



Prof. J.A. van Kemenade

Foreword

Without democracy, no one fares well. That is the title of the programme for 2003-2006 in which the Board of the IMD has charted the Institute's course for the coming years. A title which indicates that it is not possible to combat poverty in the long term without democracy.

In democratically-run countries, governments can be held accountable by voters and a free press for their policies to fight poverty. Moreover, the poor in a democracy have a say in shaping improvements to their living conditions.

That voice and contribution are mobilised by political parties. Democracy cannot exist without them. Anyone wanting to support the development of democracy cannot overlook the work of the parties. Yet very little attention has been paid to this point within international cooperation in recent years. Wrongly! Political parties face all kinds of difficulties and, in young and established democracies alike, enjoy little trust or respect amongst the general population. Improving their performance is therefore urgently needed if the processes of democratisation which are falteringly unfolding in today's world are to be made more effective.

The IMD was founded in 2001 by Dutch political parties to support their counterparts in young democracies. In 2002 support programmes were launched in Tanzania, Zimbabwe, Ghana, Guatemala and Bolivia, as well as in Mozambique. Preparations were made for further programmes through dialogue with political parties in Malawi, Zambia, Mali, Surinam and Indonesia. The IMD hopes to be able to start supporting parties in those nations in 2003. The total number of countries in which partnership relationships are maintained is thus eleven.

Thanks to the IMD's unique formula – it is a joint initiative by the Dutch political parties with an entirely unpartisan approach to democratic parties in the partner countries – we have already managed to facilitate a number of remarkable activities in our short existence. In Guatemala, for example, we are working with the UNDP to develop a common vision of the nation's future from all 16 registered parties. This should act as a guide for the politicians, with elections deciding which party or parties are given

governmental responsibility to achieve that vision, and what strategy should be used. With all the divisions which still dominate Guatemala, this is seen as a necessary consolidation of the peace treaties which ended the civil war in 1996.

In Bolivia, too, all the parties represented in Parliament have now set up a joint organisation which acts as a forum where they can meet to debate how to reinforce their fragile democracy. Since the sharp polarisation of that country, this is now the only place where the political antagonists confer with one another.

One of the IMD's activities in Tanzania was the organisation of a live television debate between all the party leaders on the theme of "poverty alleviation". Never before had leading politicians there discussed such an important and substantial topic on television. The programme was an incredible success and has been repeated twice.

These examples show that the special relationship of trust which the IMD develops with political parties creates the opportunity to give substance to the practice of democracy. Yet we are still only at the beginning of the process. We are grateful for the support and interest we have received from all sides. And we look forward to further building upon this during the coming year. The improved IMD website is an important communication tool for achieving this. If you are interested in the IMD's programme, do not hesitate to consult the site or contact our organisation directly. Your interest and contributions are most welcome.

Prof. J.A. van Kemenade
President, IMD

Contents

1. Institutional development of the IMD in 2002.....	6
2. Programme development summary.....	10
3. Ghana.....	11
4. Mozambique.....	14
5. Tanzania.....	17
6. Malawi.....	20
7. Mali.....	22
8. Zambia.....	24
9. Zimbabwe.....	26
10. Bolivia.....	28
11. Guatemala.....	31
12. Surinam.....	34
13. Indonesia.....	37
14. About the IMD.....	40

Democracy: transition, evolution or role model?

What is often thought of as an uneasy, precarious middle ground between full-fledged democracy and outright dictatorship is actually the most common political condition today of countries in the developing world and the post communist world.

- Thomas Carothers

Without democracy, no one fares well. There is a growing consensus that "democracy" is a form of government in which conflicts are resolved without violence, in which human rights are respected and in which the socio-economic conditions to combat poverty can be achieved. The development of democracy is not an autonomous process, however. That was underlined in November 2002, in the lecture entitled "The end of the transition paradigm" given by Thomas Carothers on the occasion of the official opening of the IMD Bureau in The Hague. The thesis that democracy automatically develops once dictatorial systems have been toppled is, according to Carothers, untenable. After taking a few positive steps, many countries seem to descend into monopolistic one-party structures or unworkable coalitions.

In the debate on democracy, it was originally assumed that the design and establishment of democratic structures like institutions, parliaments and party organisations – the "hardware" – would automatically lead to a properly-functioning democracy. However, the culture of democracy – the "software" – actually appears to be at least as important. It is through dialogue that mutual trust between parties is created, it is through dialogue that citizens' mistrust of governments is diminished, and it is through dialogue that broad support for a national agenda is generated. For this reason, the IMD's long-term programme places a prominent emphasis upon the initiation, facilitation and monitoring of the national dialogue in the programme countries. This dialogue can also serve to develop priorities upon which support can focus, and thus ensure the ownership of the process.

Democracy assessment

The question which arises out of Carothers' statement that democracies do not necessarily follow the same path of development is: how can the democratic quality of a state be quantified? If there are transitional phases, how are these defined? Do "hardware" parameters like the gross national product, institutional evolution and the development of parties determine the level of democracy? And how do we measure the "software": levels of participation, quality of electoral processes, dialogue?

These questions are very topical. In 2003, we intend to organise a symposium which will address this aspect of the debate on democracy. Democratic development as a transitional process is an important topic for the 2003 agenda.

Institutional development of parties

One challenge in the debate about the consolidation of democratic reform is the way in which political parties develop institutionally. Parties in many young democracies are often active only at election times, disappearing entirely from the stage during the intervening periods. How can political parties ensure they develop into effective channels of communication between the people and their administration? What kind of organisation is needed to achieve this? How is internal party democracy organised? How are members involved in formulating policy priorities? How can financing be arranged in such a way that it reinforces party independence? Within what legal frameworks do political parties operate and do they offer sufficient scope for the parties to perform their core tasks? Does the electoral system enable the pluriform development of political parties? Do those parties have enough knowledge and ability to carry out their tasks effectively?

All these questions are essential to the proper functioning of the channels of democracy. Polls show that political parties in many countries can count upon little public trust. And the processes of democratisation in many young democracies are in danger of foundering as a result of power politics amongst party elites. It is therefore important that the political reform which is necessary for good governance and progress also encompasses appropriate change inside political parties, in order that they remain in step with the administrative system within which they operate.

The information society

The rise of information and communications technology is raising new questions for parties, institutions and citizens. The growing demand for transparency and customised information is putting great pressure upon party organisations. More direct forms of political participation are reinforcing – or undermining – the traditional types of representation. The significance of physical frontiers also continues to decline, with the result that the importance and influence of the international community keeps on growing.

Another consequence of ICT is the further articulation of single-issue movements, which sometimes develop out of government view. But the information revolution could also lead to a digital divide, between "haves" and "have nots", particularly when the overall level of development is low. Advances in the availability of information thus require not just technical infrastructure but also a high standard of development and further emancipation of the individual.

Institutional development of the IMD in 2002

General

Compared with 2001, the IMD experienced rapid growth this year. Whereas the Institute's work last year concentrated upon setting up the organisation itself, in 2002 our main focus turned to establishing and increasing the number of support programmes. The IMD has defined its vision, and the justification for it, in the long-term programme entitled *Without democracy, no one fares well*. A structural expansion of the Institute's programmes requires good policy and administration on our part. These, too, were developed during 2002 in parallel with the main programme.

