

## **CUTS Centre for Competition, Investment and Economic Regulation (CUTS CCIER)**

**Retreat | 26 June 2009**

**Participants:** PSM, RDM, SM2, RSG, USM, RK2, VB, VM2, CD, RB2, NY, KK, JG2, AS5

**CUTS Overseas Centre:** AK, AMM, AP, VOO, JM

**Special Invitee:** David Ong'olo (DO)

**Purpose:** To take stock of the progress and outcomes of the CUTS Centre for Competition, Investment & Economic Regulation (CUTS CCIER) over the past year – analyse activities of the centre over the period, strategise its future activities and discuss new project ideas. This exercise will feed into the 'Strategic Business Plan' of the Centre.

### **1. Introduction and Setting the state**

1.1 At the outset PSM welcomed those in attendance with a special mention of David Ong'olo who we consider part of the CUTS family. PSM highlighted that his role would be extremely important for strengthening CUTS Nairobi in times to come.

1.2 PSM briefly introduced the history of CCIER and elaborated many milestones that the centre had achieved. He noted that the centre carries its activities forward under the guidance of an international advisory board, comprising of renowned experts and practitioners in competition, regulation and investment issues from the North and the South.

1.3 PSM remarked that the 7Up1 project was the first major international project implemented by CCIER on competition regimes in seven developing countries. This led to the establishment of the 7up Model which has achieved considerable recognition globally and has become the brand name for the research based advocacy projects on competition undertaken in various parts of developing world.

1.4 He further mentioned that one of the spin-offs of our sustained work on competition has been the creation of International Network of Civil Society Organisation on Competition (INCSOC) which is a one-of-its-kind network of CSOs on competition issues. The network currently has over 120 members from 55 countries.

1.5 On the functional areas of the centre, PSM said that, so far, the main focus of our work is on competition, regulation and consumer protection whereas a reasonable amount of work has also been done on investment issues, which has made it necessary to rework our strategy in this area.

1.6 PSM then spoke about the CUTS Institute for Regulation & Competition (CIRC), which aims to fill the prevailing gaps and enhance knowledge on regulatory issues, particularly on infrastructure regulation. The goal is to offer education and training programmes on these subjects, conforming to international standards.

1.7 Finally, PSM expressed his joy on the 25 year journey of CUTS which was celebrated last year in the presence of national and international audience in an event in New Delhi. In conclusion, he shared some of the key points which emerged out of CUTS CITEE's (CUTS Centre for International Trade, Economics and Environment) retreat a day before and urged CCIER too to focus on the following issues:

- ❑ Quality of work/outcomes: Maintaining quality is crucial and all of us should provide due attention to ensure quality outcomes
- ❑ Timeliness: Meeting deadlines is crucial to our work
- ❑ Handholding: Close engagement with our partner organisations is required to ensure the sustainability of our work
- ❑ Outcomes are more important than outputs
- ❑ Knowledge enhancing needs to be a continuous exercise
- ❑ Proactiveness in discussions and sharing of ideas between team members is a must

## **2. Ongoing Projects – Lessons for the future**

### ***2.1 Introduction:***

The technical sessions was started with a presentation by RSG on the recent and ongoing projects of CCIER highlighting emerging issues, future plans and the lessons for the future based on our experience to-date.

### ***2.2 Discussions/Suggestions:***

2.2.1 The team unanimously agreed that our advocacy strategy needs to be revised in order to make it more effective and reach out to a wider range of stakeholders and to make an impact at the policy level.

2.2.2 Some of the non funded work such as PARFORE, Consumer Protection Regime in the World, INCSOC and World Competition Day should have been mentioned as ongoing projects.

2.2.3 Some emerging issues that can be taken up by CCIER in the future include political economy issues in regulation, and UTPs among others. Financial sector regulation is another prospective area, which needs to be explored by engaging people who have technical know-how on the given issue. The Centre is also making efforts to work on important issues such as Regulatory Impact Assessment (RIA), Consumer Impact Assessment (CIA), and Regulatory Failures in certain sectors. It was noted that fundraising potential for these issues through the Government of India is high.

2.2.4 It was emphasised that we also need to educate the common man and subsequently society at large as well as the policy community on the benefits of competition. Social sector regulation, (i.e. health and education sectors) is one area where competition can help the poor by lowering prices and improving the quality of services and delivery.

2.2.5 Ministry of Foreign Affairs and NORAD, Norway; DFID, UK; IDRC, Canada; British High Commission, India; SECO and DANIDA in Africa were identified as prospective development partners for deeper work in the future.

