



ROOM DOCUMENT 13

DAC Network on Development Evaluation

TRADE CAPACITY BUILDING RESULTS MONITORING/ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK:

INFORMAL EXPERTS' MEETING - 16 JUNE 2004

Item V: d

This note has been prepared by the Policy Coherence Division, DAC Secretariat for consideration at the meeting of the DAC Network on Development Evaluation on 9 – 10 November, 2004.

**2nd meeting
9 – 10 November 2004**

TRADE CAPACITY BUILDING RESULTS MONITORING/ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK: INFORMAL EXPERTS' MEETING - 16 JUNE 2004

SUMMARY REPORT¹

I. Objective of the meeting

Several bilateral donors and multilateral agencies have recently undertaken or commissioned evaluations of their trade-related technical assistance and capacity building (TRTA/CB) strategy and activities. Many of those agencies expressed an interest in sharing lessons learnt regarding the methodological approach used (e.g. assessment criteria, specific indicators, evaluation scope) and the conclusions reached concerning effectiveness of TRTA/CB (i.e. what conditions have led to successful results at output, outcome and impact level).

Hence, at the recent joint DAC-WTO meeting on Trade Capacity Building held in Paris on 2-3 March 2004, participants suggested developing a "common framework" for results monitoring and assessment of trade capacity building efforts. Yet no specific suggestions were made regarding the precise objective or nature of such a framework. As a consequence, the DAC Secretariat took the initiative to convene interested stakeholders at a meeting in Paris on the 16th of June 2004, in order to:

1. Discuss - and agree on- the purpose, nature and timetable for eventual collaborative (OECD/DAC) work in the area of results monitoring/ impact assessment of TRTA/CB;
2. Share experiences and preliminary lessons learnt in conducting TRTA/CB evaluations, focusing on the main (methodological) challenges faced. (Presentations by consultants and internal evaluation specialists currently working on TRTA/CB evaluations);

The background documents distributed in preparation of (or at) the meeting included a Background note prepared by the DAC Secretariat ("DAC's approach and programme of work"), reports and approach papers on TRTA/CB evaluations of the EC, the Netherlands, the World Bank, the WTO, ITC and USAID, as well draft guidelines for evaluating capacity development (Danida).

II. Challenges in evaluating TRTA/CB

Session I included presentations by the EC/ADE, the Netherlands/ECORYS/NEI, the World Bank, ITC and DFID/NSI. It provided an overview of the challenges and lessons learnt in conducting TRTA/CB evaluations (summarized in Table 1- Annex). The main constraints for most evaluators seem to be the difficulty to:

1. *clearly identify an agency's TRTA/CB activities* (reasons: no clear definition; difficulty in extracting the trade capacity building component from sometimes broader programmes); and
2. *assess their effectiveness and impact at the macro-level* (i.e. on the beneficiary's overall trade capacities and performance).

No consensus could be reached on the definition of a "successful trade capacity building result"², as evaluators often assessed success against different measures (see Table 3 on the use of assessment criteria in the Annex). More generally, it is noteworthy that interpretations of the conventional assessment criteria (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability) vary across aid agencies.

The presentations made it clear that the emphasis (or object) of the evaluations sometimes differed, with some agencies focusing on assessing the *efficiency* and comparative advantage of the funding/implementing

¹ Comments or questions can be addressed to caroline.lesser@oecd.org

² All trade-related technical assistance – TRTA- should aim to build sustainable trade capacity, i.e. reinforce the ability of policy-makers, enterprises and civil society to collaborate in formulating and implementing a trade development strategy embedded in a broader national development strategy; expand the volume, value-added and diversification of exports; and to participate and benefit from the multilateral trading system (WTO and other trade rules). See DAC Guidelines on Strengthening Trade Capacity for Development (2001).

agency (e.g. ITC) or the *relevance* and *effectiveness* of multilateral TRTA/CB programmes/agencies (The Netherlands), while others adopted a somewhat broader approach, assessing not only the efficiency of the agency, but also the *effectiveness* or *impact* of agency trade policy and/or trade development programmes' on the beneficiaries' negotiation, mainstreaming and productive capacities and the degree of ownership and donor co-ordination/coherence (e.g. EC and DFID evaluations).

