



Morocco Report: Parliamentary Data Draft

This summary is compiled for the exclusive use of authors working on the state of the parliament in Morocco and ACRLI advisors. The findings reported below are extracted from the survey of expert users (Parliamentarians, Employees and Moustachar/Councilors) carried out by Information International for the benefit of ACRLI. The survey included a sample of 25 parliamentarians, 10 employees and 15 Moustachar/Councilors. Out of these 50 participants, 7 came from Marrakech, 18 were from El Dar El Bayda and 25 from Rabat.

The total population of parliamentarians in Morocco is 325, belonging to 11 different parties (فرق نيابية). The method of sample selection relied on stratified random sampling, based on a list of parliamentarians in three areas in Morocco. Out of the 25 participants, 9 were to be chosen from Marrakech, 9 from El Dar El Bayda and 7 from Rabat. However, due to the very high refusal rate, the method of sampling became a “convenience” sample. Ultimately, 9 participants were from Rabat, 13 from El Dar El Bayda and 3 from Marrakech (see Information International report for details; Appendix C).

The total population of Moustachar/Councilors in Morocco is 270 while the total number of employees who deal with العمل التشريعي is 160. Fifteen surveys had to be administered to Moustachar/Councilors and 10 to employees. The method of sample selection relied on stratified random sampling, based on a list of Moustachar/Councilors in three areas in Morocco. From the 15 participants, 6 were to be chosen from Marrakech, 4 from El Dar El Bayda and 5 from Rabat. However, due to the very high refusal rate, the method of sampling became a “convenience” sample. Ultimately, 6 participants were from Rabat, 5 from El Dar El Bayda and 4 from Marrakech (see Information International report for details; Appendix C).

Finally, the 10 employees were randomly selected from the six different (اللجان النيابية). No problems or difficulties in data collection occurred in this phase of the study.

Refusal rates (direct or indirect) reached 59%. The ability to generalise to the entire population should be made cautiously.

The findings from the survey are presented in two parts. The first part presents an overview of the major findings from the survey, while the second part presents detailed findings from the individual items in the survey. Appendix B presents the detailed findings for each item from the survey and will be referred to during the discussion of the main findings from the survey below.

I. OVERVIEW OF KEY FINDINGS FROM SURVEY

Main Findings: Dimension Analysis

When items are combined to measure a dimension of a specific principles (e.g. items 1 & 2 as measures of “Free and fair elections”, a dimension of the general “representation and participation” principle), 3 dimensions proved to be problematic for parliamentarians, 3 were negatively viewed by employees and 4 flagged as significant for the Moustachar/Councilors.



The most important grievance for parliamentarians resided in the “Effective oversight of the executive” dimension [performance]. The other two complaints occurred in a) “Efficiency of administrative and technical bodies” [performance] and b) “Equal opportunities” [representation and participation] .

On the other hand, employees voiced their grievances on a) “Political financing rules for parties and Election campaigns” dimension [integrity], b) “Equal opportunities” [representation and participation] and c) “Independence in fulfilling mandates” dimension [independence], consecutively.

Finally, Moustachar/Councilors rated “Equal opportunities” [representation and participation] as the most negative dimension. Although still negatively evaluated, “Free and fair elections” [representation and participation] elicited less negative ratings than the 4 other dimensions.

Main Findings: Item Analysis

An important finding is that parliamentarians, employees and moustachar/councilors have different evaluations of the state of the parliament. Overall, both the parliamentarians and the employees had a higher number of grievances about the state of the parliament than moustachar/councilors did. Of the core questions asked, 2 were unique to parliamentarians, 2 specific to employees, and 1 item was rated negatively by only moustachar/councilors. Interestingly though, a) 4 items were sources of common complaint for the three groups, b) 2 items elicited negative evaluations for both parliamentarians and employees, c) 1 was negatively viewed by both parliamentarians and moustachar/councilors, and d) 3 items resulted in grievances for employees and moustachar/councilors.

