



DONOR QUESTIONNAIRE ON AID FOR TRADE

1 WHAT IS YOUR AID FOR TRADE STRATEGY?

Q1.1 Do you have an operational Aid for Trade strategy? Does it have a “pro-poor” focus? What are its key objectives and delivery/implementation modes? (Please break down by types of aid: "multilateral contributions" / "trust funds" / "budget support" / "other bilateral")

Please describe and exemplify. If applicable, feel free to refer to your 2007 response.

Korea does not have an explicit separate Aid for Trade strategy. However, we consider objects which Aid for Trade strategy pursues in performing development projects or technical cooperation. For example, some of our projects aim to foster small and medium enterprises that can contribute to diversity of domestic industries and create employment, and some other projects seek to foster exports, including help in making policies for export promotion.

Q1.2 If your Aid for Trade Strategy has evolved since 2007, please describe the changes and/or new focuses.

Please describe and exemplify.

Q1.3 Have you articulated a set of best practices in the design and/or delivery of Aid for Trade?

Yes

No

Not sure/Not applicable

If yes, what form does this best practice guidance take?

Please describe and exemplify.

2 HOW MUCH AID FOR TRADE DO YOU PROVIDE?

For CRS Reporting Donors

Q2.1 Does the attached CRS profile accurately reflect the volume of your Aid for Trade?

Yes

No

If no, please provide further details of your Aid for Trade activities for 2006 and 2007.

Please add any data that are missing in their appropriate CRS categories, including those activities that should be considered as Aid for Trade under the category of "Other Trade-related Needs" and describe, if applicable, the method used to identify trade-related activities in the relevant CRS categories. Please also provide any activities that may fall under the new category of "Trade-related Adjustment" for 2006.

See attached file.

For non-CRS Reporting Donors

**Q2.1 How much Aid for Trade did you provide in each of 2006 and 2007?
Please also indicate the volume as percentage share of your total ODA.**

Please use the WTO Task Force definition and include estimates of the value of in-kind Aid for Trade such as technical cooperation programmes.

For All Donor Agencies

Q2.2 Do you have indicative forward spending plans that include estimates on Aid for Trade?

Yes

No

Not sure/Not applicable

If yes, please provide details of your indicative forward Aid for Trade spending plan.

Please delineate the plan per Aid for Trade category.

For Donors who had made Aid for Trade pledges

Q2.3 Please describe how you are meeting your pledges? And how much progress in delivering your final pledges do you expect to have made in 2008 and 2009?

Please provide details and evidence in accordance with your accountability mechanism.

Korea has committed to fund 1 million USD during 2007-2008(2 year plan) at the pledging conference for 'the Enhanced Integrated Framework for Trade-Related Technical Assistance to LDCs(EIF)'. We have met all pledges we made.

For Multilateral Donors

Q2.4 Please describe how funding for your Aid for Trade activities is evolving
[e.g. share of activities funded from your agency's core (regular budget) vs. non-core (earmarked) resources, including multi-donor funds; likely trends in these categories].

Please describe.

Please feel free to provide any other relevant information in relation to the volume of your Aid for Trade.

3 IMPLEMENTATION: HOW ARE YOU DELIVERING AID FOR TRADE?

Mainstreaming and Ownership

Q3.1 What measures have you undertaken to mainstream Aid for Trade in your overall assistance strategy?

Please describe and exemplify.

Q3.2 In how many of the partner countries you support, are Aid for Trade concerns an important part of your policy dialogue with them (based on your best estimate)?

- | | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> less than 25% | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 25% to 50% | <input type="checkbox"/> 50% to 75% | <input type="checkbox"/> above 75% | <input type="checkbox"/> Not sure / Not applicable |
|--|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|

Q3.3 How many of your country assistance strategies contain trade or Aid for Trade elements (based on your best estimate)?

- | | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> less than 25% | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 25% to 50% | <input type="checkbox"/> 50% to 75% | <input type="checkbox"/> above 75% | <input type="checkbox"/> Not sure / Not applicable |
|--|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|

Q3.4 Has demand for Aid for Trade increased from partner countries since 2005?

- | | | | | |
|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Significantly increased | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Increased | <input type="checkbox"/> Little / no change | <input type="checkbox"/> Declined | <input type="checkbox"/> Not sure / Not applicable |
|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|--|

If increased, from which countries / regions, and for which Aid for Trade categories / sectors?

Please describe and exemplify.

The amount of commitments in the transport and energy sectors has increased dramatically since 2005.

