



PAVING THE WAY FOR BUSINESS
BUILDING A BETTER INVESTMENT CLIMATE

Quarter one report

March to June 2012



Contents

| | | |
|-------|---|----|
| 1. | Summary of progress for this period | 3 |
| 2. | Logframe | 10 |
| 3. | Lessons learned | 14 |
| 4. | Financials | 15 |
| 5. | Summary of activities planned for next period | 18 |
| <hr/> | | |
| I. | Appendix 1 | 20 |
| <hr/> | | |

1. Summary of progress for this period

1.1. Summary of progress for this period

This quarterly report covers the first quarter of IFUSE implementation in Year 1. Since the start of April, the programme has developed a pipeline of assignments, receiving technical assistance (TA) requests for 23 deployments covering a range of issues, including regulatory reform, customs and tax procedures and competition policy. Demand has spanned 15 DFID partner countries, including Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Tanzania and Uganda, and has come from Other Government Departments (OGDs), DFID country offices, Foreign & Commonwealth Office (FCO) and partner country governments. Two have been completed to date, and a further four will be completed by the end of September, with others scheduled for later in the Autumn.




- **Quality of logistical support** - initial feedback from experts who are deployed on IFUSE assignments has been positive, both in terms of the quality of the logistical support received, as well as the developmental nature of the work. The shape of deployments has meant that there have so far been no adverse resourcing impacts for participating OGDs. No deployment to date has required more than five days in-country, and deployment timing has been flexible in order to meet experts' availability and work schedules.
- **Participation of two additional OGDs** - Infrastructure UK (IUK) and the Government Actuary's Department (GAD) have signed up to the IFUSE programme. We are currently in discussions with a number of other UK Government Departments regarding their participation in the programme, including the Financial Services Authority (FSA), the Department for Business, Innovation & Skills (BIS), UK Trade & Investment (UKTI), the Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC) and the Bank of England.
- **Development of peer-to-peer networks** - as part of IFUSE's strategy to build peer-to-peer networks within and between OGDs and DFID priority countries, and to help build a pipeline of future demand, we are working with Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs (HMRC) to organise a video-conference knowledge sharing event with revenue authorities in East Africa. We have held one-to-one meetings with each OGD in order to continue to build a pipeline of demand and to understand what more we could do to support their participation and engagement in the initiative.
- **Planning the launch event** - progress has also been made on the launch event, which will be held in October or November. Value for money has been one of the guiding principles of IFUSE, and the event will be held in Parliament, at no charge to the programme.
- **Requests are broad in scope** - time must be invested upfront to liaise with the relevant Government Department (OGD), requestor and often the third party (such as the International Finance Corporation (IFC)), to shape a request into a specific ToR and deployment.
- **More than one deployment is required to achieve expected results** - we anticipate that these repeat assignments will be more conducive to relationship-building between the expert and their counterpart in the host country government department, which may in turn improve the quality of the knowledge transfer and permit the development of a peer-to-peer relationship. We are currently testing this approach with Kyrgyzstan, Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania requests. Feedback so far suggests that this strategy is likely to be more effective than 'one-off' assignments. The FCO representative in Tanzania noted that this approach will lead to more sustainable change and to stronger networks between HMRC and the Tanzania Revenue Authority.
- **Three requests have been turned down** - two assignments were declined because the right source of Whitehall expertise could not be found (BIS and UKTI have yet to engage in IFUSE and this may have contributed to this problem) and one because the request did not meet IFUSE criteria.

1.2. Key risks and issues

A number of risks have emerged during Quarter One, which are summarised here and set out in more detail in the table below.

The main challenge is to continue to generate a strong pipeline of future demand for IFUSE, through raising awareness of what the programme can offer both directly with priority countries, as well as indirectly through key third parties. We are tackling this by working closely with OGDs to identify specific opportunities, and by reaching out to third parties, particularly IFC and World Bank. Another risk is around maintaining the security of experts 'in country', particularly where the security situation changes quickly. It will be important that we continue to communicate clearly with deployed experts on this matter, in order to help them and their Department manage deployment risk, and to ensure that they understand the FCO's security policy in the respective country and use this to make effective decisions on security-related issues.

