



PAVING THE WAY FOR BUSINESS
BUILDING A BETTER INVESTMENT CLIMATE

Quarter three report

October to December 2012



Contents

1.	Summary of progress for this period	3
2.	Logframe	8
3.	Lessons learned	13
4.	Financials	15
5.	Summary of activities planned for next period	17
<hr/>		
I.	Appendix 1	20
II.	Appendix 2	23
<hr/>		

1. Summary of progress for this period

1.1. Summary of progress for this period

This quarterly report covers the third quarter of IFUSE implementation in Year 1. Below are key messages of our progress this quarter:





- **Completed deployments** – seven deployments were completed during the third quarter – an increase on three from the second quarter. Two deployments were postponed, one deployment (Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs (HMRC) – Rwanda) had to be rescheduled to January 2013 and the scope of the second deployment (Government Actuary's Department (GAD) – Rwanda) was reviewed by the OGD as other activities in-country impacted slightly on the original terms of reference (ToRs). Appendix 1 includes a summary of deployments completed as well as the current pipeline of requests for IFUSE support.
- **Annual review** – DFID undertook the first annual review of the IFUSE programme during December. The Managing Agent (MA) supplied information to the annual review team, set up a number of interviews with stakeholders and participated in interviews by DFID. The draft report was commented on and discussed during December. The annual review will be followed by a strategic report to be drafted by DFID which will address the critical issues of demand and supply for the facility. Actions responding to the review's recommendations will be discussed and agreed between the MA and DFID during January 2013.
- **Launch event** – the official launch of IFUSE took place on 4 December in London. 10 other government departments (OGDs) were represented at the event and representatives from 11 embassies also attended. The event was hosted by Nick Dyer, Director of Policy at DFID. Guests heard a keynote speech from Lynne Featherstone MP, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for International Development. The event also included addresses from Graham Russell, Chief Executive Officer of the Better Regulation Delivery Office (BRDO); Javier Encinas, Assistant Director at Infrastructure UK (IUK); and His Excellency Mr Carlos dos Santos from the Mozambique High Commission.
- **Promotion of IFUSE** – a number of OGDs have continued to actively promote IFUSE: HMRC distributed IFUSE brochures to the regional offices of the World Customs Organisation and to the Caribbean Foreign & Commonwealth Offices (FCO). The MA promoted IFUSE the BRDO and World Bank conference in London on 21 November, distributing publicity material and information detailing the recent successes of IFUSE and the type of technical assistance requests received to date. In addition IFUSE was promoted during a recent Land Registry conference, which was attended by 34 countries.
- **Demand** – the MA has reached out to a number of DFID country offices - Burma, Mozambique, Nigeria and Tanzania - where they believe IFUSE support may be required to support strategic Investment Climate goals. In addition, we have continued to work with participating OGDs as well as third parties to identify potential sources of future demand for IFUSE support.
- **Supply** – The Department for Business Innovation and Skills ('BIS'), and UK Trade and Investments ('UKTI') have formally joined the programme in this quarter. In addition, the Crown Prosecution Service has agreed to take part in IFUSE and the MA is now formalising this agreement with a memorandum of understanding (MoU). Ordnance Survey and the Export Credit Guarantee Department have also expressed a keen interest in becoming involved with the IFUSE programme; they are currently reviewing the memorandum of understanding with the view of becoming actively engaged in the IFUSE programme. Talks on possible IFUSE participation continue with the Sanctions and Illicit Finance department of HM Treasury, and with the Bank of England.


1.2. Key risks and issues

We note three important challenges this quarter:

- The first is building and sustaining a strong pipeline of demand. We used the IFUSE launch event on 4 December to promote the programme. We have also reached out to a number of DFID country offices - Mozambique, Burma, Nigeria and Tanzania - to determine where they believe interest in IFUSE support may be required.
- Another challenge is attracting a supply of qualified and available UK Government investment climate (IC) experts to the IFUSE programme. We have continue to explore ways of engaging new OGDs to broaden the expertise available as part of the IFUSE programme, and will continue to do so in Q4.
- Another challenge is that OGDs can find it difficult to identify suitable and available experts within the required timescales. We are tackling this by working closely with the OGDs involved in IFUSE, and managing the expectations of the requestor.