### **3. Forthcoming Projects – approaches and strategies in Africa**

#### ***3.1 Introduction:***

This session focussed on CCIER's approach and strategies to explore funds in the area of competition issues in Africa presented by AK.

#### ***3.2 Discussions/Suggestions:***

3.2.1 In the presentation, AK stated that there is a need to link the ongoing/proposed work with the mission statement of CCIER i.e. "Promoting Fair Markets to Enhance Consumer Welfare and Economic Development". He also emphasised that the mission should be clearly reflected in the draft proposals and presentations submitted to donors.

3.2.2 While speaking on the difficulties in raising funds, AK emphasised understating the aim, national strategies and modalities followed by donors. Understanding the work areas of potential donor(s) is very important. Another problem which often crops up while discussing any prospective project is the understanding on such issues by the programme officer of the respective donor agency. However, it is advisable not to deviate from our objectives and should not lose hope as the priorities of development agencies keep on changing.

3.2.3 DO informed that funding is available for work on governance issues in Africa. However, within governance, economic governance and regulation are the more preferred areas. Private sector development strategy too is an important research area in Kenya. There is also reasonably good scope for work on regional issues such as infrastructure and trade facilitation

3.2.4 There were some mixed reactions on the size and design of Strategic Business Plan (SBP). Some felt that the SBP should be concise and should not be more than 4-5 pages whereas the other view says that SBP should focus on the key programme areas, listed progress of the various projects undertaken by the centre, future plans proposed to be taken up as all these details prescribed a roadmap for the future. However, as an outcome, it was recommended that even if the SBP is long it should carry an executive summary that should cover all the aspects cogently as mentioned above, as suggested by USM.

### **4. Forthcoming Projects – approaches and strategies in South East Asia**

#### ***4.1 Introduction:***

Next on the agenda was a presentation by USM and AP on the approaches and strategies to promoting CUTS' regional work on competition policy & law in South East Asia and explore the possibilities of cooperating with various partners.

#### ***4.2 Discussions/Suggestions:***

4.2.1 Starting the presentation, USM briefly outlined the background to their scoping mission to few of the South East Asian countries. CUTS has extensive experience of implementing competition policy and law interventions in countries of South Asia, Southeast Asia (*Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia*), Eastern Africa and Southern Africa, the success of which has inspired CUTS to explore the possibility of taking such initiatives in the ASEAN region. The objective was to meet with representatives of all relevant national and regional stakeholders including the ASEAN Secretariat, relevant government departments, business associations, consumer organisations etc and seek their views on those areas that need to be developed/strengthened with regards to national and/or regional dimensions of competition, so as to formulate a strategy for CUTS interventions and/or research and capacity building programmes in the ASEAN region in the near future.

4.2.2 In Indonesia, while the competition law is in place there is no competition policy and the level of awareness in wider society too is low, and there is scope for comprehensive research on how the competition law relates to other policies. In Malaysia, the draft competition law is in the advance stages of adoption and consumer groups are quite active in competition advocacy. After a few years of implementation, there is scope for looking into the effectiveness of the law. Interestingly, in Thailand, the law has been enacted but there is no political will for enforcement and the business lobby too opposes its enforcement, which make it very difficult to start.

4.2.3 AP shared interesting observations on competition issues in Singapore and Vietnam. She stated that the competition law has been in place since 2004 in Singapore and the competition authority is quite well-resourced but run by bureaucrats. In Vietnam, the law is in place but there is no significant progress in the process of implementation of the competition law. However, there is scope for sector specific studies of competition.

4.2.4 To the end, a few actions points emerged out of the discussions which could be taken up to initiate work in ASEAN region with the help of local partners. The activities include: research and advocacy, awareness generation, strengthening networking under the umbrella of INCSOC, and closer engagement with ASEAN secretariat among others.

## **5. Lessons from the TDP Evaluation**

### ***5.1 Introduction:***

SM2 presented the issues which were raised in the evaluation of the TDP Project which provided valuable lessons for CCIER and other centres to learn from.

### ***5.2 Discussions/Suggestions:***

5.2.1 SM2 noted that the outcomes of this project had generally fallen short of the donor's expectations and the issues highlighted could provide lessons for CUTS as a whole. Several issues were raised and it was mentioned that CCIER might already be implementing some of the recommendations.

