This questionnaire is intended to solicit information about the progress made since the last self assessment in 2008. It focuses in particular on the outputs and outcomes of aid-for-trade strategies and programmes to further knowledge sharing.

If you did not answer the self assessment questionnaire in 2008 please complete that questionnaire first. The 2008 questionnaire establishes a baseline concerning how your trade strategy is mainstreamed in your national development strategy.

For further details or additional forms please visit www.oecd.org/dac/aft/questionnaire or contact the secretariats of the OECD aft.monitoring@oecd.org or the WTO aft.monitoring@wto.org.

COUNTRY: Lebanon
MINISTRY/AGENCY (coordinating the self assessment): Ministry of Economy and Trade

### A. YOUR AID-FOR-TRADE OBJECTIVES AND PRIORITIES

1. **HAVE YOUR AID-FOR-TRADE OBJECTIVES CHANGED SINCE 2008?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NOT SURE</th>
<th>NOT APPLICABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1</strong> If YES, please elaborate on what these changes are:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed trade capacity needs</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed focus on:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Competitiveness</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Poverty reduction</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Green growth</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gender equality</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regional integration</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please specify:*

2. **HAVE YOUR AID-FOR-TRADE PRIORITIES CHANGED SINCE 2008?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NOT SURE</th>
<th>NOT APPLICABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.1</strong> If YES, please indicate your new aid-for-trade priorities in each sector. (Below are listed the most common priority areas grouped according to broad aid categories – please rank the top three NEW priority areas among the 12 listed.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTOR</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trade policy and regulations</td>
<td>Trade policy analysis, negotiations and implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.2 If your aid-for-trade objectives or priorities have changed since 2008, please explain what were the main drivers of these changes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MOST IMPORTANT</th>
<th>IMPORTANT</th>
<th>LESS IMPORTANT</th>
<th>NOT IMPORTANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The economic crisis</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New development priorities</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of government</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral trade policy changes</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional trade policy changes</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National trade policy changes</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please specify:

---

### 3. If your aid-for-trade objectives or priorities have changed, did you mainstream these changes into your overall development strategy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES ☐</th>
<th>NO ☐</th>
<th>NOT SURE ☐</th>
<th>NOT APPLICABLE ☒</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please elaborate:

---

### 4. If you have operational strategies for your aid-for-trade priorities (with action plans, timelines and budgets), did you update these operational strategies to reflect the changes in your aid-for-trade objectives or priorities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES ☐</th>
<th>NO ☐</th>
<th>NOT SURE ☐</th>
<th>NOT APPLICABLE ☒</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4.1 If NOT, are you planning to update these operational strategies with these new objectives or priorities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES ☐</th>
<th>NO ☐</th>
<th>NOT SURE ☐</th>
<th>NOT APPLICABLE ☒</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
5. **DID YOU INCLUDE THESE NEW AID-FOR-TRADE OBJECTIVES OR PRIORITIES IN YOUR NATIONAL DIALOGUE WITH DONORS?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NOT SURE</th>
<th>NOT APPLICABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5.1 **If NOT, are you planning to include these new objectives or priorities in your national dialogue with donors?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NOT SURE</th>
<th>NOT APPLICABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

**FOR LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES**

6. **ARE THE ENHANCED INTEGRATED FOCAL POINT AND COMMITTEE INVOLVED IN OVERSEEING AND COORDINATING YOUR TRADE AGENDA?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NOT SURE</th>
<th>NOT APPLICABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Are all relevant ministries involved in the EIF process?*

*Please detail:*

*If NOT, what are the reasons?*

6.1 **Do donors use the EIF structures to coordinate the support they offer?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NOT SURE</th>
<th>NOT APPLICABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*If YES, to what extent do donors:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALWAYS</th>
<th>SOMETIMES</th>
<th>RARELY/NEVER</th>
<th>NOT SURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use the DTIS Action Matrix as a basis for programming</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ordinate their actions with the help of the in-country donor facilitator</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please specify:*

---

7. **HAS THE ENHANCEMENT OF THE INTEGRATED FRAMEWORK HAD AN IMPACT ON YOUR ABILITY TO MAINSTREAM TRADE INTO YOUR NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGNIFICANT</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>INSIGNIFICANT</th>
<th>TOO EARLY TO ASSESS</th>
<th>NOT SURE</th>
<th>NOT APPLICABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7.1 **Please elaborate further on what the EIF has allowed you to achieve now compared to before its enhancement:**

B. **AID-FOR-TRADE FINANCING**

8. **DO YOU KEEP TRACK OF EXTERNAL CONCESSIONAL FINANCING FLOWS AT THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT LEVEL?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NOT SURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

1 The Aid for Trade Statistical Queries page offers access to aid-for-trade statistics (through the online interface called the Query Wizard for International Development Statistics, or QWIDS). Users can extract and download aid-for-trade statistics from 2002 onwards (i.e. volume, origin, and aid categories for over 150 developing countries and territories, including project-level information). The latest year for which information currently exists is 2008.
8.1 If YES, do you use one of the following tracking systems:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tracking System</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NOT SURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aid Management Platform</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Assistance Database</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National accounting system</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please specify: Please see attached excel sheet with details on aid flows.

