


A manual for the identification and removal of administrative barriers to investment

Module 4: Public-private
dialogue

March 2005

FIAS
Leaders in Investment Climate Solutions
International Finance Corporation and
The World Bank Group



Contents

About this manual	1
How this manual is structured.....	1
Intended audiences for each module.....	1
Acronyms and abbreviations used in the manual	1
1 Structured dialogue between government and the private sector	2
Overview: organizing and facilitating meetings as part of the structured dialogue between the government and the private sector	2
Workshop to discuss the draft report on self assessment of administrative barriers and to prioritise recommendations.....	4
Public communication	6
Formulation of proposed actions (solution design)	6
Immediate commitment to resolve discrete problems	7
Action plan as a comprehensive tool to coordinate related activities in the short to medium term.....	7
White Paper for major adjustments or long-term goals	7
Initiating development of an action plan	9
Developing detailed proposals for an action plan.....	11
Using technical sub-groups to develop detailed proposals for inclusion in the action plan	11
Structure/content of an action plan	13
Final administrative barriers report.....	17
A Appendix.....	18
Task force roles and responsibilities.....	18

About this manual

This manual, and the accompanying tools (a business survey questionnaire and a set of templates for government agencies), describe how to assess administrative barriers to investment. Its purpose is to help government agencies, business associations, foreign aid agencies, and consultants interested in carrying out such an assessment.

How this manual is structured

This manual is structured into six separate modules.

Module 1: About the manual: the cycle of reform

Module 2: Prerequisites and preparation

Module 3: Identifying barriers

Module 4: Public-private dialogue

Module 5: Action plans

Module 6: Monitoring, evaluation and continual assessment

Intended audiences for each module

Very few individuals will be willing and able to read the entire manual!

Senior decision-makers in government and foreign aid agencies will probably only want to read Module 1.

Whoever will be responsible for the overall assessment of administrative barriers (**team leader and staff of the secretariat**) should initially read Module 1 and 2. They can study the remaining modules as the project progresses.

There will probably be an individual or **team responsible for the business survey** (administrative and regulatory costs survey, usually contracted to a local survey company). In addition to Module 1 and 2, they should especially read Module 3 and Module 6.

There will probably be another individual or **team responsible for the templates** for government agencies. In addition to Module 1 and 2, they should especially read the relevant sections in Module 3 and Module 5.

Whoever is primarily responsible for the **dialog** between the public and private sectors, and the preparation of the **action plan** should focus on Module 2, Module 4 and Module 5.

Acronyms and abbreviations used in the manual

AB	Administrative barriers
ARCS	Administrative and regulatory cost survey
BIS	Business intermediary survey
CMB	Citizenship and migration board
ES	Enterprise survey
GDP	Gross domestic product
FDI	Foreign direct investment
FIAS	Foreign Investment Advisory Service
IPA	Investment promotion agency
LoI	Letter of intent
MI	Ministry of interior
MW	Ministry of welfare
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
S-A	Self assessment
SES	State employment service
SME	Small and medium enterprises
QMS	Quality management systems
ToR	Terms of reference
VAT	Value added tax

1 Structured dialogue between government and the private sector

Particularly in countries where there is no or little tradition of constructive dialogue and cooperation between the government and the private sector, the establishment of public/private dialogue must be a priority, since it allows government officials to be exposed to the real effects of their decisions and it allows representatives of the business community not only to become involved in the process of decision-making, but, equally importantly, to understand that their constructive inputs can have a positive influence on government policy. Dialogue is also a method to ensure that the stakeholders from the government and the business community share at least some of the same goals and monitor implementation of the same activities.

When facilitating dialogue, it must be kept in mind that dialogue applies not only to business-government interaction, but also to government-government interaction. In far too many cases, it is obvious that government institutions, which are responsible for a single process (e.g. border crossing), do not communicate with one another.

This section presents the key factors and considerations that should be taken into account when organizing and facilitating dialogue between the public and private sector. This section will also describe the workshops to discuss the draft report on self-assessment of administrative barriers as a specific type of structured dialogue in the context of a self-assessment exercise.

Overview: organizing and facilitating meetings as part of the structured dialogue between the government and the private sector

Once the dialogue partners have been selected from the government and the business community (see Module 2), it is important to generate a maximum level of trust and commitment during the brief time that the two parties meet. The following description provides some guidelines for the secretariat to consider when organizing meetings, overcoming mutual distrust and ensuring subsequent activity.

