

PARTNER COUNTRY QUESTIONNAIRE ON AID FOR TRADE

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: Solomon Islands

MINISTRY/AGENCY (coordinating the self assessment): Department of External Trade, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and External Trade

A. YOUR AID-FOR-TRADE OBJECTIVES AND PRIORITIES

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

YES

NO

NOT SURE

NOT APPLICABLE

1.1 If YES, please elaborate on what these changes are:

	MOST IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	LESS IMPORTANT	NOT IMPORTANT	NOT SURE
Changed trade capacity needs	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Changed focus on:					
• Competitiveness	<input type="checkbox"/>				
• Poverty reduction	<input type="checkbox"/>				
• Green growth	<input type="checkbox"/>				
• Gender equality	<input type="checkbox"/>				
• Regional integration	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>				

Please specify: The Government does not have any coherent or articulated strategies, objectives or priorities which specifically refer to aid for trade. It does however have broader development plans and objectives. Whilst there may be some sectoral and Ministry-specific aid objectives and priorities which include trade-related issues, information on these is weak. It is therefore difficult to assess to what extent the country's aid for trade objectives and priorities have changed since 2008. The 2009 Solomon Islands Diagnostic Trade Intergration Study provides the most coherent guide for the formulation of national aid for trade objectives and priorities but has not yet been incorporated into the national development strategy documents. In December 2010, the new NCRA Government's published a strategy in its policy translation document to engage with donors to 'coordinate and secure resources for trade-related technical assistance' and to mainstream trade policy into the mid-term development strategy and the National Development Plan.

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

YES

NO

NOT SURE

NOT APPLICABLE

2.1 *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.)*

	SECTOR	PRIORITY
Trade policy and regulations	Trade policy analysis, negotiations and Implementation	
	WTO accession costs	
	Trade facilitation	
Economic infrastructure	Network infrastructure (power, water, telecom)	
	Other transport	
	Cross-border Infrastructure	
Building productive capacity	Competitiveness	
	Value chains	
	Export diversification	
Other	Adjustment costs	
	Regional Integration	
	Other	

Please describe: As above, it is not possible to indicate or rank the Government’s aid for trade priorities as it does not prioritise specifically under the definition of aid for trade. The Government does however regard all of the trade-related areas listed in 2.1 as important areas, except for WTO accession costs, and recognises that additional resources are required to achieve improvements in all these areas. Solomon Islands’ Diagnostic Trade Integration Study that was launched in 2010 also highlights most of these categories as priority areas for trade-related assistance and support.

2.2 *If your aid-for-trade objectives or priorities have changed since 2008, please explain what were the main drivers of these changes?*

	MOST IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	LESS IMPORTANT	NOT IMPORTANT
The economic crisis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
New development priorities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Change of government	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Multilateral trade policy changes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Regional trade policy changes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
National trade policy changes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please specify: This question is not applicable given the difficulties in defining the country's objectives or priorities specific to Aid for Trade.

3. IF YOUR AID-FOR-TRADE OBJECTIVES OR PRIORITIES HAVE CHANGED, DID YOU MAINSTREAM THESE CHANGES INTO YOUR OVERALL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY?

YES

NO

NOT SURE

NOT APPLICABLE

Please elaborate: As indicated in question 2.2, this question is not applicable given the difficulties in defining the country's objectives or priorities specific to Aid for Trade.

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?

YES NO NOT SURE NOT APPLICABLE

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

YES NO NOT SURE NOT APPLICABLE

5. DID YOU INCLUDE THESE NEW AID-FOR-TRADE OBJECTIVES OR PRIORITIES IN YOUR NATIONAL DIALOGUE WITH DONORS?

YES NO NOT SURE NOT APPLICABLE

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

YES NO NOT SURE NOT APPLICABLE

FOR LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRIES

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

YES NO NOT SURE NOT APPLICABLE

*Are all relevant ministries involved in the EIF process?
Please detail: All major national trade stakeholders including relevant ministries are represented in the EIF National Steering Committee. The role of the EIF focal point and committee however is currently limited mostly to EIF issues and they do not address many other trade-related issues. Their roles are however in the process of being revised so as to expand the committee to play a much greater role in overseeing and coordinating the national trade agenda. This is development is reflected in the new NCRA Government's Policy Translation Document and is planned for 2011-2012
If NOT, what are the reasons?*

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

YES NO NOT SURE NOT APPLICABLE

If YES, to what extent do donors:

	ALWAYS	SOMETIMES	RARELY/NEVER	NOT SURE
Use the DTIS Action Matrix as a basis for programming	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Co-ordinate their actions with the help of the in-country donor facilitator	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please specify: The DTIS was only officially launched in 2010 and the EIF structures are still being established or strengthened. It is hoped that in the near future these structures will be considered by donors for the coordination of trade-related support. It is also expected that the DTIS Action matrix will be incorporated into the next national Medium Term Development Strategy which is due to be published in 2011. This intention is reflected in the new NCRA Government's Policy translation Document.