A summary of the risks and mitigating actions is listed in the table below.

Risk/Issue	Planned Actions	R/A/G Status
Suitable demand is not created for the IFUSE programme.	MA has followed up with participants at the IFUSE launch event to encourage participation in the programme, and to use additional contacts in DFID partner countries, in OGDs, and through third parties, to stimulate demand.	
DFID country offices do not have a comprehensive understanding of the type of support available through IFUSE and how to use it.	Undertake demand discussions with lead contacts DFID offices in target countries including Burma, Nigeria, Mozambique and Tanzania to identify a concrete pipeline of specific opportunities. Conduct video conference with DFID partner country offices to highlight the aims, objectives and benefits of the IFUSE programme early in the New Year. Consider revising IFUSE marketing material, using deployments to date to illustrate to DFID country offices (and OGDs) what IFUSE looks like in practice.	
Insufficient supply of qualified and available UK Government IC experts	Continue to explore ways of engaging new OGDs to explain the IFUSE programme and obtain their commitment to involvement in IFUSE e.g. Bank of England and HM Treasury;	
IFUSE cannot respond quickly enough to future requests for support because OGDs are unable to identify experts within short timescales	MA to remind OGDs at Oversight Committee meeting on 17 January 2013 of agreed timeframes to identify suitable experts, so that the requestor's expectations can be effectively managed, and to take suggestions on how we can manage the pipeline to give greater predictability to OGDs.	

Risk/Issue	Planned Actions	R/A/G Status
Progress against the agreed log frame cannot be demonstrated due to late or incomplete expert and beneficiary feedback	MA to remind OGDs at Oversight Committee meeting on 17 January 2013 of agreed timeframes for returning feedback.	

1.3. Summary of requests




Status of technical assistance requests





During the third quarter we received four new TA requests. We also finalised ToRs for five requests received during quarter two. We have received 30 TA requests during the last nine months. Some of these have been multi-stage requests, meaning that the overall number of deployments rises to 36. Seven deployments completed during quarter three, bringing a total of 13 completed deployments. We anticipate a rise in deployments during the next three months, with two confirmed deployments in the month of January, and in December worked to catalyse outstanding requests and discard those which were not progressing.






Please refer to appendix 1 for full details of all TA requests during quarter 1, 2 and 3.

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 scheduled for 17 January 2013. 	
Communications & Engagement		
Follow up conference call with MA and World Bank/IFC to discuss how IFUSE could support future opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MA has been liaising with IFC Tanzania with a TA request. The MA will set up a conference call with the World Bank/IFC in the New Year to discuss future opportunities. 	
MA to make contact with four DFID country offices (Tanzania, Mozambique, Nigeria and Burma) to determine what	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MA sent emails to the four named DFID country offices requesting that they each set out the key areas IFUSE could support. 	

Key activities planned	Progress made in this period	R/A/G Status
areas IFUSE could support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MA has followed up with each country office to agree a way forward and two new opportunities have been identified in Nigeria and in Burma. 	
Conference call with DFID country offices, relevant OGDs and PwC to agree the nature and timing of IFUSE support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MA held detailed discussions with DFID Nigeria and Burma to identify a concrete pipeline of specific opportunities. Further to initial approaches from the MA, DFID UK has sent emails to DFID Tanzania and Mozambique requesting their participation to identify a concrete pipeline of specific opportunities. 	
Financials		
Monthly reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monthly forecasting is included in all monthly reports to date. 	
Review the time required to successfully deliver an IFUSE deployment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MA has reviewed the time required to successfully deliver an IFUSE deployment and provided details of how time is broken down for multiple incoming visits and an in-country deployment. This is connected with the VFM element of the annual review. Following the annual review the MA and DFID will review the time required to successfully deliver an IFUSE deployment, as part of a broader response to the review's recommendations. 	
Monitoring & evaluation		
Report on expert and beneficiary feedback through monthly report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Positive and constructive feedback has been obtained from beneficiaries and experts involved in deployments to date. This activity receives an amber rating given the lateness in some of the replies from beneficiaries (which the MA continues to chase) which skews the feedback figures. 	
Strengthening monitoring and evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the light of the annual review recommendations, the MA will make proposals on how to improve IFUSE monitoring and evaluation systems and the ensuing changes to the logframe. 	TBC