Organisation

The Executive Board of the IMD comprises representatives from a number of Dutch political parties. There were three membership changes during 2002. Since March the Executive Board has been chaired by Professor Jos van Kemenade. Following the merger of the GPV and RPF parties to form the ChristenUnie (Christian Union), RPF representative Roel Kuiper stepped down from the Board. Fred Teeven, parliamentary leader of the party Leefbaar Nederland, joined the Board. The full Executive Board met every two months, and in 2002 an Executive Committee was formed comprising the President, Vice-President and Treasurer of the Board.

With the creation of a full-time Bureau to carry out operational tasks, the Board has increasingly been working at a distance. It now concentrates upon defining policy and approving programmes. At the operational level, the parties are represented within the Bureau by their own programme officers. These are party workers who have been seconded to the IMD. As part of the IMD's institutional policy adjustment, work began in 2002 on the development of a strategic plan which clearly defines the political function of the programme officers. This will focus primarily upon political direction of the content of programmes in individual countries and upon increasing support for IMD activities within the Dutch political parties.

This policy adjustment is running in parallel with the development of a centrally coordinated network organisation. The Executive Director and the Bureau are at the heart of this structure, managing the programmes and guiding the programme officers. Since March 2002 the Bureau has been headed by an Executive Director, Roel von Meijenfeldt, who until shortly beforehand had been Director of the International Institute for Democratic and Electoral Assistance (IDEA). Also recruited to the Bureau in 2002 were a Senior Policy Officer, Jan Tuit, and an Office Manager, Marieke van Doorn. At the operational level, the Executive Director, the Bureau staff and the programme officers meet fortnightly.

In some programme countries the IMD makes use of local staff. In Mozambique we have had a Permanent Representative, Jan Nico van Overbeeke, since September 2000. Doris Cruz became Permanent

Representative in Guatemala in 2000. In Ghana and Tanzania the IMD is represented by liaison officers. The Permanent Representative is being given a more regional role, covering all of Southern Africa.

The Advisory Board met on 7 November 2002. At this meeting a Chairman was elected: Mr P. Luijten of the Liberal Party (VVD). A Presidium was also appointed, made up of the Chairman, Ms B. Stolte-van Empelen of the Green Party (Groen Links) and Mr J. Dankers of the Reformed Party (SGP).

With its institutional reinforcement and the creation of a permanent office, the IMD has also invested in premises. After being temporarily housed in the Zürich Tower, the Institute moved to a permanent address at Korte Vijverberg 2 in The Hague. The new office was officially opened by the Institute's President, Professor Jos van Kemenade, on 7 November 2002.



Opening of the IMD office: Roel von Meijenfeldt, Executive Director, 7 November 2002.

Programme-related institutional developments

The IMD's initial grant funding was originally scheduled to expire on 30 April 2002. This period was subsequently extended until 30 September, and then until 31 December 2002. These extensions allowed time for the IMD to apply for funding under the new "thematic co-financing" (TMF) scheme. Extensive consultations were held with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs about this change. One result of these is that the IMD's financial administration has been further refined in accordance with the Ministry's expectations.

The Institute received the decision on its grant application from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on 2 December 2002. This awarded only part of the requested funding for the period 2003-2006. The IMD Board met on 19 December 2002 to discuss this matter and decided to submit a "holding" objection. This was prompted by the so-called "Terpstra amendment" adopted by the House of Representatives during its consideration of the 2003 Foreign Affairs and Development Cooperation Budget in December.

After the general election of May 2002, the new Pim Fortuyn List (LPF) and Leefbaar Nederland (LN) parties were invited to participate in the IMD. The Socialist Party (SP) was also once again invited to take part. The changed composition of the House of Representatives following the election also had repercussions for the distribution of resources and the allocation of country coordination responsibility amongst the parties within the IMD. In carrying out this realignment, which takes effect from 1 January 2003, the Institute has endeavoured to maintain as much managerial continuity as possible.

The IMD published its 2001 annual report and financial report, and subsequently received endorsement for them from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. A report on the IMD/IDEA conference, "Network Democracy: Enhancing the Role of Parties", was also published and distributed. The financial report on this event was submitted to the Ministry during the second half of the year. Finally, the Institute's half-yearly report was approved by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in October 2002.

The IMD knowledge organisation

As well as the consideration given to programme development, the IMD has been working on its own evolution and advancement as a knowledge organisation and on generating broad support for its work within the Dutch political parties. A number of articles about the Institute appeared in party journals and its programme was discussed at several party meetings. On 7 November 2002 the IMD organised a lecture on democratisation. The keynote speaker was Thomas Carothers, Vice-President of the Carnegie Endowment for Peace.

Another aspect to the development of the knowledge organisation is enhancing policy and support for it amongst IMD staff. This issue was addressed during two internal sessions, held in April and December 2002 and attended by Bureau staff, programme officers and field representatives.

Management system

As indicated earlier, the increase in the number of programme countries has made it essential for the IMD to develop a good management structure. The basis for this was established during the compilation of the long-term budget for the Institute's programme. This policy was then translated into a process management system (PMS). The IMD's objective is to computerise its management tasks as extensively as possible, so that the projects and programmes can be coordinated at different locations. The computerised PMS is expected to enter service in April 2003.

Network

The IMD is not just a network organisation in the sense that its work is decentralised, but also because it is an active networker with other organisations operating in support of the democratic and governance

agenda. Since the support or involvement of political parties does not feature in the broad development strategies as these are currently enshrined in the World Bank's Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers/Comprehensive Development Framework (PRSP/CDF) processes and, based upon them, the country strategy papers of the multilateral and bilateral donors, the IMD maintains active relationships with development partners both "large" and "small". This is done partly so as to achieve complementarity and partly from an advocacy perspective: to draw attention to the need for support from political parties.

The IMD is in close contact with the Dutch embassies in the programme countries. Whilst recognising that respective responsibilities must be kept separate, regular consultation provides the Institute with important advice regarding the development of its programmes. It is also expected that our contacts with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, with which equally good relations are maintained, will in the future be upgraded to a policy dialogue and thus become even more substantial.

Other contacts are maintained with a number of international organisations. These include the International Institute for Democratic and Electoral Assistance (IDEA), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the World Bank (WB). Apart from being in touch with the EU delegations in programme countries, we have not yet had the opportunity to establish links with the central EU institutions. In addition, the IMD is officially represented on the NGO Forum of the Community of Democracies, the Inter-American Forum on Political Parties of the Organisation of American States and the Advisory Council of the Association of Dutch Local Authorities International (VNG-I).

In the Netherlands, the IMD Bureau maintains contacts with the party directors of the participating political parties so as to facilitate smooth implementation of the secondment agreements between them and us. There are only sporadic contacts with party research departments. It is our intention to intensify these in the future.

Financial development

<i>Total expenditure</i>	2002: €	2,273,549
	2001: €	740,874

Increase: 207%

<i>Programme expenditure</i>	2002: €	1,584,404
	2001: €	238,042

Increase: 566%

Programme development summary

In line with our vision as laid out in the programme for 2003-2006, programmes have been established in Guatemala, Tanzania, Ghana and Bolivia, adding to those already under way in Mozambique. Important preparatory work has also taken place in Zimbabwe, Malawi, Zambia, Mali, Surinam and Indonesia. It is expected that these will lead to the creation of actual programmes during 2003.