Finally, we note the risk that we may need to turn down future deployments in the event that we are not able to secure the right expertise to support particular deployments. We are liaising closely with DFID, and using our own internal network, to continue to reach out to relevant OGDs to help mitigate this risk. We have set out current risks and issues in more detail below.

| Risk/Issue | Planned Actions | R/A/G Status |
|--|---|---|
| Attract a supply of qualified and available UK Government Investment Climate (IC) experts | <p>Continue to explore ways of engaging new OGDs to explain the IFUSE programme and obtain their commitment to involvement in IFUSE e.g. UKTI; BIS; and DECC.</p> <p>Explore with DFID the potential to exploit capability linked to Whitehall but sitting outside it, for example through our network of retired civil service contacts.</p> |  |
| Attract suitable demand for the IFUSE programme | <p>Conduct video conferences with DFID partner country offices to highlight the aims, objectives and benefits of the IFUSE programme. DFID is scheduling and organising these video conferences, with input from the IFUSE team.</p> <p>Reach out to third parties, including IFC and the World Bank.</p> <p>Engage OGDs regularly to see if new opportunities for external communication on IFUSE arise.</p> |  |
| High level of security risk in partner countries, which discourages experts visiting countries | <p>On receipt of the initial request, confirm the key contact within FCO in country in order to stay attuned to changing policies in country.</p> <p>Explore alternative ways to deliver IFUSE support where the security situations makes an in-country deployment impractical, for example through the use of video conference (VC) and WebEx technology</p> |  |

1.3. Summary of requests

Status of technical assistance requests

The table provides an overview of the status of TA requests at the end of quarter one. 18 requests have been received. Of these, a number have required more than one deployment to deliver them, hence the total of 23 in the table below.

| Status of TA requests | Total Number |
|--|--------------|
| No. of deployment requests received | 23 |
| No. of ToRs agreed and expert identified | 1 |
| No. of ToRs in progress | 17 |
| No. of deployments completed | 2 |
| No. of requests declined | 3 |

Please refer to appendix 1 for full details of all TA requests during quarter one.

Source of TA requests

The table below details the source of TA requests received.

| Source of TA requests | Total Number |
|----------------------------|--------------|
| Contact through OGD | 9 |
| DFID in partner country | 7 |
| FCO in partner country | 1 |
| Partner country government | 1 |


TA requests by country







The table below details the countries for which TA requests have been received.








| Countries | Total number of TA requests |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Bangladesh | 1 |
| Ethiopia | 1 |
| Kenya | 2 |
| Kyrgyzstan | 1 |
| Malawi | 1 |
| Mozambique | 1 |
| Nigeria | 1 |
| Pakistan | 2 |
| Rwanda | 1 |
| Tajikistan | 1 |
| Tanzania | 1 |
| Turks & Caicos Island | 1 |
| Uganda | 1 |
| Vietnam | 1 |
| Zambia | 1 |
| International | 1 |



1.4. Status report summary

The table below summaries progress on key activities planned in the last reporting period, as well as progress on further activities that have been progressed.