However, as the Danish representative highlighted, in spite of the sometimes different evaluation foci, all agencies have endorsed the TRTA/CB commitments included in the Doha Ministerial Declaration (2001)³, as well as the DAC Guidelines on *Strengthening Trade Capacity for Development* (2001). Hence, the ultimate objectives of each agency's TRTA/CB strategy or programmes should in principle be converging.

III. Collaborative work in TRTA/CB results monitoring and assessment

Notwithstanding the different evaluation approaches, many stakeholders expressed an interest in conducting some type of joint work on TRTA/CB results monitoring and assessment. At the meeting, 3 different products were under discussion: (1) a desk study; (2) a "toolkit": indicators for each TRTA/CB category; (3) joint review in a developing country. The purpose of each of those products is described below.

Desk study

A great number of participants expressed an interest in sharing recommendations and "best practices" identified by TRTA/CB evaluations. They supported the idea of conducting a "**desk study**" that would summarize lessons learnt from past TRTA/CB implementation across the different agencies. (It was suggested to include *country-specific* lessons and recommendations). The objective of such a desk study would be to provide:

1. a more accurate picture of what factors are contributing (or not) to satisfactory results.
2. *practical advice* to staff involved in TRTA/CB programme planning, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluations.⁴

"Toolkit"/ indicators for each TRTA/CB category

In addition, some participants felt it would be useful to clarify the specific objectives of each TRTA/CB category (cf. TCBDB codes in WTO/OECD TCB Database) and subsequently identify **common indicators for each category**.⁵ Due to the wide range of TRTA/CB projects, it was clear that it would be impossible to use the same indicators in each evaluation...Hence the suggestion to develop a flexible "toolkit" that would include specific objectives and (output, outcome and impact) indicators per category. The objectives of such a "toolkit" would be to:

1. reach (if possible) a common understanding of each category's objectives,
2. "standardize" the indicators used per category, and
3. provide guidance to evaluators.

(Table 4 in the Annex, which summarizes the specific indicators currently used, could provide a starting point for this exercise). It would be important to involve beneficiary country stakeholders in this process to ensure that indicators are domestically –owned.

Joint TRTA/CB review in one beneficiary country

The proposal to conduct **joint TRTA/CB reviews** (review of several donor TRTA/CB activities in 1 country) was suggested as a way to alleviate attribution problems as well as the burden on the beneficiary (in terms of reporting and other administrative procedures related to donor evaluations). In addition, it would facilitate the full engagement of the beneficiaries in the assessment process. Yet many participants felt it was too early to move forward with this proposal at this stage.

The objective of a joint review would be to:

³ Can be downloaded from the WTO website (www.wto.org). Document code: WT/MIN(01)/DEC/1.

⁴ This advice would be complementary to the (more general) DAC Guidelines on Strengthening Trade Capacity for Development (2001).

⁵ Future work on this could be done jointly with the Working Group on the Joint WTO/OECD TCB Database that regularly meets in Geneva.

1. assess the effectiveness and impact of the various trade policy and trade development programmes conducted in one beneficiary country (as well as the degree of donor co-ordination and coherence).
2. be a “learning tool”, to improve planning, implementation and monitoring of TRTA/CB programmes (rather than being used solely for accountability purposes).

IV. Next steps

Discussions regarding the 3 suggested “joint products” were wrapped up in Session III. Participants had the opportunity to indicate which of the products they favoured (see Table 1 below), though many highlighted the need to consult additional agency’s staff, in order to verify each product’s genuine value-added. A number of participants also expressed an interest in participating in a Steering Committee that would guide the work of the DAC Secretariat/ consultants on the selected product.⁶

Immediate next steps for participants include:

1. Sharing prospective TRTA/CB evaluation reports⁷(see Annex Table 2);
2. Confirming support for one or more of the suggested products, after verification of its value for the agency’s staff - by September 2004 if possible.

The DAC Secretariat hopes to be able to share the participants’ final position regarding the 3 products in September 2004 and subsequently initiate work on one of these.

