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PART I: MESSAGES

MESSAGE FROM THE CHAIRMAN

If the unexpected and the unusual, “turn you on”, then the place to be is the Parliamentary Centre.

Once again the Centre had a successful year, and what is more, laid the groundwork for a busy, fruitful and profitable 2002-2003.

Bob Miller, the Associates, and the staff worked hard and harmoniously together and on behalf of the Board I thank them most warmly.

MESSAGE FROM THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

In early 2003, Om Radsaddy, a decent man and champion of Cambodian democracy was murdered while sitting at an outdoor café in Phnom Penh. The murder has so far gone unsolved, but it is widely believed that the motive was political. Radsaddy had been working closely with the Chair of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the National Assembly on investigating suspiciously well organized riots against the Embassy of Thailand and Thai businesses in Phnom Penh. The top leadership of the country had angrily rejected a request by the Foreign Affairs Committee to appear before Parliament to account for its handling of the riots. Not long afterwards Radsaddy was murdered.

He was certainly not the first nor will he be the last victim of authoritarianism. It is commonplace to observe that meaningful political change almost always comes at a high cost. At least two of the participants at the Global Organization for Parliamentarians Against Corruption (GOPAC) founding conference last October had direct experience of those costs. One parliamentarian from Kuwait had been severely maimed in a shooting likely intended to cut short his fight against corruption. Another parliamentarian from Mongolia had lost her brother - himself a parliamentarian and potential Prime Minister - to assassination. Here too the crime has gone unsolved, but it was probably no coincidence that the victim had been a leader in fighting corruption and organized crime in Mongolia.

The willingness of those who oppose democracy to use any means reveals that the battle is of so much more than democracy alone. The holding
of free and fair elections – two of the important democratic indicators – and the development of parliamentary institutions represent the principle of majority rule. Equally, however, they represent principles derived from human rights and rule of law. Majority rule would (and has) become tyranny were it not for counterbalancing minority rights. In the parliamentary system the right of the government to govern is balanced by the right of the loyal opposition to criticize and oppose. Similarly, parliamentary procedure is the effort to apply rule of law to the political battles in parliament.

It is important to remind ourselves of these elementary facts to offset the temptation of reducing democratic development to a simple formula. As the current situation in post-war Iraq illustrates, turning democratic principles into democratic practices is enormously difficult, hard, slow work. Moreover, as the death of our friend Om Radsaddy showed, it is risk-filled work demanding the highest form of courage.

MESSAGE FROM HON. JOHN BOSLEY, PARLIAMENTARY DEVELOPMENT ADVISOR: AFRICA

I suppose I should start at the beginning – which for this purpose is that day in October 1993 when I became an ex-MP.

Defeat is no fun – whether for a Conservative MP in 1993 or for the Ottawa Senators in 2003 – especially if you are not prepared for it in the least. In 1993, despite all the signs, I was pretty sure that I would win and had given no thought or preparation for the worst. Pretty dumb from someone whose present business card describes him as a strategic planner!

I won’t ever forget that first year. The professional options were neither numerous nor really appealing. Before politics, I had worked briefly for my family’s real estate brokerage company in Toronto – and it was assumed I would go back to that. But 20+ years had passed. My cousin had bought the business from his father and mine – and he was very supportive if I wanted to go back to the firm – but it really wasn’t sure I was ready to go to work FOR someone again after having been so happily ‘self-employed’ for so long.

I thought I might try my hand at Government relations – but of course so did a lot of other defeated Tories. Anyway, former Tory MPs weren’t much in demand either!

One day, Robert Miller called. I came to know Robert as a colleague and as a friend during the years I served as Chair of the then External Affairs Committee and he provided and the Centre provided us with excellent professional support.