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

SIGNIFICANT <input type="checkbox"/>	MODERATE <input type="checkbox"/>	INSIGNIFICANT <input type="checkbox"/>	TOO EARLY TO ASSESS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NOT SURE <input type="checkbox"/>	NOT APPLICABLE <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------------------	---	--	--------------------------------------	--

7.1 Please elaborate further on what the EIF has allowed you to achieve now compared to before its enhancement: Solomon Islands' first project under the EIF was only approved in December 2010. It is therefore too early to assess its impact on the mainstreaming of trade into the national development strategy.

B. AID-FOR-TRADE FINANCING¹

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

YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	NOT SURE <input type="checkbox"/>
---	-----------------------------	-----------------------------------

8.1 If YES, do you use one of the following tracking systems:

	YES	NO	NOT SURE
Aid Management Platform	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Development Assistance Database	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
National accounting system	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please specify: All external financing flows into Solomon Islands are monitored by the Central Bank. Solomon Islands does not receive any external concessional financing as the Honiara Club Agreement prohibits borrowing. The Ministry of Finance maintains records of external and domestic debt (which includes external concessional financing flows), keeping records on the principal outstanding (amount still owed) as well as the payment schedule for each loan from each creditor. External grants for general budget support and sector budget support are kept track of by the Ministry of Finance and Treasury. The Ministry of Development Planning and Aid Coordination also keeps track of some aid flows as reported by donors. In neither case is a distinction made for trade-related programmes. The Ministry of Development Planning and Aid Coordination is in the process of finalizing a development assistance database which aims to keep track of all development assistance flows, but will still require reporting by donors. In addition, the Ministry of Development Planning and Aid Coordination is currently developing an Aid Management Platform to improve the coordination of aid in the country.

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

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.

	INCREASE	REMAIN STABLE	DECREASE	NOT SURE	
DAC Donors (see glossary)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Non DAC Donors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
South-South Providers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Multilateral donors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Private Development Assistance (NGOs)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
8.3 If YES, do you know the share of different aid-for-trade providers in your overall aid-for-trade flows?					
	> 90%	90-50%	50-25%	< 25%	NONE
DAC Donors (see glossary)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Non DAC Donors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
South-South Providers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Multilateral donors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Private Development Assistance (NGOs)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

9. COMPARED TO YOUR EXPERIENCE WITH OVERALL EXTERNAL FINANCING, DO YOU FACE ANY SPECIFIC CHALLENGES IN ACCESSING TRADE-RELATED FUNDING?				
	YES	NO	NOT SURE	
DAC Donors (see glossary)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Non DAC Donors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
South-South Providers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Multilateral donors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
9.1 If YES, please indicate which additional challenges you face:				
	MOST IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	LESS IMPORTANT	NOT IMPORTANT
Eligibility	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Conditionality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Predictability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Understanding procedures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Difficulties in designing “bankable” projects	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Volume of available funding	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Please define: There is insufficient information available to answer these questions, particularly given the broadness of the definition of aid for trade and the fact that trade-related financing is not distinguished from other types of external financing. The private sector has difficulties securing trade financing due to high interest rates and lack of appropriate collateral.</i>				

C. HOW DO YOU IMPLEMENT YOUR STRATEGY?

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

YES

NO

NOT SURE

NOT APPLICABLE

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

Ministry of Trade	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sector Ministries	<input type="checkbox"/>	Specify:
Coordinating Ministry	<input type="checkbox"/>	Specify:
National Committee	<input type="checkbox"/>	Specify:
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	Specify:
No one	<input type="checkbox"/>	

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?

SIGNIFICANTLY

MODERATELY

RARELY/NO

NOT SURE

11.1 If YES, please describe and exemplify: Since aid for trade covers a range of trade-related areas and there is no central coordinating body, it is unclear whether dialogue may have been strengthened with donors in some areas of trade. Broadly, however, aid for trade does not yet feature as a main area of discussion in the regular national government-donor dialogues. This is likely to be partly due to the fact that aid for trade did not feature prominently in the 2008-2010 national Medium Term Development Strategy Document.