Key activities planned	Progress made in this period	R/A/G Status
Knowledge management		
Update IFUSE web page with a summary of IFUSE deployments and upcoming conferences/events	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The IFUSE web page was updated on 12 December. A discussion between DFID and the MA to evaluate the success of the website and determine any changes in approach will be held as part of a broader discussion about improving knowledge management arrangements following completion of the annual review. 	
Video conference event with HMRC and national revenue authorities (Rwanda, Uganda, Tanzania and Burundi)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HMRC is determining what experts could lead a presentation and discussion on transfer pricing and international taxation. The video conference event is planned to occur during February 2013. 	
Programme / Risk Management		
Regular communication with DFID	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fortnightly meetings scheduled with DFID. 	
Regular IFUSE team meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Weekly IFUSE team meetings take place, plus briefings between the director and operations lead and the project partner. 	
Date, location, speaker(s) and participants of IFUSE promotion event to be agreed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The IFUSE launch event took place on Tuesday 4 December in London. The MA briefed Graham Russell, Chief Executive Officer of BROD; Javier Encinas, Assistant Director at Infrastructure UK; and His Excellency Mr Carlos dos Santos from the High Commission for the Republic of Mozambique. 	

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 IC 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. 	MA needs to discuss with DFID the methodology for these indicators, including the 'attributability' of such improvements to IFUSE interventions, as part of its response to the annual review
	2. Qualitative assessment of IC in priority countries shows discernible improvements.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too early to report; will report at end of year one. 	As above.
Outcome	Outcome Indicator	Results	Comments/risks
Improved design and implementation of IC reform	1. No. and proportion of IFUSE recipients who note additional TA benefits from HMG involvement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Six out of 13 beneficiaries noted additional TA benefits from HMG involvement – feedback from 4 beneficiaries is outstanding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Four end of mission reports are still to be finalised.
	2. Quality of institutional relationships and engagement between OGDs and partner government departments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All 13 institutional relationships and engagement between OGDs and partner government departments have been strengthened through the IFUSE programme From six completed end user surveys (out of 13) 33% strongly agree that following TA the strength of their relationship with the UK Government Department had improved; 50% agreed and 17% remained neutral. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Four institutional relationships were formed during the BRDO conference – feedback is outstanding from these four institutions. Feedback is also outstanding from Kenya, Rwanda and Uganda.

Outcome	Outcome Indicator	Results	Comments/risks
	3. Number of policy/ legislation/ procedures/ reform proposals approved by partner governments which were supported by IFUSE.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seven (out of 10) It is difficult to determine this indicator for the remaining three deployments as one was round table discussions with Burmese MP's; the second was an inward visit from 2 Tajik delegates to the Land Registry conference; and the third was an inward visit from four partner countries (Kenya; Tajikistan; Kyrgyzstan; Mozambique and Nigeria) to the BRDO conference 	
1. High quality advisory expertise in IC reform delivered by Whitehall network	1.1 Percentage of assignments rated "good" or "very good" by end user.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 38% rated assignments as excellent 50% rated assignments as very good 12% rated assignments as good 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whilst there are 20 completed deployments we have yet to receive feedback from 5 deployments, therefore this figure is calculated out of 15 completed deployments.
	1.2 Percentage of assignments with clear ToRs that meet IFUSE criteria (clear IC impacts, feasible scope of work and clear deliverables).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100% of 20 completed assignments had clear ToRs that met IFUSE criteria. 	

Outcome	Outcome Indicator	Results	Comments/risks
2. Processes and procedures set up and function	2.1 Number of assignments where deployment processes meet agreed schedules and policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seven deployments have been completed in the third quarter and met agreed policies. Although there is however a long delay between deployment and finalised ToRs, the timing of the experts' missions have all met the beneficiaries' requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100% of 13 completed assignments had a clear ToRs that met IFUSE criteria.
	2.2 Percentage of IFUSE advisers who report appropriate technical briefing on technical assistance best practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 68% rated briefing as excellent 17% rated briefing as very good 17% rated briefing as good 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of IFUSE advisers who report appropriate technical briefing on technical assistance best practice is calculated using feedback from 6 deployments, an additional three were inward visits, and there are 5 deployments for which feedback is yet to be received.
	2.3 Satisfaction of OGDs with function of IFUSE mechanism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 38% rated satisfaction as excellent 62% rated satisfaction as very good 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Satisfaction of OGDs with function of IFUSE mechanism is calculated using feedback from six deployments, an additional 2 were inward visits, and there are five deployments that feedback is yet to be received.