- *Prepare and distribute an agenda of the meeting.* The secretariat's task is to prepare a coherent agenda for the meeting and any documentation on the issues to be discussed. It is important that the agenda be distributed in advance, so that the participants have a reasonable time for planning and preparation. The secretariat should also have a clear goal and focus for each meeting that it organizes so that its credibility is not undermined.

- *Select a neutral but knowledgeable person to chair the meeting.* At the beginning of the meeting, the chairperson should explain the goal or purpose of the meeting, and adhere to it. This person should be able to ask precise questions and have the ability to pursue specific issues in search of causes and solutions to the problems. It is important for the chair to maintain a balanced view throughout the discussions so that the invited parties feel that they are being given an unbiased forum in which to air their views. Where the chair must step in and take sides, this should be done carefully so as to solicit at least the understanding, if not always the support, of the participants. The staff of the secretariat should be able to fulfill the role of the neutral but knowledgeable moderator.
- *Take and distribute minutes of the meetings.* Taking minutes of the meeting is the task of the secretariat. The minutes need not always be detailed, verbatim documentation, but it is very important that there be at least: (1) a summary of the main points discussed, (2) a record of the commitments made (and the timeframe within which they will be implemented) and (3) any points of disagreement. The draft minutes should then be distributed to the participating parties for commentary. Once comments are received (and if a party does not send comments within the agreed timeframe, the secretariat may decide that “silence implies consent”!), the comments should be incorporated to the extent possible in the final version of the summary of the minutes. A last step to ensure ownership by all sides participating would be the signatures of the parties who participated. The secretariat can later follow up on these commitments, especially when the action plan is revised to incorporate new activities, as described in Module 6.
- Consider carefully the participants of a meeting. The general suggestions for the selection of dialogue partners both from the public and private sectors apply when organizing these types of meetings as well. The secretariat should not limit private sector participation only to those businesses or business associations that were selected as members of the steering committee. If a specific issue requires new representatives of the business community to be invited for discussions with the government, the secretariat should be able to come up with suggestions.

It is important to ensure that discussion in these meeting does not lose focus, so that the time is lost due to some parties insisting on a certain issue and forcing all parties to discuss such issue in details. In other words there should be a mechanism that can prevent eventual monopolizing of the discussion. This role can be played by the chair, who can re-direct the discussion to the specific issue being discussed, and thus keep the meeting focused.

Certainly, it will not always be possible to adhere to all the suggestions described above. In any event, this should remain the goal, and any steps taken in that direction will serve to make the meeting much more meaningful for both participating sides. Documentation of the meeting may be particularly important for the business representatives, who may generally be skeptical of the usefulness of such meetings. For more detailed information about organizing and conducting meetings, see **Annex 5.1**.

Workshop to discuss the draft report on self assessment of administrative barriers and to prioritise recommendations

Task 1: Present findings to public and private sectors (steering committee, secretariat, consultants and FIAS)

Following circulation of the draft report, a workshop should be held with public and private sector officials (including the business focus group, other interested members of the business community, and representatives of the agencies covered by the administrative barriers study), to discuss the findings, and hopefully to reach consensus on how to proceed with reforms. In particular, feedback from stakeholders will be needed in order to help prioritize the impediments identified in the draft report, both in terms of urgency (which impediments represent the most severe bottlenecks) and the degree to which they are already being addressed by the government and other experts. The seminar should also identify or clarify responsibilities within the government for the implementation of reforms.

The Overview describes some general suggestions on establishing and maintaining structured dialogue. In case the self-assessment of administrative barriers exercise is conducted by a government, the report produced will form an agenda for dialogue between the public and private sectors on administrative reforms. The steering committee should serve as a public-private sector consultative mechanism to bring together the two principal stakeholders on a regular basis.

The initial public forum for discussion of the findings of the report is the workshop that should be held after the circulation of the draft report. The participants of the workshop (and the persons to whom the report is sent) should include:

- the members of the business associations represented in the steering committee
- participants of focus groups

- other interested members of the business community
- representatives of the government institutions sitting on the steering committee
- other agencies covered by the report on self-assessment of administrative barriers
- interested members of parliament
- local government representatives
- representatives from international organizations and donor institutions, and
- representatives from the media.