Table 1

<i>Product</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Interest in participating in a Steering Committee</i>
Desk study	EC DFID World Bank (with country focus) Switzerland The Netherlands (with country focus; as part of the joint reviews) USA (tbc) ITC Denmark EC Belgium GTZ (with country focus)	11	DFID GTZ The Netherlands EC (tbc)
Indicators per TCB category – flexible “toolkit”	DFID The Netherlands USA (tbc) ITC Denmark EC GTZ (tbc)	7	
Joint reviews	Switzerland The Netherlands USA (tbc) ITC (at a later stage) Denmark EC (possibly at a later stage)	6	

⁶ The desk study might not require the establishment of a Steering Committee, though it would be useful to obtain participants’ feedback regarding the specific content and structure of such a study.

⁷ Evaluations of the *multiple* TRTA/CB activities undertaken by an agency over the last year(s).

ANNEX

Table 1- Challenges in evaluating TRTA/CB and lessons learnt from evaluations⁸

	<i>Challenges</i>	<i>Possible next steps</i>	<i>Lessons learnt</i>
EC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - no clear definition of trade capacity building (TCB) - absence of a clear mapping of past interventions (i.e. before 2001) - difficulty in isolating the TCB component from broader programmes (e.g. in private sector development, rural development, etc.) - different focus depending on the region of intervention - difficulty in measuring impact at macro-level, i.e. on the enterprise sector or on trade conditions as a whole. So looked at results at the micro-level (i.e. for direct beneficiaries). - lack of sound, domestically-owned diagnosis/needs assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - need to work more on the log framework (on how donor support connects to macro-level impacts) - work jointly on a methodology for diagnosis of trade needs 	<p>10 recommendations have been included in the Summary of the evaluation report, which was circulated to all participants</p> <p>e.g. adopt a strategic approach to TCB implementation, based on a sound trade diagnosis</p> <p>e.g. strengthen a regional approach to TCB where relevant</p> <p>e.g. improve sequencing between different activities.</p>
The Netherlands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - difficulty in identifying initial objectives of TCB - difficulty in measuring efficiency (due to lack of info on input-output relation or demand-driven approaches) - difficulty in assessing effectiveness, esp. at outcome and impact level (e.g. institutional capacity building), due to attribution problems, lack of data (questionnaires are not enough) and time lags - difficulty in assessing local TCB needs (different domestic groups have different interests and a sound trade needs assessment and strategy is often lacking and/or not reflected in the PRSP). 	-conduct joint donor reviews?	Success of TCB programs depends very much on human resources' capacity (e.g. IF focal point is often overloaded), local ownership and political leadership/commitment.
The World Bank (WB)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - difficulty in "extracting" TCB as it is not always clearly defined/identifiable in WB work (not 1 dept. responsible for TCB) - changing institutional arrangements - methodological: weak baseline and monitoring indicators; 	n/a	n/a

⁸ Source: presentations and discussion held in sessions I and II.

	attribution problems; TCB being assessed as part of the whole trade work of the Bank.		
ITC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - difficulty in assessing impact and sustainability due to the small size of the projects. - activities and competencies spread are across many countries. - ITC intervenes through intermediaries and often works with other organizations. - activities are sometimes tools/networks <p>So looked at results at the micro-level.</p>	- Identify indicators for impact and sustainability	The vitality of networks and trade support institutions is essential
DFID	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - difficulty in “extracting” TCB component from broader programmes (e.g. in private sector development). - no clear definition: technical assistance vs. capacity building - difficulty in assessing cost-efficiency of the projects 	n/a	n/a
Denmark Guidelines on evaluating capacity development (CD)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - attribution problem: identify and assess the impact of external factors on organizational capacity development. (CD depends on multiple factors/actors) - difficulty in analyzing the political dimension of capacity development <p>thus: establishing a causal link between inputs and results at impact level is almost impossible</p>	- Look for changes at output and outcome level and try to explain these changes	<p>Recommendations for evaluating capacity development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - first evaluate the contribution of internal factors/actors to capacity development, then that of donors - conduct joint donor evaluations (identify an agency’s contribution, not attribution) - use evaluations as learning tools
USAID	-difficulty to capture flexibility in TCB delivery in the evaluation	n/a	<p>Recommendations have been included in Annex D of the USAID paper.</p> <p>e.g. concentrate assistance on countries with best prospects for success (committed to economic reforms consistent with trade development)</p> <p>e.g. increase and strengthen the capacity of USAID staff</p>

Table 2- Overview of TRTA/CB evaluation activities (updated version)