Outcome	Outcome Indicator	Results	Comments/risks
<p>3. High quality knowledge sharing among IFUSE participants, partner government professionals and UK government professionals</p>	<p>3.1 Number of active and effective institutional engagement relationships which are generated a result of IFUSE</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nine active and effective institutional engagement relationships have been generated during the third quarter. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12 active and effective institutional engagement relationships have been generated in the last nine months.

Outcome	Outcome Indicator	Results	Comments/risks
	3.2 Number/ proportion of professionals participating in IFUSE who note emergence of a peer-to- peer network (where assignment ToRs allow).	Of 13 deployments to date, 11 have remain in contact.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Of the 13 deployments completed to date three involved the TRA; three involved the Inspectorate in Kyrgyzstan; and two involved the National Inspection Body INAE in Mozambique.
	3.3 Usage of knowledge management mechanism /instrument.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too early to report. 	
4. Emergence of collaborative approach across OGDs participating in IFUSE in their support to IC in IFUSE participating countries.	4.1 Proportion of assignments that are coordinated between OGDs before deployment to expert	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too early to report. 	
	4.2 Proportion of assignments that have follow-up support from another HMG team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> During the third quarter no deployment has afforded the opportunity for support from another HMG team. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> During the first three quarters no deployment has afforded the opportunity for support from another HMG team.

3. Lessons learned

Below is a summary of the key lessons learnt during Year 1 Q3 of the IFUSE programme.

Stakeholder	Lessons learned
MA and OGDs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of experts – in order to offer certainty in supply of expertise it is important that OGDs consider carefully the balance between giving staff equal access to IFUSE opportunities alongside being able to mobilise quickly. Some departments have indicated that they wish to run ‘mini competitions’ to identify experts for assignments on the basis of fairness which may clash with the programme’s objectives (and comparative advantage) of being able to mobilise resources quickly to respond to demand. This is something the MA will continue to work on with OGDs to manage. • Preparation lead time – to ensure that deployments take place during the agreed timeframe, it is important that OGDs allow adequate lead time for experts to prepare for the deployment. • Use of IFUSE guidance it is important for experts to use the guidance, as detailed in the IFUSE handbook, when drafting their end of mission report. Making use of the end of mission report template will help ensure consistency for this form of deliverable. It is also important that reports are jargon-free and that acronyms are clearly defined at the outset of the report to make sure that the report’s intended audience understands it. The MA will work on producing clearer guidance for experts in order to promote more uniform quality in deliverables.
MA and DFID	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capturing key programme data – important that we continue to capture key programme data for M&E and review purposes. We will review our systems in the first quarter of 2013 in anticipation of an increase in the volume of deployments through the end of Year 1 and into Year 2, to ensure that we continue to capture data in a sufficiently robust manner. • Length of time to shape ToRs - the process of shaping and agreeing a ToRs 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. We will discuss ways of reducing lead time at the Oversight Committee meeting. • Logistics – important to have consistency for all deployment logistics in relation to IFUSE policies regarding expenses, visa applications and other services such as in-country interpreters. We suggest that the MA and DFID issue a reminder on this point of IFUSE policy at the next Oversight Committee meeting. • Security in partner country – it is important to have the contact details of a security officer in either the FCO or DFID country office at an early stage. A number of recent requests have been in countries where the FCO advice is to avoid all but essential travel to parts of the country. The security officer can provide an insight into the FCO guidance and provide additional information to assist OGDs and experts to make an informed decision on whether they can support the deployment based on the security situation in-country. DFID will issue communication to all

Stakeholder	Lessons learned
	DFID partner countries setting out the iFUSE process, as well as asking for contact details of a representative within the FCO.