| Key activities planned | Progress made in this period | R/A/G Status |
|--|---|---|
| Oversight Committee | | |
| Hold an Oversight Committee meeting every quarter. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oversight Committee meeting held during the first quarter on 11 April 2012, and at the end of the first quarter in July 2012. |  |

| Key activities planned | Progress made in this period | R/A/G Status |
|---|--|---|
| Oversight Committee to approve IFUSE handbook, engagement plan, expert pool and document. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oversight Committee approved all IFUSE documentation including handbook, engagement plan etc April 2012. |  |
| Oversight Committee to approve logframe and the proposed approach to evaluation. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oversight Committee approved the logframe and the proposed approach to evaluation April 2012. |  |
| Communications & Engagement | | |
| Develop branding and marketing materials for IFUSE. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> IFUSE branding and flyer developed and approved by DFID. One pager on IFUSE progress developed and shared with OGDs. |  |
| Communication with OGDs on how they can promote IFUSE. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The managing agent scheduled a number of meetings with the OGDs to reinvigorate interest in the IFUSE programme. The managing agent shared a one pager in June to provide an update on IFUSE. This document has been a good outreach tool for PwC and the OGDs. |  |
| OGDs to promote IFUSE to potential beneficiaries. | <p>This activity receives an amber rating as some OGDs could be more engaged. Actions are being taken to improve OGD engagement during Q2, set out below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In May, BRDO distributed the IFUSE leaflet to eleven countries from East Africa during a conference in Rwanda. In May, OFT distributed IFUSE flyers at the 11th ICN Annual Conference in Rio de Janeiro. In June, HMRC attend a conference in the Caribbean and promoted IFUSE during this event. |  |
| Communication with DFID COs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In June, DFID, with input from the managing agent, hosted two video conference events with DFID countries offices to promote the IFUSE programme. No interest expressed for the first event, interest in second event encouraging however limited numbers attended. Note sent to Ministers on IFUSE programme. This will also have been cascaded down from senior management. |  |

| Key activities planned | Progress made in this period | R/A/G Status |
|--|--|---|
| Knowledge sharing event with Revenue Authorities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This activity receives an amber rating due to the slow pace of receiving feedback and interest from some of the revenue authorities. However, we are confident that this event is worthwhile and have received interest from Uganda and Rwanda. The managing agent is working with HMRC to develop a knowledge sharing event with four revenue authorities. The objectives of the event will be to help revenue authorities share lessons and experience on common issues and to explore how IFUSE could provide support to help the authorities take forward any of the discussed actions. |  |
| Financials | | |
| Develop financial systems for reporting mechanisms | Financial systems developed to capture consulting time as well as expenses incurred during deployments. |  |
| Monthly reporting | Monthly forecasting is included in all monthly reports to date. |  |
| Monitoring & Evaluation | | |
| Develop M&E logframe | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> M&E logframe discussed with OC, issued to all representatives for comment, and agreed with DFID. |  |
| Develop and agree feedback process for deployments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feedback forms designed and agreed for expert and beneficiary feedback. The forms have been used on two deployments. We received very little feedback from the Rwanda recipient (only a short email). We will therefore initiate a call with the person and document their response. |  |
| Knowledge Management | | |
| Develop and agree knowledge management process | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Knowledge management proposal developed and shared with DFID. |  |
| Agree platform for hosting knowledge management | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DFID is in the process of creating a web page on its website page to accommodate knowledge management. |  |

| Key activities planned | Progress made in this period | R/A/G Status |
|------------------------------------|---|---|
| Programme / Risk Management | | |
| Regular communication with DFID | Fortnightly meetings scheduled with DFID. |  |
| Regular IFUSE team meetings | Weekly IFUSE team meetings have been scheduled. |  |