Country	Overall Evaluation	Evaluation Guidance/ Framework
APEC		"Evaluation Framework" package (initially prepared by Australia) is currently being examined by APEC sub-fora.
Australia		
Austria		
Belgium		
Canada	(pending)	
Denmark		Methodology for evaluation of Danish support to capacity development (received- 09/2003)
EBRD	(not made public yet)	
EC	(summary received in 06/2004. Full report available in 07/2004)	
FAO	(not received)	
Finland		
France		
Germany	(pending- 09/2004)	Evaluation mechanism specifically adapted to TRTA (E-VAL)
Greece		
Iceland		
IMF		
Ireland		
Italy		
ITC	(pending- 07/2004; done by Denmark. Another evaluation will start in 2005).	Indicators of achievement at corporate level
Japan		
Luxembourg		
Mexico		
The Netherlands	(summary received in 05/2004. Evaluation reports available in 07/2004. Will conduct another evaluation – of TD programs, esp. in SPS/TBT field).	
New Zealand		
Norway		
Portugal		
Spain		
Sweden		
Switzerland		
Thailand		
Turkey		
UNCTAD	(September 2002; received)	
UNESCO	(September 2003; received- capacity development)	
UNDP		
UNESCAP	(WTO-ESCAP TA programme; November 2003; received)	
UNECE		
UNIDO		
UK	(pending- end 09/2004)	
USA	(pending- deadline not clear yet. 09/2004: summary of lessons learnt will be available. 2005: evaluation of TCB by other depts.)	
WCO		WCO Capacity Building Diagnostic Framework (not just for ev.)
World Bank	(pending- 10/2004. Full trade evaluation: 12/2004)	
WTO	(annual reviews; 2003 received. 1 st ex-post evaluation: 12/2004. Later on: external evaluation of WTO TRTA).	

Table 3- A comparative overview of the assessment criteria used TRTA/CB evaluations (updated version)

Assessment criteria used⁹

World Bank ¹⁰ (TPR and TD programmes; bi- and multilateral) ¹¹	EC (TPR and TD; bi- and regional programmes)	UK (TPR and TD; bi- and multilateral programmes)	The Netherlands (TPR only; multilateral programmes)	UNCTAD (multilateral programmes)	WTO (TPR only; bilateral programmes)	IITC (multilateral programmes)	IF (multilateral programme)	DAC Guidelines
R E L E V A N C E								
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Country conditions, most pressing needs and development priorities ▪ WB mission 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ National priorities (incl. 1. a review of existence & quality of diagnosis and needs prioritization; 2. trade elements in PRSP) ▪ EC objectives & priorities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ National PRSPs, Trade policy & development strategies; ▪ National capacity gaps ▪ DFID/UK capacities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ National needs ▪ National policy-making ▪ Negotiation and implementation of WTO agreements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ National priorities ▪ National capacity gaps¹² 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ National context 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comparative advantage of the support agency ▪ MDGs ▪ National PRSP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Poverty reduction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Level of development of the country ▪ Regional economic relations ▪ Degree of integration into the global economy. ▪ Real needs ▪ Mission, competence and comparative advantage of the donor.

⁹ Sources: DFID, Working Paper no.3, Methodology for TRCB Evaluation, April 2004; Wijmenga and Plaisier, Evaluation of TRTA: A Synthesis Report, March 2004 (for the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs); UNCTAD, Evaluation of Capacity Building in UNCTAD's Technical Cooperation Activities, July 2002; IDRC, Evaluating Capacity Development, 2003; DAC Guidelines on Strengthening Trade Capacity for Development (2001). ADE, Evaluation of TRA by the EC in Third Countries: Summary Report, May 2004.

¹⁰ Coverage: lending operations, analytical and advisory services, training and capacity building activities and partnerships with other agencies.

¹¹ TPR: refers to activities supporting trade policy and regulations; TD refers to activities supporting trade development. See Approach note, or TCB Database (tcdbb.wto.org) for more information.

¹² Use of such criteria implies that an assessment of capacity gaps and a diagnosis and prioritization of needs have been conducted.