The identification and dialogue phases conducted by the IMD in various countries in 2002 have made it clear that we cannot implement a "standard" programme. The political situation, history and culture of each nation is so individual that every programme must be specifically developed to suit its circumstances. This makes the dialogue phase very important. The IMD programmes are created through a dialogue with representatives of the leading political parties in the countries upon which we are focusing. The programme focus for each country is the result of that dialogue and so varies from nation to nation, although actual contents and working methods display a high degree of coherence.

This has resulted in a variety of programmes, which often consist of a mix of programme types. Bilateral support based upon so-called "drawing rights" – an allocated, maximum sum a participating party may draw to facilitate approved activities – is combined with cross-party projects which may contain both training and dialogue elements. In some countries dialogue is key. A policy development formulated by the parties themselves should lead to a long-term programme to support the political parties in the countries concerned. Crucial to this is the building of local capacity. The organisation, development and implementation of the programme are in the hands of local partners.

The unique composition of the IMD, which is the result of a joint effort on the part of the Dutch political parties, enables us to facilitate sensitive political processes as a neutral and expert institution. With our specific focus upon political parties, the IMD homes in on an essential link in the democratic development and stability of a nation – one which is not supported by other organisations in their implementation of the agenda of governance.

Ghana

Introduction

Ghana provides a positive example of democratic development in Africa thanks to the peaceful change of government following the 2000 general election. The political debate there was dominated by four developments in 2002. The first concerned the economic progress forecast by the governing New Patriotic Party of President Kufuor. In particular, the drastic investments and reforms made by the government – specifically, the adoption of HIPC status and extensive privatisation – led to much discussion and controversy.



Ghana (population 20,244,154)

A second development was the outbreak of violence between several tribes in the north of the country. The murder of a "paramount chief" in March 2002 triggered a spiral of violence which reached into the highest echelons of the regional administration.

Thirdly, at the party-political level, a struggle broke out within the largest opposition party – the National Democratic Congress (NDC) of former Flight-Lieutenant Jerry Rawlings – about who should be its presidential candidate in the 2004 election. This was between Rawlings' protégé, Atta Mills, and another prominent member of the NDC, Kwesi Botchwey. These two men symbolise the debate within the party between those who want to preserve Rawlings' legacy and those who want to break with the past. Finally, there was the formation of the National Reconciliation Commission (NRC), which is investigating the abuses of past regimes ever since Ghanaian independence in 1957.

Programme structure and activities

By the end of 2002 the programme in Ghana had reached the implementation phase. This involves the formulation and development of a national agenda for the consolidation of democracy and the role of political parties in that process, by means of a forum made up of those parties represented in Parliament. The first stage of the implementation phase is

due to last until December 2003. The national agenda to be formulated during this phase will form the basis for the subsequent long-term programme.

A follow-up mission took place at the end of January 2002. Its main objectives were to improve relations with the opposition party NDC and to organise the modalities for a programme and the start-up conference. The mission succeeded in both tasks, although it turned out later that the legislative framework – cooperation with the Ghanaian Electoral Commission – remained a sticking point.

The goal of the start-up conference in May 2002 was to allow the participating political parties to identify the main objectives for a programme. This was done based upon both the national agenda in Ghana and the current ability of the parties to function fully within a multi-party democracy. The participants recognised that the political parties needed a platform to conduct focused debate on national issues in a spirit of national reconciliation. They also believed that such a platform could act as a basis for a programme of action to implement the outcomes of the various discussions.

A follow-up mission took place in mid October 2002. The purpose of this was to further develop the programme direction. After consultation with all the parliamentary parties, deliberations with the Electoral Commission resulted in the foundation of a platform for political parties which, in partnership with the local Institute for Economic Affairs, is at the heart of the programme.

This set-up was endorsed at the end of November, when IEA Director Dr Charles Mensa visited the IMD in The Hague. Subsequently, in Accra, the General Secretaries of the four Ghanaian parliamentary parties met to approve the Memorandum of Understanding drawn up between them. That agreement was formally signed in January 2003.

Partners

The Ghanaian parties with which the IMD is working are the New Patriotic Party, the National Democratic Congress, the Convention People's Party and the People's National Convention.

Structurally, the IMD cooperates with the Institute for Economic Affairs.

And there are ad-hoc contacts with the Ghana Centre for Democratic Development, the NGO Productivity Enhancement Network, the law firm Gaisie Zwennes Hughes & Co., the Electoral Commission and various government agencies in their capacity as EC consultants.

We also cooperate with the German Friedrich Naumann Foundation, Friedrich Ebert Foundation and Konrad Adenauer Foundation. Other international partners are the UNDP, Soft Internet Solutions and the Dutch Embassy in Accra.

The IMD has its own contact person in Ghana, Tjalling Y. Wiarda. He administers the Institute's local entity, the NGO IMD Ghana. Programme responsibility during 2002 was in the hands of the Liberal Party (VVD) and Democratic Party (D66) programme officer. The programme is largely being moderated by our local partner, the Institute for Economic Affairs.

Conclusions and results

At the end of 2002 the four political parties in Ghana committed themselves to a programme which, in the first instance, is investigating their role in consolidating the nation's democracy. This should result in an agenda which will form the basis for the IMD's long-term programme – and, possibly, that of other donors in Ghana.

Lessons learned

Our work originally centred upon intensive consultation with the Electoral Commission. But new options were also explored during the second half of 2002. This resulted in a revision of the programme, with the selection of another implementation partner. In future it would be sensible to gain a proper insight into the policy direction of a country before actually selecting partners.

The party-led choice of programme countries, which tends to result in the selection of nations where a sister party holds an important position, can be disadvantageous. The VVD's preference for Ghana, where the neo-liberal NPP took power in 2000, led to questions from the main opposition party, the NDC. It took a lot of time and effort on the part of the IMD to convince all those involved of our independent status.

Mozambique

Introduction

Political life in Mozambique is dominated by two main players: the governing party Frelimo and the opposition Renamo. At the last elections to the "Assembleia da República", the Republican Assembly, in late 1999 Frelimo won 48 per cent of the popular vote and the Renamo-led coalition 38 per cent. Renamo heads an alliance with 10 other parties, each of which has two parliamentary seats. The other opposition parties are smaller and are not represented in Parliament. These parties have limited influence upon national politics.



Mozambique (population 19,607,519)

Mozambique is a young democracy, independent for 28 years and only free of civil war for the past ten years. The two opposing movements have succeeded in creating a fairly stable situation with a slowly institutionalising democratic arena – which, given their history, is a major advance in itself.

Positive signals include the participation by Renamo and other opposition parties in the forthcoming local elections and the formulation of a number of new electoral laws. But it remains a cause for concern that Mozambique features in the "top ten" on the list of most corrupt nations published by Transparency International. The sensational trial of the murderers of investigative journalist Carlos Cardoso has recently ended. Those directly

involved were given heavy sentences, but many people feel that those who actually ordered the killing have escaped justice.

Programme structure and activities

The programme in Mozambique began in October 2000. Legally and financially it falls under the Foundation for a New South Africa (NZA).

The NZA-IMD office is located in Maputo. As well as the Dutch regional representative, it employs three part-time Mozambican staff: a project officer, a secretary and a driver. This local expertise has been enhanced by giving the project officer intensive coaching and responsibility.

The emphasis during the implementation phase is upon projects designed to improve the functioning of political parties. The IMD Board has reserved more money for cross-party activities so that we are not facilitating the parties' own initiatives but can also provide qualitative input for capacity building.