5.2.2 The first issue to be raised was website management. SM2 mentioned that CCIER is generally better in this regard but we should avoid the specific pitfalls mentioned in the TDP report. It was noted in the TDP report that documents were not accurately cross referenced and a link to something was often broken or would direct the user to an entirely different page (i.e. the Vietnam link would direct the user to the Cambodia page). SM2 remarked that this sort of error is very embarrassing for the project and the organisation as a whole. Website links should be accurate and self explanatory. Another recommendation with regard to the website was that websites should be easily searchable and have a logical design. SM2 mentioned the example of the CITEE homepage which is around 4-5 pages long when you scroll down. This represents too much detail. Ideally the home page should contain only limited information and the website should have layers, with each being more detailed (a general to specific approach). We ought to be aiming for a website which a 12 year old is able to surf with ease.

5.2.3 There was a great deal of emphasis in the TDP evaluation on adopting a systematic approach to Monitoring and Evaluation using tools such as the Logical Framework Analysis (LFA) and MEALS. The advantage of this is that it creates an institutional memory for the next person who comes in to the project which means that the project can withstand staff turnover. This approach therefore has both a practical use and a symbolic value for donors. A detailed discussion on the LFA ensued. It was noted that the approach to date has been to simply try to fill in the boxes without going through the process. CD commented that the matrix is simply the outcome of the process of the logical framework 'analysis'. SM2 promised to circulate the presentation he had made recently on the subject which all who had attended agreed was useful.

5.2.4 It was also reported in the TDP evaluation that there was no advocacy strategy before the project. It was agreed that an explicit advocacy strategy is needed for each project. SM2 also raised the issue of staff capacity and noted that we need to consider having specialised staff or seeking core funding to develop current capacity in this area. AK commented that a single member of staff cannot straddle all aspects of a project unless he/she is a specialist in all. He also noted that, where centres lack capacity in a certain area, Head Office should provide support to build capacity.

5.2.5 The TDP evaluation also noted that communication throughout the project had been between the partner and CUTS rather than among partners. This has implications for the creation of sustainable linkages among project partners. SM2 proposed that one solution to this would be a transparent and structured reporting system on the website. He noted that during the TDP project, two partners were holding events within 4 days of each other. If the event dates had been shared on the website, the two partners might have communicated to share their experiences/expertise. With regard to communications following the project, online networks and forums were suggested. SM2 also commented that, in an ideal world, post-project communication could be continued through CUTS annual meetings. RSG commented that, while these don't exist on a project to project basis, there are 2 forums (FunComp and Colf) currently hosted in CCIER which includes the members of past and present projects.

5.2.6 The financial management of the TDP project was also criticised in its evaluation and SM2 suggested that we need to rethink our systems. We should insist that expenditure by partners is

supported by vouchers and we should audit the same internally. If need be, we can also include expenses incurred for the purpose of auditing in the budget and there have been instances, where donors have agreed to support such costs. There should also be better internal coordination between project staff and financial staff.

5.2.7 Other lessons which were raised were the need for orientation of staff to different cultures and the development of capacity of CUTS partners. SM2 requested (overseas) participants to give opinion on the cultural differences between India and other countries.

AP noted that in Vietnam CUTS is either viewed with suspicion or not taken seriously. At the working level there is also no culture for debate so individuals are less forthcoming with their views. VOO noted that there is mutual suspicion in Kenya between the government and civil society. Sometimes a government official will agree with you but will not openly support you. Other cultural clashes which were noted include intellectual dominance in South East Asia and a difference in the work ethic in Africa compared to India. JM noted that when we make demands about deadlines it can be understood as harassment and looks less like a partnership. CD noted that we should avoid the term equal partnership at the beginning of a project since in practice this is not the case and only creates problems for us in project implementation. Others felt it was just a question of how we articulate ourselves when we communicate with our partners.

## **6. Approach to undertaking projects: In need of a fresh approach?**

### ***6.1 Introduction:***

RSG made a presentation looking at CCIER's approach to undertaking projects and identified areas where we need to readdress our methodology. He identified three main issues in our approach: research, advocacy and the modus operandi of partnership with overseas centres.

### ***6.2 Discussions/Suggestions:***

6.2.1 RSG stated that presently our dependency on project partners is fairly high which sometimes increases the 'risk factor'. He raised the question of whether it is possible to envisage a strategy such that the risk could be minimised. He also noted that CUTS also attached relatively less emphasis on collection of primary data in many of our research activities, which should also be reviewed.