The secretariat is in charge of organizing the workshop, orchestrating the speakers, ensuring that all sides are sufficiently satisfied with the results and following up on the commitments that were expressed during the workshop. The secretariat should also note the more active private sector participants, follow-up with them and try to engage them in future work.

The aim of this one-day workshop is to:

- familiarize the larger community with the work that has been carried out and the related future plans
- provide a forum for discussion of the findings of the report
- solicit views of the participants on reform priorities, and
- solicit views of the participants on how to proceed with reforms.

In particular, feedback from stakeholders is crucial in order to help prioritize the impediments identified in the draft report, both in terms of urgency (which impediments represent the most severe bottlenecks) and the degree to which they are already being addressed by the government and other experts.

The discussions among the participants of the workshop should establish which reforms are highest-priority from the private sector's point of view; which are feasible from the government's point of view, and should indicate what are the possible concrete proposals for implementation. The items that are considered high priority by the business community and feasible by the government should be the basis for the action plan (see Initiating development of an action plan).

Public communication

Public communication of the administrative barrier study findings, recommendations and (later) the action plan and actual implementation of reforms is essential if FIAS is to maximize its effectiveness as a change agent. It is a precondition of FIAS work that the reports be made public. FIAS could also organize investor briefings after a study is completed.

Source: Adapted from Jacobs & Associates, Assessment of the Program of the Foreign Investment Advisory Service to Reduce Administrative Barriers to Investment, 1995-2004 (9 September 2004)

FIAS is increasingly utilizing new techniques with respect to enhancing administrative barrier removal program outreach and the constituency for reforms through public-private dialogue. Some of the techniques being applied include:

- Cooperation with the World Bank's Development Communications Division (within the Department of External Affairs), to produce outreach workshop series, newsletters, program videos, etc. (This has recently been initiated in projects in Sierra Leone and in Tajikistan, for instance).
- Cooperation with the World Bank Institute, to conduct joint learning/report dissemination/dialogue events. (This has recently been initiated in Tajikistan, for instance).
- Cooperation with different elements of the Joint World Bank/IFC Vice-Presidency for Private Sector Development, in order to organize dialogue/implementation readiness training events. (This has recently been done in Bangladesh, for instance); and
- Application of lessons learned in reform project branding and marketing, as for instance demonstrated by certain of the design aspects of the UN's "Bosnia Bulldozer Initiative."

[A full discussion on the application of these new techniques, as well as of highly successful applications of the traditional FIAS Public-Private Dialogue techniques, as for instance demonstrated by FIAS projects in Albania, Turkey, and Latvia is currently being prepared]

Formulation of proposed actions (solution design)

After the self-assessment report is prepared (see Module 3), there are several approaches that FIAS recommends for consideration to implement actions based on the problems identified.

Immediate commitment to resolve discrete problems

Some problems can be resolved immediately, when a government leader or head of an institution acknowledges the existence of a problem and when there is an easy and quick way to resolve it by, for example, altering internal procedures or preparing information for businesses. In such cases, the secretariat should document the commitment and follow up on whether it is implemented.

Action plan as a comprehensive tool to coordinate related activities in the short to medium term

For medium-term solutions (which can be undertaken within a couple of months and up to two years) FIAS recommends the preparation and adoption by the government of an action plan to address the problems identified. An action plan is a documentation of the discussions between the government and the business community and is a commitment by the government to the business community that implementation will be carried out. The action plan thus serves as a basis for business to monitor implementation of measures. Experience suggests that an action plan is not the most appropriate instrument for resolving long-term issues, like education reform or reduction of corruption. This is because the action plan is most successful when it is based on discrete activities that can be undertaken and completed, and whose impact can be monitored and evaluated.

An in-depth description of preparing an action plan is described later in this Module.

White Paper for major adjustments or long-term goals

Finally, some broad problems that are identified to be the root causes of certain administrative barriers can only be resolved in the medium- to long-term. This is because there needs to be a conceptual evaluation of the problems, which are often complex and multi-faceted, and thus can generate various options for their resolution. In addition, political support for the issues must be generated. But a prerequisite to political support is the preparation of information, its dissemination, consideration by the interested parties, and receipt and inclusion of their comments.

Examples include a study on pre-court appeals mechanisms, broader judicial reform, a white paper on a new system of cadastral valuation in determining the real estate tax, broader tax reform, customs reform, land reform, or other broad, major reforms requiring major policy reforms rather than regulatory/procedural reforms. In terms of content, the common thread for all these types of studies are a presentation of general principles as well as what specific activities should follow.

