Annex I
Key Data

Table A1.1. Aid for trade (bilateral and multilateral) by category (2002-05)
Commitments, USD million (2005 constant prices)

	2002	2003	2004	2005	Baseline average (2002-2005) volume & Share
Trade Policy & Regulations	**817**	**614**	**478**	**654**	**641**
as % of sector allocable ODA	*1,6*	*1,0*	*0,7*	*1,0*	*1,1*
Economic infrastructure					
Transport & Storage	4 955	4 942	6 600	7 325	5 956
Communications	318	563	848	441	543
Energy	4 148	4 230	6 407	4 408	4 798
sub-total	**9 421**	**9 735**	**13 855**	**12 174**	**11 296**
as % of sector allocable ODA	*18,5*	*16,2*	*19,8*	*18,0*	*18,1*
Productive capacity building (1)					
Banking & Financial Services	1 227	1 332	1 210	1 263	1 258
Business & Other Services	1 126	1 421	1 818	1 056	1 355
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing	3 788	4 623	4 172	4 457	4 260
Industry, Mining & Construction	1 402	1 921	2 496	1 977	1 949
Tourism	45	91	63	164	91
sub-total	**7 587**	**9 388**	**9 759**	**8 918**	**8 913**
as % of sector allocable ODA	*14,9*	*15,6*	*13,9*	*13,2*	*14,4*
Total aid for trade	**17 826**	**19 738**	**24 092**	**21 745**	**20 850**
Sector allocable ODA	**51 051**	**60 232**	**69 973**	**67 528**	**62 196**
Aid for trade as % of sector allocable ODA	*34,9*	*32,8*	*34,4*	*32,2*	*33,6*

(1) Productive capacity building includes trade development.

Source: OECD Creditor Reporting System

Table A1.2. Aid for trade: by donor and major category (2002-05 average)
Commitments, USD million (2005 constant prices)

	Trade policy & regulations	Economic infra-structure	Productive capacity building (1)	Total aid for trade	Total aid for trade as share of donor sector allocable ODA
Australia	7,1	51	97	155	15,6
Austria	0,1	21	19	41	17,1
Belgium	3,6	48	158	210	26,8
Canada	16,2	38	226	280	20,3
Denmark	0,5	181	193	374	37,3
Finland	2,1	26	41	70	20,4
France	3,9	330	325	660	21,9
Germany	13,3	520	606	1140	27,3
Greece	0,3	7	5	12	7,6
Ireland	0,1	7	21	28	9,7
Italy	2,2	137	86	225	43,3
Japan	50,8	3749	964	4764	62,3
Luxembourg	0,2	1	13	14	12,1
Netherlands	16,5	130	365	512	24,8
New Zealand	1,4	3	12	17	13,9
Norway	8,0	84	141	233	19,0
Portugal	0,1	33	8	41	19,9
Spain	1,3	229	158	388	34,3
Sweden	15,0	95	101	210	17,1
Switzerland	27,9	30	165	222	33,9
United Kingdom	26,8	298	386	711	22,9
United States	219,7	1581	1622	3423	25,4
Total DAC countries	**417**	**7601**	**5712**	**13731**	**31,3**
AfDF	43	240	291	574	48,0
AsDF	31	330	363	724	49,1
EC	171	1261	971	2403	36,4
IDA	32	1747	1320	3099	47,3
IDB Special Fund	4	110	108	222	48,2
IFAD	..	15	146	161	40,1

(1) Productive capacity building includes trade development.

Source: OECD Creditor Reporting System

Table A1.3. The 25 highest recipients of aid for trade during 2002-05

Commitments, USD million (2005 constant prices) (1)