6.2.2 Advocacy was another issue highlighted by RSG during his presentation. Drawing again on the lessons from the TDP evaluation he asserted the need for a clear 'advocacy strategy' in our projects. We also need to look into how our research feeds into advocacy. There is a need for continuous guidance to partners so that research outcomes can be translated into advocacy inputs. This is important in order to ensure consistency across states (national project) and countries (multi-country project). SM2 stressed the need for context-based advocacy and 'stakeholder mapping' to identify the winners and losers from an expected policy change.

6.2.3 A well defined communications strategy was also proposed which would cover both communication between CUTS and partners, and communication among the partners

themselves. The issue of whether this can be properly achieved through internet and email was raised, as was the need for regular meetings.

6.2.4 RSG also supported a new approach to undertaking activities by increasing engagement on the ground by CUTS project staff themselves (as opposed to only relying on partners); he asserted that such an approach would help in proper ‘Monitoring and Evaluation’ of the outcomes from the project especially through ‘ground truth verification’. In order to improve Monitoring and Evaluation we need to develop/define our criteria for evaluating success. Our ultimate goal should be achieving outcomes rather than outputs.

6.2.5 It was noted that in earlier retreats synergies between CITEE and CCIER was explored. RSG underscored the importance of strengthening the mechanism of active cooperation between CCIER and the overseas resource centres (especially Nairobi, Lusaka and Hanoi) working together in implementing projects in those countries (as opposed to relying on locally available ‘consultants’ that sometime affect quality of outputs).. The agenda of the overseas centres reflect the programmatic areas of CUTS CCIER, CITEE and CART and therefore a joint-project implementation process makes a good case for joint capacity building (of both the overseas Centre and CUTS CCIER, or any other programmatic Centre of CUTS). It was resolved that CUTS CCIER staff would try to assist the overseas centres (whenever possible and is required) at three stages of project development/implementation - 1) developing the methodology, 2) in the intermediate timeframe, and 3) during project wrap-up. We also need to look carefully at how overseas centres can draw from the inventory of resources in Head Office. AMM supported visits of CUTS CCIER staff to the overseas centres as it makes a good impression in the host country and also sensitises the individual to the country’s culture. SM2 agreed that frequent staff visits are a good idea but pointed out that there are budgetary constraints to implementing this. AP made some suggestions on how the relationship between HQ and the overseas centres can be strengthened through information sharing and communication. She raised the example of monthly conversations over skype with USM to discuss the monthly report which is circulated. VVS agreed that personal interaction is important as well as a better contextual understanding for those in head office.

## **7. CUTS CCIER’s Advocacy Role**

### ***7.1 Introduction:***

VM2 made a presentation reviewing CUTS CCIER’s current advocacy activities, drawing similarities and making suggestions for how this can be strengthened in our future work.

### ***7.2 Discussions/Suggestions:***

7.2.1 Arguing for a fresh look at our advocacy strategy VM2 suggested that the nature of advocacy has changed since CUTS was established and we need to recognise the fact that we are operating in a market where we sell our ideas and suggestions for policy change. This marketplace has become increasingly crowded over recent years which means that we need to think carefully about how to make sure policy makers are listening to us and not our ‘competitors’. Reviewing our advocacy strategy is not only important now; it requires constant review because the ‘market’ is constantly changing.

7.2.2 VM2 identified that, to varying degrees, CCIER's current advocacy activities currently involve events, parliamentary advocacy, media engagement, networking and outreach and campaigns. The centre's activities however have certain common weaknesses, primarily a tendency to focus on the policy community and sometimes neglect the general public, media and other stakeholders.

7.2.3 Various arguments for engaging with wider stakeholders were raised. As a CSO we have a responsibility to be representative and as an organisation we claim to work from the grassroots to the international level. This ought to be the case across centres rather than relying on other centres or our project partners to provide this aspect. Suggestions for improving practice in this area include engaging with CART to share their expertise on grassroots level work, engaging with the media through internal capacity building and specifically media focussed capacity building, and looking at engaging more with other stakeholders such as business chambers and trade associations.