Box 1: Russia: Land issues

Administrative barriers studies conducted in various oblasts within the Russian Federation have identified land and construction issues as the most significant barriers to investment and growth. The initial diagnostics of the problems were able to sketch out the overall procedures and their costs in terms of time and money. However, because of the multiplicity of procedures and the complexity of the issues, it was agreed that the FIAS studies did not provide enough detail for immediate identification of detailed priority actions. Therefore, in Tomsk, Perm, Nizhny Novgorod and Leningrad oblasts, more detailed evaluations of land and construction issues were carried out under FIAS supervision by specialist consultants (local and international), so as to provide a more comprehensive and detailed basis for formulation of reforms. In the case of Tomsk and Perm oblasts, the recommendations of these detailed reports were the foundation of the oblasts' action plans in the area of land and construction.

In terms of implementation, it is important to distribute the draft studies to the interested parties, from both the government and the business community, giving them an opportunity to comment on the findings. This may be helpful to the authors or the secretariat in ensuring that the information presented and procedures described are accurate. There may also be some comments on the analysis, observations or conclusions. It is up to the authors to decide how much of this to incorporate in the final version of the paper. Nevertheless, it would be useful to maintain a table with the following information: which institutions or organizations have responded, their specific comments, and whether or not the comments have been taken into account in revising the report. Such a document will be useful in the future when implementation of some of the suggestions of the paper begins. It will help identify which institutions may present obstacles and why, and which may be champions of the proposals.

Some of the actions recommended in the whitepaper, and for which there seems to be the requisite consensus or political support, can then be included in the action plan as discrete activities.

Initiating development of an action plan

Task 2: Outline an action plan for removal of administrative barriers to investment (steering committee)

The output of the workshop should be considered by the steering committee which will be responsible for developing an action plan, indicating priorities (e.g. five to six areas to concentrate reform efforts over the coming year) and allocation responsibilities including:

- what problems need to be solved
- what reforms will be undertaken to solve them
- who will be responsible for implementing the reforms
- when they should be completed, and
- how they should be assessed.

Identification of problems and their discussions between government and the private sector are of little use unless concrete action arises as a result. The workshop and other further meetings are held to ensure that the problems are raised, but also to find the most viable solutions that are acceptable to both sides. The decisions taken should then be articulated into some form of commitment. This commitment can be a simple promise to get something done by a certain time, requiring no legal tools to enforce the commitment. If the problem is broader and requires a gradual approach, it may be necessary to prepare a legal act, such as an action plan providing a timetable and designating institutions responsible.

For medium-term solutions (which can be undertaken within a couple of months and up to two years) FIAS recommends the preparation and adoption by the government of an action plan to address the problems identified. An action plan is a documentation of the discussions between the government and the business community and is a commitment by the government to the business community, whose implementation can be monitored by businesses. The action plan must be seen as a living document – it should be regularly revised and updated, taking into account changes in the business environment, new problems and possibly unsuitable solutions. There are various types of measures that can be required by the action plan, including legislative change, training, revision of procedures, and coordination of institutions, and preparation and dissemination of information. The preparation of the action plan will be described in detail in this section.

The steering committee should have two to three months to develop a full-fledged action plan. This time period might seem too short at first, however FIAS believes that if significantly more time is given for this task, the generated momentum might be lost and in any event the actual work will probably start two months before the deadline and not earlier.

After the workshop, the secretariat should already be able to prepare a “long list” of the top priority problems to be discussed in the steering committee with the aim to come up with viable solutions to be incorporated into the action plan. The steering committee and secretariat should critically assess the quality of discussion and the representativeness of the participants, especially from the private sector, during the workshop. This is so that any bias on the part of the business representatives present at the workshop does not skew or deny the problems and recommendations provided in the report, which were, after all, derived on the basis of the representative sample of businesses in the survey.

For the meeting of the steering committee, when the recommendations have to be further prioritized and worked out in more detail, it is often most efficient if the secretariat prepares a distilled list of major issues (problems identified and possible solutions), which will further evolve into the draft action plan. Such a document is prepared on the basis of the report and the results of the discussions during the workshop. In addition to listing the major issues, the secretariat should also attempt to identify which of the recommendations can be implemented immediately, which ones are short to medium term and which recommendations are long-term in nature, and indicate this in the list. Such an approach will help to prioritize the recommendations and to decide on which issues to focus initially.