2. Logframe

2.1. Logframe

| Impact | Impact Indicator | Results | Comments/risks |
|--|---|--|----------------|
| IFUSE TA contributes to reform improvements that reduce monetary time and cost of doing business, increasing predictability of investment climate and promoting fair and competitive markets in five priority countries. | 1. Improvements in specific areas of ease of doing business in priority countries. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too early to report, will report at end of year one. | |
| | 2. Qualitative assessment of investment climate in priority countries shows discernible improvements. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too early to report, will report at end of year one. | |
| Outcome | Outcome Indicator | Results | Comments/risks |
| Improved design and implementation of Investment Climate Reform | 1. No. and proportion of IFUSE recipients who note additional TA benefits from HMG involvement. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too early to report, will report at end of year one. | |
| | 2. Quality of institutional relationships and engagement between OGDs and partner government departments. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too early to report, will report in quarter two report. | |
| | 3. Number of policy/ legislation/ procedures/ reform proposals approved by partner governments which were supported by IFUSE. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> BRDO spent five days in-country supporting the Inspectorate of Technical and Ecological Security in reviewing and strengthening the implementation of their regulatory reform programme. | |
| Output | Output Indicator | Result | Comments/risks |
| 1. High quality advisory expertise in investment climate reform delivered by Whitehall network | 1.1 Percentage of assignments rated "good" or "very good" by end user. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waiting feedback from BDRO Kyrgyzstan deployment and chasing RRA for feedback. | |

| Output | Output Indicator | Results | Comments/risks |
|---|---|--|--|
| | 1.2 Percentage of assignments with clear ToR that meet IFUSE criteria (clear IC impacts, feasible scope of work and clear deliverables) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100% of completed assignments had a clear ToR that met IFUSE criteria. One request was turned down as it did not meet the criteria. Feedback from OGD, "Managing Agent facilitated discussions between ourselves and the beneficiary effectively, and kept us on track with deadlines." | |
| 2. Processes and procedures set up and function | 2.1 Number of assignments where deployment processes meet agreed schedules and policies | <p>Two deployments have been completed within the first quarter BDRO's deployment to Kyrgyzstan and HMRC's deployment to Rwanda:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rwanda 1 month from initial request to finalised ToR. Kyrgyzstan 2.5 months from initial request to finalised ToR. The delay was due to the requestor changing the scope – additional days and request split into two deployments. | |
| | 2.2 Percentage of IFUSE advisers who report appropriate technical briefing on technical assistance best practice | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100% BRDO rated briefing as good HMRC rated briefing as excellent; undertaken by HMRC and British Embassy | <p>One of the deployed experts noted that he received two briefings. The OGD has done a separate briefing to ours because the duty of care remains with them. There is some duplication in certain instances and we will need to discuss this with the OGD concerned so that this is not repeated in the future.</p> |

| Output | Output Indicator | Results | Comments/risks |
|--|--|--|----------------|
| | 2.3 Satisfaction of OGDs with function of IFUSE mechanism | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> BRDO (Kyrgyzstan) rated IFUSE mechanism as very good. Additional feedback from HMRC and others is that their experiences of the IFUSE mechanism has been excellent. | |
| 3. High quality knowledge sharing among IFUSE participants, partner government professionals and UK government professionals | 3.1 Number of active and effective institutional engagement relationships which are generated a result of IFUSE | <p>Three active and effective institutional engagement relationships have been generated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> BDRO's relationships with World Bank and the Kyrgyzstan government. HMRC's relationship with the RRA. | |
| | 3.2 Number/ proportion of professionals participating in IFUSE who note emergence of a peer-to-peer network (where assignment ToRs allow). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> BRDO experts have developed peer-to-peer networks within Kyrgyzstan. They are planning to return to the country in autumn 2012 for a follow up visit. HMRC are expected to develop a peer-to-peer network through the knowledge sharing video conference event. | |
| | 3.3 Usage of knowledge management mechanism /instrument | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too early to report. | |
| Output | Output Indicator | Results | Comments/risks |
| 4. Emergence of collaborative approach across OGDs participating in IFUSE in their support to investment climate | 4.1 Proportion of assignments that are coordinated between OGDs before deployment to expert | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too early to report, however at the OC meeting (17 July) it was agreed that there would be a greater focus on issues that cut across all OGDs. | |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| <p>in IFUSE participating countries.</p> | <p>4.2 Proportion of assignments that have follow-up support from another HMG team</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During the first quarter neither deployment has afforded the opportunity for support from another HMG team. | |
|--|--|---|--|

3. Lessons learned

Below is a summary of the lessons that were shared by the OGDs.

