs Task Force
Hon. Dr. Nurhayati Ali Assegaf, M.Si.
Democratic Faction

Commission VIII

Hon. Anita Jacoba Gah, SE
Democratic Party Faction
Hon. Hj. Adji Farida Padmo Ardan
Democratic Party Faction
Hon. Hj. Tetty Kadi Bawono

Golkar Party Faction

Commission IX

Hon. Dr. Sumarjati Arjoso, SKM
Gerindra Faction
Hon. Hj. Ledia Hanifa Amaliah, S.Si.,
M.Psi.T
Prosperous Justice Party Faction

Commission X

Hon. Ir. Heri Akhmadi
Indonesian Democratic Party of Struggle
Faction
Government Officials
Mr. Komet Mangiri
Coordinating Ministry for Social Welfare
Ms. Amelia Toraja
Coordinating Ministry for Social Welfare
Dr. Budihardja, DTM&H, MPH
Ministry of Health
Drs. Herman Siregar, MA
Ministry of Women Empowerment and
Child Protection
Mr. Darno
Ministry of Women Empowerment and
Child Protection

Expert/Staff Member

Commission IX

Ms. Roosyana Hasbulah
Mr. Abdul Wahab Samad
Mr. Fatih Waluyo Wahid
Ms. Fitriana Yuliawati

Inter-Parliamentary Cooperation Committee

Mr. Fahlesa Munabari
Mr. Heriono Adi Anggoro
Ms. Leni Mailaini

Centre for Research and Information Services

Ms. Anih Sri Suryani
Ms. Dina Martiany
Ms. Dinar Wahyuni
Ms. Hana Nika Rustia
Ms. Hartini Retnaningsih
Ms. Herlina Astri
Mr. Lukman Adam
Mr. Lukman Nul Hakim
Mr. Mohamad Teja
Ms. Rahmi Yuningsih
Ms. Sri Nurhayati Q.
Ms. Sulis Winurini
Mr. Teddy Prasetiawan
Ms. Tri Rini Puji Lestari

Italy

List of Interviewees

Chamber of Deputies – MP's

Hon. Enrico Pianetta (PDL)
Chairperson of the Sub-Committee on
MDGs
Hon. Mario Barbi (PD)
Member of Sub-Committee for MDGs
and of Foreign Affairs Committee
Hon. Margherita Boniver (PDL)
Member of Sub-Committee for MDGs
and of the Standing Committee for
Foreign Affairs, Special Envoy for the
Minister for Foreign Affairs for
humanitarian emergencies and
vulnerable contexts; Chairperson of the
Parliamentary Committee on control
over the implementation of Schengen
agreement.
Hon. Fabio Evangelisti (IDV)
Member of Sub-Committee for MDGs
and of the Standing Committee for
Foreign Affairs
Hon. Federica Mogherini Rebesani (PD)
Spokesperson for the inter-
parliamentary group for Development
Aid and Against Hunger, member of the
Committee of Defence
Hon. Francesco Tempestini (PD)
Member of Sub-Committee for MDGs
and of the Standing Committee for
Foreign Affairs, leader of the
Democratic Party at Foreign Affairs
Committee
Hon. Gianni Verneti (AI-mixed group)
Member of Sub-Committee for MDGs
and of the Standing Committee for
Foreign Affairs

Chamber of Deputies – Foreign Affairs Committee staff

Piazza Francesca
Counsellor
Giacomo Birindelli
Clerk

Chamber of Deputies – Research Department on Foreign Affairs staff

Cinoglossi Filippo
Counsellor
Monguzzi Lorena

Clerk

UN Millennium Campaign

Marta Guglielmetti
Italian coordinator

Italian Civil society

Farida Bena
Ucodep-Oxfam and member of the
Italian Global Coalition Against Poverty
(GCAP)
Laura Ciacci
GCAP spokesperson
Alberta Guerra
FOCSIV and member of the GCAP
Natalia Lupi
AIDOS and member of the GCAP
Egizia Petroccione
CINI spokesperson and member of the
GCAP
Livia Zoli
ACTION AID and member of the GCAP

Italy, On the Activity of Banks and Multilateral
Development Funds and On the Italian Financial
--Participation to Cited Organisms Resources for
the year 2008, Department of Finance report

Italy, Bill C.3400 Pianetta Tempestini, Chamber
of Deputies, Apr. 2010

Italy, Bill C.3448 Evangelisti Leoluca Orlando,
Chamber of Deputies, Apr. 2010

Italy, Administration of Foreign Affairs
Management of Development Cooperation
Funds A.C. 3400 and 3448, Chamber of Deputies
documentation for bill examination, May 2010