In order to maintain the momentum and the interest of the business community in the dialogue, the steering committee will have to be able to prove its efficacy by some relatively quick success stories (e.g. effective resolutions of a problem identified by the business community), as well as more difficult, longer-term activities.

Following the workshop, a joint meeting of the steering committee should be held where the distilled list of major issues developed by the secretariat and the work plan for the next two to three months is presented and agreed upon.

Developing detailed proposals for an action plan

Task 3: Development of an action plan (steering committee in collaboration with stakeholders)

The steering committee, having established priorities during the workshop (Task 2) should have two to three months to develop a full-fledged action plan. For each of the five to six priority areas, the group should appoint technical subgroups, each composed of three to four technocrats from the relevant agencies, plus three to four knowledgeable and interested private sector representatives to work out detailed proposals. These in turn should be reviewed by the steering committee before the final action plan is agreed and sent to the government for review and adoption.

Using technical sub-groups to develop detailed proposals for inclusion in the action plan

The size and diversity of the steering committee will most probably not permit it to hold detailed, technical discussions on very different topics covered in the report ranging from business registration to building occupancy permits and to border control. Therefore, the steering committee should break into four to six technical sub-groups for preparing concrete proposals on sectoral issues.

These sub-groups should be composed of steering committee members and technocrats from the relevant agencies and a number of knowledgeable and interested private sector representatives. The selection of the themes for the technical sub-groups can be based on the division used in the report, e.g. start-up procedures, locating procedures and operating procedures. Depending on the number of issues to be covered it might be necessary to further divide each of these three broad topics and have another separate technical sub-group. The ultimate goal is to have technical sub-groups with optimal number of people who are responsible for issues at stake and can take adequate decisions.

Formation of technical sub-groups also allows involvement of middle tier civil servants (e.g. heads of departments, divisions, deputy heads of agencies) and experts from the ministries and other government agencies in preparation of the detailed proposals. These civil servants and experts will usually represent the higher-level member of the steering committee in the technical sub-groups. Their participation can be crucial, especially in cases when the problems and recommendations apply to the administrative routines of the agencies, because these people are a valuable source of information, and can provide possible suggestions for improvements. There might be situations when some of these middle tier civil servants see these reform efforts as a tool to foster the changes that they have already been advocating and in such a case will provide lots of useful and constructive suggestions. The secretariat should seek out such allies and the champion should give them due credit once the change is effected.

The role of the secretariat at this point is to keep track of all on-going activities in the technical sub-groups. The staff of the secretariat can be appointed to chair the technical sub-groups. In any event, they should be the driving force behind the elaboration of the action plan. The secretariat is responsible for calling and organizing meetings of the technical sub-groups, mediating the meetings and discussions between the private and public sector representatives, recording the minutes of the meetings, keeping the work focused on the goal of producing viable proposals for reform to be included in the action plan, researching the issues, preparing written proposals for discussion and formulating the activities to be included in the action plan.

Experience shows that during such meetings of technical sub-groups both the public and private sector representatives will come up with interesting and workable suggestions. But it will be very rare that any of them will put it down in writing and formulate it coherently, which means that in order to achieve the goal –preparing the action plan - the staff of the secretariat or local consultants might have to further research these suggestions, analyze legislation and formulate acceptable proposals, often with FIAS assistance or guidance (see Box 2). These proposals can then be discussed in the technical sub-group and altered as necessary. People are much more likely to react and comment on a drafted proposal than to provide the initial input themselves.

Box 2: Kenya: Licensing reform

A FIAS administrative barriers study carried out in 2004 confirmed the findings of many earlier studies that business growth was hampered by inefficient, costly and often redundant licenses and permits. Piecemeal efforts at reform had largely failed, and government decided that a global and radical approach was needed.

The government asked FIAS to help develop and implement a “guillotine” strategy to reduce the number of licenses in a short time. In January 2005, the government established a high-level task force with a clear and publicly

announced mandate. FIAS and KIPPRA, a local research firm, formed a technical assistance team that prepared a detailed reform plan, defining targets, specifying policy, legal and institutional actions, setting timetables and identifying resources needed for implementation. The report was submitted to the task force in March 2005, and the task force sought Cabinet approval in April, with a view to incorporating the first stage of the reform in the 2005/6 budget speech.