If increased, what steps have you taken to strengthen your capacity to respond to increasing demand for Aid for Trade from partner countries? Tick the box of all that apply:

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Increased aid resources |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Strengthened in-house trade expertise |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Improved training, tool-kits and/or guidelines for Aid for Trade programming |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Increased awareness among policy-makers and practitioners at the HQ and the field |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Strengthened political commitment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Increased coordination among donors (e.g. joint assessment, joint delivery, etc.) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Please feel free to add other steps you have taken</i> |

Please feel free to provide any other relevant information in relation to mainstreaming and ownership.

Working with Others: Harmonisation and Alignment

Q3.5 In how many of the partner countries you support, have you contributed to the following joint donor initiatives?

| | < 10% | 10-30% | > 30% |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Joint needs assessment | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Joint Aid for Trade strategy formulation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Joint Aid for Trade programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Pool funding | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Joint monitoring and evaluation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Delegated cooperation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Q3.6 Do you have a specific approach to South-South and/or trilateral cooperation in Aid for Trade?

Yes

No

Not sure/Not applicable

If yes, what are its key elements or particular focuses?

Please describe and exemplify.

Q3.7 How much of your Aid for Trade is aligned with your partners' country systems (based on your best estimate)?

- | | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> less than 25% | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 25% to 50% | <input type="checkbox"/> 50% to 75% | <input type="checkbox"/> above 75% | <input type="checkbox"/> Not sure / Not applicable |
|--|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|

Please feel free to provide any other relevant information in relation to harmonisation and alignment.

4 MONITORING RESULTS, EVALUATION AND MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Q4.1 Does your Strategy include specific monitoring and evaluation guidelines for Aid for Trade programmes?

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Specific to Aid for Trade | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Generic guidelines |
|--|--|

If you do have specific guidelines, please provide the details of your Aid for Trade M&E framework. How often do you review progress towards your strategy objectives? Who do you report to?

Please describe and exemplify.

Q4.2 Do you regularly monitor the potential trade impact of your aid projects / programmes?

- | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Not sure/Not applicable |
|---|-----------------------------|--|

If yes, please describe how.

Please describe and exemplify.

Korea has generic guidelines for Korea's aid including Aid for Trade related projects/programmes and we're monitoring the impact of aid projects/programmes regularly.

Q4.3 Do you have plans to improve the evaluation of your Aid for Trade programmes?

Please describe and exemplify.

Korea renewed its development cooperation evaluation guidelines last year and we will continuously make efforts to ensure that the impact of our aid including trade related area is better assessed.

Q4.4 Have you carried out or do you plan to carry out an impact assessment of your Aid for Trade programmes?

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes: please indicate when: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Not sure/Not applicable |
|---|--|--|

Q4.5 Do you involve partner country stakeholders in developing measurable objectives/indicators to assess the quality of your Aid for Trade programmes?

| | | |
|---|-----------------------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Not sure/Not applicable |
|---|-----------------------------|--|

If yes, please describe the indicators used.

Please describe and exemplify.

When we develop measurable objectives/indicators in generic monitoring and evaluation guidelines, we do consider requests of the partner country and make adjustments if needed. One example includes the Project Performance Indicators (PPIs) for monitoring potential impact of our aid projects including Aid for Trade related sectors.

Q4.6 Have you undertaken joint evaluations of your Aid for Trade with your partner country stakeholders?

| | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Not sure/Not applicable |
|------------------------------|--|--|

If yes, please describe when and the results of the evaluation.

Please describe and exemplify.

Please feel free to provide any other relevant information in relation to monitoring, evaluation and mutual accountability.

5 REGIONAL DIMENSION

Q5.1 How important is the regional dimension in your Aid for Trade strategy?

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Essential element | <input type="checkbox"/> Important element | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor element | <input type="checkbox"/> Not present | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not sure / Not applicable |
|--|--|--|--------------------------------------|---|

If essential or important, please describe how your Aid for Trade strategy addresses regional challenges.

Please describe and exemplify.

Korea has paid little attention to the regional dimension in Aid for Trade strategy so far.

Q5.2 Which of the following factors are important for determining whether or not to support particular regions or regional programmes? Please list in the order of importance.

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Relevance to ongoing regional trade agreements / negotiations |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Regional proximity / support to neighbouring regional economic integration processes |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Cultural, linguistic or historical ties with the region |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Existence of a viable counterpart at regional level |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Request for assistance from a regional body |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Availability of a clearly defined regional development strategy |

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Geographical concentration of donor activities |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Other, please describe</i> |

Q5.3 By how much has the volume of your regional Aid for Trade increased since 2005?

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Declined | <input type="checkbox"/> By less than 5% | <input type="checkbox"/> By 5 to 15% | <input type="checkbox"/> By 15 to 30% | <input type="checkbox"/> More than 30% |
|-----------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|

Q5.4 In which assistance categories are you particularly active at regional level?

| | Frequently | Occasionally | Rarely | Not sure / Not applicable |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| Training (trade negotiations/WTO rules) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Trade facilitation | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Development of cross-border infrastructure | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Capacity building of regional organisations | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Other, please describe and exemplify

Q5.5 What are the most important challenges in implementing regional Aid for Trade?
Please list in the order of importance.