The 4 items that were of common concern among the three groups are ranked from highest to lowest complaint in the table below (*Note*: Scores represent the average (mean) for each item on a scale from 1 to 5. Scores below 3 reflect a positive evaluation of the item, while scores above 3 reflect a negative evaluation):

1. Parliamentarians declare their financial assets in an accurate and honest manner (Item 58, $x = 3.44$)
2. Candidates for parliamentary seats have equal access to private and public media enabling them to communicate with their constituents (Item 4, $x = 3.32$)
3. Parliament effectively oversees the government in all of its activities (Item 32, $x = 3.31$)
4. Parliament effectively monitors the disbursement and collection of the funds in the budget (Item 29, $x = 3.23$)

One of the 4 items above are within “representation and participation” (item 4), two are within “performance” (items 29 & 32) and one is within the “integrity” principle (item 58).

The two items to which only parliamentarians responded negatively (but not employees or Moustachar/Councilors) are: a) Parliament effectively investigates matters of corruption and mismanagement of public funds (item 33), and b) Parliamentary staff are selected according to objective professional criteria (item 46).



The two items to which only employees responded negatively¹ (but not parliamentarians or employees) is: a) Parliament do not frequently delegate its legislative power to the executive (reverse coded) (item 21) and b) Parliamentarians effectively adhere to conflict of interest rules (item 55).

Finally, Moustachar/Councilors rated negatively one item within “Internal parliamentary rules are clear” (item 39). This item was not negatively viewed by either the parliamentarians or the employees.

For an exhaustive list of items to which two of the three groups provided negative feedback, please refer to appendix B.

Items Rated Most Negatively

As depicted above, many aspects of the state of the parliament were negatively evaluated. The five items least favourably evaluated by parliamentarians, employees and Moustachar/Councilors lead to the following conclusions:

	P	E	M
32 Parliament do not effectively oversee the government in all of its activities.	X	X	X
4 Candidates for parliamentary seats do not have equal access to private and public media enabling them to communicate with their constituents.		X	X
15 Parliamentarians do not receive the adequate financial compensation that guarantees their independence	X		X
47 Parliamentary staff do not regularly attend compulsory training sessions.	X	X	
58 Parliamentarians do not declare their financial assets in an accurate and honest manner		X	X
1 Elections are not administered in a free and fair manner without pressures			X
29 Parliament do not effectively monitor the disbursement and collection of the funds in the budget	X		
39 Internal parliamentary rules are not clear			X
46 Parliamentary staff are not selected according to objective professional criteria.	X		
57 Political finance is not regulated by clear rules.			X
60 Anyone can not access the minutes of parliamentary sessions without restrictions		X	

Parliamentarians ranked items 29, 47, 32, 46 and 15 consecutively as the least favourable in the state of the parliament. Four of these items refer to the “performance principle” (items 29, 47, 32, & 46), and one item (15) to the independence principle.

Employees ranked items 58, 60, 32, 4 and 47 consecutively as the least favourable in the state of the parliament.; Two of these items (items 58 & 60) are in the “integrity” principle, two refer to “performance” (items 32 & 47) and one belongs to the “representation and participation” principle (item 4).

Moustachar/Councilors ranked items 4, 58, 15, 57, 1, 32 and 39 consecutively as the least favourable in the state of the parliament. Items are relatively scattered across dimensions: Two of these items belong to the “representation and participation” principle (1 & 4), two

¹ Both of these items were on the cut off point. Their means are 3.00.



refer to integrity (items 57 & 58), one pertains to “independence” (items 15) and two are within the “performance” (items 32 & 39) dimension.

Items Rated Most Positively

On the more positive end of the analysis, the five items most favourably evaluated by parliamentarians, employees and Moustachar/Councilors lead to the following conclusions:

	Morocco		
	P	E	M
35 Parliamentary committees effectively study and debate draft laws before submission to the plenary assembly	X	X	X
51 Parliamentarians have effective access to government documents.	X	X	X
48 To what extent are the parliament’s documented resources adequate (library or research centre or data bank)		X	X
24 Parliamentarians study and debate draft laws seriously and in details before approving them	X		X
28 Parliamentarians refer to the previous year’s budget numbers to correct and estimate the projected year’s budget		X	X
52 Parliamentarians participate in workshops for professional development.		X	X
2 Candidates have the means to contest the election results.		X	
14 Parliamentarians are not subject to threats of physical harm	X		
15 Parliamentarians receive the adequate financial compensation that guarantees their independence		X	
16 Parliamentarians do not occasionally legislate laws under undue pressures (internal or external)	X		
25 Parliament refers to experts when studying draft laws.			X
27 Parliamentarians resort to economists and financial experts to study and approve the budget			X
41 Parliamentary sessions are managed in full conformity with internal rules	X		
43 Parliamentary groups work according to their own internal organizational rules	X		
49 Parliamentarians regularly use the resources (library or research centre or data bank)		X	

