



Multilateral Parliamentary Diplomacy between the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Russian Federation: Institutional Capacities and Development Prospects

Gholamreza Khademi^{1*} , Mohammadreza Majidi²

1. Corresponding Author, Department of Regional Studies, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran. Email: khademi2735@gmail.com
2. Department of Regional Studies, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran. Email: mmajidi@ut.ac.ir

Article Info	ABSTRACT
Article type: Research Article Article History: Received 29 August 2025 Revised 25 October 2025 Accepted 28 April 2026 Published Online 01 May 2026 Keywords: Parliament, Islamic Republic of Iran, Multilateral Parliamentary Diplomacy, Russian Federation, Parliamentary Assemblies.	In the contemporary era, non-governmental actors have increasingly entered the arena of safeguarding national interests in their comprehensive sense, alongside traditional state actors. In this context, the role of parliaments—through multilateral parliamentary diplomacy as a form of complementary diplomacy—has become increasingly consistent and enduring, particularly over the past few decades. This development has drawn the attention of researchers in various countries. In this regard, the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Russian Federation are among the states that have taken the initiative in this field by establishing regional and trans-regional parliamentary assemblies. Given this fact, a key question arises: what role can multilateral parliamentary diplomacy play in advancing relations between the two countries? To address this question, the study employs available library and internet sources, applying an exploratory and comparative reading of texts within the framework of the rational choice institutionalism approach. It is assumed that inter-parliamentary relations and cooperation between the two countries—considering the functions of parliaments—can serve as a facilitating factor in developing bilateral and multilateral relations aimed at securing their mutual interests. Accordingly, this article begins with an introduction outlining the importance of multilateral parliamentary diplomacy, its historical context, research background, and theoretical foundations. It then examines the evolution of multilateral parliamentary diplomacy in both countries, followed by an analysis of the capacities for inter-parliamentary cooperation in strengthening bilateral relations. Finally, the article discusses the prospects for further development of multilateral parliamentary diplomacy between Iran and Russia.

Cite this article: Khademi, Gh., & Majidi, M. (2025). Multilateral parliamentary diplomacy between the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Russian Federation: Institutional capacities and development prospects. *Journal of Iran and Regional Studies*, 8 (2), 111-123. <https://doi.org/10.22059/jices.2026.401499.1101>



© The Author(s) retain the copyright.

Publisher: University of Tehran Press.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22059/jices.2026.401499.1101>

Introduction: The National Roots of Parliamentary Diplomacy

In both the ancient and modern eras, the foremost duty of governments—both in general and specific terms—has been to safeguard national interests. In their minimal and narrow sense, national interests were historically defined in military terms: protecting territorial integrity and ensuring the stability of the political system, often realized through individual will. Over time, this notion evolved into a broader and more advanced concept—comprehensive national security—encompassing cultural, social, political, and economic dimensions alongside the military, and grounded in legal and institutional frameworks characteristic of the modern era. This expanded understanding of national interests, centered on the security and prosperity of citizens, has become a major social demand. The most significant institutional response to this demand has been the establishment of legislative bodies across diverse political systems—parliaments. Since the formation of the English Parliament in the 13th century, the scope and influence of parliaments have continuously evolved. In recent decades, particularly alongside the emergence of international organizations composed of governments, parliaments have sought to create coordinated parliamentary mechanisms that align with these intergovernmental institutions.

Any multilateral inter-parliamentary initiative, activity, or cooperative mechanism that closely aligns with the core legislative function of national parliaments tends to foster more effective parliamentary diplomacy, and vice versa. In this context, the parliaments of the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Russian Federation—both influenced by the growing parliamentarization of regional and international affairs—have actively participated in this process. They have even introduced initiatives with the potential to expand within the framework of mutual cooperation. Accordingly, this article analyzes the capacity of multilateral parliamentary diplomacy in the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Russian Federation, with particular emphasis on their parliamentary initiatives aimed at promoting bilateral cooperation. To contextualize the discussion, it first outlines the research background, theoretical foundations, and the significance of the topic.

Research Background

Given that several decades have passed since national parliaments around the world began engaging in multilateral parliamentary diplomacy, it is unsurprising that few comparative studies exist in this field—particularly on the parliamentary diplomacy of Iran and Russia. Nonetheless, researchers in both countries have addressed this subject individually within their respective national contexts.