World Bank (TPR and TD; bi- and multilateral programmes)	EC (TPR and TD; bi- and regional programmes)	UK (TPR and TD; bi- and multilateral programmes)	The Netherlands (TPR only; multilateral programmes)	UNCTAD (multilateral programmes)	WTO (TPR only; bilateral programmes)	ITC (multilateral programmes)	IF (multilateral programme)	DAC Guidelines
E F F I C I E N C Y								
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bank performance ▪ Inputs-results link ▪ Appropriateness of “tools” used: <p>Sequencing and coherence of WB interventions (research, lending, policy advice); consideration of external factors</p>	<p>Appropriateness of implementation modalities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Selection, mix and quality of inputs; ▪ Suitability to beneficiary’s absorptive capacity ▪ EC’s capacity to deliver (human/ financial resources; punctuality and sequencing of implementation) ▪ Consideration of other factors (preconditions for success) 	<p>Management, costs (cost-effectiveness), timeliness.</p> <p>=> Incl. comparison and coherence between DFID’s TPR and TD activities;</p> <p>=> Comparison and coordination between DFID and other agencies’ activities (coherence, comparative advantage, clear division of roles).</p> <p>=> look also at how TCB needs and supply are prioritized.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Outputs delivered according to plan, budget and schedule ▪ Relationship between the inputs and the outputs ▪ Donor coordination ▪ Is the programme focused? ▪ Selection of recipients ▪ Adequate needs assessment 	<p>The input/output ratio and more generally the cost of a programme in relation to the results attained.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Costs of organisation and delivery of courses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ITC performance : suitability of ITC’s internal systems and human and financial resources. ▪ Collaboration with other agencies at HDQ/field level; ▪ Cost-benefit ratio of multilateral vs. bilateral programmes; ▪ Timeframe; ▪ External factors influencing success (e.g. location; level of development) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Benefits (current achievements vs. costs of the IF and partnership agencies) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Punctuality ▪ The capacity of the teams supplying the inputs needed for the activities. ▪ The extent to which those inputs can be transformed into products or results ▪ Linkage and coherence between the various activities executed by one donor, on the one hand, and the links between these activities and those of other bilateral and multilateral donors on the other.

World Bank (TPR and TD; bi- and multilateral)	EC (TPR and TD; bi- and regional programmes)	UK (TPR and TD; bi- and multilateral programmes)	The Netherlands (TPR only; multilateral)	UNCTAD (multilateral)	WTO (TPR only; bilateral)	ITC (multilateral)	IF (multilateral)	DAC Guidelines
E F F E C T I V E N E S S / I M P A C T								
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Eff:</i> Extent to which indiv project objectives are achieved. ▪ <i>Impact on:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ economic growth ▪ job creation ▪ poverty reduction ⇒ Attempt to identify additional internal and external factors that have contributed to success (e.g. beneficiary government leadership; other donor interventions; uncontrollable external factors) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Eff:</i> Capacity to contribute to the 4 intermediary objectives (mainstreaming; trade-related reforms/RTAs; negotiation capacity; productive sector capacity) ▪ Co-ordination with other donors ▪ Coherence with other EC activities (e.g. CSPs, regional TCB programs) ▪ <i>Impact on:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Expansion and diversification of external trade ▪ Position of the current balance of payments account ▪ FDI 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contribution of DFID projects vs. other factors: ⇒ effectiveness of different components (e.g. training; equipment); ⇒ effectiveness of gender/poverty focus. ▪ Different indicators for TD and TPR projects. ⇒ TPR: human/institutional capacity; change in trade policy; link to poverty. ⇒ TD: project-specific 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contribution to national policy process/T&D policy formulation- 1. Ability to identify trade policy interest and align short and long term needs 2. Contribution to dialogue/participatory governance ⇒ Contribution to knowledge and capacities of individual trade officials ▪ Contribution to negotiating capacity and implementation of trade agreements ▪ Contribution to overall economic governance ▪ Degree of ownership by beneficiaries. 	<p><i>Eff:</i> Objectives defined prior to the implementation of a programme have indeed been achieved.</p> <p><i>Impact:</i> The effect of a programme on national, social and economic development or in a specific domain such as trade expansion or debt management savings.</p> <p>⇒ Better coordination among donors + ⇒ Improved management within UNCTAD would result in greater effectiveness and impact.</p>	Impact on the participants, working environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Capacity to meet/set objectives (incl. a review of how clear and measurable the initial objectives are). ▪ Contribution to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. national trade policies & strategies; 2. infrastructure for trade promotion/im-port management/export development; 3. trade support services; 4. training institutions 5. enterprise level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contribution to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. mainstreaming 2. increased awareness of the importance of trade for development 3. internal, inter-ministerial dialogue ▪ Degree of ownership ▪ Degree of donor co-ordination / partnership in the delivery of TCB 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Eff:</i>: extent to which objectives have been attained and products delivered.