The party projects have mainly taken the form of national or regional conferences on such themes as elections, strategy development, internal communications, and so on.

The following cross-party activities have been organised: a course on financial management, a seminar on party organisation, a seminar on the relationship between the party and the media, two seminars on "the functioning of municipal government" and "electoral legislation", and a strategic planning project for political parties.

Partners

Cooperation with other organisations has been satisfactory. During 2002 we worked with European Parliamentarians for Africa (AWEPA) and the National Democratic Institute (NDI), as well as with the Mozambican consultancy CBE. And, in addition to contacts with the smaller parties, close partnerships were built up with both Frelimo and Renamo.

Conclusions and results

There appears to be much appreciation of the NZA-IMD programme. The parties have become more visible in society and have been acting with greater self-awareness. However, their financial accountability remains a worrying and time-consuming issue.

Although all the parties in the NZA-IMD programme started on an equal footing, we are now witnessing the emergence of "leaders" and "stragglers". Strategy development is an important and necessary aspect in further capacity building, but here our support is increasingly going to those parties which perform well and is being scaled down for those which do not fulfil agreements.

The combination of bilateral and cross-party projects is working well. Parties are using the knowledge gained from cross-party activities in their own projects, and the cross-party projects dovetail well with party needs. Our experiences of cooperation with parties from South Africa and Portugal are positive.

The confidence which this approach has built up, combined with the number of cross-party activities, has made a contribution to increasing political tolerance in Mozambique and to improving the visibility of the various political parties in society. This development fits in with the framework of a clearer cross-party strategy and the advancement and use of regional expertise.

Lessons learned

Although a system of "drawing rights" has its advantages, such as its apolitical character and the rapid building of a relationship of trust, there are also several drawbacks – for example, the complex administrative processing of countless small financial transactions. Structuring the programme as a series of rounds of drawing rights allows us to phase out those parties which do not take their own institutional development seriously.

In a country like Mozambique, with a fragile democracy in which support for political parties is a delicate topic, the presence on the ground of a local representative encourages frequent and intense communication with the political parties. This, in turn, fosters a thorough knowledge of the NZA-IMD and its procedures.

Tanzania

Introduction

Our main objective for 2002 was to initiate a support programme in Tanzania and to improve mutual trust.



Tanzania (population 37,187,939)

Programme structure and activities

The missions conducted in February and March were dominated by the need to generate support. On the government side, in particular, there originally existed considerable doubt as to the necessity of an IMD programme in Tanzania. It was thanks to efforts by the Registrar of Political Parties that those objections evaporated and broad support was created. The political parties were enthused almost immediately by the possibilities which the IMD has to offer. Even before it had become entirely clear that the Institute could actually launch a programme in Tanzania, all the parties had approached us with project proposals. The first series of these were implemented during the second half of 2002.

The initial project proposals required a good deal of refinement. Clearly, there was a need for a liaison officer who could address that issue quickly and straightforwardly. So, during the second quarter of the year, the IMD contracted a "first point of contact".

To obtain clarity about the financial management of the political parties, they themselves decided jointly to commission an investigation. Conducted by a local accountant based upon a questionnaire, this is still under way at the time of writing. It is intended to use the results as the basis for one or more workshops on financial management. This plan was discussed with the accountants and put to the political parties during a working visit in November.

The activities carried out by the parties under the bilateral programme – workshops on training the trainer, human rights, party policy, communications strategy, and so on – have resulted in party officials

meeting one another. The importance of such encounters was reaffirmed later by the parties. It is important that there be investment in the quality of activities over the next few years – for example, by drawing upon experiences from elsewhere in the region and through cooperation with partner organisations.

Television debate

The IMD helped to foster the debate between political parties about reform of the Tanzanian constitution by making financial and intrinsic contributions to a symposium, held in early July, on the first ten years of multi-party democracy. We also facilitated a television debate between the party leaders on fighting poverty. This took place in September. The debate was carefully prepared in partnership with the university of Dar es Salaam and was chaired by a Kenyan BBC journalist.



All the parties were delighted with this unique encounter. Never before had all the political parties met in order to discuss an issue in this way. By popular demand, the debate was repeated twice on both television and radio. A follow-up event is now being considered.

Partners

In Tanzania the IMD works in partnership with the Friedrich Naumann Foundation and the Friedrich Ebert Foundation. The parties with which we work are the governing Chama Cha Mapinduzi (CCM), plus the Civic United Front (CUF), the Chama Cha Demokrasia na Maendeleo (Chadema), the Tanzanian Labour Party (TLP), the United Democratic Party (UDP) and the National Convention for Construction and Reform Mageuzi (NCCR-Mageuzi).

Conclusions and results

It was definitively decided to include Tanzania on the list of programme countries after the identification mission of 2001. The political parties were

informed of this conclusion in January 2002, as were the Registrar of Political Parties and the Dutch Ambassador in Dar es Salaam.

The Board's decision was further explained during a working visit in February. During this visit, discussions were held with the political parties about the details of the project proposals to be submitted. The desirability of organising a launch activity was also investigated.

A second working visit took place in March. During this trip we held discussions with the Minister of Political Affairs. Agreements were also reached with the IMD's Liaison Officer. In addition, we met with an accountant to discuss an investigation of the political parties' financial capabilities and the auditing of their financial reports in respect of the projects.

The support we provide to political parties is based upon so-called "drawing rights". The parties submit proposals which result in funds being made available to them based upon a distribution formula. However, such a formula regularly generates dissatisfaction amongst those smaller opposition parties without parliamentary representation.

Negotiations about project proposals were conducted with the ruling CCM and with the CUF, Chadema, the NCCR-Mageuzi and the TLP. The first contracts have now been signed.

Lessons learned

Although those parties which have long dominated the political stage, like the CCM, tend to show little tolerance towards smaller parties, our first impression is that the IMD has succeeded in somewhat alleviating that situation.

The system of "drawing rights" can lead to dissatisfaction amongst parties without parliamentary representation.

The availability of a local Liaison Officer both reinforces understanding of the IMD's intentions and procedures amongst recipients and simplifies the planning, programming and effectiveness of our visits to the country in question.

Malawi

Introduction

The political situation in Malawi was dominated in 2002 by the possible amendment of the Constitution to allow President Muluzi to serve a third term in office. This created a tense situation within the already divided political parties, between supporters and opponents of change. This discussion led to the foundation of several new parties and movements opposed to Muluzi's plans during the year, and to attempts to unite the opposition.



Malawi (population 10,701,824)

Programme structure and activities

The IMD sent two identification missions to Malawi during 2002 with the aim of investigating opportunities for establishing a programme there.

The first mission took place in July and August. Its purpose was to meet political parties, NGOs, international organisations and government representatives so as to acquaint them with the IMD programme. It also sought to establish whether the political situation would allow for the establishment of a programme and whether there was a will to do so amongst the major players in Malawi.

The second mission followed in October and November. Its objectives were to verify the conclusions of the first, to investigate how we could work with sharply factionalised parties and to study how dialogue between the

various parties could be stimulated so as to develop a common agenda in terms of institutional reinforcement. During this mission the IMD employed the services of an external consultant.

Initially, a programme covering one calendar year is being set up. Prior to any follow-up phase, the pilot project will be evaluated in partnership with those concerned and a decision made on whether to continue or revise the current programme.