4. Financials

4.1. Quarterly spend

Overview of programme financials to date

	Planned	Actual	Variance
Inception	£75,000	£75,000	-
Year 1	£308,646	£205,680	£102,966

The above programme financials include the total MA fee and the managed fund costs to date. The variance of £102,966 is due in part to the impending submission of receipts from BRDO for the Kyrgyzstan, Mozambique, and Kenya deployments and UKTI for the Burma deployment. In addition a number of planned deployments for quarter three have been postponed and have been rescheduled to occur in January and February 2013.

Quarterly forecasting

The table below provides an overview of actual and forecasted expenditure for the IFUSE programme from March 2012 to March 2013. The costs include the agreed monthly management fee for the programme as a whole, the agreed management fee per deployment, as well as associated expenses, which include salary, flights and accommodation for deployments. Actual expenses are based on those incurred to date (end December 2012). Forecasted expenses are based on assumptions outlined in our original proposal, which equates to £11,272 per deployment, based on one expert staying in country for 15 days. Fees and expenses for each deployment are included for the month within which they occur, with invoicing taking place in the following month. Three scenarios are presented below to support financial forecasting to end March 2013.

1. Low case – assuming that only those requests already received and confirmed are completed.
2. Medium case – assuming a ‘mid case’ between the forecasts set out in the low case (above) and high case (below).
3. High case – forecast to end of March 2013, assuming that everything within the existing IFUSE pipeline (as set out in the monthly report for December) is delivered by the end of March 2013.

	Low Case												Medium Case			High Case											
	Mar-12	Apr-12	May-12	Jun-12	Jul-12	Aug-12	Sep-12	Oct-12	Nov-12	Dec-12	Jan-13	Feb-13	Mar-13	Jan 13	Feb 13	Mar 13	Jan 13	Feb 13	Mar 13								
Deployments delivered (actual)	1			1	1		3	5	2																		
Deployments forecasted																											
Monthly management fee (£)	£6,913	£6,913	£6,913	£6,913	£6,913	£6,913	£6,913	£6,913	£6,913	£6,913	£6,913	£6,913	£6,913	£6,913	£6,913	£6,913	£6,913	£6,913	£6,913	£6,913	£6,913	£6,913	£6,913	£6,913	£6,913	£6,913	
Deployment fee (£)	£3,375			£3,375	£3,375		£10,125	£16,075	£6,750	£0	£0,750	£10,125	£6,750	£6,750	£6,750	£10,125	£20,250	£6,750	£13,500	£33,750	£6,750	£13,500	£33,750	£6,750	£13,500	£33,750	
Managing agent monthly cost (£)	£10,288	£6,913	£6,913	£10,288	£10,288	£6,913	£17,038	£23,788	£13,663	£6,913	£13,663	£17,038	£13,663	£13,663	£17,038	£27,163	£13,663	£20,413	£40,663	£13,663	£20,413	£40,663	£13,663	£20,413	£40,663	£13,663	
Managing fund total cost (£)	£4,763			£10,979	£11,927		£37,798	£43,234	£10,470	£0	£10,500	£34,716	£23,144	£23,144	£34,716	£69,432	£23,144	£34,716	£127,292	£23,144	£34,716	£127,292	£23,144	£34,716	£127,292	£23,144	
Other expenses e.g. printing, communication and travel costs							£127	£156	£497	£0	£504	£504	£504	£504	£504	£504	£504	£504	£504	£504	£504	£504	£504	£504	£504	£504	
Annual audit																											
Total cost per month (£)	£15,051	£6,913	£6,913	£21,267	£22,215	£6,913	£54,963	£67,178	£24,629	£6,913	£24,667	£52,258	£42,311	£37,311	£52,258	£102,099	£37,311	£55,633	£173,459	£37,311	£55,633	£173,459	£37,311	£55,633	£173,459	£37,311	
	Overall forecasted costs year 1												£352,191			£424,623			£499,358								
	Commercial proposal costs year 1												£546,312			£546,312			£546,312								

Key:

- actual (invoiced to DFID)
- combination of actual and forecasted (wait for outstanding invoices from OGDs)
- forecasted

Monthly forecasting

	December 2012			Next month
	Planned	Actual	Planned vs. Actual	Planned
MA Total Costs	£6,913	£6,913	£0	£13,663
Managed Fund Total Costs	£34,639	£3,748	£30,891*	£32,887
Total	£41,552	£10,661	£30,891	£46,550

*BRDO has not submitted their invoice for associated expenses relating to the Kyrgyzstan, Mozambique, and Kenya deployments and UKTI has not submitted their invoice for the Burma deployment. Expenses associated with these deployments are likely to appear in the monthly report for January 2013.