In Iran, Mansourian and Akbari Talarpashti (2020), in their article “The Position and Importance of Parliamentary Diplomacy in the Islamic Republic of Iran,” argue that considering the rapid pace and broad scope of developments in Iran’s bilateral and multilateral relations, the legislature—alongside the government and affiliated political institutions—has played a fundamental and unique role through public-parliamentary diplomacy in resolving international issues and advancing relations (p. 213). Similarly, Hajimineh and Abedi (2021), in “Parliament in the Foreign Policy of the Islamic Republic of Iran,” note that while parliamentary diplomacy is an established and growing component of Iran’s foreign policy framework, it still faces significant obstacles. These include the absence of clear legislation, a lack of strategic vision,

and the absence of a defined mission for the parliamentary diplomacy of the Islamic Consultative Assembly (p. 123). Hosseini and Shirzadi (2023), in “The Role of Parliamentary Diplomacy of the Islamic Parliament of Iran in Securing the National Interests of the Islamic Republic,” contend that parliamentary diplomacy, at both national and transnational levels, holds considerable potential to enhance the national security of the Islamic Republic (p. 133). Likewise, Dehghani Firouzabadi and Delavarpour Aghdam (2016), in “The Shortcomings and Strategies for Empowering Parliamentary Diplomacy of the Islamic Republic of Iran,” argue that strengthening Iran’s parliamentary diplomacy requires redefining and reforming certain institutional structures and policy-making processes within the parliament (p. 408). In line with these perspectives, Rasoulizadeh and Khoeini (2018), in their study on the interaction of Iran’s parliament with regional and international parliamentary assemblies, emphasize that parliamentary diplomacy can serve as a facilitator and complement to state diplomacy (p. 1351).

In Russia, Savelchev (2024) highlights that the geopolitical processes of the latter half of the twentieth century have transformed parliamentary diplomacy into a novel instrument of soft power. According to Eshkunkov (2023), inter-parliamentary cooperation has become an important and increasingly prominent aspect of international relations, drawing scholarly attention in recent decades. Aziz (2021) further notes that both Russia’s parliamentary system and academic community have intensified their focus on parliamentary diplomacy as part of Moscow’s broader effort to mitigate the effects of geopolitical conflicts. Parliamentary diplomacy, therefore, plays a vital role in fostering sustainable inter-parliamentary and legal cooperation to strengthen interactions between states. Serohin (2017) outlines the objectives of multilateral inter-parliamentary cooperation as enhancing mutual understanding between states, democratizing interstate relations, representing popular interests, increasing the democratic legitimacy of international organizations, supporting global socio-political stability, and promoting constructive dialogue for resolving international and regional issues. Similarly, Prokhorenko (2020), in his book “Inter-Parliamentary Institutions in World Politics,” discusses various instances of Russian parliamentary diplomacy, particularly within the post-Soviet space. However, Alekseev (2022) cautions that Russian parliamentary diplomacy remains an underdeveloped concept requiring deeper research and theoretical clarification. From this perspective, examining the multilateral parliamentary diplomacy of Iran and Russia can offer valuable insights into how such mechanisms might complement and strengthen formal state diplomacy. This reflection can also contribute to enhancing regional coordination, cooperation, and convergence between the two countries in pursuit of their national and shared interests. The following section therefore turns to the theoretical foundations of this research before analyzing the bilateral context in greater depth.

Theoretical Framework

Institutionalist approaches do not regard institutions as neutral or passive mechanisms; rather, they view institutional arrangements as active structures that shape the outcomes of political processes (Christianse, 2019: 31). Parliaments, by definition, constitute institutional structures (García Pérez de León & Dumont, 2020: 332). Consequently, institutionalist frameworks—particularly rational choice institutionalism—are well-suited for analyzing inter-parliamentary

cooperation. Rational choice institutionalism assumes that actors are rational decision-makers who seek to maximize their utility. From this perspective, institutions function as both constraints and opportunities in the pursuit of actors' preferences, operating through mechanisms such as legal frameworks, procedural norms, and access to information (Christiansen, 2019: 31). In this context, institutions provide the setting in which personal, subnational, national, and transnational interests are expressed and negotiated, varying in intensity and influence before decision-making.