Partners

The IMD is working with all the registered political parties, the Malawian government, representatives of social organisations, academics, Dutch diplomats and representatives of bilateral and multilateral organisations.

The Dutch Liberal Party (VVD) and Reformed Party (SGP) are involved in the Malawi programme. The VVD Programme officer is responsible for its coordination. Our regional representative based in Maputo, Mozambique, is also actively involved. As yet, we have no local contact person or institution.

Conclusions and results

The conclusion from the first mission was that there certainly is a desire for cooperation. This was clear from the three – very extensive – project proposals received by the IMD. Nevertheless, the political situation at the time was reason enough to shelve those proposals whilst studying the opportunities in Malawi in greater detail.

The second mission concluded that the best course of action in Malawi would be to initiate a pilot project so as to avoid the potential danger of becoming a "football" in party political disputes. The requests from parties were mainly for bilateral institutional support, whereas most of the NGOs and international organisations advised us to follow the cross-party route. The IMD eventually opted for a mixed programme.

Lessons learned

The political stage in Malawi is small. There is a strong network of political players, social actors and international organisations, promoting a variety of interests. Within such a sensitive and limited arena, the IMD has decided to take a cautious approach in developing its relationships and programme.

Given the importance of personal contacts in Malawi, a permanent presence in this country is important – even if it serves only as an intermediary. The fact that the IMD is made up of political parties is a key plus point with which our partners in Malawi can identify.

Mali

Introduction

Mali has had a multi-party system since 1992 and currently finds itself in a transitional phase to pluralistic democracy. The first democratic parliamentary elections were held in 1997. The opposition parties refused to take part in these, however, and popular mistrust of political parties and the development of democracy grew. It took until 2000 before all the parties were prepared to join in a reconciliation forum and the climate became more favourable for further progress towards democracy.



Mali (population 11,340,480)

A presidential election was held early in 2002, with parliamentary elections following during the second half of the year. In the former, Amadou Toumani Touré – known as "ATT" – became the first-ever President of Mali not to be directly affiliated to any party or group of parties. Both the presidential and the parliamentary polls were free and peaceful, although both were affected by a low turnout.

Fourteen parties are represented in Parliament, out of 40 which took part in the elections. Most of these will also stand in the 2003 local elections. Many of the parliamentary parties have grouped themselves into three blocs: Hope 2002 with 66 seats, the Alliance for the Republic and Democracy (ARD) with 51 seats and President "ATT"'s Alliance for Convergence and Change (ACC) with 10 seats. There is also a group of eight independent MPs and another party, SADI, with 6 seats.

Partners

In Mali the IMD is working with the NGO Support Network for the Electoral Process in Mali (APEM) and the Dutch Embassy in Bamako. International contacts are maintained with the UNDP and NDI. Other partnerships are in the process of being established.

Programme structure and activities

The first identification mission to Mali took place in April 2002. Talks were held with many political parties, including the then governing Alliance for Democracy in Mali (ADEMA), and with representatives of social organisations, resource persons and the Dutch Embassy in Bamako. The main issues relevant to the reinforcement of a multi-party democracy which were highlighted during the mission were as follows.

- Mali is a fragile democracy, but the developments since 1992 certainly provide hope for the future.
- There is no clear "party landscape". Mali has 80 political parties, but most have no programme or organisation. Parties are not visible, and in reality only exist during election periods. Politics is not driven by the expression of concepts or ideologies.
- The public has no trust in politics and the parties are unable to engage voters. They lack grassroots support in the regions. Illiteracy, poverty and lack of infrastructure make communication extremely difficult.
- A process of decentralisation has been set in motion, but needs further development. Political leaders are convinced of the necessity of this process. The preparatory phase was completed. The programme has been initiated and in early 2003 will be evaluated together with those involved.

Conclusions and results

Based upon this analysis, the IMD concluded that support for parties in Mali certainly could contribute to the development of a multi-party democracy. But developing a programme is difficult because of the great number of parties. We decided to initiate a programme after the parliamentary elections, and to do this in partnership with APEM and supported by a contact person. The umbrella organisation was identified during the first mission to the country.

APEM organised a preparatory conference in December 2002. This was intended to pave the way for the start-up conference planned for 2003. The topics at that conference are to be selected with the aid of a survey amongst political parties. The broad range of subjects raised during the preparatory conference have necessitated a process of dialogue so as to delineate priorities.

Lessons learned

The large number of parties makes it impossible to institute a system based entirely upon "drawing rights". A cross-party programme with a Malian partner, however, could produce a better understanding of the political landscape before we consider moving into a system of "drawing rights".

After our experience with APEM, the IMD will seek other people in Mali who could act as a "sounding group" and monitor the content of the programme. APEM will remain involved in organisational activities, media contacts and media capacity building.

Zambia

Introduction

Levy Mwanawasa was elected President of Zambia in December 2001 and inaugurated in January 2002. There were mixed feelings during this period because of irregularities surrounding his election – abuses which were identified by international observers, including those from the European Union. But, despite this, the new President's early work in a number of fields was promising. His efforts to stamp out corruption, for example, were warmly received in Zambia.



Zambia (population 9,959,037)

Mwanawasa continued the process of privatisation which was begun by his predecessor, Frederick Chiluba. This particularly focused upon the country's copper mines, which had long been under the direct control of the government-affiliated Zambia Consolidated Copper Mines.

The year 2002 was also characterised by accusations of fraud and corruption levelled at and between politicians. Moreover, quite a few political figures changed party during the year. This only reinforced the feeling amongst ordinary Zambians that the political class is dedicated primarily to furthering its own interests.

Partners

In April 2002 an IMD mission made contact with a number of Zambian organisations. With the originally American National Democratic Institute (NDI) and the Zambian Forum for a Democratic Process (FODEP), we explored whether it would be possible to investigate the strengths and weaknesses of political parties, particularly during the run-up to the last presidential election. The IMD's desire to promote the position of women politicians also led to contacts with two gender organisations, the National Women's Lobby Group and Women for Change.

A follow-up mission in November resulted in an agreement in principle with the NDI and FODEP, and led to further clarification of the

opportunities to assist women politicians through a National Women's Lobby Group programme.

Programme structure and activities

The IMD first had to identify possible approaches in Zambia. Once they had been identified, a dialogue began with intermediary institutions, political parties and donor organisations. The participative analysis of political parties' strengths and weaknesses is the most important stepping stone towards a comprehensive programme of support.

Conclusions and results

During 2002 the IMD gained a better understanding of the Zambian political arena. A more extensive analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of political parties should be conducted not only at the IMD level but also, and more importantly, within the parties themselves.

Lessons learned

Although Zambia has many of the traits of a multi-party democracy, there are a lot of weaknesses in the system and the rules of democracy are not always properly observed. For the IMD, this implies that we must tread very carefully and properly identify the sensitivities involved.

Zimbabwe

Introduction

In April 2002 a presidential election was held in Zimbabwe amidst an atmosphere of intimidation and repression. Freedom of expression was limited by the introduction of new legislation which was used to gag the opposition. International interest in the election was unusually high. Many organisations expressed concern about the high risk that the results might be manipulated.