| Stakeholder | Lessons learned |
|-------------------------|---|
| OGDs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain momentum - the IFUSE process is seen as agile, which is different to similar donor programmes. There is also a recognition that we need to maintain this momentum. • Structure invaluable - the structure that the IFUSE process provides is invaluable. • Flexibility - the flexibility that the IFUSE programme affords is important to OGDs, as they may not always have an expert available during the initial timescales. The IFUSE team negotiate with the requestor and OGD to agree a compromise. • Staff development - the IFUSE programme allows OGDs to build the expertise of their staff and prepare them for more demanding roles within their home Department. |
| Managing Agent and DFID | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Length of time to shape ToR - the process of shaping and agreeing a ToR is very time consuming. This process can take between a few months to a few weeks, mainly due to the availability of the individuals within the requesting organisation. For example, one request has taken two months to agree, as the individuals within the requesting organisation were not contactable and they were the only persons who could assist with this aspect of the process. • Multiple deployments – the majority of the requests received are very loosely scoped and often require more than one deployment. This is advantageous as repeat assignments are more conducive to knowledge sharing and the development of a peer-to-peer relationship (output 3 of IFUSE logframe). Cancellation of deployments - This raises important risks for value for money as significant inputs are made by DFID, the managing agent, the OGD and the requestor prior to the experts' actual deployment. We have learned that we need to get firmer commitment from the OGDs that their proposed experts are prepared to travel to the relevant country, and that the OGDs will identify another candidate should the first expert decide not to travel. • Requests from third parties - a number of requests are coming in from third parties, in particular from multi-lateral organisations that are providing support to the partner government institutions. We have therefore decided to enhance our engagement plan by targeting these organisations. We will work with DFID to identify stakeholders in organisations like the World Bank and IFC and share information on IFUSE with them. |

4. Financials

4.1. Quarterly spend

Overview of programme financials to date

| | Planned | Actual | Variance |
|-----------|---------|---------|----------|
| Inception | £75,000 | £75,000 | - |
| Year 1 | £60,307 | £43,465 | £16,842 |
| Year 2 | | | |
| Year 3 | | | |

The above programme financials include the total managing agent fee and the managed fund costs to date. The variance of £16,841 is a result of expected deployments being postponed until after the Olympics, the postponed deployment in Kenya and the impending submission of receipts from BDRO for the Kyrgyzstani deployment.

Quarterly forecasting

The table below provides a forecast for the months of July, August and September 2012. The figures relate to the deployment fee for the Managing Agent, as well as an estimate of associated expert expense, which include salary, flights and accommodation. The expenses will be invoiced in the month following the deployment mission.

| | July 2012 | | August 2012 | | September 2012 | |
|---------------------------------|----------------|---|----------------|---|----------------|--|
| | Cost | Deployment | Cost | Deployment | Cost | Deployment |
| MA monthly fee | £6,913 | | £6,913 | | £6,913 | |
| Deployment fee | £3,375 | HMRC/ Tanzania 1 st deployment | None | £0 | £6,750 | HMRC/ Tanzania 2 nd deployment and IUK/ Vietnam 1 st deployment |
| MA total costs | £10,288 | | £6,913 | | £13,663 | |
| Managed fund total costs | £12,376 | BRDO/ Kyrgyzstan 1s deployment | £13,500 | HMRC/ Tanzania 1 st deployment | £0 | None |
| Total costs | £22,664 | | £20,413 | | £13,663 | |

Monthly forecasting

| | June 2012 | | | Next month |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|----------------|
| | Planned | Actual | Planned vs. Actual | Planned |
| Managing Agent Total Costs | £10,288 | £12,988* | £2,700 | £10,288 |
| Managed Fund Total Costs | £12,376 | £0 | £12,376** | £12,376** |
| Total | £22,664 | £12,988 | £9,676 | £22,664 |

*Increase of £2,700 is due to 80% of deployment fee for BRDO Kenya assignment.