World Bank (TPR and TD; bi- and multilateral)	EC (TPR and TD; bi- and regional programmes)	UK (TPR and TD; bi- and multilateral programmes)	The Netherlands (TPR only; multilateral)	UNCTAD (multilateral)	WTO (TPR only; bilateral)	ITC (multilateral)	IF (multilateral)	DAC Guidelines
I N S T I T U T I O N A L D E V E L O P M E N T								
Development of trade-related institutions; institutions dealing with regional/multilateral agreements; export promotion institutions.			Link between human and institutional capacity building				Human and institutional capacity building (e.g. IF Focal Point)	Human and institutional capacity building at both national and regional levels.
S U S T A I N A B I L I T Y								
Resistance over time: the extent to which outputs and impact continue after external support has ended (incl. degree of ownership).		Financial, political, institutional		The survival potential of programmes once support has been terminated. (e.g. financial, networking, managerial, substantive or operational sustainability).				Sustainability of activities in relation to available resources

Table 4- Specific outcome and impact indicators used (updated version)

Trade Policy and Regulations	Trade Development
<p>1. Objective: Strengthen institutional capacities for (trade) policy/strategy formulation and implementation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No. of national consultative bodies incl. with other relevant Ministries, private sector associations and civil society; ▪ Degree of sustained participation in those bodies; ▪ No. of sustainable business associations interacting amongst themselves and with government. ▪ Existence of strategies for implementation; ▪ Degree of progress in implementation; ▪ Degree of clear division of labour between stakeholders. 	<p>1. Objective: Support the development and implementation of export strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existence and degree of implementation of a comprehensive and coherent (national/sectoral) export strategy. ▪ Degree of consultation with the private sector (see left).
<p>2. Objective: Enhance implementation/compliance with WTO agreements and standards or other trade agreements/commitments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Timeframe of implementation/ adapting domestic legislation; ▪ Available local support; ▪ Degree of consultation with the private sector/civil society. 	<p>2. Objective: Strengthen trade support services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No. of support structures and range of services provided; ▪ Level of co-ordination between support structures; ▪ Use, relevance and efficiency of services provided.
<p>3. Objective: Enhance capacity to participate in/ shape the multilateral trading system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Degree of participation in negotiations/meetings; ▪ No. of bilateral/regional agreements negotiated; ▪ No. of national coordination mechanisms on WTO/specific Regional Trade Agreement (RTA) matters; ▪ No. of cases brought to WTO DSB; ▪ Timeframe/ progress in accession. 	<p>3. Objective: Enhance export performance and diversification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Export volume and export growth rate ▪ Share of exports of a sector, or of the economy as a whole, in world trade. ▪ Share of exports of targeted firms. ▪ Change in export structure ▪ Change in share of value-addition to exports
<p>4. Objective: Support trade reforms: no. of reforms & regulatory adjustments undertaken.</p>	<p>4. Objective: Increase the importance of trade for the economy (integration in world economy):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Trade as share of GDP
<p>5. Objective: Support “mainstreaming”: i.e. links between trade policies/ objectives/ action plans and national economic policy and development/poverty reduction strategies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To what degree are trade objectives/IF Action Plans integrated into national economic plans/ development plans or PRSPs? ▪ Are there joint committees/ consultations between the IF/trade policy teams and PRSP teams? ▪ Are there joint donor round tables for the IF and PRSP? 	<p>5. Objective: Improve firm-level (business) practices and capacities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Change in productivity or gross profit margin; ▪ Degree of compliance with standards and ability to obtain certification; ▪ No. of joint ventures/ partnerships with other firms.
<p>6. Objective: Strengthen capacity to produce and access coherent and sound local statistics, research and information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No. of trade research centres; ▪ No. of trade policy networks/ degree of co-operation between the different national/regional research centres ; ▪ Quantity and quality of data collected; ▪ No. of trade policy papers produced; ▪ Degree of access to info for the private sector ▪ Degree of use of local statistics/research in policy-making 	<p>6. Objective: Support regulatory (sector-specific) adjustments (improve business climate):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No. and quality of new regulations or laws.
<p>7. Objective: Improve “trade facilitation”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Customs clearance time; ▪ Efficiency of the customs institutions (...) 	<p>7. Objective: Support employment and income increase:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No. of jobs created in a sector/ the economy. ▪ Change in income of those producing export goods.
	<p>8. Objective: Improve access to trade finance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No. and quality of specialized financial services (e.g. credits) for local exporters/ importers; ▪ No. of guarantees and revolving credit facilities for local banks. ▪ No. of trade finance specialists in local banks.
	<p>9. Objective: Support infrastructure development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No. of infrastructure impediments; ▪ Availability and cost of transportation; ▪ No. of storage facilities.