Other Documents

Motion 1/00253, first subscriber: Hon. Quartiani
Emilio Angelo (PD), 14/10/2009

Motion 1/00254, first subscriber: Hon. Boniver
Margherita (PDL), 19/10/2009

OECD, *Italy (2009) DAC Peer Review*, available
at:

http://www.oecd.org/document/60/0,3343,en_2649_34603_44387452_1_1_1_1,00.html last
access Jul 20th, 2010

Urgent Parliamentary Question 2-00786,
presented by Federica Mogherini Rabesani,
July 6th, 2010. Seating n.348

List of relevant documents

Italy, United Nations Millennium Development
Goals, Chamber of Deputies report, Dec. 2008

Italy, United Nations Millennium Development
Goals, Chamber of Deputies report, Jul. 2009

Italy, "*National Parliaments for MDGs*", Seminar
held on July 2nd 2009, final document

Italy, Fact-finding inquiry on the Millennium
Development Goals, III Committee Foreign and
EC Affairs mid-term document, Jul.2009

Italy, Italian Development Cooperation, Current
Policies and Perspectives of Reform, Chamber of
Deputies report, Mar. 2010

Italy, New Profiles of the Italian participation in
International Military Missions, Chamber of
Deputies report, Jun. 2010

Italy, Permanent Committees, Procedures,
Activities and Competences, Chamber of
Deputies, report for the beginning of the XVI
Legislature

Kenya

List of interviews

Meeting with the MDGs Caucus

Hon. Ntoitha M'Mithiaru, M.P.

Hon. Julius Kones, M.P.

Hon. Lenny Kivuti, M.P.

Hon. Martin Otieno Ogindo, M.P.

Hon. Joyce Cherono Laboso, M.P.

Hon. David Aoko Were, M.P.

Hon. Silas Rutere, M.P.

Hon. Charles Nyamai, M.P.

Hon. Abdi Nasir Nuh, M.P.

Hon. David Njuguna Mwaura, M.P.

Hon. Clement Wambugu, M.P.

Hon. Benjamin Langat, M.P.

Hon. Erastus Mureithi, M.P.

Hon. Rachel Shebesh, M.P.
Hon. Abdalla Shakila, M.P.
Hon. Eugene Wamalwa, M.P.
Hon. Francis Chachu Ganya, M.P.
Hon. Peter Baiya, M.P.

Meetings with Parliamentary staff

Phyllis Makau – Principal Budget Officer
Nicodemus Odongo – Budget officer
Njenga Njuguna – Principal Research Officer
Bonnie Mathooko – Research Officer

Meetings with Civil Society

Ms. Sylvia Mudasia – UNDP
Ms. Sophie Nyokabi – MCK – EAK
Mr. G.K. Ndungu – SUNY Kenya
Mr. Katra Sambili – UNMC
Ms. Rahel A. Oyugi – AIHD
Mr. James Njoroge Gitau – KASWESHA
Mr. Edgar Lumbasio – CPDA
Mr. Kabazi Richard – GCAP Kenya
Mr. Elijah Maina – SEED INSTITUTE
Ms. Agnes Mwikali – SEED INSTITUTE
Mr. Gichohi Mwaniki – SUNY Kenya

Mozambique

List of Interviewees

Committee Chairpersons

Mr. Lutero Simango
Former chair of the Economic Activities and Services Committee
Mr. Eneas Comiche
Chair of the Planning and Budget Committee
Ms. Telmira Pereira
Chair of Social, Gender and Environmental Affairs committee
Ms. Maria Inês Martins
Chair of the International Relations Committee
Mr. Francisco Mucanheia
Chair of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Economic Activities and Services Committee

Other MPs

Mr. Abel Mabunda
Former Rapporteur of the Planning and Budget Committee

Mr. Lutero Simango
MP and Former chair of the Economic Activities and Services Committee

Research Units and NGOs

Mr. Fernando Menete
Mozambican Debt Group (GMD)
Mr. Erasmo Mabunda
ABIODES
Ms. Amarília Mutemba
AWEPA
Ms. Elisa Muianga
AWEPA
Ms. Sábera Mussagy
G20
Mr. Silvestre Baessa
IBIS