7.2.4 There is a need to institutionalise our advocacy at various levels and stages. Firstly there should be a team/centre wide strategy which frames our overall advocacy priorities. DO added that this should be part of a wider 'communications strategy'. We should also look at the possibility of stakeholder mapping now that our programme areas are expanding – this would create an institutional memory. There should also be an advocacy document prepared for every project we undertake as ad-hoc advocacy will be less effective and will also be un-measurable. If we document our advocacy strategy from the beginning we will be able to review the success of the advocacy element of any project at the end. This would then inform the strategies of future projects. Equally, while research-led advocacy is a CUTS stronghold, there is scope for this relationship to become two-way by also adopting 'advocacy-led research'. By this we mean designing a research methodology which will produce 'marketable' outputs such as case studies etc which are much more attractive to the media and the common man. Given that donors are increasingly insisting on human impact analysis, adopting this sort of approach could be win-win. A strategy should also be adopted for non-project campaigns and advocacy which would enable us to monitor our non-project advocacy more closely.

7.2.5 It was also noted that the 'marketplace' of the overseas centres is different to that of the programmatic centres in India and we need to be sensitive to this fact. It would be unwise to simply 'export' the advocacy we have been doing in India to our overseas centres with no regard for the differences in the political landscape and the 'newcomer' or 'outsider' status of CUTS.

## **8. New Research Areas**

### **8.1 Introduction**

NY presented some ideas for new research areas for CUTS CCIER around the themes of SMEs, Private Sector Development (PSD) and climate change.

### **8.2 Discussions/Suggestions**



8.2.1 Given the obvious overlaps and CUTS CCIER priorities, NY proposed addressing private sector development (PSD) and Small-Medium Enterprises (SMEs) jointly. Ideas in this area included research into anticompetitive practices by large firms towards SMEs, looking at the mechanisms for dealing with this and the effects on SME competitiveness. A related area for research would be to look at anti-competitive practices among SMEs. A further suggestion was to do some research into the level of awareness and understanding of competition principles among SMEs which could then feed into advocacy and awareness generation activities.

8.2.2 It would also be interesting to look at the impact of SME trade and industry associations on competition and assess whether cooperation promotes competition and innovation. A new area which we could look at would also be research into responsible business practices in SMEs since, in a company of 1-4 persons, the ethics of an individual may be reflected in the business activities.

8.2.3 Some analysis into the various impediments to competition across the life cycle of an SME would also be interesting. There are three main stages of enterprise evolution: Start-up, Survival, and Growth. These are followed by failure of SMEs in some cases. It would be useful to do some analysis of the barriers to competition at each stage in this cycle to get a more detailed picture and inform advocacy.

8.2.4 At the policy level NY suggested some analysis of whether policy measures for SMEs are in practice pro or anti-competitive. This would look at such aspects as government procurement policies. Another idea was to look at whether policies to promote small enterprises hinder their transition into middle enterprises. This arises from the problem of the 'missing middle' in many developing countries which are characterised by a combination of small enterprises and very large enterprises, with very little in between. There is also scope for work on the information provision to start-up SMEs and non-registered enterprises and a cost-benefit analysis of registering enterprises. Awareness of Intellectual Property issues for SMEs is a further potential research area along with the impact of structural, social and administrative regulations on SME performance.

8.2.5 NY noted that it had been difficult to find a link between climate change and competition and personally advised against work in this area because of a lack of expertise internally on the issues. A few ideas which were raised however include a study into the relationship between per capita carbon emissions and market competition and a study concentrating on the intellectual property system for developing countries in the area of mitigation and adaptation technologies to cope with global warming. It would be interesting to look at the scope for overriding patents in this area. Other ideas were to look at 'market' approaches to reducing carbon emissions, regulation of CDM projects and climate change and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR).

8.2.6 There was agreement on the issue of looking at PSD through the SME lens since most policy in this area (in India at least) looks at big business houses. This is not necessarily the case in Africa. Climate change was also a popular topic though doubts were raised by various people as to the capacity of the team to engage in this area and the impact of adverse results on our future work on competition.

## **9. Approach to Undertaking Projects**

### **9.1 Introduction:**

RSG presented a new methodology for how CUTS CCIER can go about assessing the impact of CUTS work on competition issues. This has been shown to be particularly important for CUTS following discussions with DFID and the British High Commission.

### **9.2 Discussions/Suggestions:**

9.2.1 RSG began by disaggregating the different types of ‘impacts’ which can be expected from CCIER’s work on competition issues: policy impact, consumer Impact and systemic impact.

9.2.2 Policy impact refers to the policy inputs which result in competition reforms. This might include such aspects as the fact-tracking or refinement of a competition law, the establishment of government working groups and committees to develop or reform the competition policy or law. The integration of CSOs into the process could also be an indicator if, for example, CUTS partners and other CSOs are included into working groups/committees set up to review/reform competition legislations, etc.. Requests for CUTS to provide technical assistance to the government are a further indicator of Policy impact.