The process, as described above, should lead to the development of the actual action plan. Once the technical sub-groups have agreed upon a set of detailed proposals (in the format of the action plan) to resolve the problems identified and implement the recommendations provided in the report, the secretariat compiles proposals from all the technical sub-groups and assembles them into one document – the draft action plan. The draft action plan is then reviewed and approved by the steering committee before the final action plan is sent formally to government for approval and adoption.

The role of the secretariat, under the authority of the steering committee, is to coordinate work with the responsible government officials, to draft the plan and to ensure that the government adopts it. The secretariat is also responsible for revising and updating the action plan to reflect new problems, submitting it for review and subsequent adoption.

Structure/content of an action plan

Based on its experience, FIAS recommends the following structure for an action plan.

Technically, the action plan is a table with five columns in the following sequence – (1) problem, (2) measure/action to be performed, (3) responsible institution and responsible member of the steering committee, (4) deadline for implementation of the action, and (5) indicators to be monitored to assess the impact of the reforms enacted.

(1) Problem

This column provides the description of the problem that needs to be solved. There are two alternative sources for the description of the problem. The formulation of the problem can come either from the administrative barriers study or directly from the businessmen in the technical sub-groups. In any event, the viewpoint of the business representatives should be undiluted by interventions or explanations from the public sector. The problem should be described openly.

It is also important to formulate the problem as precisely as possible, and with clarity such that later down the road, the problem is still well understood by new personnel coming on board.

(2) Measure/action to be performed

This column provides concrete measures and/or actions to be performed. Again, precise formulations are key to ensure that the responsible institution actually takes the envisaged action and does not shirk it. For example, if the action to be performed is to amend a certain regulation or law, the action plan should clearly stipulate what those amendments must provide for and if possible, cite specific articles of the legislative act that need to be changed. Such measures will ease the work of the secretariat in following through the implementation of each separate action envisaged in the action plan with the timeframe of a year or even two years.

Examples of measures that can be included in the Action Plan are as follows:

- legislative change at all levels (amendments to the laws, regulations, internal decrees and instructions)
- revision of procedures that do not require legislative change
- requirement to improve coordination among institutions that oversee a single process
- preparation of information on certain issues or procedures for publication or other wide dissemination
- training of civil servants on substantive, sectoral issues (application of the tax law, customs procedures, etc.), as well as on organizational issues (preparation of effective information for businesses, on how to set up feedback mechanisms in government agencies, etc.)

(3) Responsible institution and responsible member of the steering committee

This column identifies the institution that is responsible for implementation of the respective action. In addition, FIAS has found it useful to name the responsible government position (e.g. the head of the customs service).

For each action, only the primary responsible institution should be indicated, so as to ensure that there is no shifting of responsibilities as the deadline approaches.

(4) Deadline for implementation of the action

This column provides deadline for implementation of the respective action. As discussed above, the action plan can be most effective if the deadlines fall within the period of several months to a maximum of two years.

Establishing deadlines is one of the issues where the steering committee, with the support of the political champion, can and should override the responsible institutions if they suggest unfeasibly long implementation terms. The deadlines should neither be too long, such that interest of both sides wanes, nor too short, such that it might not be possible to generate the necessary activity within the government. The steering committee (backed by information provided by the secretariat) will have to learn to walk this fine line and to persuade institutions to be reasonable. If the action requires amending the government regulation, the secretariat should be able to assess how long such an activity would take under normal circumstances (perhaps somewhere between three to five months) and require the responsible institution to work within such a timeframe.

(5) Indicator to be monitored to assess the implementation and method of monitoring

This column establishes the performance indicator for each respective action against which the implementation will be monitored. The column also includes the method of monitoring.

As much as possible, monitoring indicators should be objective measures of the impact of a particular reform. In many cases, the business surveys and procedure templates will be useful monitoring devices. For example, if a reform is intended to simplify and streamline a procedure, and if the reform is successful, the business survey should show a reduction in the time and/or cost requirements for that procedure over time. If a reform is intended to reduce opportunities for corruption, the business survey should show a reduction in the proportion of respondents who report paying a bribe to complete the relevant procedures.

See Figure 1 for an example an action plan. An example of a complete action plan is presented in Module 5 Appendix A.