	Region	Income Group	2002	2003	2004	2005	Baseline average 2002-2005 (volume)	AfT over total world AfT (%) (2)	AfT over total sectoral ODA	Aid as a percentage GNI (2005)
Viet Nam	Asia	Other Low Income	1 455	1 130	1 495	1 484	1 391	9	51	3,7
India	Asia	Other Low Income	1 196	1 462	1 757	1 097	1 378	9	38	0,2
Indonesia	Asia	Lower-Middle	596	1 366	1 322	925	1 052	7	52	0,9
China	Asia	Lower-Middle	858	1 070	506	399	708	4	29	0,1
Bangladesh	Asia	Least-Developed	509	863	777	347	624	4	32	2,1
Egypt	Africa	Lower-Middle	619	480	540	389	507	3	51	1,0
Ethiopia	Africa	Least-Developed	367	542	422	564	474	3	42	17,1
Sri Lanka	Asia	Lower-Middle	591	373	336	364	416	3	54	5,1
Serbia	Europe	Lower-Middle	376	369	351	364	365	2	35	..
Pakistan	Asia	Other Low Income	383	508	186	292	342	2	36	1,5
Thailand	Asia	Lower-Middle	437	92	444	390	341	2	61	-0,1
Tanzania	Africa	Least-Developed	203	210	361	487	315	2	24	12,2
Philippines	Asia	Lower-Middle	751	172	156	173	313	2	65	0,5
Kenya	Africa	Other Low Income	30	260	529	360	295	2	27	4,0
Morocco	Africa	Lower-Middle	237	337	293	241	277	2	28	1,3
Mozambique	Africa	Least-Developed	202	328	280	289	275	2	37	20,1
Madagascar	Africa	Least-Developed	160	407	164	269	250	2	58	18,7
Ghana	Africa	Other Low Income	174	259	239	239	228	1	24	10,6
Uganda	Africa	Least-Developed	243	66	321	229	215	1	29	14,0
Bolivia	America	Lower-Middle	220	318	164	137	210	1	35	6,4
Senegal	Africa	Least-Developed	84	239	213	247	196	1	40	8,5
Burkina Faso	Africa	Least-Developed	67	379	173	147	192	1	44	11,6
Tunisia	Africa	Lower-Middle	521	64	106	59	188	1	42	1,4
Nigeria	Africa	Other Low Income	186	78	234	240	185	1	14	7,6
Zambia	Africa	Least-Developed	136	162	243	151	173	1	29	13,9
TOTAL of 25			**10 600**	**11 534**	**11 610**	**9 882**	**10 906**	**69,1**		

(1) These are the 25 countries that, averaged over the four-year period, received most aid for trade.

(2) Calculated as the average of the share in each of the four years.

Note: AfT: aid for trade; GNI: gross national income

Source: OECD Creditor Reporting System and World Development Indicators.

Table A1.4. Regional distribution of aid for trade (2002-05)
Commitments, USD million (2005 constant prices)

	2002	2003	2004	2005	Baseline average 2002-2005 (volume)	Baseline 2002-2005 (share: %)
Africa						
Trade policy and regulations	525	170	152	313	290	1
Economic infrastructure	2 438	3 399	3 252	3 742	3 208	15
Productive capacity building (1)	2 377	3 019	2 955	2 588	2 735	13
Sub-total					6 232	30
America						
Trade policy and regulations	31	36	84	75	57	0
Economic infrastructure	503	309	346	539	424	2
Productive capacity building (1)	1 086	870	1 083	830	967	5
Sub-total					1 448	7
Asia						
Trade policy and regulations	146	164	112	135	139	1
Economic infrastructure	5 445	5 305	9 495	6 193	6 610	32
Productive capacity building (1)	2 554	4 385	4 408	4 096	3 861	19
Sub-total					10 610	51
Europe						
Trade policy and regulations	3	25	21	23	18	0
Economic infrastructure	531	390	167	1 372	615	3
Productive capacity building (1)	641	238	230	420	382	2
Sub-total					1 015	5
Oceania						
Trade policy and regulations	3	2	2	2	3	0
Economic infrastructure	34	98	218	90	110	1
Productive capacity building (1)	144	62	52	110	92	0
Sub-total					204	1
Global programmes						
Trade policy and regulations	109	217	106	105	134	1
Economic infrastructure	471	235	377	239	330	2
Productive capacity building (1)	786	814	1 032	873	876	4
Sub-total					1 341	6
Total aid for trade	**17 826**	**19 738**	**24 092**	**21 745**	**20 850**	**100**

(1) Productive capacity building includes trade development.