FINAL PARTICIPANTS LIST

INFORMAL EXPERTS' MEETING: TRADE CAPACITY BUILDING RESULTS MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT

16 June 2004

I. OECD member states or permanent delegations

Belgium	Mme Françoise RENIER Conseiller adjoint Direction Générale de la Coopération au Développement Programmes Multilatéraux et Européens Nations Unies et Organisations Internationales 6 rue Bréderode, B-1000 Brussels, Belgium	Tel: +32 2 519 07 18 Fax: +32 2 519 05 85 e-mail: francoise.renier@diplobel.fed.be
Denmark	Ms. Esther LONSTRUP Evaluation Officer Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2 Asiatisk Plads, DK-1448 Copenhagen, Denmark	Tel: +45 33 92 10 41 Fax: +45 33 92 16 50 e-mail: estlon@um.dk
EC	M. Andrea NICOLAJ DG Commerce - European Commission 200 rue de la Loi, Bruxelles, Belgium	Tel: 32 22 96 7319 Fax: 32 22 99 0000 e-mail: Andrea.NICOLAJ@cec.eu.int
EC	Mrs. True SCHEDVIN EuropeAid, European Commission J-54, 00/91, Bruxelles, Belgium	Tel: +32 2 299 9824 Fax: +32 2 299 2912 e-mail: True.SCHEDVIN@cec.eu.int
Germany	Mr. Wolfgang ZEHENDER Senior Advisor/Programme Coordinator Trade and Investment Promotion GTZ German Technical Cooperation Postfach 5180, D-65726 Eschborn, Germany	Tel: + 49 6196 79 1250 Fax: + 49 6196 79 6150 e-mail: wolfgang.zehender@gtz.de
Italy	Ms. Eleonora AVAGLIANO, Stagiaire Permanent Delegation of Italy to the OECD	e-mail: eleonora.avagliano@ rappocse.org
Japan	Ms. Reiko KAWAMURA Advisor for Development Permanent Delegation of Japan to the OECD 11 avenue Hoche, 75008 Paris, France	Tel: 01 53 76 61 59 Fax: 01 45 63 05 44 e-mail: kawamura@deljp-ocde.fr
Japan	Mrs. Maki MARUYAMA Programme Analyst Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) 8, rue Sainte-Anne, 75001 Paris, France	Tel: +33 1 40 20 04 21 Fax: + 33 1 40 20 97 68 e-mail: maruyama@jica.fr

The Netherlands	Mr. Otto HOSPES Evaluator, Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Tel: +31-(0)70-3485413 Fax: +31-(0)70-3486336 e-mail: otto.hospes@minbuza.nl
Switzerland	Ms. Lorence ANSERMET Secrétariat d'Etat à l'Economie Berne, Switzerland	Tel: 41 31 324 08 17 Fax: 41 31 324 09 54 e-mail: lorence.ansermet@seco.admin.ch
United Kingdom	Ms. Sue BASSETT Department for International Development (DFID) 1 Palace Street SW1E5HE London, United Kingdom	Tel: +44 (0) 20 7023 0573 Fax: +44(0) 20 7023 0470 e-mail: s-bassett@dfid.gov.uk
United States	Mr. Michael SHEA U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) 1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Suite 1425, 20004 Washington	Tel: +1 202.661.5806 Fax: +1 202.661.5890 e-mail: mshea@dis.cdie.org