After the July 2006 war with Israel, the Government of Lebanon established a Development Assistance Database (DAD) at the Prime Minister’s Office (PMO), with support from UNDP, with the objective of capturing all emergency and relief aid that was provided to Lebanon after the war. The main objective of DAD Lebanon was to create an integrated aid coordination platform which was designed and delivered to serve the Lebanese government as a tool for tracking donor assistance to Lebanon as well as to enhance transparency and accountability of funds.

The Ministry of Finance also decided to develop an Aid Monitoring and Reporting system which would monitor all financial flows, and cover all types of external assistance to all sectors in Lebanon. The project, financed by the World Bank, started in March 2007 and ended in December 2008 with the creation of the system. Since then, the Ministry of Finance has been working closely with relevant stakeholders and partners in order to have access to accurate, timely and complete information and make the system active.

In the meantime, the Ministry of Finance has been monitoring and reporting on financial flows to Lebanon, namely funds pledged at the Paris III International Donor Conference on Support to Lebanon (held on January 25, 2007), through an Excel spreadsheet and by relying on information provided by donors.

8.2 If YES, did the volume of external financing for trade-related programmes and projects change since 2008:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aid Provider</th>
<th>INCREASE</th>
<th>REMAIN STABLE</th>
<th>DECREASE</th>
<th>NOT SURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAC Donors (see glossary)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non DAC Donors</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-South Providers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral donors</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Development Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3 If YES, do you know the share of different aid-for-trade providers in your overall aid-for-trade flows?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aid Provider</th>
<th>&gt; 90%</th>
<th>90-50%</th>
<th>50-25%</th>
<th>&lt; 25%</th>
<th>NONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAC Donors (see glossary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non DAC Donors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-South Providers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral donors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Development Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. **COMPARSED TO YOUR EXPERIENCE WITH OVERALL EXTERNAL FINANCING, DO YOU FACE ANY SPECIFIC CHALLENGES IN ACCESSING TRADE-RELATED FUNDING?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NOT SURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAC Donors (see glossary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non DAC Donors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-South Providers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral donors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.1 **If YES, please indicate which additional challenges you face:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>MOST IMPORTANT</th>
<th>IMPORTANT</th>
<th>LESS IMPORTANT</th>
<th>NOT IMPORTANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditionality</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties in designing “bankable” projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume of available funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please define: A number of trade-related projects are held up based on conditionalities related to the country’s legislative framework (new laws and/or amendments to existing laws). These conditionalities can take time to meet due to a tense political situation that has faced Lebanon over the last six years.*

C. **HOW DO YOU IMPLEMENT YOUR STRATEGY?**

10. **HAS THE ENTITY (OR ENTITIES) RESPONSIBLE FOR COORDINATING YOUR AID-FOR-TRADE ACTIVITIES CHANGED SINCE 2008?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NOT SURE</th>
<th>NOT APPLICABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10.1 **If YES, which entity or entities are now overseeing your aid-for-trade activities?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Trade/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Ministries</td>
<td>Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating Ministry</td>
<td>Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Committee</td>
<td>Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No one</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.2 **If YES, why did the changes take place? Please specify:**

11. **HAS THE DIALOGUE ON AID FOR TRADE BETWEEN YOUR GOVERNMENT AND DONORS BEEN STRENGTHENED SINCE 2008?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Level</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11.1 **If YES, please describe and exemplify:**
12. HAS THE DIALOGUE ON AID FOR TRADE BETWEEN YOUR GOVERNMENT AND NATIONAL STAKEHOLDERS BEEN STRENGTHENED SINCE 2008?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGNIFICANTLY</th>
<th>MODERATELY</th>
<th>RARELY/NO</th>
<th>NOT SURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12.1 If YES, please describe and exemplify: Increased measures by Government to engage stakeholders, including outreach activities, such as conferences, meetings, engagement of national stakeholders in key events and activities involving international donors, etc.

13. ARE DONORS HARMONISING THEIR SUPPORT BETTER THAN PRIOR TO 2008?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGNIFICANTLY</th>
<th>MODERATELY</th>
<th>RARELY/NO</th>
<th>NOT SURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13.1 How often do donors in your country coordinate through:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALWAYS</th>
<th>SOMETIMES</th>
<th>RARELY/NEVER</th>
<th>NOT SURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint needs assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-financing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector-wide approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please elaborate: Some efforts, such as the Lebanon Recovery Fund, and the Paris III Process cover significant amounts of aid, and arise out of a particularly concerted focus for donors (alongside the Government) to harmonize support.