What he wanted to talk about was a surprise. Up until this time (1994), the Centre had done 99% of its work with Canadian Parliamentary units. Suddenly Parliaments – both as Institutions in themselves and for their potential impact on development in the newly emerging democracies – were beginning to interest the development agencies. What Bob wanted to know was whether I would be interested in going to Cambodia – with Peter Dobell – to do an orientation seminar for the new MPs. Over the next two years I undertook a number of these short-term assignment for the Centre.

In 1996, Robert called again to say that the UNDP was putting together a long-term Project for the new Parliament of Ethiopia – the first ever widely elected one – and were looking for a Technical Advisor to go there for three months – and was I interested.

The work until then had always been short term one to two week projects – and then home to Ottawa. This was not the same thing at all.

If I had known at the time that for the Ethiopians that first three month contract was really just to size me up for a much longer involvement, I am sure I would have said no – but I did agree to apply – and immediately started to wonder which
I really wanted – to get the contract or not to get the contract.

What I didn’t know was that I hadn’t even made the short list – as the specs for the job called for someone with a PhD. Canada’s Ambassador at that time in Ethiopia was Gabriel Lessard. He was very interested in the parliament project personally. He took it upon himself to call the new Speaker of the new Ethiopian Parliament – to tell him that in the pile of names culled by the Technical Review Committee was a former Canadian Speaker – and was he aware of that? The Speaker added my resume to the short list – and then announced that he thought perhaps he would to try this person who appeared to have some hands-on experience in his job – rather than someone who had studied it.

And the rest, as they say, is history. The three months flew by, the contract was renewed and renewed – and renewed – and I found myself spending six months a year in Addis Ababa.

So – what happened. Firstly, the Speaker of the Ethiopian Parliament and I became fast friends – and I became and am convinced of his commitment to broadening and deepening his country’s young democracy.

What I have found in Ethiopia – and elsewhere in Africa on the occasional project sabbaticals that I have taken over the last seven years – to Benin again, to Zambia, to Botswana, to Uganda. There ARE leaders in parliaments across Africa who are committed to deepening democracy and making change happen. And I seem to be able to help them – in short, I finish each week with the best of all feelings for a politician – that one has been useful.

Ethiopia isn’t yet a liberal democracy in the sense that we use that phrase in Canada – but that is the goal that they have set for themselves in their Constitution and towards which they are making progress. They have had two elections. Several opposition parties boycotted the first one in 1995. Major workshops were held prior to the election in 2000 – some under the sponsorship of the UNDP project – to see how the election process could be improved. In the end, all of the opposition parties participated. The House is still heavily dominated by the ruling coalition – but it has more opposition MPs – and more women – than was the previous case. More activities are planned to make the next election in 2005 a better process than the one in 2000 – civic and voter education, training of domestic monitors, help to the Elections Board.

In 1999, I was again unable to say no when CIDA asked if I would move to Addis full time to work – in addition to the UNDP project – on a bilateral project with Parliament that focuses on the Research Department, the major Committees of the House – and the establishment of a Human Rights Commission and Office of the Ombudsman.

Because of the Canadian bilateral project, the Committees of the House – and even the overall management of the House – have been completely reorganized following a Study visit to Canada by the Speaker’s Senior Ethiopian Advisor.

There is no Association of Governance Advisors that I am aware of – and the practitioners don’t get to chat very often – but if this were a workshop to discuss lessons being learned and applied in African Projects and programmes, we might be able to agree on the following:

The best projects – meaning those that achieve their planned results – are the ones in both the African parliamentary partner and the funding agency have really been committed and fully engaged from beginning to end.

Partnership on a daily basis is key – and sometimes the donor’s rules are hard for the African parliament to understand. It is important to be extremely clear at all times – but especially at the beginning – about the purpose of the project – and what sorts of activities can be and cannot be considered.