Accordingly, rational choice institutionalism has offered some of the most influential interpretations of parliamentary activity, including recent developments in multilateral parliamentary diplomacy (Benoit & Rozenberg, 2020: 213). The theory further assumes that decisions are guided by the goal of maximizing collective welfare and that policymakers possess adequate information regarding the associated costs and benefits (Shah, 2025: 229). Based on this framework, the potential for parliamentary cooperation between Iran and Russia to become more effective could enhance mutual engagement in other areas, generating greater added value for both sides and contributing to the advancement of their shared national interests.

Parliamentary Diplomacy Capacities

The diplomatic tools used by parliaments in regional and international relations are diverse (Elasco, 2025: 170). These include, first, the traditional instruments employed through friendship groups and the ratification of international agreements, and second, the newer mechanisms through which parliaments have engaged in foreign relations in recent decades, such as regional and international parliamentary assemblies and organizations—innovations in parliamentary governance. Through these mechanisms, parliaments have developed new capacities to influence regional and international relations. Although this trend remains secondary to the dominant forms of state-led diplomacy, the quantitative increase in regional and international parliamentary mechanisms nonetheless demonstrates their growing, albeit limited, effectiveness in facilitating and strengthening inter-state cooperation. Consequently, parliaments worldwide—regardless of political system—are increasingly encouraged to use parliamentary capacity to advance national interests while pursuing shared goals. The parliamentary cooperation between Iran and Russia can be assessed within this framework.

The Capacities of Parliamentary Cooperation between Iran and Russia

In today's highly interconnected and fluid world, states seek to utilize all available instruments—including parliamentary mechanisms—to promote security, stability, and progress. In this regard, parliamentary relations between Iran and Russia have gained greater scope and capability in line with the overall expansion of bilateral ties. Despite the skepticism among some Iranian scholars about Russia's reliability, Moscow's initiatives and activities in developing multilateral parliamentary diplomacy are undeniable. Parliamentary interaction serves as a facilitating and complementary element of both bilateral and multilateral cooperation, contributing constructively across diverse fields. The ratification of the Comprehensive Strategic Treaty between the two countries further accelerates this process. The

capacities of Iran–Russia parliamentary cooperation can be examined in two categories: traditional and modern. Although this article focuses primarily on modern, multilateral parliamentary interactions, it briefly notes the historical bilateral dimension as well.

Current Capacity of Parliamentary Cooperation between Iran and Russia

The current capacity of Iran–Russia parliamentary cooperation includes the ratification of bilateral agreements and treaties, as well as direct interactions through parliamentary friendship groups. Building on the growing trend of trade and economic cooperation, especially the creation of necessary infrastructure and joint commissions, both parliaments play a crucial role in facilitating and deepening bilateral relations. For instance, both parliaments have approved the Free Trade Agreement between Iran and the Eurasian Economic Union (EAEU) and its member states—Belarus, Kazakhstan, Russia, Kyrgyzstan, and Armenia. Observer members include Iran, Uzbekistan, Moldova, and Cuba. Furthermore, both parliaments have ratified the Comprehensive Strategic Partnership Treaty, signed in Moscow on January 17, 2025 (28 Dey 1403), covering cooperation in defense, security, counterterrorism, industry, energy, agriculture, education, and culture. The Parliamentary Friendship Group between the Islamic Parliament of Iran and the Russian State Duma—established in 1994—has long served to promote dialogue and coordination among legislators, facilitating exchanges and visits between senior officials. Within the framework of the new treaty, its role is expected to expand.

New Capacity for Parliamentary Cooperation between Iran and Russia

New capacities for cooperation are emerging through multilateral parliamentary mechanisms established in recent decades to advance regional and international collaboration. This development has gained urgency given both countries' strained relations with the West. However, to avoid exaggerated pessimism or optimism, Iran–Russia interactions must be assessed within their real and evolving context. Examining multilateral parliamentary diplomacy as a means to secure mutual interests fits this realistic approach. The ratification of the Comprehensive Strategic Partnership Agreement is likely to further strengthen parliamentary engagement through regional and international assemblies in which both countries are active—though Russia currently participates in a wider range of such bodies.