The Lebanon Recovery Fund (LRF) was established by the United Nations Development Group (UNDG) following the Stockholm Donors Conference held on August 31, 2006 in support of Lebanon’s recovery after the Israeli July 2006 aggression. The Fund resulted from a request by the Lebanese Government to devise a pooled funding facility that would channel donor resources for the financing of Government-approved priority recovery and reconstruction activities, and which can be executed with the support of United Nations organizations, in partnership with governmental and non-governmental organizations.

Contributions to the LRF have so far been made by the Kingdom of Sweden, the Kingdom of Spain and the Republic of Romania for a total of USD 45,857,496. To date, the LRF’s Steering Committee has approved a total of 24 projects in various sectors such as industry, agriculture, environment, energy, water management and infrastructure, culture, social and local development. Eight of these projects were successfully completed and the remaining sixteen are still ongoing. A dedicated monitoring and evaluation unit, as well as a coordination office, support successful and timely implementation of the LRF programme.

14. HAS THE MONITORING OF YOUR AID-FOR-TRADE PROGRAMMES IMPROVED SINCE 2008?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGNIFICANTLY</th>
<th>MODERATELY</th>
<th>RARELY/NO</th>
<th>NOT SURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14.1 If YES, please describe how you improved the monitoring of aid-for-trade programmes: National stakeholders have expressed interest that monitoring and evaluation of programs be improved. In response, there is a noticeable effort amongst donors to gather performance information.
15. HAVE DONORS ALIGNED THEIR SUPPORT BETTER AROUND YOUR COUNTRY’S TRADE-RELATED PRIORITIES SINCE 2008?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGNIFICANT</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>RARELY/NO</th>
<th>NOT SURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15.1 If donor support is better aligned, please describe how this was achieved:
When a new government was declared in 2008, a new program was inaugurated and which was embodied in the Ministerial Declaration. This document spells out the Government’s specific objectives, including those that are related to trade. The creation of such a document, along with various donor support and coordination mechanisms established within the Office of the Prime Minister, has helped donors better align their support around our trade priorities.

15.2 If donor support is less aligned, please explain why and any steps you plan to take to reverse this trend:

D. IS AID FOR TRADE WORKING?

16. HOW DO YOU DEFINE THE SUCCESS OF AID FOR TRADE IN YOUR COUNTRY?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MOST IMPORTANT</th>
<th>IMPORTANT</th>
<th>LESS IMPORTANT</th>
<th>NOT IMPORTANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced understanding of trade</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased profile of trade in development strategy (mainstreaming)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More harmonised and aligned aid-for-trade projects and programmes</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased aid-for-trade resources</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased exports</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased trade</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversified exports</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased economic growth</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced poverty</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater environmental sustainability</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater gender equality</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please define: Lebanon’s trade profile is largely defined by a chronic trade deficit, rendering the country as a net importer of most goods, including food. This underscores the status of the productive sectors (industry and agriculture), the contribution of which to GDP has declined, while the services sector has for some time played the dominant role. As such, the increase in the quantity and diversity of Lebanon’s exports are the ultimate indicators of success for all trade (including aid for trade) programs. Indeed, export promotion is an essential component of the Government’s economic growth strategy and by extension, social development.

17. IN YOUR COUNTRY, DID AID FOR TRADE RESULT IN:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SIGNIFICANT</th>
<th>MODERATE</th>
<th>INSIGNIFICANT</th>
<th>NOT SURE</th>
<th>NOT APPLICABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enhanced understanding of trade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Mostly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Very Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Increased profile of trade in development strategy (mainstreaming)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Mostly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Very Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More harmonised and aligned aid-for-trade programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Mostly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Very Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Increased aid–for-trade resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Mostly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Very Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Increased exports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Mostly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Very Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Increased trade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Mostly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Very Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diversified exports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Mostly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Very Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Increased economic growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Mostly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Very Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reduced poverty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Mostly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Very Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Greater environmental sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Mostly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Very Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Greater gender equality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Mostly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Very Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Mostly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Very Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please define: Lebanon’s WTO accession process has generated a strong and broad need amongst national stakeholders to not only improve understanding of specific trade agreements, but to also boost the understanding of international trade and its dynamic developments. International support has been quintessential in ensuring that at least a minimal level of understanding exists, however there are still enormous gaps in the understanding of the design and implementation of national laws.

Aid for trade has helped maintain trade on the national development agenda. However, there is significant opportunity for aid programs to help the trade agenda play a more prominent and pro-active role in the development agenda.