Fourthly, the practitioners sometimes worry that the Donors don’t understand well enough that better governance cannot be created quickly – and can take a long time. A project may need to be carried out over as much as ten years to have the wanted impact.
PART II: PROGRAMMING DURING THE PAST YEAR

The Parliamentary Centre continued to expand the reach and depth of its programming in support of parliament, both in Canada and elsewhere in the world. Peter Dobell and Martin Ulrich, a senior Treasury Board official seconded to the Centre, began interesting and important work on two key aspects of the Canadian House of Commons – the budget process and relations between parliamentarians and bureaucrats. Elsewhere in the world, the Cambodia-Canada Parliamentary Strengthening Program completed its inception phase and the Russian program entered the final phase of its work focussed on the strengthening of financial accountability mechanisms. After several years of effort, the Centre succeeded in obtaining CIDA support for a Middle East program focussed on parliaments and WTO accession. In addition to these and other country programs, the Centre further developed three global programs: an anti-corruption program centred on the establishment of the Global Organization for Parliamentarians Against Corruption (GOPAC); a program for parliamentarians on poverty reduction policies; and a research project entitled “Parliaments that Work” that aims to develop indicators of parliamentary performance.

COUNTRY PROGRAMS
Parliament of Canada

The Parliamentary Centre supports Parliament directly, through:

- undertaking research, publication and advocacy;
- facilitating learning opportunities for parliamentarians; and
- supporting certain inter-parliamentary networking initiatives.

The individual activities have evolved as interests of parliamentarians have changed. In addition to these changes, we are now managing the activities as an integrated package and in a manner that complements our regional parliamentary strengthening programs. Also included in this section is the Parliamentary Centre’s involvement in the Trilateral Commission although it is not limited to parliamentary participants.

The objectives of serving the Parliament of Canada and strengthening the effectiveness of Canadian parliamentarians have not changed. However, as the world is becoming more connected, the perspectives of parliamentarians have evolved. An important effect on Canada Program is the
opportunity to provide additional support for parliamentarians as they network internationally.

**Research, Publication and Advocacy:** The past year we undertook substantial research on the Parliament of Canada and advised on a number of additional matters.

The first study was a thorough review of the performance of the House of Commons committee activity related to budgetary and financial oversight activity. Parliament’s Performance in the Budget Process: A Case Study, IRPP Policy Matters, Vol. 3, no. 5 describes how and how well Parliament plays its representation, legislative and oversight roles as related to the budget process. Based on a review of all committee reports tabled during 2001 by House of Commons Committees and interviews with committee Chairs and members of all parties, the study identified both strengths and weaknesses. The finding indicate that performance was strongest regarding the aggregate budget and weakest regarding the supply process and scrutiny of performance and policy.

The second area of research – Building Better Relations, Occasional Paper on Parliamentary Government, Number 13, May 2002, focused on relations between the executive and House committee relations. It was undertaken together with the Public Policy Forum. It followed up on earlier work of the Public Policy Forum on committee reactions to departmental performance reporting. The research involved interviews with both senior officials and committee members. It confirmed the increasingly strained relations, the mutual desire in both communities to improve relations and outlined a series of proposals aimed at improving mutual understanding and trust. These conclusions were reviewed by the Government House Leader’s Office, the Privy Council Office and some follow-up work is underway.


This work provides the background and context for our 2002/03 program, which is focusing on parliamentary reform.

**Facilitating Learning Opportunities:** The Parliament, Business and Labour Trust (PBLT) has been the focus for this activity. Funding support from business and labour groups for PBLT has decreased over the last several years. With the growing experience parliamentarians in the House of Commons, the demand for such activity has fallen off as well.

While it is clear that there continues to be interest and we are continuing to provide existing services – visits, speakers at lunches/dinners on the Hill, and links to inter-parliamentary events – at reduced levels, we are continuing to review the financial viability of this activity.

**Supporting Inter-parliamentary Networking:**

This area of activity – sometimes characterized as parliamentary diplomacy – is not new, but is becoming more important and therefore highlighted as a line of business. As described in last year’s report, we are supporting the Global Organization of Parliamentarians Against Corruption (GOPAC), Inter-Parliamentary Forum of the Americas (PIFA), and linking training and networking in a revised Centre for Legislative Exchange (CLE).