Inter-Parliamentary Union

Established in 1889 and headquartered in Geneva, the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) is one of the world's most influential institutions of parliamentary diplomacy, with 166 full members and 10 associate members. As a multilateral non-governmental organization comprising national parliaments, the IPU provides a valuable platform for fostering parliamentary diplomacy. Meeting twice annually, the IPU aims to promote democracy, peace, and security through political dialogue, uphold human rights, strengthen representative institutions, and support conflict prevention through multilateral engagement. The IPU also cooperates with UN bodies and advocates for women's participation in political and social life. Given that both Iran and Russia are members, the IPU provides an opportunity for their parliaments to discuss shared

concerns and propose joint resolutions—especially as the IPU’s role within the UN system has grown significantly in recent years.

Asian Parliamentary Assembly

The Asian Parliamentary Assembly (APA)—established in 2006 as the successor to the Asian Parliamentary Association for Peace—aims to enhance cooperation among Asian states in promoting peace, justice, and sustainable development. It reflects a shared commitment to spiritual and moral values, freedom, and the rule of law, while emphasizing regional unity and progress. One of the APA’s main goals is to strengthen parliamentary diplomacy and increase the role of parliaments in regional decision-making. Given that Iran was among its founding members, Tehran’s potential for engagement within the APA is significant, especially in advancing its neighborhood policy. The APA also includes observer participation from the Inter-Parliamentary Assembly of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), offering a useful platform for reinforcing Russia’s eastern parliamentary orientation. However, the APA’s influence remains limited, as its outcomes have largely been confined to the adoption of resolutions without binding mechanisms.

BRICS Parliamentary Assembly

Recognizing the importance of parliamentary dialogue for advancing multilateral cooperation, BRICS member parliaments initiated the creation of a BRICS Parliamentary Assembly in 2011. The first session was held in Moscow during Russia’s BRICS presidency. Today, the Assembly includes representatives from Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa, Iran, the UAE, Egypt, Ethiopia, and Indonesia. It provides a platform for cooperation on security, economic development, technology, sustainable growth, and reform of the global financial system. Within this framework, BRICS parliamentary diplomacy also aims to enhance cultural, educational, and people-to-people exchanges. Despite its growing importance, BRICS parliamentary diplomacy remains underdeveloped (Semenov & Yamoshevich, 2024: 128–136). The 11th BRICS Parliamentary Assembly (Brazil, June 2025) emphasized the need to formalize the institution further. Nonetheless, it offers both Iran and Russia a valuable avenue for pursuing shared national interests and advancing the parliamentary dimension of South–South cooperation.

International Forum for the Development of Parliamentarism

The parliamentary system in Russia has been active in establishing numerous transnational parliamentary mechanisms in recent decades. One such mechanism, organized in the form of an international conference, is the International Forum for the Development of Parliamentarism. This forum was created as a step toward optimizing the interaction between the Russian Parliament and foreign parliaments. In fact, this forum, as a regular mechanism for global inter-parliamentary dialogue, represents the emergence of a new parliamentary identity within contemporary international relations.

The Forum emphasizes several broad areas of inter-parliamentary cooperation: international de-escalation; support for the creation of a just, multipolar world order; promotion of fair and

comprehensive cooperation between states and their alliances; ensuring sustainable global development; international and regional security and stability; establishing a safe and open global information space (through cooperation on common rules and standards for information exchange and protection); strengthening collective efforts to combat terrorism and other common challenges and threats; coordinating parliamentary activities in legislative drafting for innovative regulatory areas linked to the transition toward a new technological structure of the economy and the rapid digitalization of all spheres of life; developing unified standards for information exchange and protection; organizing international conferences and other confidence-building measures to promote mutual understanding in conflict situations; resolving conflicts through bilateral meetings or inter-parliamentary organization sessions that ensure dialogue between parliamentarians from countries involved in or affected by conflicts; and fostering technical cooperation and knowledge exchange between parliaments (Voda, 2022: 218). Thus, parliamentary diplomacy can be seen as a complementary tool to official diplomacy. Interaction between parliamentarians from different countries opens new channels of dialogue and provides a degree of flexibility in addressing complex issues. Accordingly, it is important to review and assess the regional parliamentary mechanisms in which Russia is an active member, in order to learn from and utilize their experiences—particularly the model legislative initiatives of the Inter-Parliamentary Assembly of the Commonwealth of Independent States and the Parliamentary Assembly of the Collective Security Treaty Organization—for the establishment of new mechanisms of regional parliamentary cooperation.