17.1 Please illustrate with examples of both successful and unsuccessful aid-for-trade process, approaches and programmes: Please see attachment

18. IN YOUR COUNTRY HOW DEPENDENT IS THE SUCCESS OF AID FOR TRADE ON COMPLEMENTARY POLICIES?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERY IMPORTANT ☒</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT ☐</th>
<th>NOT IMPORTANT ☐</th>
<th>NOT SURE ☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

18.1 If important, how do you rate the importance of the following complementary policies?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERY IMPORTANT</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT</th>
<th>NOT IMPORTANT</th>
<th>NOT SURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal policies</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monetary policies</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour market policies</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory environment</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Please elaborate:** With Lebanon seeking to accede to the WTO, aid for trade programs have depended on a whole range of reforms and modifications in other related policies. For example, aid that has been earmarked to promote competition depends to a great deal on the ratification of a Competition Law (similar to an anti-trust law) and the consequent establishment of a Competition Council.

**19. **DO YOU DISCUSS COMPLEMENTARY POLICIES IN THE AID FOR TRADE DIALOGUE WITH:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>SOMETIMES</th>
<th>NOT</th>
<th>NOT SURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAC Donors</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non DAC donors</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-South Providers</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral donors</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your private sector</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please elaborate: As an example, in its engagement with national stakeholders involved in international trade, the European Union funded a trade needs assessment, which covered the whole range of trade-related activities. However, in addition to the specific trade infrastructure priorities (e.g. moving towards digital and automated systems at Customs, etc.) there was a long list of complementary laws that need to be passed, which the assessment provided in perfect detail. This document was intended to be used as an instrument to facilitate dialogue with the donor (in this case a DAC/multilateral donor).

**19.1** Please illustrate the importance of complementary policies with examples of both successful and unsuccessful aid-for-trade process, approaches and programmes:

Projects to boost the exports of Lebanese food and other agro-industrial products have faced a number of challenges in accessing DAC markets, especially the EU market. A number of projects have been put in place to try to boost exports, including most prominently the QUALEB project, which is funded by the EU with the objective of strengthening quality management, capabilities and Infrastructure in Lebanon. While moderately successful in increasing exports, these projects still rely on the enactment of the Food Safety Law, which has been proposed to Parliament, but has encountered delays mostly related to the overarching political situation. The absence of this law implies the absence of a food safety regime, which can negatively affect food exports.

**20. **HOW DOES YOUR GOVERNMENT ASSESS THE MONITORING OF THE GLOBAL AID-FOR TRADE INITIATIVE TO DATE?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>POSITIVE</th>
<th>NEUTRAL</th>
<th>NEGATIVE</th>
<th>DON'T KNOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**20.1** What do you see as major challenges or areas for improvements: Awareness raising amongst national stakeholders on the concept of aid for trade, and its potential to help unify both aid and trade activities that can be classified as aid for trade. Other challenges include increasing donor requirements for partner country co-financing, rising to as high as 40% of a program's budget.

**21. **ARE THERE ANY PARTICULAR EXAMPLES OF YOUR AID-FOR-TRADE PROCESSES, PROGRAMMES OR PROJECTS THAT HAVE OBTAINED GOOD RESULTS OR BAD THAT YOU THINK COULD CONTRIBUTE TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF GOOD PRACTICES? SEE RESPONSE TO Q 17.1

**22. **PLEASE FEEL FREE TO RAISE ANY ISSUE THAT HAS NOT BEEN ADDRESSED IN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE AND THAT YOU CONSIDER WORTHWHILE TO RAISE:
EXPLANATORY NOTES

WHAT IS THIS QUESTIONNAIRE ABOUT?

The Task Force on Aid for Trade underscored that all providers and recipients of aid for trade have a responsibility to report on progress and results, and to increase confidence that aid for trade will be delivered and used effectively. Partner countries were invited to report on trade mainstreaming in national development strategies, the formulation of trade strategies, aid-for-trade needs (including national, regional), donor responses, implementation and impact.

The qualitative information is obtained through structured questionnaires tailored to partner countries. Questions are designed to elicit information to the effectiveness of aid for trade. This Questionnaire furthers the analyse and gauges progress made since 2008. It asks about how strategies and priorities have changed, how aid-for-trade financing has evolved, probes implementation issues and solicits your views on whether aid for trade is working.

The questionnaire is being sent to those countries which completed the 2008 Questionnaire which formed the basis of the analysis in the Aid for Trade at a Glance Report 2009. Details of the previous responses to the questionnaire can be found here:
http://www.oecd.org/document/1/0,3343,en_2649_34665_42926849_1_1_1_1,00.html

WHO SHOULD RESPOND TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE?

The self-assessment report (including answers to this questionnaire) should represent a whole-of-government view, and not solely a trade ministry perspective. Thus, substantial cross-ministerial cooperation and coordination is likely to be required. In some countries, officials from the Trade Ministry are best placed to coordinate the different inputs from Finance, Agriculture, Transport, Cooperation ministries, etc.

In many countries, particularly LDCs participating in the Enhanced Integrated Framework (EIF) process, there are already national processes to discuss and consult on trade policy and integration strategies. These national committees might provide a good forum to discuss the response to the questionnaire. In EIF countries, the focal point is probably best suited to lead the coordination role as this person is already responsible for coordinating the Diagnostic Trade Integration Studies and implementation of the Action Matrix. Remember that the function of the self-assessments is to report to the Global Review the outcome of national processes that address aid dedicated to increasing trade capacity. We would encourage you to use the results of other monitoring and reporting requirements as much as possible.