**CLE:** The changes described in last year’s report to make CLE a program providing a more in-depth learning and policy deliberation experience, that is more than “one-off” visit, is seen as the appropriate. CLE has now established an arrangement with the Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars – an organization close to and partially funded by Congress – to strengthen both access to policy expertise and Congress. In addition, it is seeking finding from
the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, as well as foundations to strengthen the program. The continuing support of the Canadian Region of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association will provide for the participation of provincial legislators.

**OSCE and Trilateral Commission**

Since the establishment of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) in 1991 the Centre has provided research support and advisory services to Canadian parliamentary delegations attending Assembly meetings. With the OSCE playing an increasingly important role in reducing tension and conflict in troubled countries in Eastern Europe and in monitoring democratic development in the region, the Parliamentary Assembly has grown in importance. At the annual meeting held in Berlin between July 5 and 9, 2002, three Canadian Members of Parliament were elected to the office of treasurer, rapporteur of the first political committee and vice-chair of the third human rights committee.

The Centre has provided the secretariat of the Canadian Group of the Trilateral Commission since it was first set up in 1973 and the founding director, Peter Dobell, has been a member of the Commission since that time. The Commission is a non-governmental policy-oriented discussion group composed of leaders from Europe, North America and Asia drawn from various backgrounds. Its purpose is to encourage mutual understanding and closer cooperation among the three regions. The annual meeting of the Commission was held in Washington, D.C. in April 2002.

With Mexico having been invited to join the Commission it was decided to hold a regional meeting of the North American members, a practice which the European and Asian members have found useful. The first North American meeting was held in Toronto on November 2-3. The focus of discussion was on relations between the three North American countries, themes that had not been appropriate at plenary meetings, adding a useful dimension for Canadians to Commission meetings.

**Africa**

**Africa-Canada Parliamentary Strengthening Program**

On June 26, 2002, the Canadian government announced a major series of commitments to help build “New Partnerships with Africa” flowing from the Africa Action Plan of the G8 countries meeting at the Kananaskis Summit. One such commitment was a contribution of $9 million over 4 years to strengthen parliaments in Africa, with the Parliamentary Centre named as “the principal Canadian partner in this initiative.” The announcement indicated that the focus would be on:

- Enhancing and assisting African parliamentary networks
- Increasing participation of women in the political process
- Improving financial accountability and parliamentary oversight
- Strengthening parliamentary anti-corruption measures
- Enhancing public access to government in Africa, and
- Improving parliamentary administration and parliamentary involvement in national poverty reduction strategies.

These priorities reflected African leaders’ commitments in NEPAD to “strengthening parliamentary oversight; promoting participatory decision-making; (and) adopting effective measures to combat corruption and embezzlement.”

The Parliamentary Centre was very involved in 2002 developing plans, providing ideas and proposed actions to the CIDA-housed Canada Fund for Africa. As the year came to a close, the Africa Team was well placed to begin implementing several key consultative mechanisms with African MPs and advocates from over 14 different countries with the CIDA contribution agreement on the way to being signed. A creative approach, taking into account what other donors are already doing with respect to parliamentary strengthening,
aiming at sustainable initiatives and relying on the insights and experts views of Africans themselves, is seen as key to the program’s success in its first year (2003).

**Legislative Accountability Program**

The 2002 year marked the implementation of the Legislative Accountability Program. This program differs from the Centre’s other Africa projects in that it is not a bilateral project. This project which is funded through CIDA’s Partnership Branch has as its objective the improvement of systems of accountability in South Africa and the Southern Africa Development Community (SADC) through more effective committees and parliamentary organisations. This three year program is composed of two main projects: building the capacity of members and staff of selected committees in the South Africa legislatures and capacity building of two institutions—the Association of Public Accounts Committees (APAC) and SADC Parliamentary Forum (PF).