Parliamentarians ranked items 35, 14, 24, 16, 43, 51, and 41 consecutively as the most favourable in the state of the parliament; five items refer to the “performance” dimension (items 35, 24, 43, 51, & 41) and two belong to independence (items 14 & 16).

Employees ranked items 51, 15, 35, 48, 49, 52, 2 and 28 consecutively as the most favourable in the state of the parliament. One of these items (item 15) belongs to “independence”, one item refers to “representation and participation” (item 2) and the remaining six items pertain to the “performance” dimension.

Moustachar/Councilors ranked items 35, 25, 52, 28, 24, 51, 48 and 27 as the most favourable in the state of the parliament. All these items refer to “performance” and such clustering is indicative of the positive attitudes that the Moustachar/Councilors in Morocco hold towards the performance of the state of the parliament.

Frequencies of Specific Items

The table below presents the percentage of participants who believe that the election campaigns are financed by several sources and that the parliament is influenced by several sources as well.





	P			E			M		
	Good/ Fine/ significant	Neutral	Poor/ weak/ insignificant	Good/ Fine/ significant	Neutral	Poor/ weak/ insignificant	Good/ Fine/ significant	Neutral	Poor/ weak/ insignificant
5 Generally, to which degree are Election campaigns financed by Personal funds of the candidate	76%		24%	70%	20%	10%	73.3%		26.7%
6 Generally, to which degree are Election campaigns financed by Individual donations	47.8%	26.1	26.1%	50%	37.5%	12.5%	30.8%	15.4%	53.8%
7 Generally, to which degree are Election campaigns financed by Corporate donations	20.8%	29.2%	50%	71.4%	28.6%		25%	33.3%	41.7%
8 Generally, to which degree are Election campaigns financed by Public funds	35%	30%	35%	28.6%	42.9%	28.6	21.4%	14.3%	64.3%
18 To which degree is the Parliament influenced/pressured by The government	32%	16%	52%	30%	20%	50%	33.3%	6.7%	60%
19 To which degree is the Parliament influenced/pressured by Non-governmental entities	4.2%	25%	70.8%	22.2%	33.3%	44.4%	6.7%	20%	73.3%
20 To which degree is the Parliament influenced/pressured by International entities	8.7%	30.4%	60.9%	22.2%	33.3%	44.4%		25%	75%



Opinions on Most Needed Reforms in Parliament

The questionnaire included a series of “reform” questions. Participants were asked to rate the importance of reform in each of the subsections of the state of the parliament questionnaire.

The five domains that require the highest need for reform according to parliamentarians, employees and Moustachar/Councilors are presented:

	P	E	M
31 It is essential to have specialized financial experts assisting parliamentarians in reviewing and overseeing the budget	X	X	X
50 Improved staffing and equipment would strengthen the ability of parliament to function effectively	X	X	X
34 Parliament should be more active in overseeing the executive	X	X	
38 It is essential to assign parliamentarians to committees based on their expertise in order to increase the committees’ efficiency	X		X
53 More specialized, on-going training for parliamentarians would make the parliament more competent and more efficient	X		X
13 Parliamentarians should consult more frequently with constituents and civil society organizations to make the parliament more representative		X	
42 Reforms of the internal parliamentary rules are needed to improve the efficiency of parliament		X	
56 Effective enforcement of conflict of interest rules is needed to ensure the integrity of the Parliament			X
59 Reforms of political financing rules are needed to strengthen the integrity of the Parliament	X		
61 More transparency in parliamentary activity would improve the integrity of the Parliament		X	

Parliamentarians ranked items 50, 31, 34, 38 and 59 consecutively as the most needed reforms in the state of the parliament. One of the items highlighted above refers to integrity (item 59) and the remaining four pertain to the performance domain.