Because of this diversity, despite our best efforts to send this information to the right people in your country, we are bound to have made mistakes along the way. If you are not the right person, we would be extremely grateful if you could pass on this questionnaire to the best person in your country to coordinate the response.

WHEN IS IT DUE?

You should send your response to aft.monitoring@oecd.org and aft.monitoring@wto.org by 31 January 2011. This will ensure that your response is included in the next OECD-WTO Aid-for-Trade at a Glance report and is widely available for others to read and be discussed at the next Global Review on Aid for Trade. Your response, in its original language, will also be posted on the dedicated publication website for better transparency and wider viewing.

If you do not meet the deadline, your response won’t be included in the analysis of the joint OECD-WTO report to be presented and discussed at the Global Aid-for-Trade review. However it will be posted on a dedicated website which will contain all the responses to the current and the previous round of questionnaires.

---

2 See http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/devel_e/a4t_e/global_review09_e.htm for information on the 2009 Global Review held in Geneva at the WTO in July 2009
WHO CAN HELP ME?

There are a number of technical events being scheduled at the regional level between October 2010 and January 2011 to support this process. If you need further assistance, please feel free to contact the WTO or OECD staff at afd.monitoring@wto.org.

THE QUESTIONNAIRE STEP BY STEP

A. YOUR AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY

The objective of the first section is to assess if and why your strategy or policies have changed since the last questionnaire. It examines the reasons why you may have changed your strategy or priorities and if those changes were integrated (e.g. mainstreamed) in your national development strategy and included in your dialogue with donors. As noted in the previous questionnaire, in many countries, trade strategies are undistinguishable from general competitiveness strategies, particularly those focused on the globalisation of national economies.

Question 1 addresses the issue of changing strategies and the follow up question asks you to elaborate on specific objectives that may have changed. The answer should help you to signal to donors and the wider aid-for-trade community emerging trends and priorities in your strategy as different countries use very different mechanisms to draft and communicate their development plans. This can also help your government to assess whether existing strategies and plans are still relevant or have been overtaken by events. If you have changed your strategy, was this due to an increasing focus by your government on national competitiveness, changed trade capacity needs or due to increasing emphasis on poverty reduction, greener growth, gender equality or regional integration. It would be useful for you to indicate which of these changes was most important, or less so.

Question 2 asks if your priorities have changed since the first questionnaire and presents a list of possible priorities in Trade Policy and Regulations, Economic Infrastructure and Building Productive Capacity. Countries with unlisted priorities should make full use of the 'other' priorities category. A follow-up question asks about the main drivers for this change of priorities in order of importance. Possible reasons might include the economic crisis, new development priorities, change of government or trade policy changes.

Question 3 asks if changed strategies or priorities have been integrated into your overall development strategies. Responses should show whether you are finding the aid-for-trade concept useful for developing coherent trade strategies that encompass a full range of different activities (from infrastructure building to trade policy training), or whether you prefer developing strategies specific to the sector, type of activity or funding source.

Question 4 asks about whether changes outlined in Question 3 were included in updated strategies for aid-for-trade priorities. If current operational strategies do not include your revised objectives, when do you plan to update?

Question 5 asks if the changes in objectives or priorities were included in recent dialogues with donors.

Questions 6 and 7 are specifically targeted to Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and ask specific questions about the Enhanced Integrated Framework (EIF). The first asks about the involvement of the EIF focal point and committee in overseeing and coordinating your trade agenda. It asks which ministries are involved in the EIF process and whether donors use these structures to coordinate the support they offer. This is followed by a question on the enhancement of the IF and whether this has had an impact on your ability to mainstream. These questions will enable the aid-for-trade community to assess the contribution of the EIF to LDCs with a view to better coordinating with the Aid-for-Trade Initiative.
B. AID-FOR-TRADE FINANCING

This section asks about how you measure your aid-for-trade flows and how those flows have changed since 2008. Better information on flows at the local level is essential in planning and programming of trade capacity building. The WTO Task Force suggested that aid should be considered aid for trade only if designed to address trade-related challenges identified in national development strategies. We do not expect the majority of partner countries to have in place the necessary systems to identify aid for trade precisely but in those cases would like to know how they account for the aid for trade they receive and if they experience any particular challenges in accessing or measuring aid-for-trade flows compared to other forms of ODA.

**Question 8** tries to understand how partner governments measure and keep track of concessional aid-for-trade flows. If such flows are tracked, what system is used:

- An Aid Management Platform (AMP) is an application designed for use by governments and their development partners, AMP provides information for planning, monitoring, coordinating, tracking and reporting on international aid flows and activities. For more information: [http://www.developmentgateway.org/programs/aid-management-program/aid-management-platform.html](http://www.developmentgateway.org/programs/aid-management-program/aid-management-platform.html)

- A Development Assistance database is a web-based Aid Information Management System which involves information collection, tracking, analysis and planning tool for use by national governments and the broader assistance community, including bilateral donors, international organisations, and NGOs

- National accounting systems based on compiling all inflows of aid to the Finance Ministries, semi-governmental agencies, line ministries and associations.