In this first year, members of staff entered into partnership agreements with four provincial legislatures—Eastern Cape Provincial legislature, Western Cape provincial legislature, Limpopo, and Gauteng and jointly developed workplans aimed to improve capacity of budgetary and policy issues following training needs assessment. The Eastern Cape Provincial Legislature benefited from budget training by the Association of Public Accounts Committee for members of selected committees and also used project funds to contribute to an educational outreach initiative by members of the Education Standing Committee. A delegation from the Western Cape Provincial parliament undertook a study tour to Canada, focussing on legislative process, fisheries management and law enforcement. The Limpopo Legislature held a two day seminar for committee members and support staff on financial management and the Research department undertook and completed a research project into existing models of legislative accountability used by committees. In the Gauteng legislature, progress was made in the development of a program and Budget Analysis Model. Although funds were not disbursed in Year 1, the legislature has identified priorities and plans to hire a consultant for further development and implementation of the Model.

The Committees Staff training program which involves the ten legislatures of South Africa also got underway in year one. Each legislature identified three participants for program one of this multi year program. So far three modules have been undertaken with very positive evaluation reports by the participants. In this case, a partnership agreement was entered into with the Committees Forum that oversees the selection of the participants and the evaluation program results.

The second component of the Legislative Accountability Program works with partner institutions, namely SADCPF and APAC, in order to increase their capacity to support legislative oversight. Significant activities have been undertaken by APAC, including a needs assessment, the development of training modules, and progress towards the development and accreditation of an evaluation system. Several setbacks prevented the completion of activities planned with SADCPF. In year one the identified activity was the development of teaching modules following a seminar on Poverty Reduction. Unfortunately, due to funding constraints, the Poverty seminar did not take place during the time planned and the teaching modules were not delivered.

In general, the Legislative Accountability Program is being implemented as planned. Funds have been disbursed on schedule with significant contributions by the partners. The program has attracted support from the participating legislatures and other partner institutions. It has also sparked initiatives and attracted funds from other donors, including WBI and DFID.

**Ghana Parliamentary Committee Support Project**

Phase 1 of the Ghana Parliamentary Committee Support project (1998-2002) was scheduled to end in December 2002; however, an extension was granted until April 30, 2003 and a further extension has been granted to July 2003.
Though all planned project activities have been completed, an extension will ensure there is no gap in project delivery. While awaiting the final reports for the project, ongoing evaluation and a summary end-of-project assessment have shown that the Ghana Parliamentary Committee Support Project has been a success. Gains were achieved through the implementation of project activities, most expected results were obtained, and progress was made towards the general objective of the program. The results from the first phase include:

- Implementation of all planned project activities (workshop retreats, Information Resource Coordinators, international linkages, Northern social interaction, plus several training events – on Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) and Medium Term Expenditure Frameworks (MTEFs), for instance);
- Increased knowledge and effectiveness of committee members, resulting in widely positive perceptions of the work of the Finance and PAC committees;
- Significant contributions to cross-partisan cooperation at the committee level that has strengthened Ghana’s governance system;
- Increased Parliamentary involvement in Ghana’s PRSP process;
- Gains achieved in transparency of economic reporting;
- Significant increases in understanding and communication between civil society groups in the North and Parliamentary committee leaders;
- Gains in strengthening democratic choice in Ghana by improving credibility of opposition MPs via their leadership of the PAC; and
- Increased engagement and participation of women in economic decision-making.

The second phase of the project has been developed to cover the period 2003-2007. This phase will consolidate the successes of the present project, and achieve new advances in the capacity of the Committees to monitor poverty reduction plans, assure sustained participation of the poor in those plans, and improve transparency and effectiveness of governance.

Canada-Ethiopia Parliamentary Development Project

2002 has been an active year for the Canada-Ethiopia Parliamentary Development Project in all three programming streams: strengthening Parliamentary Committees; building a professional and independent Research Support Service; and the establishment of a Human Rights Commission and an Office of the Ombudsman that meet internationally accepted standards.