Again, employees identified items 50, 53, 13, 31, 34, 61 and 42 consecutively as those requiring reform in the state of the parliament. One of these items refers to integrity (item 61) and another belongs to the “representation and participation” (item 13) domain. The five remaining items pertain to the “performance” principle.

Finally, Moustachar/Councilors believe that items 31, 53, 50, 56 and 38 consecutively are those that require most reform in the state of the parliament. Item 56 refers to integrity while the remaining four items are within the “performance” dimension.

II. DETAILED FINDINGS FROM SURVEY

Representation and Participation

There is a concern over whether elections are free and fair and if there are equal opportunities for candidates in Morocco. The parliamentarians’ regular communication with constituents and civil society organizations does strengthen the participation of the Parliament.



Free And Fair Elections

- Forty-nine percent do not think that the elections are administered in a free and fair manner without pressures.
- A strong majority agree that candidates have the means to contest the elections results (78%).

Equal Opportunities Of Candidates

- Respondents disagree that candidates for parliamentary seats have equal access to private and public media enabling them to communicate with their constituents (58%).
- According to respondents, elections campaigns are generally financed by the personal funds of the candidate (74%) and individual donations (43%). A plurality disagree that public funds (43%) and corporate donations (39%) finance election campaigns.

Participation

- Seventy-four percent indicate that parliamentarians communicate periodically with their constituents on issues pertaining to public life, and 64% agree that they consult with civil society organizations on issues submitted to parliament.

Reforms

- Ninety-five percent agree that parliamentarians should consult more frequently with constituents and civil society organizations to make the parliament more representative.
- Reforms are needed to ensure equal media and campaign funding opportunities (81%) and to reinforce the freedom and fairness of elections (76%).

Independence

Respondents indicate that the parliamentarians do enjoy some independence, but there are a few concerns. Parliamentarians are protected from harm and undue pressures, but respondents question whether they receive adequate financial compensation to ensure their independence. The absence of external pressures on the Parliament ensures the ability of the parliamentarians to fulfill its mandate.

Protection Of Parliamentarians

- Sixty-five percent disagree that parliamentarians are subject to threats of physical harm.
- Respondents do not think that parliamentarians receive the adequate financial compensation that guarantees their independence (51%), and 61% indicate that parliamentarians do not occasionally legislate laws under undue pressures (internal or external).

Independence Of Parliament In Fulfilling Its Mandate

- Respondents report that the Parliament is not influenced by international entities (61%) and the government (54%).
- There is a mixed opinion as to whether non-governmental entities pressure the Parliament (33% agree, neutral and disagree).

Reforms

- Ninety-percent of respondents agree that reforms are needed to guarantee that parliamentarians fulfill their duties independently.



- Respondents think that reforms of the parliament's administrative agencies are necessary to reduce the influence of the executive on them (89%), and 74% agree that additional measures are needed to increase the protection of parliamentarians.

Performance

Respondents report that the Parliament performs effectively. The legislative process, the parliamentary committees and groups, the competence of the parliamentarians and the performance of parliamentarians according to internal parliamentary rules strengthen the overall efficiency of the Parliament. Respondents are concerned with the oversight of public finance due to the Parliament's ineffective monitoring of the funds in the budget. The lack of confidence in the Parliament's oversight of the executive undermines its overall performance. With an exception of the respondents wavering back and forth over whether the parliamentary staff attend the compulsory training sessions, the administrative and technical bodies are considered to be efficient.

Efficiency In The Legislative Process

- A strong majority agree that parliamentarians study and debate draft laws seriously and in details before approving them (81%).
- Seventy-one percent think that the Parliament refers to experts when studying draft laws.

Effective Oversight Of Public Finance

- According to respondents, parliamentarians resort to economists and financial experts to study and approve the budget (71%).
- Eighty-five percent indicate that parliamentarians refer to the previous year's budget numbers to correct and estimate the projected year's budget, but 50% do not think that the Parliament effectively monitors the disbursement and collection of the funds in the budget.
- A majority agree that the parliamentarians use the reports of the Court of Audit to correct the expenditure of public funds (62%).

Effective Oversight Of The Executive

- Fifty-six percent disagree that the Parliament effectively oversees the government in all of its activities.
- According to respondents, the Parliament effectively investigates matters of corruption and mismanagement of public funds (59%).