**Question 8.2** asks about the changes of aid-for-trade flows since 2008, according to your best estimates did flows increase or decrease? **Question 8.3** asks about the relative performance of donors and providers of South-South cooperation.

**Question 9** looks at whether the issues around aid-for-trade are different from those affecting generic ODA and aid to other sectors. Is aid for trade different in the way it is allocated by bilateral and multilateral donors, or South-South providers? A follow up question for those who do experience particular issues with aid for trade delivery can specify in 10.1 what the specific issues are: eligibility, conditionality, predictability etc.

C. HOW DO YOU IMPLEMENT YOUR STRATEGY?

The objective of this section is twofold: i.) to find out how your aid-for-trade strategy is implemented, by which entity, involving dialogue with which stakeholders and ii.) to assess and encourage progress in the application of aid effectiveness principles on aid for trade. Designing and implementing aid for trade strategies requires the involvement of actors across local and national government, the private sector and civil society as well as donors. How well are donors aligning and harmonizing their aid-for-trade projects? We do not want to duplicate the monitoring exercise of the Paris Declaration, but to ensure that the progress made in applying the aid effectiveness principles is benefiting trade as much as other sectors.

**Question 10** asks about which entity is responsible for coordinating your aid-for-trade activities and whether this has changed since 2008. As noted above aid for trade requires the involvement of many governmental and non-governmental stakeholders but which body is responsible for coordination? This may be the Ministry of Trade or another Ministry or a specific National Committee. If a change took place it would be useful to indicate why to determine if practices are shifting and why.
Question 11 introduces dialogue on aid for trade and asks you to assess if your dialogue with donors has improved since 2008. If there have been changes, we would like to know more about what happened during this period to bring on this change.

Question 12 goes deeper into the issue of dialogue, this time between government and national stakeholders. Have these changed since 2008. If so how and why?

Question 13 begins looking at aid effectiveness issues starting with harmonisation. In the Paris Declaration donors committed to streamline and harmonise their policies, procedures, and practices; intensify delegated cooperation and increase the flexibility of country-based staff to manage country programmes and projects more effectively. This question asks if donors are doing this more effectively compared to 2008. It goes on to ask about specific coordination mechanisms such as joint needs assessments, co-financing arrangements and joint implementation and evaluation.

Question 14 asks about your Government’s monitoring systems for aid for trade. We are aware that many partner countries won’t have set up independent monitoring processes for externally financed programmes, and that joint approaches with donors are not very common. At the same time, progress in this area is essential to foster mutual accountability and to increase aid effectiveness. We hope the question will encourage you to take stock of the situation in your country, and that your answer will help us to identify the most common forms of monitoring systems in partner countries and encourage progress in this area. So, please feel free to expand your response to include the challenges your government encounters or has encountered in establishing monitoring systems.

Question 15 looks at the issue of alignment. Donors have committed to align their development assistance with the development priorities and results-oriented strategies set out by the partner country. In delivering this assistance, donors will progressively depend on partner countries’ own systems, providing capacity-building support to improve these systems, rather than establishing parallel systems of their own. Are donors making progress towards this objective in aid for trade. If they are, please describe how this was accomplished and if donor support is less aligned please explain why where possible and outline any steps that might reverse this.

D. IS AID FOR TRADE WORKING?

The final section of the questionnaire looks at how partner countries define success of aid for trade, the degree to which complementary policies are considered and the quality and importance of global monitoring in an attempt to determine if aid for trade is working. It also gives partner countries an opportunity to elaborate on issues of importance to them that may not have been raised in this questionnaire.

Question 16 asks how you define success in aid for trade. What are you looking to achieve through your plans, strategies aided by donor support? Aid for trade can have multiple outcomes or impacts. The Aid for Trade Task Force defined aid for trade as whatever the partner countries consider trade

Question 17 asks about the results you achieved? From your perspective, what impact has aid for trade had in your country. Did the aid-for-trade process lead to enhanced understanding and increased profile of trade or did it help you to increase trade, growth and reduce poverty. Please explain why or why not you achieved these objectives with examples of both successful and unsuccessful aid-for-trade processes, approaches and programmes.
**Question 18** introduces the issue of complementary policies. Aid for trade will be more effective, and its impact on trade and economic growth larger, if it is used in a supportive environment in terms of regulations, taxes, labour market policies etc. Policymakers need to be aware of the importance of these complementary policies and this question asks you to outline how dependent aid-for-trade outcomes and impacts are on these policies. Question 18.1 asks which complementary policies matter most in your experience? Question 18.2 asks if you discuss these policies with DAC donors, non-DAC donors, South-South providers and multilateral donors. Question 18.3 asks for examples which illustrate the importance of complementary policies with examples of successful and unsuccessful aid-for-trade processes, approaches and programmes.