From July to December 2002, committees were reorganized in the Parliament of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia. The number of Standing Committees was increased from 9 to 12, and the mandates of all the Committees were rewritten. Lessons learned from earlier Workshops and from the visits to Canada by Ethiopian Committee Chairs and Mohammad Sheriff in 2001 played an important role in this reorganization. Each Committee saw the appointment of a Clerk and developed a comprehensive training plan to strengthen understanding of the new mandates and improved committee functioning. One important change is that Committees must now hold a public hearing whenever a Bill is referred to them.

Gains were also achieved in the building of research capacity in designated policy areas, in staff understanding of oversight and legislative development, and in identifying and using extra-parliamentary research. This training was facilitated by Dr. Bob Gardner of the Ontario Legislative Library. He held several workshops with research staff and librarians, during which a Strategic Plan was developed. Planned increases in research staff have not yet materialized, but new resources were approved paving the way to increase the number of professional Parliamentary staff from 10 in 2001 to over 100 by the end of 2004.

With respect to gender equity the Women’s Committee supported the development of two women’s networks: one for elected women MPs in Ethiopia, and another for academic and
professional women. The Committee has built networks and mechanisms to strengthen the participation of women in the public service and in political affairs. Study visits to Canada were carried out by the Women’s Affairs Standing Committee and the Minister for Women’s Affairs, with meetings at national and provincial legislatures, Status of Women Canada, the Women’s Bureau of Health Canada and HRDC. Meetings were held with women MPs and Parliamentary staff members.

A study visit by committee Chairpersons and Secretaries had discussions on policy issues pertaining to the various committees. In visiting Queen’s Park, the delegation met the Head of the Ontario Legislative Assembly’s Library, Research and Information Division, and were made aware of the importance of professional, impartial in-house research services for Members. On their return to Ethiopia, members of the delegation pushed for the Parliamentary Secretariat to further develop the capacity of the Parliamentary Library and the Research Division (now the Research and Consultancy Centre).

Asia

Cambodia

Since April 2001, the Centre has managed the CIDA funded Cambodia-Canada Legislative Support Project (CCLSP), a $4.5 million capacity development project with the National Assembly and Senate of Cambodia. The Centre opened a field office in Phnom Penh in October 2001 with a Canadian Field Manager and local staff to manage the implementation of project activities. The Parliamentary Centre in cooperation with Canadian institutions such as the Centre for Asia-Pacific Initiatives (CAPI) and Cambodian organizations such as the Cambodian Development Resource Institute (CDRI) is working to strengthen three aspects of the Cambodian Parliament: parliamentary review of legislation, the responsiveness of parliamentary committees to the people and improving secretariat management. Beginning with the lawmaking stream of the project, the main goal of the project for the first year of implementation was to contribute to an improvement of the quality of lawmaking review and analysis, with special attention given to international standards of law as well as the gender and poverty impact of legislation. In addition to working with MPs and Senators, the project also worked with staff from both Secretariats to improve their capacity to analyze policy and compose briefing notes for parliamentarians. One of the highlights of the first year of implementation was the development of the first three chapters of a Parliamentary Best Practices Handbook to be used by parliamentarians and staff in their daily legislative work.

The second component of the project, the “representative” stream, aims to strengthen public consultation in the work of parliamentary commissions. The project organized with the World Bank Institute a workshop to study and review the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper process, emphasizing the importance of consultations by MPs and Senators with the poor and marginalized. The third stream of the project aims to strengthen planning by senior management and to begin the improvement of the administrative skills of Secretariat staff. Some highlights from 2002 were the CCLSP’s assistance to both the Senate and National Assembly to produce strategic plans, the completion of management training for senior managers on their roles and responsibilities, as well as English language and computer training for staff.

In the coming year, the National Assembly of Cambodia faces a national election. During the electoral campaign, the project will continue to focus its efforts on strengthening the capacity of parliamentary staff. Following the elections, the CCLSP will organize a series of workshops for newly elected members of the National Assembly.