Other Staff

Mr. Alfredo Mutombene
Ministry of Planning and Development

List of Relevant Documents

Assembly of the Republic Relevant Documents
Lei nº 17/2007 de 18 de Julho de 2007. Concernente à revisão do Regimento da Assembleia da República, aprovado pela Lei nº 6/2001, de 30 de Abril de Abril. BR nº 29. I Série
Assembleia da República/SGAR (2009). Levantamento de Necessidades de Formação e Plano de Formação para os Funcionários do Secretariado Geral da Assembleia da República, 2010-2012. Maputo, Secretariado Geral da Assembleia da República
Assembleia da República (2009a). Boletim Estatístico (2005-2009) VI Legislatura. Nº1. Maputo, Assembleia da República
Assembleia da República (2009b). Um Olhar sobre a VI Legislatura. Maputo, Assembleia da República

Country and Government Reports

ABIODES, GMD E G20 (2007). Objectivos de Desenvolvimento do Milénio em Moçambique: Percepções sobre os progressos e Desafios. Maputo, ABIODES/GMD/G20

ABIODES (2006). Sumário sobre os Objectivos de Desenvolvimento do Milénio, NEPAD e o Plano de Implementação da CMDS. Maputo, ABIODES

G20. *Relatório Anual da Pobreza – RAP* 2004. Maputo, Mozambique

G20. *Relatório Anual da Pobreza – RAP* 2005. Maputo, Mozambique

G20. Uma análise Preliminar no Contexto da Contribuição das OSC na IX Sessão do OD. Abril de 2010

Relatório de Auto-Avaliação do País. (Mecanismo Africano de Revisão de Pares, APRM/MARP)

República de Moçambique (2006). *Relatório sobre os Objectivos de Desenvolvimento do Milénio 2005*. Maputo, Government of Mozambique

República de Moçambique (2007). *Balanço do Plano Económico Social de 2006*. Maputo, Government of Mozambique

República de Moçambique (2008). *Balanço do Plano Económico Social de 2007*. Maputo, Government of Mozambique

República de Moçambique (2009a). *Balanço do Plano Económico Social de 2008*. Maputo, Government of Mozambique

República de Moçambique (2009b). *Balanço Meio – Termo do Programa de Governo 2005-2009*. Maputo, Government of Mozambique

República de Moçambique (2009c). *Relatório sobre os Objectivos de Desenvolvimento do Milénio 2008*. Maputo, Government of Mozambique

República de Moçambique (2010). *Balanço do Plano Económico Social de 2009*. Maputo, Government of Mozambique

Country and Government Plans and Programmes Assembleia da República (2004). *Constituição da República*. Maputo, Imprensa Nacional de Moçambique

Comité dos Conselheiros (2003). *Agenda 2025: Visão e Estratégias da Nação*. Maputo

Conselho de Ministros (2001) *Plano de Acção para a Redução da Pobreza Absoluta I (2001-2004) – PARPA*. Maputo: Conselho de Ministros

Conselho de Ministros (2005) *Programa Quinquenal do Governo para 2005-2009*. Maputo: Conselho de Ministros

Conselho de Ministros (2006) *Plano de Acção para a Redução da Pobreza Absoluta II (2006-2009) – PARPA*. Maputo: Conselho de Ministros

Conselho de Ministros (2010) *Programa Quinquenal do Governo para 2010-2014*. Maputo: Conselho de Ministros

República de Moçambique. *Plano Económico Social para 2006*. Maputo

República de Moçambique. *Plano Económico Social para 2007*. Maputo

República de Moçambique. *Plano Económico Social para 2008*. Maputo, Setembro de 2007

República de Moçambique. *Plano Económico Social para 2009*. Maputo, Dezembro de 2008

República de Moçambique. *Plano Económico Social para 2010*. Maputo, Abril de 2010

Sustainability Watch International Network Secretariat (2006). *Sustainability Watch 2006 Report. Implementation Barriers to Sustainable Development: A civil society assessment in 15 countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America*. Kampala, Sustainability Watch International Network Secretariat

Nigeria

List of Interviewees

Committee Chairpersons

Hon. Saudatu Sani
House Committee on MDGs
Hon. Farouk Lawan
House Committee on Education
Hon. O. Olakunle
House Committee on HIV/AIDS
Senator I. Obasanjo Bello
Senate Committee on Health

Research Unit

Mr. O. Adejokun
Director, Library, Research and Stat.
Mr. Ishaya Habu
D/Dir Library, Research and Stat.
Mrs. R. Bira
Librarian, Library, Research and Stat.
Dr. David Imosemi
Asst. Dir., Library, Research and Stat.
Mr. David Okonnah
Asst. Dir., Library, Research and Stat.