Efficiency Of Parliamentary Committees

- Ninety-four percent think that the parliamentary committees effectively study and debate draft laws before submission to the plenary assembly.
- A majority agree that the committees effectively oversee government activity (68%) and that the committee meetings are run in an efficient manner (73%).

Performance Of Parliamentarians According To Internal Parliamentary Rules

- Fifty-two percent report that the internal parliamentary rules are clear and 53% indicate that these rules are implemented in a way that guarantees the ability of the Parliament to fulfill its mandate.
- A majority agree that the parliamentary sessions are managed in full conformity with internal rules (66%).



Efficiency Of Parliamentary Groups

- Respondents think that the parliamentary groups work according to their own internal organizational rules (79%).
- Seventy-seven percent agree that the parliamentarians regularly attend the block meetings and follow a set agenda.

Efficiency Of Administrative And Technical Bodies

- Respondents agree that the parliamentary staff are selected according to objective professional criteria (51%).
- There are mixed views on whether the parliamentary staff regularly attend compulsory training sessions (48% agree and disagree).
- Seventy-eight percent report that the parliament's documented resources are adequate, and 66% agree that the parliamentarians regularly use these resources.

Competence Of Parliamentarians

- Respondents strongly agree that the parliamentarians have effective access to government documents (90%) and 76% think that the parliamentarians participate in workshops for professional development.

Reforms

- Reforms are needed to improve staffing and equipment (100%) and the internal parliamentary rules (81%) to improve the efficiency of the Parliament.
- Ninety-eight percent think that the Parliament should be more active in overseeing the executive.
- According to respondents, it is essential to have specialized financial experts assisting parliamentarians in reviewing and overseeing the budget (97%).
- Ninety-three percent think that there should be more specialized training for the parliamentarians.
- Respondents report that parliamentarians should be assigned to committees based on their expertise (93%), and 85% encourage the creation of parliamentary blocks to increase the efficiency of Parliament.
- Eighty-five percent agree that the use of independent research centers by parliamentarians would make the legislative process more efficient.

Integrity

Respondents' concerns with the political financing rules and the lack of transparency in the parliamentary activity challenges the integrity of the Parliament. The Parliament's clear conflict of interest rules and the parliamentarians' adherence to these rules strengthens its integrity.

Conflict Of Interest

- Sixty percent agree that the Parliament has clear rules prohibiting conflict of interest.
- A plurality thinks that the parliamentarians effectively adhere to conflict of interest (47%, 38% disagree, 13% neutral).

Political Financing Rules For Parties And Election Campaigns

- Sixty-one percent disagree that the parliamentarians declare their financial assets in an accurate and honest manner.
- Only 46% agree that political finance is regulated by clear rules, but 42% disagree.



Transparency Of Parliamentary Activity

- Respondent disagree that anyone can access the minutes of parliamentary sessions without restrictions (54%).

Reforms

- Ninety-six percent think that more transparency in parliamentary activity would improve the integrity of the Parliament.
- Reforms of the political financing rules (85%) and effective enforcement of conflict of interest rules are both necessary to strengthen the integrity of the Parliament (88%).

III. Missing Data Analysis:

An analysis of missing data yielded significant findings that warrant attention. The overall pattern of missing responses did not exceed 4%, except for item 39 “Internal parliamentary rules are clear” in which the missing responses reached 18%. This indicates that the questionnaire, on the whole, did not create unexpected complications for participants. However, closer attention to the pattern of missing data points to

- 1- **Item 14** “Parliamentarians are subject to threats of physical harm” had the highest rate of missing data with 48% of participants reporting their inability to assess this item. Either participants felt the item to be too sensitive or they did not feel confident enough to provide an assessment on that question.

Analysis based on the two items highlighted above need to be treated with caution. Results may be biased by a series of factors.

IV. LIMITATIONS

It is important to note that the study does not allow sweeping generalisations about the state of the parliament; the survey used a random sample of parliamentarians, employees and Moustachar/Councilors, but the sample size is too small to allow for confident generalisations. Furthermore, difficulties accessing these population (see refusal rates) limit the ability to generalise to the population since those that accepted to participate in this survey and those that refused may have different characteristics and perspectives.