China

The first phase of cooperation between the Centre and the National People’s Congress of China (NPC) ended successfully in 2001 after three years of CIDA funded activities including workshops, seminars and study missions in both Canada and China. During much of 2002, the Centre negotiated with CIDA the approval of a longer-term
legislative cooperation project to further assist the NPC and local congresses with their legislative reform. In the fall of 2002, CIDA announced the approval of the China-Canada Legislative Cooperation Project and indicated the project would be implemented through a contribution agreement with the Parliamentary Centre.

The purpose of this new project is to strengthen democratic rule in China by increasing the People’s Congresses capacity to legislate, improve governance, respect for human rights and the development of public participation processes. The project will further support the People’s Congress System (nationally and locally) in strengthening its capacity with respect to legislative work, its internal management processes, its interaction with the public through consultation and participation mechanisms as well as its capacity to supervise the work of government organs and increase their accountability.

The Centre launched the inception phase of the project in the fall and undertook a design mission to China in February 2003. Project implementation is expected to start in the fall of 2003 following in depth collaboration between the NPC and the Centre to develop a project workplan.

As well, at the request of the Budget Affairs Commission of the Standing Committee of the NPC, the Parliamentary Centre helped organize and deliver a study tour for a delegation headed by Mr. Su Ning, Vice-Chair of the Budget Affairs Commission. The visit took place in May and focussed on the budget process in Canada with particular attention to the oversight role of parliamentary committees. The Centre will continue its cooperation with the Budget Affairs Commission through the new Legislative Cooperation Project.

Other Initiatives
The Centre worked in partnership with the Bangkok-based King Prajadhipok’s Institute and British-Columbia’s Royal Roads University to organize a program of workshops and a study tour for the Parliament of Thailand. The program focussed on methods of public consultation and conflict resolution practices in Canada. The purpose of the program was to provide mechanisms to assist Thai parliamentarians in strengthening measures to encourage public involvement and resolve public conflicts through an open parliamentary process. The Parliamentary Centre hopes to continue a program with the Thai Parliament in 2003.

Eastern and Central Europe
Since April 1994, the Centre has managed the Canada Russia Parliamentary Program (CRPP), undertaking parliamentary development and staff training with both houses of the Russian Federal Assembly— the State Duma and Federation Council. In 1999, the Parliamentary Centre began a three-year program working with legislatures in seven Subjects of the Federation (i.e. regions) in Russia’s north.

In July 2000, CRPP added an accountability component to its program, designed to improve parliamentary oversight by strengthening the linkages between the Accounting Chamber of the Russian Federation— Russia’s State Audit Institution and the Duma Sub-Committee on Financial Control (the Russian equivalent to the Public Accounts Committee of the House of Commons). Goals included strengthening the capacity of the designated parliamentary committees in each chamber, and working with the Accounting Chamber to prepare reports conducive to consideration by parliamentarians.

This led to the launching of a 30-month pilot project to further strengthen horizontal accountability in Russia, in January 2002. With the support of the Office of the Auditor General of Canada, this innovative project has been helping the Accounting Chamber develop value-for-money accounting methodology, and to undertake audits of two Russian federally-funded programs— the “Children of the North” and “Social Support to the Handicapped.” Both the Duma Subcommittee on Financial Control, and the Federation Council Commission on Interaction with the Accounting Chamber will hold hearings on these audit reports. The Parliamentary Centre has been using its expertise
to help strengthen the capacity of this parliamentary committee and commission. Activities in 2002 included a visit by the Chairmen of both bodies to observe the work of the Public Accounts Committee of the House of Commons, and seminars in Moscow for staff of the Accounting Chamber to emphasize the importance of value-for-money-auditing.