**BDRO has not submitted their invoice for associated expenses relating to the Kyrgyzstan deployment. The associated expenses are likely to appear in the monthly report for July 2012.

Year to date

| Year to date | | |
|----------------|----------------|--------------------|
| Planned | Actual | Planned vs. Actual |
| £41,152 | £37,102 | £4,050 |
| £19,155 | £6,363 | £12,792 |
| £60,307 | £43,465 | £16,842 |

4.2. Value for money

We are continually looking to deliver value for money in shaping the ToRs and the deployments of experts. A majority of the ToRs are aligned to existing programmes, bringing niche expertise to progress ongoing initiatives. For example, the deployment of experts from HMRC to Tanzania seeks to bring specialist UK expertise in tax communication to maintain other work supported by the FCO in-country. To give another example, the deployment of BRDO experts to Kyrgyzstan and Kenya, is aligned with the IFC's ongoing programmes. Through this coordination, iFUSE is providing bespoke expertise that would otherwise be unavailable to these programmes, and supporting catalytic change and progress. In doing so, the programme is making a wider contribution than could be achieved through the delivery of 'standalone' deployments.

Our logistical support has meant that all deployments to date have met DFID's VfM policy. We have identified the most economical flights for each deployment's time constraints. Experts have stayed in hotels

that offer security and safety. We have also provided experts with extensive and up-to-date information on security and confirmed their duty of care arrangements, bringing rigour and a sense of risk management for outbound experts.

The involvement of third parties such as the IFC and World Bank in past deployments is helping to build demand for IFUSE and to connect the relevant parties to the initiative. The good reputation that IFUSE is building is also creating more demand, avoiding the need for costly communications and promotional activities by the Managing Agent.

5. Summary of activities planned for next period

5.1. Summary of activities planned for next period

| Key activities planned for next period | Due date | Responsible | Comments |
|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------|----------|
| Oversight Committee | | | |
| Oversight Committee meeting scheduled for September 2012 | TBC | Managing Agent | |
| Communications and engagement | | | |
| DFID, supported by the Managing Agent, to arrange a second video conference with DFID offices in partner countries | Before 31 August 2012 | DFID and Managing Agent | |
| Conference call with Managing Agent and World Bank/IFC to share information on IFUSE | 17 July 2012 | Managing Agent | |
| Financials | | | |
| Provide quarterly financial forecasting in monthly reports | August monthly report onwards | Managing Agent | |
| Monitoring and evaluation | | | |
| Report on expert and beneficiary feedback through monthly report | Monthly and quarterly reports | Managing Agent | |
| Knowledge management | | | |
| Information on IFUSE programme, upcoming conferences and a summary of IFUSE deployments to be added to DFID Intranet site | By 31 August 2012 | DFID and Managing Agent | |
| Programme / risk management | | | |
| Date, location, speaker(s) and participants of IFUSE promotion event to be agreed | By 31 August 2012 | DFID and Managing Agent | |