Inter-Parliamentary Assembly of the Commonwealth of Independent States

The most prominent example of regional cooperation in the post-Soviet space within the framework of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) is the Inter-Parliamentary Assembly of the Commonwealth of Independent States (IPA CIS). Initially established under the agreement signed on March 27, 1992, by the heads of the parliaments of CIS member states, the Assembly served as a body of inter-parliamentary cooperation rather than an intergovernmental organization. However, following the signing of the Convention of the Inter-Parliamentary Assembly of the Member States of the Commonwealth of Independent States on May 26, 1995, and its entry into force on January 16, 1996, the Assembly was transformed into an intergovernmental organization (Saidamirova, 2021: 177–178).

The current members of the Inter-Parliamentary Assembly of the CIS are Azerbaijan, Armenia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan. Notably, the Assembly has largely become a channel for interaction between Russian and Central Asian parliamentarians. Even Turkmenistan, which has not signed the Agreement or Convention, regularly participates in the Assembly's events as a guest. One of the Assembly's most significant activities is the preparation and adoption of model laws aimed at harmonizing national legislation among its members. The adoption of such model laws stems from the need to align CIS national laws with international law, promote convergence through harmonization, and ultimately create a more uniform legal system among member states (Antonova, 2018: 237). Although the consultative nature of these model laws is consistently emphasized in

official CIS documents, their importance as part of Russia's soft strategy for regional integration has gained increasing recognition due to their positive and functional characteristics (Mikhaliyova, 2021: 56).

Harmonizing legislation within the CIS has thus become the primary activity of the Inter-Parliamentary Assembly. These efforts demonstrate the soft power potential of regional integration. To date, nearly 700 documents have been adopted, including more than 400 model laws and 100 recommendations aimed at harmonizing national legal systems. According to the Secretariat of the Inter-Parliamentary Assembly, over 70% of the provisions in these documents have been incorporated into member states' national legislation (Novikov & Bykov, 2024: 155).

Parliamentary Assembly of the Collective Security Treaty Organization

The Parliamentary Assembly of the Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO PA) was established by the Resolution of the Speakers of the Parliaments of the CIS Member States on November 16, 2006. The CSTO PA includes parliamentarians from all CIS Member States that are also part of the CSTO: Armenia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, and Tajikistan. Its activities are based on the Interim Regulations adopted at the session of the Inter-Parliamentary Assembly of the CIS on March 30, 2007.

According to Article 1 of the Provisional Rules, the CSTO PA is defined as "a body of inter-parliamentary cooperation composed of member states of the Inter-Parliamentary Assembly of the Commonwealth of Independent States that participate in the Collective Security Treaty Organization." Following an amendment to the CSTO Charter in 2010, the CSTO PA was formally recognized as the organization's inter-parliamentary cooperation body, with the consent of all member states except Kazakhstan. The CSTO PA adopts model legislative acts regulating legal relations within the CSTO's jurisdiction, as well as recommendations to harmonize member states' national laws with the provisions of international treaties concluded within the CSTO framework. The Assembly also discusses cooperation among CSTO member states in legal, political, and military fields, developing relevant recommendations that, once approved, are sent to national parliaments for implementation (Novikov & Bykov, 2024: 156–157).

Prospects for the Development of Parliamentary Cooperation between Iran and Russia

With the growing role of non-state actors in international interactions, parliaments now play increasingly significant roles within regional and supra-regional parliamentary unions and assemblies. As a result, the parliamentary dimension has expanded across many regional and transregional organizations. The era when governments acted alone and international affairs were considered their exclusive domain has long passed (Nayimo, 2025: 436).

At the same time, the dynamic nature of international relations and geopolitical developments at both regional and transregional levels highlight the need to adapt parliamentary diplomacy to rapidly changing conditions (Ilyicheva, 2025: 126). A more developed global community benefits when parliamentary diplomacy operates constructively and proactively, fostering environments more conducive to cooperation than conflict. Of course, any assessment of parliamentary diplomacy must note that, while it offers several advantages over traditional

state diplomacy—such as greater flexibility, informality, and reduced bias—its institutional limitations, including restricted powers and resources, can affect its performance (Savelchev, 2024: 113). Nevertheless, the evolution of parliamentary diplomacy reflects its compatibility and interdependence with global democratic values and long-standing national traditions.