**Ukraine**

In October 2002, Geoff Dubrow was engaged as a consultant by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) in Ukraine to conduct an assessment of the linkages between oversight institutions (such as the Ukrainian Supreme Audit Institution and the Human Rights Ombudsman), and the Ukrainian Parliament, the Verkhovna Rada.

**Southeast Europe**

In Bosnia-Herzegovina, the Centre provided advice to the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe’s Parliamentary Development Project. In Bulgaria, the Centre assisted the Bulgarian National Assembly to develop legislation for an ombudsman’s office. In Romania, the Centre conducted as assessment mission of the capacity of the Romanian Parliament for the UNDP.

In August 2002, the Parliamentary Centre was selected to begin negotiations with the Canadian International Development Agency for the implementation of the Southeast Europe Parliamentary Program. The program is designated to begin in Serbia, where it will work to strengthen the Serbian National Assembly’s institutional capacity. The program is also working to strengthen linkages between parliaments in the region. Program activities could be extended to other countries in the region, including possibly Bosnia Herzegovina.

**Middle East**

After successfully negotiating a program for the Middle East with CIDA, the Centre undertook activities during the year with mixed results. On the positive side, the Centre both participated in and contributed papers to an experts meeting on Governance and Poverty Alleviation held in Cairo in November 2001. Additionally the Director of the Middle East program and the Centre’s Executive Director undertook a capacity building assessment mission to the Parliament of Kuwait in March 2002. Finally, the Centre organized a study visit to Canada in July 2002 for the Secretaries General of the Arab Parliamentary Union and the Parliament of Jordan.

Less positively, the main activity of the new program on Parliament, WTO Accession and Poverty Reduction failed to be launched at a planned regional seminar in the Parliament of Morocco. It was concluded that a number of factors, including political events in the regional and poor intelligence on the ground, contributed to the failure. Following extensive consultations with CIDA, this and other planned activities were redesigned and rescheduled.

**Global and Regional Programs**

**Anti-Corruption**

In October, 2002 a global conference was hosted by the Parliament of Canada. The Parliamentary Centre as the secretariat-designate for GOPAC provided the lead role in supporting the interim GOPAC steering committee in arranging the conference agenda, inviting and preparing program participants, and in providing financial support to delegates – with funding coming from CIDA and the World Bank Institute. With over 200 participants – and more than 150 parliamentarians from all regions of the world – actively participating in discussion of GOPAC, its constitutions, its regions and its priorities, the conference was seen as a great success. A Board of Directors and an Executive Committee – both chaired by John Williams, Member of Parliament from St Albert in Canada – were formed and the Parliamentary Centre designated as its global secretariat. Steps were taken immediately to begin formal incorporation, establishing its functioning and financing and implementing a program of activity.

**Inter-Parliamentary Forum of the Americas – FIPA**

The Parliamentary Centre continues to provide secretariat support to the President of Inter-
Parliamentary Forum of the Americas (FIPA) - Senator Hervieux-Payette - and to its working groups. The key initiative is the Virtual Parliament - a program to enable FIPA members to sustain and extend their information and policy deliberation between face-to-face meetings through the use of information sharing and facilitating of discussion through the internet.

The Virtual Parliament of the Americas

In support of the work of the FIPA, the Parliamentary Centre in partnership with Bellanet International, is working in the design and implementation of the Virtual Parliament of the Americas. The project will build an on-line site to allow parliamentarians to discuss issues with their colleagues throughout the Americas without having to travel. It will also create a set of tools and information services that encourage and support interaction among parliamentarians; build capacity among Members and their support staff to use information and communication technologies (ICTs) in their work; and, provide opportunities for parliamentarians to engage constituents in innovative ways.

The design of FIPA’s Web site, was carried out successfully on June 2002, and since then has been updated. The first phase of the Virtual Parliament project helps the Executive Committee to share information and documents efficiently.

Parliaments that Work

In August 2002 the Parliamentary Centre signed a contract with the World Bank Institute to develop and test indicators with respect to the budget process. Research commenced during the year.
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