**Question 19** asks about the quality of the monitoring by OECD and WTO of the Aid-for-Trade Initiative. Since 2006 OECD has taken a lead in monitoring aid for trade through a range of quantitative and qualitative instruments including tracking flows through the Creditor Reporting System, self-assessment by donors and partner countries through specified questionnaires and case stories which expand the monitoring into looking at outcomes and impacts. Respondents also have an opportunity to flag areas of particular concern which require improvement.

**Question 20** asks you to share a concrete example of good practice. Good examples of aid-for-trade projects and programmes exist in many countries, from institutional processes which are particularly successful at engaging with the private sector, to regional initiatives, infrastructure projects or trade facilitation reforms. This body of experience could be extremely helpful to other developing countries facing similar challenges. If you have a good example in your country that you think might be useful to others, please explain the objectives of the programme or project, its main characteristics, why it worked well, and provide a list of additional materials and/or contacts for those interested in further information.

**Question 21** gives you an opportunity to raise any issue you feel is important but not addressed directly in the questionnaire. The questionnaire is a tool with which you can outline and describe the issues that are important for you. They are designed to encompass very different countries with different challenges and approaches. Thus the questionnaire needs to be flexible enough to accommodate these differences. This question provides this opportunity and gives you a chance to introduce relevant issues or explore areas that you feel did not get adequate coverage. In addition you are encouraged to expand on any topic you feel would be of interest to the wider aid-for-trade community through a case story. Details on this can be found here: [www.oecd.org/dac/aft/casestories](http://www.oecd.org/dac/aft/casestories)
### GLOSSARY

| **Action Matrix** | The outcome of the Enhanced Integrated Framework trade needs assessment. It is a summary list of recommendations and follow-up measures coming out of the Diagnostic Trade Integration Study and validation workshop. |
| **Additionality** | Additional aid for trade is aid increases that do not crowd out other aid flows, such as aid to health and education, but rather, reflect increases in total sector allocable development aid. |
| **Aid Activity** | Aid activities include projects and programmes, cash transfers, deliveries of goods, training courses, research projects, debt relief operations and contributions to non-governmental organisations. |
| **Aid for Trade** | The WTO Task Force on Aid for Trade states that Aid for Trade is about assisting developing countries to increase exports of goods and services, to integrate into the multilateral trading system, and to benefit from liberalized trade and increased market access. It proposes to break down Aid for Trade into six categories:  

  a. *Trade policy and regulations*, including: training of trade officials, analysis of proposals and positions and their impact, support for national stakeholders to articulate commercial interest and identify trade-offs, dispute issues, institutional and technical support to facilitate implementation of trade agreements and to adapt to and comply with rules and standards.  
  b. *Trade development*, including: investment promotion, analysis and institutional support for trade in services, business support services and institutions, public-private sector networking, e-commerce, trade finance, trade promotion, market analysis and development.  
  c. *Trade-related infrastructure*: transport and storage, energy, and telecommunications.  
  d. *Building productive capacity*.  
  e. *Trade-related adjustment*, including supporting developing countries to put in place accompanying measures that assist them to benefit from liberalized trade.  
  f. *Other trade-related needs*. |
| **Alignment** | One of the Paris Declaration’s five main principles on Aid Effectiveness. Donors will align their development assistance with the development priorities and results-oriented strategies set out by the partner country. In delivering this assistance, donors will progressively depend on partner countries’ own systems, providing capacity-building support to improve these systems, rather than establishing parallel systems of their own. Partner countries will undertake the necessary reforms that would enable donors to rely on their country systems. |
| **Creditor Reporting System (CRS)** | The OECD CRS aid activity database covers bilateral and multilateral donors’ aid and other resource flows to developing countries. The objective of the CRS is to provide a set of readily available basic data that enables analysis on where aid goes, what purposes it serves and what policies it aims to implement, on a comparable basis for all DAC members. The CRS provides detailed information on individual aid activities, such as sectors, countries, project descriptions etc. Three main CRS categories are used as proxies to track Aid-for-Trade volumes: (1) *trade policy and regulations*; (2) *economic infrastructure* (energy, transport & communications); and (3) *building productive capacity*. From 2008 onwards, a new CRS category will track aid to “trade-related adjustment”. The database has free access. For more information, follow this link. |
**Diagnostic Trade Integration Studies (DTIS)**
Evaluation of internal and external constraints to a country’s integration in the global trading system. An action matrix is developed as a result of the study to facilitate cooperation with the government, donors, and the private sector. Refer to the Enhanced Integrated Framework for more information.