Appendix

I. Appendix 1

| Reference no. | Country | Requestor (institution) | Target OGD | Budget | IC issue | Status | Target deployment date |
|---------------|------------|---------------------------------|------------|---------|--|---|--|
| 1 | Rwanda | HMRC | HMRC | £3,495 | Strengthening leadership and management capabilities | Completed | 11 to 17 March 2012 |
| 2 | Bangladesh | DFID Bangladesh | BIS | TBC | Review of Bangladesh IC Fund | Suitable expert could not be found in BIS | N/A |
| 3 | Malawi | DFID Malawi | BIS / UKTI | TBC | Design DFID's new support to a World Bank led IC programme | Suitable expert could not be found in BIS | N/A |
| 4 | Nigeria | GAD/GIZ | GAD | TBC | Microinsurance | Request was not suitable for IFUSE funding at the present time as the procurement process had already begun for the project | N/A |
| 5 | Kenya | IFC | BRDO | £9,576 | Regulatory reform – City Council of Nairobi | ToR has been agreed | Proposal from BRDO to reschedule to September 2012 |
| 6 | Kenya | IFC | BRDO | £10,496 | Regulatory reform – City Council of Mombasa | ToR has been agreed | Proposal from BRDO to reschedule to September 2012 |
| 7 | Kenya | IFC | BRDO | £7,872 | Regulatory reform – Training | ToR has been agreed | TBC |
| 8 | Kyrgyzstan | Ministry of Economic Regulation | BRDO | £12,376 | Regulatory reform | Deployment completed, experts currently drafting report | Week commencing 28 May 2012 |
| 9 | Kyrgyzstan | Ministry of Economic Regulation | BRDO | £9,168 | Regulatory reform – Training | ToR agreed | BRDO to advise of dates for second visit |
| 10 | Tanzania | British High Commission | HMRC | TBC | Tax issues and regulation | ToR in draft sent for approval | Likely to be week commencing 9 July 2012 |
| 11 | Tanzania | British High Commission | HMRC | TBC | Tax issues and regulation – TRA visit to UK | ToR in draft | 17-21 September 2012 |
| 12 | Tanzania | British High | HMRC | TBC | Tax issues and | ToR in draft | Likely to be |

| Reference no. | Country | Requestor (institution) | Target OGD | Budget | IC issue | Status | Target deployment date |
|---------------|----------------|------------------------------------|---------------|--------|--|--|--|
| | | Commission | | | regulation | | October 2012 |
| 13 | Pakistan | DFID Pakistan | HMT / BoE | TBC | Debt management | Confirming if a suitable expert can be found in HMT | TBC |
| 14 | Vietnam | DFID Vietnam | IUK | TBC | PPP | Draft ToR sent to IUK for review Confirming if a suitable expert can be found in IUK | Late June early July 2012 (may not be possible as still unclear of role of IUK expert) |
| 15 | Uganda | Uganda Revenue Authority | HMRC | TBC | Taxation | ToR sent to Uganda Revenue Authority for further completion | TBC |
| 16 | Kenya | Competition Authority of Kenya | OFT | TBC | Consumer protection | Initial request received from CAK, MA has requested additional information on scope of request | TBC |
| 17 | Pakistan | Competition Commission of Pakistan | OFT | TBC | Technical capacity building of CCP's staff | Initial request received from CCP, MA has requested additional information on scope of request, as well as a conference call | TBC |
| 18 | Mozambique | National Inspection Body INAE | BRDO | TBC | Regulatory reform | | |
| 19 | International | BRDO/World Bank | BRDO | TBC | Reform of regulatory delivery | | |
| 20 | Tajikistan | Land Registry | Land Registry | TBC | Conference on role of land registry authorities and growth | | |
| 21 | Zambia | DFID Zambia | DEFRA | TBC | Companies law | | |
| 22 | Ethiopia | DFID Ethiopia | TBC | TBC | Social security arrangements | | |
| 23 | Turks & Caicos | DFID | BRE/IUK | TBC | Private sector development in | | |

| Reference no. | Country | Requestor (institution) | Target OGD | Budget | IC issue | Status | Target deployment date |
|---------------|---------|-------------------------|------------|--------|------------------------|--------|------------------------|
| | Island | | | | small island countries | | |

This quarterly report has been prepared for and only for the Department for International Development (DFID) in accordance with the terms of our contract dated 16 January 2012 and for no other purpose. We do not accept or assume any liability or duty of care for any other purpose or to any other person to whom this quarterly report is shown or into whose hands it may come save where expressly agreed by our prior consent in writing.

© 2012 PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP. All rights reserved. In this document, "MA" refers to PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP (a limited liability partnership in the United Kingdom), which is a member firm of PricewaterhouseCoopers International Limited, each member firm of which is a separate legal entity.