12. HAS THE DIALOGUE ON AID FOR TRADE BETWEEN YOUR GOVERNMENT AND NATIONAL STAKEHOLDERS BEEN STRENGTHENED SINCE 2008?

SIGNIFICANTLY

MODERATELY

RARELY/NO

NOT SURE

12.1 If YES, please describe and exemplify: The level of dialogue remains similar to the frequency and level in 2008.

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

SIGNIFICANTLY

MODERATELY

RARELY/NO

NOT SURE

13.1 How often do donors in your country coordinate through:

	ALWAYS	SOMETIMES	RARELY/NEVER	NOT SURE
Joint needs assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Co-financing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sector-wide approaches	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Joint implementation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Common monitoring	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Joint evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Please elaborate: Sector-wide approaches include education (NZAID being the lead donor), health (AUSAID being the lead donor) and transport (ADB being the lead donor). Coordination by joint evaluation is being progressively developed and is expected to become a more common practice in the near future.</p>				

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

SIGNIFICANTLY <input type="checkbox"/>	MODERATELY <input type="checkbox"/>	RARELY/NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NOT SURE <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>14.1 If YES, please describe how you improved the monitoring of aid-for-trade programmes: Aid for Trade programmes are spread across different institutions and there is no central coordinating body applying a standardised monitoring approach to all aid for trade programmes. The monitoring of Aid for Trade as a whole therefore remains fragmented and information on aid for trade programmes in Solomon Islands remains weak.</p>			

15. HAVE DONORS ALIGNED THEIR SUPPORT BETTER AROUND YOUR COUNTRY'S TRADE-RELATED PRIORITIES SINCE 2008?

SIGNIFICANTLY <input type="checkbox"/>	MODERATELY <input type="checkbox"/>	RARELY/NO <input type="checkbox"/>	NOT SURE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>15.1 If donor support is better aligned, please describe how this was achieved: The country's trade-related priorities have not been clearly articulated or documented. It is therefore not possible to assess the degree of donor alignment.</p>			
<p>15.2 If donor support is less aligned, please explain why and any steps you plan to take to reverse this trend:</p>			

D. IS AID FOR TRADE WORKING?

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

	MOST IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	LESS IMPORTANT	NOT IMPORTANT
Enhanced understanding of trade	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Increased profile of trade in development strategy (mainstreaming)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
More harmonised and aligned aid-for-trade projects and programmes	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Increased aid-for-trade resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Increased exports	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Increased trade	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Diversified exports	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Increased economic growth	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reduced poverty	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Greater environmental sustainability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Greater gender equality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><i>Please define: Based on observations, there have been small improvements in some of the areas above (eg. increased trade, increased profile of trade), however it is not clear to what extent aid for trade has been responsible for these successes. There is insufficient information on the final amounts of aid for trade received by the end beneficiaries and the country lacks the capacity and appropriate tools to accurately assess the impact of aid for trade with regard to the above indicators.</i></p>				

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

	SIGNIFICANT	MODERATE	INSIGNIFICANT	NOT SURE	NOT APPLICABLE
Enhanced understanding of trade	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Increased profile of trade in development strategy (mainstreaming)	<input type="checkbox"/>				
More harmonised and aligned aid-for-trade programmes	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Increased aid-for-trade resources	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Increased exports	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Increased trade	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Diversified exports	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Increased economic growth	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Reduced poverty	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Greater environmental sustainability	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Greater gender equality	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Others	<input type="checkbox"/>				

Please define: Based on observations, there have been small improvements in some of the areas above (eg. increased trade, increased profile of trade), however it is not clear to what extent aid for trade has been responsible for these results. There is insufficient information on the final amounts of aid for trade received by the end beneficiaries and the country lacks the capacity and appropriate tools to accurately assess the impact of aid for trade with regard to the above indicators.

17.1 Please illustrate with examples of both successful and unsuccessful aid-for-trade process, approaches and programmes: The country does not have sufficient information or appropriate tools to properly assess the success of aid for trade processes, approaches and programmes with regard to the indicators above.

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

VERY IMPORTANT <input type="checkbox"/>	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT <input type="checkbox"/>	NOT IMPORTANT <input type="checkbox"/>	NOT SURE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
18.1 If important, how do you rate the importance of the following complementary policies?				
	VERY IMPORTANT	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	NOT IMPORTANT	NOT SURE
Fiscal policies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Monetary policies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Labour market policies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Regulatory environment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Governance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Please elaborate: There has been insufficient analysis specific to aid for trade to answer this question.

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

	YES	SOMETIMES	NOT	NOT SURE
DAC Donors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Non DAC donors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
South-South Providers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Multilateral donors	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Your private sector	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please elaborate: There is little specific aid for trade dialogue with donors. There may be some isolated discussions with donors with regard to certain trade-related projects. The private sector occasionally raises concerns with regard to fiscal policies and the regulatory environment during consultation on aid for trade initiatives. In aid dialogue more generally, most donors discuss complementary policies to some extent. The DAC donors tend to discuss complementary policies more than other donors.

19.1 Please illustrate the importance of complementary policies with examples of both successful and unsuccessful aid-for-trade process, approaches and programmes:
There is insufficient information or examples available to illustrate the importance of complementary policies in the success of aid for trade processes, approaches and programmes.