Zimbabwe (population 11,376,676)

The conduct of the election was exceptionally problematic. The polling stations had insufficient capacity, particularly in the urban centres where polls forecast that the opposition could expect to obtain a majority of the votes. Waiting times rose to more than a day and many people had no choice but to abandon their attempts to vote. Only a small number of election observers were allowed into the country, but the conclusions of most were damning: irregularities were legion, access to electoral rolls was denied and there was intimidation around the polling stations. The observers were also often unable to witness counts. This election can most certainly not be labelled "free and fair".

The Zimbabwean opposition watched the large-scale irregularities with resignation. An extensive "black book" detailing many well-documented abuses was published. Even the moral support of important international critics of President Robert Mugabe could not prevent him being re-elected for another five-year term.

Partners

The IMD cannot use its standard methods, focusing upon a number of parties, in Zimbabwe. The repressive and intolerant attitude of the governing ZANU-PF makes any support for it impossible within the criteria formulated by us for the recipients of IMD resources. The Zimbabwean opposition, however, did provide an opportunity for entering into a political

dialogue. In addition, there has been dialogue with organisations in South Africa which want to play a mediating role in the problems in Zimbabwe.

Programme structure and activities

The structure of the IMD's Zimbabwe programme is based upon intensifying the dialogue about potential developments in the country. The transition from the identification to the implementation phase was made during 2002.

Conclusions and results

The results of the IMD programme cannot yet be formulated in terms of the increased democratisation of Zimbabwe. But there has been progress in the field of developing institutional capacity in the formulation of policy for future developments in Zimbabwe.

Lessons

The IMD has had to conclude that stimulating democratic development in a country which is characterised by limited democratic rights is extremely complicated. The notion that the administrative system of a nation is primarily a matter for the people of that country is only partly true, of course, and has little relevance in nations where the opportunities for citizens to have their own voices heard are very limited.

Bolivia

Introduction

A brief initial programme operated in Bolivia between April and June 2002. This focused upon providing bilateral support to the political parties in augmenting the content of their manifestos in the run-up to the general election. Several non-governmental organisations which had set out to extend public debate were also supported.



Bolivia (population 8,445,134)

The general election was held on 30 June 2002. The outgoing government was a coalition of five parties: the Nationalist Democratic Alliance (ADN), the New Republican Force (NFR), the Movement of the Revolutionary Left (MIR), Conscience of the Fatherland (Condepa) and the Civic Solidarity Union (UCS).

The result of the June 2002 election was spectacular. The Nationalist Revolutionary Movement (MNR) topped the poll, followed by the Movement Towards Socialism (MAS) and the NFR. Condepa, the UCS and the ADN were wiped out. The election was won by the MNR, which then formed a coalition with the MIR. That party was actually one of the losers at the polls, but joined the government in order to maintain stability in the country and face up to its economic crisis. In late 2002 talks were being held with the NFR on extending and strengthening the coalition, but these have not yet produced any results.

Mr. Evo Morales, who heads the MAS, has been increasingly positioning himself as an opposition leader concerned not only with the immediate interests of his own grassroots but also with other national and international issues. He may well be preparing himself for a future presidential candidacy.

The new government headed by President Gonzalo Sánchez de Lozada has developed the so-called "Plan Bolivia" as its coalition agreement. This prioritises the economy and employment. The Bolivian economy is structurally weak and has suffered heavily in the wake of the crisis in neighbouring countries, particularly Argentina. Bolivians who used to work

in Argentina have been returning en masse – together with now destitute Argentineans, who have flooded into the country in search of work at any price.

Programme structure and activities

Based upon this analysis and as a follow-up to our work in 2001, the IMD undertook a number of activities in Bolivia during 2002. This was done in consultation with Mr Cor van Beuningen, who has been acting as the consultant for the IMD programme in the country.

The activities were moulded into a short-term programme, ending in late June 2002. This focused upon support for political parties in augmenting their election manifestos and, in parallel, enhancing public political debate. Agreements in principle were reached in February 2002 with six of the Bolivian political parties: the MNR, MIR, ADN, UCS, NFR and MAS. Accords were also signed with three institutions committing to extending and enhancing the public political debate: the employers federation CEPB, the Friedrich Ebert Foundation and the Bolivian Association of Journalists. With the support of the IMD, the parties were able to augment the content of their manifestos – in most cases by drawing upon the services of Bolivian experts in various fields of policy – and the NGOs could intensify public debate.

The projects with the NFR, MIR, ADN, MNR and UCS concentrated upon manifesto enhancement using external expertise. With the MAS, a project was conducted in two indigenous languages using a number of local radio stations to facilitate a debate with the party's grassroots support. The programme components have been evaluated by Dr Toranzo Roca. The results of his assessment are being used as input in developing the long-term programme.

The CEPB organised a conference with the five presidential candidates. The subject under discussion was the Bolivian national agenda for the next five years. Broadcast time was made available free of charge by Datacom. A total of 800 people participated in the conference, 700 of them paying delegates and the remainder taking part free of charge. The debate received much coverage in the media.

Finally, we held talks with the Corte Electoral, the Bolivian electoral council. This contact was extremely important since it is illegal for political parties in Bolivia to receive support from abroad. The Corte told our mission that this rule applies to election campaigns but not to capacity building or technical assistance. In those areas, foreign support is permitted.

Between July and December 2002, those involved in the IMD's activities – the "Sounding Group" – consulted intensively and worked hard on finalising a long-term programme.

The first part of the implementation phase was completed on 30 June 2002. The Sounding Group held their first meeting on 1 July, and was subsequently formally registered as a foundation (Fundación) called Fubodem. The IMD will develop the long-term programme in partnership

with Fubodem. Draft programmes have been presented and will be further developed in 2003.

In December 2002 the Sounding Group was expanded and formalised with the formation of a General Council and an Executive Board, as well as the appointment of a Director as head of the permanent bureau. The General Council has 20 members, drawn evenly from political parties and other interested parties. The Board has four members and is chaired by Guido Riveros. The post of Executive Director has been offered to Dr Fernando Garcia, a Professor of Political Sciences.

Fubodem presented a draft structure for the 2003 programme at the end of 2002. This features a list of activities – research, workshops, seminars, a start-up conference and publications – themes and target groups, as well as an indicative budget.

Conclusions and results

During the first half of the year discussions were held with several of those involved in the IMD's 2002 programme – the Sounding Group – about the future of our work in Bolivia. These raised the following questions about the overall objectives of a three-year partnership programme in the country: what is it about?; at whom is it aimed?; how will the partnership and composition be arranged?; and who will "own" and run the planned counterpart organisation?

Lessons learned

Dr Toranzo's evaluation revealed that politicians responded positively to the opportunities for strengthening parties offered by the IMD. This is the reason why we will continue our activities in Bolivia.

Although we received information "in black and white" from the Corte Electoral about what financing of political parties would be permissible, objections were still raised after the funds had actually been distributed. This resulted in some delay to the IMD programme. The lesson to be drawn from this is that clear and unambiguous written agreements should be reached and that they need to be confirmed at the highest level. New agreements have now been reached with Fubodem and the Corte Electoral. The latter has responded positively to the creation of the former. Fubodem will remain in direct contact with the Corte as the programmes are being further developed.

Distribution of funds based upon bilateral activities during the first phase of the IMD programme proved to be of great importance in building trust amongst the parties and in establishing a good mutual understanding between them. Because all the parties are represented in Fubodem, this foundation is unique. Regardless of their differences, Fubodem brings together all Bolivia's political parties with one common goal: to change the way in which politics is conducted and so foster democracy.