Year to date

Year to date			
	Planned	Actual	Planned vs. Actual
MA Total Costs	£121,443	£115,705	£5,738
Managed Fund Total Costs	£187,203	£89,975	£97,228
	£308,646	£205,680	£102,966

4.2. Value for money

In anticipation of the likely recommendations to be made by the annual review, in Q4 we will look to enhance the way in which we measure value for money on the iFUSE programme. During the early design and implementation stages of the programme, a lot of effort has been placed on making iFUSE work in an economic and efficient manner. Now the system is fully operational, and with a number of assignments completed we intend to focus on the 'effectiveness' aspect, in order to draw fuller conclusions on the project's VFM.

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	17 January 2013	MA	
Communications and engagement			
Issue one pager on IFUSE progress to stakeholders	17 January 2013	MA	
Update marketing material	By 15 February 2013		
Follow up conference call with MA and World Bank/IFC to discuss how IFUSE could support future opportunities	By 31 January 2013	MA	
Agree timings and detailed ToRs for Nigeria and Burma and set up initial calls with Mozambique and Tanzania DFID country offices.	By 28 February 2013	DFID, OGDs and MA	
Financials			
Review the time required to successfully deliver an IFUSE deployment and agree any changes to operational procedures or budgeting required as a result	By 31 January 2013	DFID and MA	
Monitoring and evaluation			
Report on expert and beneficiary feedback through monthly report	Monthly and quarterly reports	MA	
Review and enhance M&E system, taking account of any specific recommendations made by the IFUSE Annual Review	By 28 February 2013	DFID and MA	
Knowledge management			
Complete video conference event with HMRC and Revenue Authorities and document outputs	By 28 February 2013	HMRC and MA	

Key activities planned for next period	Due date	Responsible	Comments
Programme / risk management			
Regular communication with DFID	Fortnightly meetings	DFID and MA	
Regular IFUSE team meetings	Weekly IFUSE team meetings	MA	
Review and respond to recommendations from IFUSE Annual Review	28 February 2013	MA, DFID, and OGDs	

Appendix

I. Appendix 1

Reference no.	Country	Requestor (institution)	Target OGD	IC issue	Status	Target deployment date
1	Rwanda	HMRC	HMRC	Strengthening leadership and management capabilities	Completed	11 to 17 March 2012
2	Bangladesh	DFID Bangladesh	BIS	Review of Bangladesh IC Fund	Suitable expert could not be found in BIS	N/A
3	Malawi	DFID Malawi	BIS / UKTI	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	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	Regulatory reform – City Council of Nairobi	Completed, experts currently drafting report	17-21 September 2012
6	Kenya	IFC	BRDO	Regulatory reform – City Council of Mombasa	ToRs has been agreed	November 2012
7	Kenya	IFC	BRDO	Regulatory reform – Training	ToRs has been agreed	TBC
8	Kyrgyzstan	Ministry of Economic Regulation	BRDO	Regulatory reform	Completed	28 May to 1 June 2012
9	Kyrgyzstan	Ministry of Economic Regulation	BRDO	Regulatory reform – Training	Completed, experts finalising report	22-26 October 2012
10	Tanzania	British High Commission	HMRC	Tax issues and regulation	Completed	16-25 July 2012
11	Tanzania	British High Commission	HMRC	Tax issues and regulation – TRA visit to UK	Completed	17-21 September 2012
12	Tanzania	British High Commission	HMRC	Tax issues and regulation	Completed	8-12 October 2012
13	Pakistan	DFID Pakistan	HMT / BoE	Debt management	Confirming if a suitable expert can be found in HMT	TBC
14	Vietnam	DFID Vietnam	IUK	PPP	Completed	3-7 September 2012
15	Uganda	Uganda	HMRC	Taxation	Completed, expert	November