Since the latter half of the twentieth century, various mechanisms of regional and transregional inter-parliamentary cooperation have emerged worldwide. Consequently, the formation of parliamentary assemblies has increased cooperation among national parliaments to safeguard national interests while pursuing shared regional goals (Kaminska, 2022: 41). Evaluating the performance of multilateral parliamentary diplomacy therefore requires a logical and realistic understanding of its nature and activity (Kaminska, 2024: 55). Accordingly, assessing inter-parliamentary cooperation mechanisms—both regional and transregional—where Iran and Russia are active participants is a logical and valuable endeavor. Such an assessment can be particularly instructive for the Islamic Parliament of Iran in its efforts to establish efficient regional parliamentary mechanisms. In the rapidly changing geopolitical environment, Iran and Russia can employ all available tools, including parliamentary diplomacy within regional and transregional frameworks, to pursue their national interests while simultaneously enhancing coordination, cooperation, and ultimately regional convergence.

Furthermore, given its unique geographical position and neighborhood capacity, which includes Russia, Iran can expand its inter-parliamentary cooperation in the form of neighborhood parliamentary diplomacy—a branch of multilateral parliamentary diplomacy—by drawing on existing experiences, especially the model legislation of the Inter-Parliamentary Assembly of the Commonwealth of Independent States. In doing so, Iran could propose and pursue the establishment of a Parliamentary Assembly of Neighboring Countries as a new platform for regional dialogue and cooperation.

Establishing Regional Parliamentary Mechanisms Based on Neighborly Cooperation

The establishment of regional parliamentary mechanisms—especially those composed of neighboring states—offers far greater added value than transregional parliamentary assemblies with many members, particularly in terms of cost–benefit considerations. This is largely due to shared characteristics such as geographical proximity (Delavarpour Aghdam, 2025: 14).

Of course, the difficulties and complexities of establishing an inter-parliamentary mechanism composed of the parliaments of the Islamic Republic of Iran's neighboring countries are well understood by experts, given the predominance of geopolitical rivalries and competitive dynamics in the region. Nevertheless, if the Islamic Parliament of Iran can engage in thematic clarification and confidence-building through inter-parliamentary meetings, the foundation for attracting neighboring states to such a mechanism will gradually be laid. This would not only foster coordination and cooperation but also promote regional convergence. Such a transformation requires adopting a long-term perspective grounded in realistic possibilities and environmental conditions, along with a critical awareness of why existing mechanisms have often failed to achieve their intended objectives. In the initial phase, the Islamic Parliament of Iran must demonstrate the capacity to engage in direct dialogue with the

parliaments of neighboring countries and collectively address the necessity of removing barriers to cooperation.

This initiative should be designed and implemented by the Islamic Parliament of Iran in accordance with the shared cultural and civilizational heritage of Iran and its neighbors, supported by the intellectual guidance and endorsement of national elites and respected figures who serve as opinion leaders and trendsetters.

In pursuing this initiative, several key considerations should be noted:

- Continued engagement: The Islamic Parliament of Iran should remain actively involved in existing inter-parliamentary mechanisms and strive to fulfill their declared objectives with the support of other member states.
- Bridging through existing platforms: The Islamic Parliament of Iran can utilize existing inter-parliamentary frameworks to bring together its neighbors under a new inter-parliamentary assembly that would ultimately include all of them.
- Efficiency through proximity: The greater the proximity and coherence among regional mechanisms—including inter-parliamentary mechanisms—the more effective and efficient they are likely to be. In other words, the smaller and more cohesive the membership, the higher the potential for improving performance and outcomes.
- Delegated authority: The effectiveness and efficiency of any regional parliamentary mechanism depend on the extent of power and authority delegated to it.
- Institutional evolution: Within the framework of the rational choice institutionalist approach, if the establishment and operation of an inter-parliamentary mechanism between the Islamic Parliament of Iran and the parliaments of neighboring countries is accompanied by meaningful delegation of authority, it could assume an expansive character and gradually evolve into an intergovernmental organization, benefiting from greater proximity and coherence.