Guatemala

Introduction

In 1996 decades of savage civil war in Guatemala were brought to end with the signing of a series of peace treaties. In the years since then, the country has set off down the difficult road of democratisation. That process has now reached a crucial phase.



Guatemala (population 13,314,079)

The euphoria which accompanied the peace accords has now passed. Because there has been little improvement in the socio-economic position of large sections of the population, political apathy is growing and the public's – already limited – confidence in the government and political parties is declining.

National parliamentary and presidential elections are scheduled for November 2003. As they approach, positive and negative developments have been alternating with one another. A bid for the presidency by Rios Montt, the general accused of being responsible for the vast majority of deaths and disappearances during the civil war, has been prevented by law. But continuing political attacks on and assassinations of judges and lawyers involved in investigating human rights abuses now and during the war are a cause for concern.

The "patrullas de autodefensa civil" – "civil self-defence patrols" organised by the army during the civil war as a civilian buffer organisation between the military and the guerrillas – appear not to have been disbanded.

The political parties are now preparing themselves for the elections. One of the major problems they face is a total lack of funding for their basic operation, let alone the money needed to conduct an election campaign. They receive hardly any financial support from the government, making them dependent upon rich donors. As a result, the financially powerful interest groups wield huge influence. This situation is frustrating the political definition and free ideological development of the parties. And it is

hindering efforts by the smaller opposition parties to join forces. Moreover, more than 50 per cent of the population is excluded from the electoral process. The indigenous Maya peoples in rural areas suffer from severe underdevelopment, which is further frustrating the elections.

Partners

Our programme in Guatemala was officially launched in March 2002 with the opening of an IMD office in Guatemala City. The programme structure has been based upon the findings of two previous IMD missions. Our permanent representative, Doris Cruz, found suitable premises and made the legal and financial arrangements needed to set up the Guatemala office. This is located in the same building as the renowned political research agency ASIES, where we are able to make use of all its facilities. There has already been considerable investment in bilateral support, in partnership with other donors and experts like the Organisation of American States (OAS) and various Universities. Of particularly critical importance is our cooperation with the UNDP.

Programme structure and phases

The programme's backbone in Guatemala is an IMD/UNDP project entitled "Political Party Strengthening through Electoral Programme Development". Scheduled to run from March 2002 to April 2004, this is divided into four phases. The first two of these were more or less completed during 2002. The first multi-party phase was the creation of a multi-party forum, followed by a second phase during which a debate was conducted and a basic level of consensus reached on a "National Agenda for Guatemala". Individual parties were supported in formulating and revising their own election manifestos. Based upon the election results, the third multi-party phase involved support for governing parties in developing an electoral programme and a government programme, as well as assisting the opposition parties with their shadow programme.

A second key strand in the programme is cross-party activities. Both the political parties themselves and other social actors have indicated that there is a real need for dialogue between the parties. In this respect, the IMD recognised the potential added value which could be derived from an exchange programme between Dutch/European and Guatemalan parties. For bilateral support to political parties to go ahead, it was established that the projects concerned must lead to organisational development or reinforcement. Based upon an analysis of the parties in Guatemala, it was decided that this support would be technical and ideological in nature and would be provided at the request of the parties themselves. No financial support is given. Those parties which qualify for support must be recognised by the Tribunal Supremo Electoral, the electoral commission charged with legal registration of political parties in Guatemala.

The 14 political parties have been consulting regularly with one another since July 2002. This contact has provided the basis for initiating a process

of negotiation. Four of the seven clusters of political accords had been completed by December 2002. The remainder are for the most part being developed as offshoots of this project, designed to achieve programme cohesion and so reinforce the overall effect of the individual projects.

Results and conclusions

The IMD programme in Guatemala has developed at a rapid pace. The entire programme and the presence of the IMD are greatly appreciated by the Guatemalan political parties. They have expressed considerable interest in exchanging experiences with the Dutch parties. Although the risks associated with an IMD programme in Guatemala are higher than average, in the light of the long and brutal civil war and the tensions which still pervade society there, it appears to be proceeding well.

The opportunity to provide support for programmes being run by multilateral organisations like the UN Development Programme and the Organisation of American States offers major advantages for the IMD, but also demands intensive involvement in the dialogue about how resources are spent effectively, efficiently and with focus.

Lessons learned

The lack of financial resources is a critical problem for political parties. A long-term strategy needs to be developed in this respect, one which considers the role of the IMD and the importance of permanence in our programme. One possibility is the creation of a support fund for the parties. These ideas are being elaborated in the long-term plan.

Surinam

Introduction

The links between the Netherlands and Surinam can be described as special, at the very least, due to the close historical relationship between the two nations. This is reflected in the clear wish expressed by all parties represented within the IMD that a programme be developed in Surinam. These close ties, which have been reinforced by the recent emergence of a new development relationship, should in principle provide fertile grounds for exchanges of experience and expertise between Dutch and Surinamese parties. However, the demand-driven nature of the IMD programmes requires that particular care be taken when elaborating them in the Surinamese context because of the sensitivities inherent in relations between the two countries.



Surinam (population 436,494)

Surinam has a clearly institutionalised political arena. Its politics is played out on a small scale, with family and personal ties assuming great significance. Politicians are usually involved in social developments in a variety of ways, both in civil society and in government.

Surinam is a multicultural society. The variety of cultures there influence many aspects of social life. And it is also reflected in the composition of the political parties. Maintaining the power positions of the different ethnic groups, and their own survival strategies, represent a challenge when setting policy priorities which are in the interest of all Surinamese.

The coalition government made up of the Progressive Reform Party (VHP), the National Party of Surinam (NPS), Pertjajah Luhur (PL) and the Surinam Labour Party (SPA) appears to be stable. But rising inflation and a stagnating economy are undermining trust in the political parties. Moreover, continuing tension over the border oilfields continues to cast a shadow over the relationship between Surinam and neighbouring Guyana.

The next elections to the National Assembly are scheduled for 2005. Initiatives are already under way to combine those opposition movements not currently represented in Parliament.

Partners

The IMD has no representative in Surinam. In preparing the start-up conference, however, contacts were established with the Democracy Group and the Institute for Social Scientific Research (IMWO) at Anton de Kom University (ADEK) in Paramaribo. The ADEK can currently be regarded as the IMD's local partner. Our Surinam-related work is carried out in the Netherlands. It was originally overseen by the Labour (PvdA) and Liberal (VVD) programme officers, and later by those from the PvdA and the Christian Democratic Party (CDA).

The University of Surinam is to prepare, coordinate and organise a start-up conference. In so doing, it will explicitly seek expert input from the region. The NDI has also been invited to take part. And contact has been established with the UNDP in Paramaribo, too.

Programme structure and phases

Based upon the preparations – which included discussions with Cordaid and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and, during the second-phase identification mission in January, the political parties in Surinam – it was decided to organise a start-up conference. This marks the beginning of programme implementation in Surinam, but at the same time is one means of identifying potential projects. A working visit was made in November to discuss the structure of the conference with our ADEK contact person.

The discussions conducted during the spring 2002 mission raised a number of important topics. These concern both the development of individual parties and national policy in Surinam. It was partly as a result of these issues being raised that the IMD felt that a two-day conference would be the logical next step. All the parties are to be invited.