9.2.3 Consumer Impact refers to actions that result in greater levels of consumer awareness and welfare. Indicators for this type of impact are an increase in the number of complaints by CSOs and Consumer Organisations over and beyond the life of the project, a greater number of media reports about ACPs, interventions by the CA or ministry in response to consumer complaints and other evidence arising from case studies (price reduction, consumer action).

9.2.3 Systemic Impacts refer to long term impacts which help to sustain the project effects. Evidence of these impacts include the establishment of communication between government, business and CSOs, increased interest among stakeholders on competition issues, follow up action by local stakeholders after the project period and the development of platforms and networks which aim to keep activity levels high and interest alive.

9.2.4 In order to identify these impacts RSG suggests a strategy must be integrated into the project design which includes close and continuous engagement and follow-ups with government, CSOs and business, offers of assistance to government to refine policies, assistance to CSOs to take up action and mobilising CSOs to work together for common goals.

9.2.5 Finally RSG suggested a matrix which could be used to document these impacts in the project. The matrix would look at how to record, compute and report each of the three types of impact.

9.2.6 This approach was greatly appreciated by all present. DO commented that the approach would help to relate impacts to national objectives. SM2 noted that the matrix could supplement the log frame analysis for each project and requested that RSG should write a paper on the subject.

9.2.7 CD and VM2 noted that the approach depends on there being detailed information gathered at the beginning of the project in order to map changes. CD commented that this is not available for current projects and the approach could only be used for future projects. VM2 noted that a base paper would need to be prepared at the beginning of each project.

9.2.8 There was some discussion on the difficulties which arise in trying to directly attribute a change to CUTS action. We need to look carefully at how these can be identified..

9.2.9 VM2 commented that it is particularly difficult to assess impact of capacity building activities. Research shows that if a questionnaire approach is used, many participants rate their knowledge generously before the intervention but more frugally following an intervention when they are more aware of the gaps in their knowledge. This can therefore show a negative trend in understanding. RSG agreed that, when tests were done before and after training workshops, participants are often more confused and careful about their answers afterwards because they are more aware of the nuances and doubt their answers.

## **10. Summary of the discussion**

10. 1 SM2 summarised the key issues discussed during the course of day. He highlighted the following action points:

- Project implementation strategy should be drafted clearly. While implementation, quality, timelines and adherence to TOR should be ensured. LFA is required for the output based budgeting.
- Attempts should be made to embark on projects that rely on a ‘research based advocacy’ process
- Simplification of research findings and outputs so that a common man is able to understand.
- There is a need for greater levels of cooperation between CUTS CCIER and the overseas Centres in implementing projects (through greater engagement on the ground) for mutual benefits.
- SME, private sector development are emerging new areas where CCIER can take a lead; especially given the linkage of these areas with business regulatory environment.
- Climate change and competition needs to be linked carefully and it can be one good (and unexplored) area for research and advocacy.
- Consumer access to redressal processes may be another important area for CCIER.

## **11. Concluding Remarks**

At the end of the day long meeting, PSM asserted that it is important to know how one can translate the outcomes of meeting into action, which is a challenge and the same needs to be addressed collectively. Such programmes (Retreat etc.) are very important in improving skill and knowledge of staff.

PSM shared with the team members that it is important for all of us to start working on the vision statement of CUTS for the next 25 years. He encouraged all the colleagues to give their inputs in order to draft a comprehensive plan.

He further summarised the following action points

- Translation of the discussions/thoughts into effective action is important
- Project proposal should be drafted incorporating long term objectives and should be consistent with CUTS objectives.
- Provide input for drafting the work plan of CCIER/CUTS for the next 25 years

Given the opportunity, a discussion was also held on the structure of the Strategic Business Plan (SBP)

The following format was discussed for the SBP:

1. Background (strength, lessons, opportunity, unique attribute)
2. Completed projects (programmes inclusive of budget, financial consideration)
3. Programmes (Ongoing projects, Further projects, including donor mapping)
4. New areas (one/half page on understanding on private sector development)
5. Approach to project implementation (lessons from TDP)
6. Communication Strategy (Advocacy outlook, outreach, networking - egroups, INCSOC)
7. Assessing/Impacts
8. Personnel planning
9. SLOT Analysis

Further it was resolved that a summary of SBP should also be available for the quick reference.