Conclusion

In response to the question of what role multilateral parliamentary diplomacy can play in the development of relations between Iran and Russia, after referring to the importance of multilateral parliamentary diplomacy and the current and emerging capacities of inter-parliamentary cooperation, it can be explained that Iran and Russia are active in the field of multilateral parliamentary diplomacy through participation in international parliamentary unions and assemblies such as the Inter-Parliamentary Union and the Asian Parliamentary Assembly. In addition, the parliaments of both countries have played a role in establishing parliamentary assemblies and unions in recent decades with the aim of facilitating the pursuit of national interests within the broader concept of securing common interests.

Nevertheless, the experience of multilateral parliamentary diplomacy in Russia—particularly in the exemplary legislative function of the Inter-Parliamentary Assembly of the Commonwealth of Independent States—is noteworthy in illustrating how a transnational parliamentary mechanism can effectively contribute to securing the shared interests of its members. Therefore, to take advantage of the potential inherent in multilateral parliamentary

diplomacy, especially by utilizing its neighborly capacity, the Islamic Parliament of Iran should place relevant initiatives on its agenda, drawing on existing experiences, including Russia's regional model.

In this regard, pursuing the establishment of a parliamentary assembly of Iran's neighboring countries could effectively contribute to safeguarding national interests through the pursuit of common goals, fostering coordination and cooperation, and ultimately achieving certain levels of regional convergence after formulating the necessary standards based on practical realities. As a preliminary step, meetings may be organized with these countries within the framework of existing inter-parliamentary mechanisms such as the Inter-Parliamentary Union, the Asian Parliamentary Assembly, the Inter-Parliamentary Assembly of the Commonwealth of Independent States, and the Parliamentary Assembly of the Collective Security Treaty Organization.

References

- Alexeev, A. S. (2022). Modern Russian parliament: Assessment of political significance according to the results of index analysis. *Russian Social and Humanitarian Journal*, (2), 8–37. <https://doi.org/10.18384/2224-0209-2022-2-210>.
- Antonova, L. (2018). The legal nature of model laws of the Interparliamentary Assembly of States-Members of the Commonwealth of Independent States. *Nauchni Trudove*, University of National and World Economy, Sofia, Bulgaria, (2), 237–250.
- Aziz, N. M. (2021). Parliamentary diplomacy in the system of parliamentary dimensions of international relations. In *Actual problems of international relations and global development: Collection of scientific papers* (Vol. 9, pp. 197–213). Minsk. <https://doi.org/10.33581/2311-9470-2021-9-197-213>.
- Benoit, C., & Rozenberg, O. (2020). Political science approaches to legislatures. In C. Benoit & O. Rozenberg (Eds.), *Handbook of parliamentary studies: Interdisciplinary approaches to legislatures*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Christiansen, T., & Groen, A. (2019). Inter-parliamentary cooperation in the European Union: Towards institutionalization? In K. Raube, M. Müftüler-Baç, & J. Wouters (Eds.), *Parliamentary cooperation and diplomacy in EU external relations*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Delavarpour Aghdam, M. (2025). Seventh Development Plan Law and capacities of parliamentary diplomacy. *The Islamic Revolution Approach*, 19(70), 3–27.[in Persian].
- Delavarpour Aghdam, M., & Dehghani Firouzabadi, S. J. (2016). Shortcomings and solutions for strengthening the parliamentary diplomacy of the Islamic Republic of Iran. *Majlis and Rahbord*, 23(88), 407–436.[in Persian].
- Elasco Pufleau, M. (2025). Parliamentary diplomacy and personal data protection in the digital age: An unexplored opportunity for upholding human rights in the European Union and beyond? In M. Torres Jarrín (Ed.), *Diplomacy and digital age: Science, technology and global digital governance* (pp. 167–189). Brussels, Belgium: Peter Lang. <https://doi.org/10.3726/b22286>.
- Eshonkulov, A. (2023). Inter-parliamentary relations in the modern international political process. *European Journal of Interdisciplinary Research and Development*, 16, 290–299. <https://ejird.journalspark.org/index.php/ejird/article/view/661>.
- García Pérez de León, C., & Dumont, P. (2020). Formal approaches to the study of parliaments. In C. Benoit & O. Rozenberg (Eds.), *Handbook of parliamentary studies: Interdisciplinary approaches to legislatures*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Haji Mineh, R., & Abedi, M. (2021). Parlomacy in Iran's foreign policy. *Political and International Approaches*, 12(2), 123–150. <https://doi.org/10.29252/piaj.2021.211351.0>. [in Persian].
- Hosseini, S. H., & Shirzadi, R. (2023). The role of parliamentary diplomacy in strengthening the national security of the Islamic Republic of Iran. *Foreign Relations*, 15(2), 132–157. <https://doi.org/10.22034/fr.2023.416731.1440>. [in Persian].
- Ilyicheva, L. E., & Lesnikov, A. A. (2025). Parliamentary diplomacy in ensuring Russia's national interests. *Vlast (The Authority)*, 33(3), 118–126. [In Russian].
- Kaminska, N., & Kovalov, A. (2024). Parliamentary diplomacy in the European and Asian regions: International legal framework and comparative analysis. *ScienceRise: Juridical Science*, 2(28), 55–60. <https://doi.org/10.15587/2523-4153.2024.309060>.
- Mansourian, N. A., & Akbari, E. (2020). The status and importance of parliamentary diplomacy in the Islamic Republic of Iran. *Soft Power Studies*, 10(22), 213–239.[in Persian].