**Enhanced Integrated Framework (EIF), formerly Integrated Framework (IF)**
The Enhanced IF (EIF) is an international initiative through which the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the International Trade Centre (ITC), the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), the World Bank (WB) and the World Trade Organization (WTO) combine their efforts with those of Least-Developed Countries (LDCs) and bilateral and multilateral development partners to respond to the trade development needs of LDCs. The Integrated framework was launched in 1997 and to date, up to 46 LDCs of a total of 49 have become beneficiaries. The IF process is comprised of four-parts: (1) Awareness building; (2) Diagnostic for a Trade Integration Strategy or DTIS; (3) Plan integration into the national development strategy; and (4) Plan implementation.

**Evaluation**
The systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, programme or policy, specifically its design, implementation and results. The aim is to determine the relevance and fulfilment of objectives, development efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. An evaluation should provide information that is credible and useful, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision–making process of both recipients and donors. Evaluation also refers to the process of determining the worth or significance of an activity, policy or program. An assessment, as systematic and objective as possible, of a planned, on-going, or completed development intervention. Note: Evaluation in some instances involves the definition of appropriate standards, the examination of performance against those standards, an assessment of actual and expected results and the identification of relevant lessons.

**Harmonisation**
One of the Paris Declaration’s five main principles on Aid Effectiveness. Donors will implement good practice principles in development assistance delivery. They will streamline and harmonise their policies, procedures, and practices; intensify delegated cooperation; increase the flexibility of country-based staff to manage country programmes and projects more effectively; and develop incentives within their agencies to foster management and staff recognition of the benefits of harmonisation.

**Mainstreaming = “to bring into the mainstream”**
Mainstreaming means to introduce a certain way of thinking and acting into the mainstream – in all kinds of programs and measures – and to let it develop into a natural behaviour in order to penetrate and change the “mainstream”. Mainstreaming in the trade context means to integrate a trade perspective in all economic development programmes and strategies, so that considerations about external trade interactions with the domestic economy are integrated in the design of all projects and activities in a way that contributes to the country’s capacity to benefit from trade integration.
Managing for Results

One of the Paris Declaration’s five main principles on Aid Effectiveness. Partner countries will embrace the principles of managing for results, starting with their own results-oriented strategies and continuing to focus on results at all stages of the development cycle – from planning through implementation to evaluation. Donors will rely on and support partner countries’ own priorities, objectives, and results, and work in coordination with other donors to strengthen partner countries’ institutions, systems, and capabilities to plan and implement projects and programmes, report on results, and evaluate their development processes and outcomes (avoiding parallel donor-driven mechanisms).

Monitoring

A continuing function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing development intervention with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds.

Official Development Finance (ODF)

Used in measuring the inflow of resources to recipient countries: includes (a) bilateral ODA, (b) grants and concessional and non-concessional development lending by multilateral financial institutions, and (c) Other Official Flows for development purposes (including refinancing Loans) which have too low a grant element to qualify as ODA.

Official Development Assistance (ODA)

Grants or Loans to countries and territories on the DAC List of Aid Recipients (developing countries) which are: (a) undertaken by the official sector; (b) with promotion of economic development and welfare as the main objective; (c) at concessional financial terms [if a loan, having a grant element of at least 25 per cent]. In addition to financial flows, Technical Co-operation (q.v.) is included in aid. Grants, loans and credits for military purposes are excluded. The DAC List of Aid Recipients includes all low and middle income countries, except those that are members of the G8 or the European Union (including countries with a firm date for EU admission).

Other Official Flows (OOF)

Transactions by the official sector with countries on the List of Aid Recipients which do not meet the conditions for eligibility as Official Development Assistance or Official Aid, either because they are not primarily aimed at development, or because they have a Grant Element of less than 25 per cent.

Ownership

One of the Paris Declaration’s five main principles on Aid Effectiveness. The development community will respect the right – and responsibility – of the partner country to exercise effective leadership over its development policies and strategies, and coordinate development actions.

WTO Global Review

The Global Aid-for-Trade Review on 20-21 November 2007 was the focal point of WTO’s monitoring mandate for 2007. The Global Aid-for-Trade Review had three objectives: to take stock of what is happening on Aid for Trade; to identify what should happen next; and to improve WTO monitoring and evaluation. The next Global Review is scheduled to take place in Spring 2009, and will again review the process made in implementing the Aid-for-Trade Initiative, including through an analysis of global flows, and donors and partner countries’ self-assessments.
As a result of the Hong Kong Ministerial Conference, Director General-Lamy created a task force to provide recommendations on how to operationalise the Aid-for-Trade initiative and ensure it contributes most effectively to the development dimension of the Doha Development Agenda. The Task Force consisted of 13 WTO Member countries, in alphabetical order: Barbados, Brazil, Canada, China, Colombia, the European Union, Japan, India, Thailand, the United States, and the coordinators of the ACP, African and LDC Groups. The Permanent Representative of Sweden, ambassador Mia Horn Af Rantzien, chaired it ad personam. In July 2006, the Task force delivered its recommendations (WT/AFT/1), which were endorsed by the WTO General Council on 10 October.