Figure 1: Example of an action plan

Problem	Objective	Activities	Responsible Institution./Term	Means of Verification
<p>1) Obtaining of residence and work permits are a complicated and time-consuming process.</p> <p>2) Excessive documentation requirements</p> <p>3) Inadequate cooperation between the Citizenship and Migration Board and the State Employment Service; inconsistent procedures. Investors complain about being sent from one department to another.</p> <p>4) Doubling CMB and SES formalities</p>	<p>Simplification of work permit obtaining procedure:</p> <p>1) provide for simplified work permit obtaining procedures for directors, board members and responsible representatives of enterprise executive structures;</p> <p>2) reduce the number of visits to be made to the Employment Service by establishing that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - work permit shall be issued simultaneously with residence permit - fixed payment for work permit issuance shall be made 	<p>1) Specify and submit to the Cabinet of Ministers the draft amendments to CM Regulations No. 54 On Employment of Foreigners and Stateless persons;</p> <p>2) Upon specification of amendments to CM Regulations No. 54. On Employment of Foreigners and Stateless Persons the Ministry of the Interior (MI) and the Ministry of Welfare (MW) shall consider and, if necessary, submit to the State Chancellery draft amendments to CM Regulations No. 417 On procedures for residence permit Issuance and Registration.</p>	<p>1) Ministry of Welfare – prepare and submit to the State Chancellery by 1 June 1999</p> <p>2) Ministry of the Interior</p>	<p>Feedback forms, survey of consulting firms</p>
<p>5) Entrepreneurs emphasize inadequacy of information available on the procedure for obtaining residence and work permits.</p>	<p>Provide information to entrepreneurs on the procedure of obtaining work and residence permits, required documentation and related costs</p>	<p>Prepare the following informative materials:</p> <p>1) on obtaining work permits - Ministry of Welfare</p> <p>2) on obtaining residence permits – Citizenship and Migration Board of the Ministry of the Interior</p> <p>3) dissemination of informative materials in English, German and Russian among consular departments of the Republic of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p> <p>4) placing of information in Internet home page – the Latvian Development Agency</p>	<p>Ministry of Welfare (State Employment Service)</p> <p>Ministry of the Interior (Citizenship and Migration Board)</p> <p>Consular Department of the Ministry of the Interior</p> <p>Submission of the informative materials by SES and CMB by 1 July 1999</p>	<p>Feedback forms, survey of consulting firms</p>
<p>6) Authority of the Immigration Police to detain investors and expel them from the country on the grounds of minor technical breaches of immigration rules.</p>	<p>The Immigration Police should be authorized to inflict penalty for technical breaches of immigration rules, but should not have the authority to detain foreign investors or representatives in the absence of an actual commitment of criminally penal acts</p>	<p>Review legislation regulating activities of the Immigration Police and CMB and introduce required amendments to ensure implementation of and abidance by the recommendation of the work group</p>	<p>Ministry of the Interior</p> <p>By 15 June 1999</p>	<p>Feedback forms, survey of consulting firms</p>

Final administrative barriers report

Task 4: Preparation of final report (secretariat and FIAS)

As a result of the above exercise, a final version of the report should be prepared. This report should reflect any changes or amendments to the draft, and should incorporate the outcomes of the workshop.

The final report should be readily available to interested parties, including the media, business associations, and donor agencies. Preferably the entire report should be made available on the internet.

At a minimum FIAS expects that the descriptive sections of the report should be made publicly available as an investment guide, along with either the analytical section of the report and/or the report on the results of the ARCS. Such information is very useful to potential investors and is a welcome signal of openness and transparency

Table 1: Communication phase

Recommended FIAS procedure to prepare an administrative barriers report	Primary purpose of this step
FIAS holds workshop to discuss report among stakeholders. In addition, wherever possible, Government and FIAS hold joint press conference to announce action plan	Implementation: Government commits to plan, involves stakeholders and investors
Publication of report and action plan is mandatory as a condition of the project. FIAS puts report on its website.	Implementation: Government commits to plan, involves stakeholders and investors
FIAS holds an investor briefing on the results of the study, both live and streamed on the Internet.	Implementation: Investors become agents of change, react more quickly to positive changes to produce faster benefits
Source: Adapted from Jacobs & Associates, Assessment of the Program of the Foreign Investment Advisory Service to Reduce Administrative Barriers to Investment, 1995-2004 (9 September 2004)	

A Appendix

Task force roles and responsibilities

i. Chairperson / Leader

The Chairperson / Leader controls the way the team moves towards its objectives by making the best use of task force resources, through knowing the strengths and weaknesses of the whole team. He or she also has responsibility for ensuring that Task Force meetings are effective and efficient.