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Lack of (or weak) articulated demands for regional Aid for Trade |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Lack of coherence between national and regional priorities |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Lack of credible lending authorities at regional level |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Lack of effective coordination at regional level |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Difficulties of monitoring and evaluating results at regional level |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Lack of credible mutual accountability mechanisms at regional level |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <i>Other, please describe and exemplify</i> |

Q5.6 Has the demand for regional Aid for Trade increased since 2005?

| | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Significantly increased | <input type="checkbox"/> Increased | <input type="checkbox"/> Little / no change | <input type="checkbox"/> Declined | <input type="checkbox"/> Not sure/ Not applicable |
|--|------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|

If yes, in which regions and for which activities has it increased the most?

Please describe and exemplify.

Please feel free to provide any other relevant information in relation to regional Aid for Trade.

| Aid-for-Trade Flows: CRS Proxies | | | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| ODA: USD thousands, 2006 constant prices | | | | | | |
| Country: | Korea | | Commitments | | Disbursements | |
| CRS purpose codes | | 2002-05 average | 2006 | 2007 | 2006 | 2007 |
| TRADE POLICY AND REGULATIONS and TRADE-RELATED ADJUSTMENT | | | | | | |
| 33110 | Trade Policy and administrative management | -- | 2 145 | 2 504 | 2 145 | 1 481 |
| 33120 | Trade facilitation | -- | 578 | 579 | 578 | 579 |
| 33130 | Regional trade agreements (RTAs) | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 33140 | Multilateral trade negotiations | -- | 1 416 | 1 324 | 1 416 | 1 056 |
| 33150 | TRADE-RELATED ADJUSTMENT | -- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 33181 | Trade education/training | -- | 0 | 1 199 | 0 | 1 199 |
| | sub-total | -- | 4 139 | 5 606 | 4 139 | 4 315 |
| ECONOMIC INFRASTRUCTURE | | | | | | |
| 21010 to 21081 | Transport and storage | -- | 99 535 | 228 339 | 38 201 | 52 469 |
| 22010 to 22040 | Communications | -- | 65 248 | 85 419 | 36 800 | 39 211 |
| 23010 to 23082 | Energy supply and generation | -- | 4 979 | 72 216 | 37 353 | 27 810 |
| | sub-total | -- | 169 763 | 385 974 | 112 354 | 119 490 |
| BUILDING PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY <i>(Includes Trade Development activities (1))</i> | | | | | | |
| 25010 | Business and other services | -- | 543 | 977 | 544 | 977 |
| 24010 to 24081 | Banking and financial services | -- | 434 | 3 020 | 434 | 1 850 |
| 31110 to 31195 | Agriculture | -- | 9 818 | 91 278 | 21 534 | 24 518 |
| 31210 to 31291 | Forestry | -- | 1 507 | 9 676 | 1 507 | 1 346 |
| 31310 to 31391 | Fishing | -- | 478 | 1 048 | 478 | 1 048 |
| 32110 to 32182 | Industry | -- | 11 756 | 11 883 | 9 883 | 11 328 |
| 32210 to 32268 | Mineral resources and mining | -- | 270 | 153 | 270 | 153 |
| 33210 | Tourism | -- | 202 | 1 294 | 202 | 340 |
| | sub-total | -- | 25 009 | 119 329 | 34 853 | 41 560 |
| not applicable | Focus on Trade Development (1): | | | | | |
| | Principal objective | | | not used | | not used |
| | Significant objective | | | not used | | not used |
| | sub-total | | | | | |
| OTHER TRADE RELATED NEEDS (2) <i>(USD thousands or national currency)</i> | | | | | | |
| not applicable | <i>These data will form part of donors' reporting to the WTO under the three-tier monitoring system.</i> | | | | | |
| TOTAL AID-for-TRADE | | -- | 198 911 | 510 909 | 151 347 | 165 365 |
| TOTAL SECTOR ALLOCABLE ODA | | -- | 616 689 | 944 441 | 342 811 | 451 588 |

Source: OECD, Creditor Reporting System

1. Trade development activities are identified in the CRS via the Trade Development policy marker. The amounts shown represent Productive Capacity building activities marked as contributing principally or significantly to trade development. Note however that some CRS reporting donors may not use the Trade Development policy marker and that the amounts presented under this category cannot be added up when reporting on the global flows.

2. The data covered under this category are not separately identifiable as AFT within the CRS. If so desired, your government is invited to complete the columns for 2007 data (commitments and disbursements) and to provide the relevant CRS sectors.