- Mikhailiova, T. N. (2023). Model law-making in the CIS as a legal tool for soft integration and a source of parliamentary diplomacy. In *Diplomacy of Belarus in the context of new challenges: Proceedings of the International Research and Practical Conference* (pp. 56–60). Minsk: Belarusian State University.
- Nayimo, O. (2025). Parliamentary diplomacy in contemporary international relations. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Sciences and Innovations*, 4(4), 435–438. <https://ijmri.de/index.php/jmsi>.
- Novikov, D. P., & Bykov, I. A. (2024). Parliamentary diplomacy of Russia in Central Asia: Current situation and prospects. *Vlast' (The Authority)*, 32(4–1), 151–160. <https://doi.org/10.56700/t4015-7043-4294-c>. [In Russian].
- Prokhorenko, I. L. (2020). *Inter-parliamentary institutions in world politics*. Moscow: Imemo Ran.
- Rasoulizadeh, G., & Khoeini, G. (2018). The way of interaction of the Islamic Consultative Assembly with regional and international parliamentary assemblies. *Scientific Journal National Academy of Managerial Staff of Culture and Arts Herald*, (1), 1343–1352. <https://doi.org/10.32461/2226-3209.1.2018.178786>.
- Saidamirova, F. Sh. (2021). The essence and main tasks of the model legislation of the Inter-Parliamentary Assembly of the Commonwealth of Independent States. *Proceedings of the Institute of Philosophy, Political Science and Law of the National Academy of Sciences of Tajikistan*, (1).
- Savelchev, L. A. (2024). Conceptualizing parliamentary diplomacy. *Eurasian Integration: Economics, Law, Politics*, 18(3), 112–121. <https://doi.org/10.22394/2073-2929-2024-03-112-121>. [In Russian].
- Semenov, V. A., & Yarmoshevich, A. A. (2024). Parliamentary diplomacy of Russia on the BRICS platform in 2022–2024. *Science Bulletin*, 1(9[78]), 128–139. <https://doi.org/10.24412/2712-8849-2024-978-128-139>.
- Serohin, V. O. (2017). Inter-parliamentary cooperation: Concept, indicators, principles. *The Journal of V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, Series Law*, (23), 46–50. <https://periodicals.karazin.ua/law/article/view/9679>.
- Shah, Z. (2025). Understanding the evolution of public policy and governance. *Journal of Social Signs Review*, 3(3), 238–242. <https://socialsignsreview.com/index.php/12/article/view/165>.
- Voda, K. (2022). Russia's approach to preventive diplomacy in the Asia-Pacific: Possibilities of parliamentary diplomacy. In Y. Guo & J. Miao (Eds.), *Preventive diplomacy, peacebuilding and security in the Asia-Pacific: Evolving norms, agenda and practices*. Singapore: World Scientific.