The role of Chairperson is sometimes rotated between the Team Leader and other team members for one meeting at a time. This means that all team members can have the opportunity to run a task force meeting. It also helps avoid placing an unbalanced workload on one person.

Here are some simple guidelines to being an effective Chairperson / Leader:

- Ensure everyone is aware of the agenda.
- Keep the meeting on track by sticking to the agenda.
- Ensure everyone is aware of the ground rules. These are a set of rules formulated by all team members. Ground rules provide Task Force members with guidelines on how to behave during the meeting. Fresh ground rules don't have to be decided every time the group meets. The same set may last for the life of the task force. Ground rules also provide the Chairperson with a framework to refer to when someone behaves in a way that adversely affects the work of the team. Some examples of common ground rules used with Task Forces to help govern their behaviour include provisions to ensure that the Team will:
 - always be on-time;
 - listen to the views of others with an open mind;
 - honour the right of privacy and confidentiality;
 - give every contribution, thought or idea "air time";
 - stick to the topic under discussion and not lead the group off the track;
 - will be supportive instead of judgmental;
 - treat fellow team members with respect;
 - not talk over each other so that only one voice at a time will be heard;
 - give each other feedback directly and openly and it will be given in a timely manner;

- provide information that is specific and focuses on the task in hand and not on personalities.
- Be aware of hidden agendas during the meeting. Hidden agendas cause problems because they can cause conflict and interfere with the genuine efforts of the team. If you suspect meeting members may have hidden agendas, encourage further discussion by suggesting – “Let’s go round the table so that we can all have our say on this one”.
- Cancel the meeting if group members have not done their preparation.
- Always start the meeting on time.
- Assign the role of Minute Taker.
- Assign the role of Time Keeper if you are not doing this.
- For very short meetings, try conducting the meeting standing up.
- If a key person has to leave, stop the meeting.
- Build consensus on big items, ask members to take a vote on trivial items.
- Monitor progress to see if Task Force members are making the following kinds of positive contributions to the meeting:
 - showing interest by following the discussion
 - asking questions of other members
 - making suggestions and recommendations
 - building on the suggestions of others, being constructive.
- If positive progress is not being made, tell the group that this is your observation. Ask the group to help you change the situation. Discuss ways of doing this.
- Build consensus on important issues by:
 - checking for common understanding during discussions;
 - highlighting common agreement when it occurs;
 - clarifying an individual’s ideas and suggestions by restating them for others and interpreting where there is confusion;
 - summarising discussions – bringing thoughts and ideas into focus;
 - especially at the end of each agenda item;
 - allowing additional time for discussion outside the meeting.

ii. The Minute Taker

The role of minute taker is usually a separate role from that of the Chairperson. The main responsibilities of the Minute Taker are:

- Record the agenda, date, time and place of the meeting.
- Record all attendees and absentees.

- Record any apologies that have been received.
- After a discussion (or during a long one), summarise the main points being recorded. Sometimes the Chairperson will lead in summarising the discussions.
- Clarify all points you are not sure about. If you are not sure what a speaker meant, it is highly likely that other group members are also unclear.
- Carefully record all action items, who has been given the action and the due date for completion of that item.
- Number all items so that they can be easily referenced later. Any numbers already allocated need to be carried forward. Allocate new numbers from the end of the list from the last meeting. Do not reuse numbers of items already closed.
- Check the recording of the minutes with the Chairperson once the meeting has finished.
- Complete the minutes and collate any attachments. Distribute these in a timely manner to attendees and other interested parties. A good rule is to distribute minutes within two days of the meeting having taken place.

iii. The Participant

The role of the participant is to actively contribute to Task Force meetings by sharing personal knowledge, perceptions, and views in a constructive way.

Responsibilities of the role include:

- Sticking to the ground rules agreed by the task force e.g. being on time, respecting the views of others.
- Being properly prepared for each Task Force meeting.
- Completing all assigned action items as shown in the minutes.
- Providing feedback to the Task Force members on progress in implementing assigned actions.