There have been intensive consultations with Maurits Hassankhan and Marten Schalkwijk, both from the Democracy Group, a multidisciplinary working party at ADEK. Because the IMD initiative is well-matched with their programme, they were prepared to organise it. Practical implementation is in the hands of the IMWO. Maurits Hassankhan has been appointed as responsible contact person at the Democracy Group.

Two investigations are planned during preparations for the conference. One, to be carried out by the Democracy Group, will look at policymaking within Surinam's political parties. In the other, the renowned IDOS research institute will study the views of the Surinamese public about the country's major national issues.

Conclusions and results

The result of the preparatory phase thus far has been the reinforcement of a network comprising many of the political parties in Surinam, plus the preparation of the start-up conference. The IMD has also publicised its intentions amongst those social actors who are important within the context of our programme there.

Lessons learned

The preparatory/identification and implementation phases in Surinam have provisionally led us to the conclusion that some local politicians erroneously regard the IMD as an extension of the Dutch government's policy towards the country. Our ability to find a suitable local partner will therefore largely determine the extent to which the IMD can make a useful contribution to institutional strengthening of the political parties in Surinam.

Indonesia

Introduction

The IMD has decided to investigate opportunities for developing a programme in Indonesia based upon the following considerations.

- Indonesia is the nation with the world's largest Muslim population, and is the second-largest country with a democratic system.
- The current transition to a multi-party democracy is a very fragile process.
- Political parties are active, but still developing.
- The social middle ground is slowly beginning to regain importance.
- A process of decentralisation has been initiated, and has received a positive response, but remains weak.
- A successful transition to multi-party democracy will have positive repercussions far beyond Indonesia itself.



Indonesia (population 231,328,092)

The process of reform which has been under way since the fall of President Suharto has been anything but stable, and a lot still needs to happen before the system can be called truly democratic in a material sense. But there are plenty of initiatives in place and plenty of experts working to develop democracy. That development can only succeed, though, if long-term support is provided.

Programme structure and phases

To prepare for the identification mission of August 2002, a number of activities took place. Talks were held with development organisations, with resource persons in the Netherlands and Germany, and with academic institutions. The IMD participated in a debate at the Clingendael Institute which addressed two themes:

- the future of Indonesia as a unified state; and,
- the future of democracy in Indonesia.

The IMD also organised an exchange of views about the democratisation in Indonesia with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and a wide range of Dutch organisations.

During our visit to Indonesia, the IMD initiative was enthusiastically welcomed by those with whom we spoke. There is a need for training and support in many areas, amongst MPs and established politicians, regional administrators and emerging political figures alike. The trend towards openness and decentralisation is creating new opportunities at the regional level.

The following were the main issues raised during the mission.

- The gulf between political parties and their grassroots supporters.
- The troubled progress of the decentralisation process due to such factors as the extremely high cost to political parties of being physically present and active in all regions of the country.
- The spread of corruption to the regional level.
- The economic crisis currently affecting the country and the growing social unrest amongst its people.

The enormous mutual distrust which exists between the political establishment on the one hand and the people and social organisations on the other can only be overcome through an independent approach. This could mean that the methods previously used elsewhere by the IMD might "miss their targets" in Indonesia. For the time being, direct and practical support to political parties seems neither desirable nor applicable. Debates addressing the substance of political movements are possible, but fora in which they might be held are difficult to find. Entry through NGO's is equally as problematic given the stated mutual mistrust between the political world and civil society. In the light of these difficulties, the foundation of an "Academy for Democracy" seems to provide a good alternative.

This Academy would primarily target the young, women and people who are active in politics in the provinces. Its main focus would be the democratic skills needed to function in political fora and on representative bodies, and the development or reinforcement of citizens' democratic skills.

Lessons learned

It is still too early to draw any conclusions from the IMD programme-related activities in Indonesia about the way in which that programme will be structured. But what we can already say is that the shaping of such a programme requires the utmost care, since the political situation is tense in many respects, with all kinds of contrasts latently or manifestly present. For example, in the relationship between the "centre" – Jakarta and Java – and the more outlying regions and, in religious terms, between Muslims in varying degrees of radicalisation and Christians. Other factors which could colour the future IMD programme in Indonesia are the country's enormous size, its political structures, the mutual mistrust between the political world and civil society, and its historical ties with the Netherlands.

About the IMD

In line with the Dutch government's development cooperation policy and in response to requests for support from foreign political parties and groups, seven Dutch political parties decided in 2000 to establish a new joint organisation, the Netherlands Institute for Multi-Party Democracy (IMD). The founding members were the Dutch Labour Party (PvdA), Liberal Party (VVD), Christian Democratic Party (CDA), Democratic Party (D66), Green Party (GroenLinks), Christian Union (ChristenUnie) and Reformed Party (SGP). The Institute was formally inaugurated as a foundation on 18 April 2000.

The primary objective of the IMD is to support the process of democratisation in young democracies by reinforcing political parties as a fundamental component of parliamentary democracy. In so doing, the Institute endeavours to help bring about a properly functioning, sustainable and pluralistic party political system. It also supports the activities of groups which, through their principles and objectives, have a relevant role to play in a multi-party democracy even though they do not fall within a formal party structure.

The IMD works with parties in countries which receive support under the Dutch government's development cooperation policy. Since the Dutch political parties already run an effective programme in support of their counterparts in the new and restored democracies of Eastern Europe, the IMD has resolved to concentrate upon potential cooperation in Africa, Asia and Latin America.

Netherlands Institute for Multiparty Democracy

Korte Vijverberg 2

2513 AB The Hague

The Netherlands

T: +31 (0)70 311 5464

F: +31 (0)70 311 5465

E: info@nimd.org

www.nimd.org

IMD Board



J.A. van Kemenade President



J.J.A.M van Gennip (CDA) Vice-president



R. van der Meer (VVD)



A.P. Pinto Scholtbach (PvdA)



M.C.J. Groothuizen (D66) Deputy vice-president



S. Pormes (GroenLinks)



W. Haitzma (ChristenUnie) Secretary



C.S.L. Janse (SGP)

Advisory board

J.P.R.M. van Laarhoven	CDA
J.J.M. Penders	CDA
P.J.H.M. Luijten	VVD
Z. Szabo	VVD
S. Dijkma	PvdA
A.G. Koenders	PvdA
B. Stolte-van Empelen	GroenLinks
M. Cornelissen	GroenLinks
I. Engelshoven	D66
W. Derksen	D66
T. de Vries	ChristenUnie
G. Geijtenbeek	ChristenUnie
A. Bloed	SGP
J. Dankers	SGP

IMD Bureau

H.R. von Meijenfeldt	Executive Director
J. Tuit	Senior Policy Officer
M.T.G. van Doorn	Office Manager (2002)
	Junior Policy Officer (2003)
M. Hedges	Office Manager (2003)
W. P. de Jager	Information Manager (2003)
A. Mijnsbergen	Controller

Programme officers

K. Beroud	GroenLinks (2003)
N. Blauw	D66 (2002)
D.J. Diepenbroek	SGP
M. Dijk	VVD, D66
D. Dinkhuijsen	CDA
R. Groot Wassink	GroenLinks (2002)
E. van Moorsel	CDA
E. van Koppen	PvdA
K. Quist	ChristenUnie

Resident representatives

D. Cruz	Guatemala
J.N. van Overbeeke	Mozambique / Southern Africa