II. International Organizations

European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM)	Dr. Sanoussi BILAL Trade Programme European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM) 21, O.L. Vrouweplein, NL 6211 Maastricht, Netherlands	Tel: +31 43 350 29 23 Fax: + 31 43 350 29 02 e-mail: sb@ecdpm.org
International Trade Center	Mr. Ashish SHAH Senior Programme Officer, International Trade Center	e-mail: shah@intracen.org
World Bank	Ms. Yvonne TSIKATA Lead Economist/Evaluator The World Bank 1818 H Street NW, 20433 Washington, USA	Tel: +1 (202) 473-3970 Fax: + 1 (202) 522-3124 e-mail: ytsikata@worldbank.org
World Trade Organization (WTO)	Mr. György SIMONICS Evaluation Officer in TCA Consultant/Self-Employed World Trade Organisation (WTO) Ernest Pictet; 14, 1203 Geneva, Switzerland	Tel: +41 22 739 5278 e-mail: gyorgy.simonics@wto.org

III. OECD

OECD	Richard MANNING DAC Chairman 2, rue André Pascal, 75016 Paris, France	Tel: 01 45 24 01 90 70 Fax: 33-1 44 30 61 41 e-mail: Richard.MANNING@OECD.ORG
-------------	---	---

OECD	Mr. Fred ROOS 2, rue André Pascal, 75016 Paris, France	Tel: 01 45 24 90 20 e-mail: Fred.ROOS@oecd.org
OECD	Ms. Ebba DOHLMAN DCD/COH 2, rue André Pascal, 75016 Paris, France	Tel: 01 45 24 98 48 e-mail: Ebba.DOHLMAN@oecd.org
OECD	Mr. Federico BONAGLIA Economist/Analyst 2, rue André Pascal, 75016 Paris, France	Tel: 01 45 24 96 03 Fax: 01 45 24 79 43 e-mail: Federico.BONAGLIA@oecd.org
OECD	Mr. Kiichiro FUKASAKU Counsellor 2, rue André Pascal, 75016 Paris, France	Tel: 01 45 24 94 99 e-mail: Kiichiro.FUKASAKU@oecd.org
OECD	Mme Caroline LESSER 2, rue André Pascal, 75016 Paris, France	Tel: 01 45 24 90 46 e-mail: Caroline.LESSER@oecd.org
OECD	Mr. Andrea LIVERANI 2, rue André Pascal, 75016 Paris, France	Tel: 01 45 24 90 02 e-mail: Andrea.LIVERANI@oecd.org
OECD	Mr. Hans LUNDGREN 2, rue André Pascal, 75016 Paris, France	Tel: 01 45 24 90 59 e-mail: Hans.LUNDGREN@oecd.org
OECD	Mr. Bill NICOL 2, rue André Pascal, 75016 Paris, France	Tel: 01 45 24 91 37 e-mail: william.nicol@oecd.org

IV. Other

Aide à la Decision Economique (ADE)	Dr. Tanguy DE BIOLLEY Director Aide à la Decision Economique (ADE) Traverse d'Esopo 6 Bte 9 1348 Louvain la Neuve, Belgium	Tel: 00 32 10 45 45 10 Fax: 00 32 10 45 40 99 e-mail: tanguy.debiolley@ade.be
ECORYS/NEI	Mr. Paul WIJMENGA evaluator, ECORYS/NEI, Netherlands	e-mail: paul.wijmenga@ecorys.com
ECORYS/NEI	Ms. Nora PLAISIER Consultant, Researcher NEI, Netherlands	e-mail: plaisiern@nei.nl
Nils Boesen A/S	Mr. Nils BOESEN Consultant	Tel: +4546350808 e-mail: mail@nilsboesen.dk

**North-South
Institute**

Ms. Ann WESTON
Vice-President & Research Coordinator
North-South Institute
55, Murray Street, Suite 200
K1N 5M3 OTTAWA, Canada

Tel: 00 1-613-241 3535
Fax: 00 1-613-241 7435
e-mail: aweston@nsi-ins.ca

Other

Mr. Murray SMITH
Leader of the evaluation team for ITC evaluation

e-mail: itcevaluation@yahoo.com