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

POSITIVE <input type="checkbox"/>	NEUTRAL <input type="checkbox"/>	NEGATIVE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	DON'T KNOW <input type="checkbox"/>
-----------------------------------	----------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------

20.1 What do you see as major challenges or areas for improvements: *There is insufficient information made available by donors on the breakdown of aid for trade flows. Greater transparency on how some donor aid for trade funds are spent and the extent to which aid classed as 'aid for trade' is additional to other types of funding would provide more clarity. Some countries probably lack the capacity and appropriate tools to determine the impact of aid for trade, particularly given its broad definition. Solomon Islands' monitoring processes do not yet make a distinction for aid for trade, partly due to the low profile of trade in the country and partly due to the broadness of the definition. Despite aid for trade affecting a large number of stakeholders, participation at regional and international aid for trade dialogues is usually limited to a small number of stakeholders which poses challenges for decision making and for the assessment of global AfT initiatives.*

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?

THE FORMULATION OF THE DTIS IS AN EXAMPLE OF AN EFFECTIVE AID FOR TRADE PROJECT IN SOLOMON ISLANDS. THE PROCESS OF CONSULTATION WHICH INVOLVED LOCAL STAFF AND COVERED A NUMBER OF RURAL AREAS ENSURED A GOOD LEVEL OF NATIONAL OWNERSHIP OVER THE STUDY. THE DTIS PROVIDES A STARTING POINT FOR DEVELOPING TRADE POLICY AND FORMULATING AID FOR TRADE PRIORITIES BY MAPPING OUT THE TRADE ENVIRONMENT IN SOLOMON ISLANDS. THE FINAL DOCUMENT HAS BEEN HIGHLY USEFUL IN INFORMING TRADE STAKEHOLDERS AND DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS.

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

PLEASE SEE ADDITIONAL COMMENTS WITH REFERENCE TO QUESTIONS ABOVE:

QN. 4: GOVERNMENT MINISTRIES AND DEPARTMENTS DO NOT GENERALLY HAVE OPERATIONAL STRATEGIES IN PLACE SPECIFIC TO AID FOR TRADE PRIORITIES. THIS IS LIKELY TO BE AT LEAST PARTLY DUE TO THE FACT THAT GOVERNMENT PRIORITIES ARE SELDOMLY DISTINGUISHED FROM OTHERS AS 'AID FOR TRADE' AND ARE YET TO BE PROPERLY DOCUMENTED AS SUCH. WHILST THERE MAY BE A FEW ISOLATED EXAMPLES, MOST OPERATIONAL STRATEGIES ARE STILL DEVELOPED AT THE DEPARTMENT LEVEL AND TEND TO INCLUDE A BROADER RANGE OF ISSUES. AS CAPACITY INCREASES, THIS MAY BE AN AREA WHICH RECEIVES GREATER ATTENTION AND PLANNING.

QN. 5: WHILST CERTAIN TRADE-RELATED ISSUES ARE DISCUSSED IN THE NATIONAL DIALOGUE WITH DONORS, PARTICULARLY INFRASTRUCTURE, THERE HAS NOT YET BEEN ANY CONCERTED EFFORT TO REFER TO AID FOR TRADE MORE BROADLY IN REGULAR NATIONAL DIALOGUE WITH DONORS. THIS IS LIKELY TO BE PARTLY DUE TO THE FACT THAT TRADE RECEIVES ONLY A SMALL MENTION IN THE MEDIUM TERM DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY DOCUMENT WHICH HAS OFFICIALLY GUIDED A LOT OF THE DONOR DIALOGUE SINCE 2008. IT WILL CERTAINLY BE DESIRABLE TO INCLUDE AID FOR TRADE IN THE NATIONAL DONOR DIALOGUE ONCE SPECIFIC AID FOR TRADE PRIORITIES AND OBJECTIVES ARE BETTER ARTICULATED AND DOCUMENTED.

QN. 8.2-8.3: TRADE-RELATED AID IS NOT DISTINGUISHED FROM OTHER SOURCES OF AID RECEIVED IN SOLOMON ISLANDS IN THE MONITORING OF AID FLOWS. IT IS THEREFORE NOT POSSIBLE TO RESPOND ACCURATELY TO THESE QUESTIONS.

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 Trade². 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 aft.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 were 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>
- 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

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	<p>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:</p> <p><i>a. Trade policy and regulations</i>, 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.</p> <p><i>b. Trade development</i>, 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.</p> <p><i>c. Trade-related infrastructure</i>: transport and storage, energy, and telecommunications.</p> <p><i>d. Building productive capacity</i>.</p> <p><i>e. Trade-related adjustment</i>, including supporting developing countries to put in place accompanying measures that assist them to benefit from liberalized trade.</p> <p><i>f. Other trade-related needs</i>.</p>
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 main stream"

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.

**WTO Task Force
on Aid for Trade**

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.