Other Staff

Mr. S. Maikasuwa
Deputy Clerk, National Assembly
Mrs. Rahila Ahmadu
DD/ Head NSNL
Mr. H.O Olutoye
DD/Clerk, House Cmtee on Appr.
Mr. Victor Effiong
Clerk, Senate Ad-hoc Cmtee, MDGs
Mr. G. Ojagbohunmi
Clerk of Committees, House

List of Relevant Documents

Country Report

www.nigeria.gov.ng

MDG C'mte website
www.nassmdgscommittee.org

MDG website
www.mdgs.gov.ng

Ministry of finance
www.fmf.gov.ng

Budget Office
www.budgetoffice.gov.ng

NACA website
www.naca.gov.ng

South Africa

List of Interviewees

Committee Chairpersons, all African National Congress

Ms. Y.R. Botha
Chairperson Portfolio Committee on Social Development
Ms. F.I. Chohan
Chairperson Portfolio Committee on Basic Education
Mr. T.A. Mufamadi
Chairperson Standing Committee on Finance

Other MPs

Ms. H. Bogopane-Zulu
Member of Parliament, African National Congress
Ms. P. Tshwete
Member of Parliament, African National Congress
Ms. S.P. Kopane
Member of Parliament, Democratic Alliance
Ms. H. Lamoela
Member of Parliament, Democratic Alliance
Mr. M. Waters
Member of Parliament, Democratic Alliance
Mr. L. Greyling
Member of Parliament, Independent Democrats
Ms. H.N. Makhuba
Member of Parliament, Inkatha Freedom Party

Research Unit

Ms. Carmine Rustin
Chief Researcher
Mr. Dennis Bandi

Content Advisor, Portfolio Committee on Basic Education
Mr. Livhuwani Mahada
Researcher, Portfolio Committee on Basic Education
Mr. Zubair Rahim
Researcher, Portfolio Committee on Health
Mr. Sean Whiting
Researcher, Select Committee on Social Services
Mr. Mkhululi Molo
Researcher, Select Committee on Social Services
Ms. Siyavuya Koyana
Researcher, Portfolio Committee on Social Development
Mr. Moses Mncwabe
SADC-PF HIV/Aids Research Officer
Mr. Gary Rhoda
Researcher, Portfolio Committee on Women, Youth, Children and People with Disabilities

Other Staff

Mr. Peter Lebeko
Executive Director, Office of the Speaker
Mr. Kayum Ahmed
International Relations
Ms. Marina Griebenow
National Assembly Table
Mr. Msimelelo Nyikana
Member Services

List of Relevant Documents

Country Reports

South Africa, Millennium Development Goals, Country Report 2005

South Africa, Millennium Development Goals, Mid-Term Country Report, September 2007

South Africa, Millennium Development Goals, Country Report for 2010, Concept Paper, accessed on July 20, 2010 at <http://www.statssa.gov.za/nss/documents/Concept%20Paper%20for%20MDG%202010%20Final%20Draft%202%203%204%20aposteriori.pdf>

Other Reports

Development Indicators 2009, The Presidency, Republic of South Africa, accessed on May 17, 2010, at <http://www.thepresidency.gov.za/learning/me/indicators/2009/indicators.pdf>

Together Doing More and Better: Medium-Term Strategic Framework, A Framework to Guide Government's Programme in the Electoral Mandate Period 2009-2014, accessed on May 17, 2010 at

http://www.thepresidency.gov.za/docs/pdsa/planning/mtsf_july09.pdf

South Africa: Country Report, 27th SADC-PF Plenary Assembly, Zambia, 27 May – 5 June 2010

A Critical Analysis of the Millennium Development Goals: Prospects, Progress and Challenges, Research Unit, Parliament of South Africa, 1 September 2003

MDG Fact Sheet, The Millennium Development Goals: Overseeing Their Implementation, Research Unit, Parliament of South Africa, 2006

Report of the Independent Assessment of Parliament, 13/01/2009, accessed on May 17, 2010 at

http://www.parliament.gov.za/content/The%20Panel%20for%20Assessment%20of%20Parliament%20Report_Final4_mail~1.pdf

Country Progress Report on the Declaration of Commitment on HIV/Aids, 31 March 2010

South Africa, Millennium Development Goals Updated Report, Education Sector, September 2009 ■