Reference no.	Country	Requestor (institution)	Target OGD	IC issue	Status	Target deployment date
		Revenue Authority			finalising report	2012
16	Kenya	Competition Authority of Kenya	OFT	Consumer protection	Expert confirmed	End of March 2013
17	Pakistan	Competition Commission of Pakistan	OFT	Technical capacity building of CCP's staff	Experts confirmed	TBC
18	Mozambique	National Inspection Body INAE	BRDO	Regulatory reform	Completed	15-19 October 2012
19	Mozambique Kenya Tajikistan Kyrgyzstan Nigeria	BRDO/World Bank	BRDO	Reform of regulatory delivery	Completed	21-23 November 2012
20	Tajikistan	Land Registry	Land Registry	Conference on role of land registry authorities and growth	Completed	9-14 October 2012
21	Zambia	DFID Zambia	DEFRA	Companies law	Scope of request needs to be further investigated	TBC
22	Ethiopia	DFID Ethiopia	DWP/HMR C	Social security arrangements	Scope of request needs to be further investigated Confirming if a suitable expert can be found	TBC
23	Turks & Caicos Island	DFID	BRE/IUK	Private sector development in small island countries	Unable to support due to change in political situation	November 2012
24	Ethiopia	DFID Ethiopia	OFT	Trade Competition and Consumer Protection	OFT to review draft ToRs Expert to be confirmed	Needs to be completed by 15 November 2012
25	Burma	DFID Burma	OFT	Competition assessment	Completed	Mid October 2012
26	Rwanda	Rwanda Revenue Authority (RRA)	HMRC	Intelligence, Investigation and Risk Profiling Training	Experts have been identified Logistics to be finalised	21-25 January 2013
27	Rwanda	Rwanda Revenue Authority (RRA)	HMRC	Practical training on Taxation of Banking, Telecommunication and Construction	Experts have been identified HMRC/RRA to confirm timescales	TBC

Reference no.	Country	Requestor (institution)	Target OGD	IC issue	Status	Target deployment date
				sectors		
28	Liberia	Industry of Commerce and Industry Monrovia	BRDO	Regulatory reform	Expert identified ToRs approved	w/c 21 January 2013
29	Tanzania	Tanzania Revenue Authority	HMRC	Advocate service	Confirming if a suitable expert can be found	TBC
30	Rwanda	Rwanda Social Security Board ("RSSB").	GAD	Set-up of a Provident Fund	ToRs approved Confirming suitable date for deployment	TBC
31	Burma	FCO Burma	UKTI / BIS	Capacity building	Completed	11 October 2012
32	Montserrat	Government of Montserrat	BRDO / BIS	Regulatory reform	Confirming if a suitable expert can be found	TBC
33	Tanzania	IFC	IUK	PPP	ToRs drafted Confirming if a suitable expert can be found	Second quarter of 2013
34	Pakistan	DFID Pakistan	IUK	PPP	Initial request received ToRs to be drafted	Second quarter of 2013
35	Tanzania	British High Commission	HMRC	Tax issues and regulation 4 th deployment	Experts confirmed Provisional dates	6 – 12/13 February 2013
36	Nigeria	DFID Nigeria	BIS	Small business policy	Initial ToRs produced by DFID Nigeria for review by MA	By March 2013

II. Appendix 2

The table below details the source of TA requests received year to date.

Source of TA requests	Total Number
Contact through OGD	12
DFID in partner country	14
Foreign & Commonwealth Office (FCO) in partner country	2
Partner country government	2

TA requests by country

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

Countries	Total number of TA requests	Countries	Total number of TA requests
Bangladesh	1	Nigeria	2
Burma	2	Pakistan	3
Ethiopia	2	Rwanda	4
Kenya	2	Tajikistan	1
Kyrgyzstan	1	Tanzania	3
Liberia	1	Turks & Caicos Island	1
Malawi	1	Uganda	1
Montserrat	1	Vietnam	1
Mozambique	1	Zambia	1
		International	1

We certify that any expenditure shown above in the quarter 3 report and detailed in the accompanying Statement of Expenditure has been actually and necessarily undertaken on behalf of the project as specified in the Project Document and as agreed by the Department for International Development. Any forecast of expenditure shown above in the quarter 3 report and detailed in the accompanying Forecast of Expenditure represents a realistic forecast of payments to be made by the end of the forecast period.