Source: OECD Creditor Reporting System and WTO/OECD Trade Capacity Building Database

Table A1.5. Distribution of aid for trade by income group (2002-05)
Commitments, USD million (2005 constant prices)

	2002	2003	2004	2005	Baseline average 2002-2005 (volume)	Baseline 2002-2005 (share: %)
Least developed countries						
Trade policy and regulations	34	54	29	71	47	0,2
Economic infrastructure	1 946	3 047	3 357	3 588	2 985	14,3
Productive capacity building (1)	1 519	2 448	2 392	2 498	2 214	10,6
Sub-total					5 246	25,2
Other low-income countries						
Trade policy and regulations	65	58	36	104	66	0,3
Economic infrastructure	2 695	2 258	3 387	2 341	2 670	12,8
Productive capacity building (1)	1 696	2 012	1 879	1 874	1 865	8,9
Sub-total					4 601	22,1
Lower middle-income countries						
Trade policy and regulations	511	175	180	204	268	1,3
Economic infrastructure	3 786	3 093	6 382	4 510	4 443	21,3
Productive capacity building (1)	2 259	2 973	3 495	2 717	2 861	13,7
Sub-total					7 571	36,3
Upper middle-income countries						
Trade policy and regulations	20	33	24	16	23	0,1
Economic infrastructure	381	466	95	1 169	528	2,5
Productive capacity building (1)	782	372	237	520	478	2,3
Sub-total					1 029	4,9
Regional/ multi-country						
Trade policy and regulations	187	294	209	258	237	1,1
Economic infrastructure	613	871	633	566	671	3,2
Productive capacity building (1)	1 331	1 583	1 756	1 309	1 495	7,2
Sub-total					2 403	11,5
Total aid for trade	**17 826**	**19 738**	**24 092**	**21 745**	**20 850**	**100,0**

(1) Productive capacity building includes trade development.

Source: OECD Creditor Reporting System and WTO/OECD Trade Capacity Building Database

Table A1.6. Multi-country programmes by activity

Commitments, USD million (2005 constant prices) and percentages

	2002	2003	2004	2005	Average 2002-2005
Trade Policy and Regulations	164	284	204	258	227
% of total Trade Policy and Regulations	*20*	*46*	*43*	*39*	*37*
Economic Infrastructure	11774	12489	16882	14493	13909
% of total Economic Infrastructure	*7*	*10*	*6*	*7*	*8*
Building Productive Capacity	1110	1376	1596	1200	1321
% of total Building Productive Capacity	*15*	*15*	*16*	*13*	*15*

Source: OECD Creditor Reporting System

Table A1.7. Multi-country programmes by region

Commitments, USD million (2005 constant prices) and percentages

	2002	2003	2004	2005	Average 2002-2005
Africa	376	1122	719	437	663
America	200	145	122	180	162
Asia	119	148	151	212	157
Europe	34	50	44	47	44
Oceania	18	18	19	40	24
Multi-country, Unspecified	988	896	1193	1025	1026
Total Regional	1736	2379	2248	1942	2076
% of total AFT	*9,7*	*12,1*	*9,3*	*8,9*	*10,0*

Source: OECD Creditor Reporting System

Annex II
Methodological Considerations

The WTO Task Force defined aid for trade in a way that is both broad enough to reflect the diverse trade needs identified by countries, and clear enough to establish a border between aid for trade and other development assistance of which it is a part. More specifically, projects and programmes should be considered as aid for trade if these activities have been identified as trade-related development priorities in the recipient country's national development strategies. At the same time, clear and agreed benchmarks are necessary for reliable global monitoring of aid-for-trade efforts to assure accurate accounting and to assess additionality. The WTO Task Force concluded that aid for trade comprises the following six categories: (a) trade policy and regulations; (b) trade development; (c) trade-related infrastructure; (d) building productive capacity; (e) trade-related adjustment; and (f) other trade-related needs.

To track aid-for-trade flows, data are needed that match, or closely correspond to, these six aid categories. The CRS – a database covering around 90% of all ODA - was recognised as the best data source for such a global tracking function. It was proposed to use the CRS instead of expanding the joint WTO/OECD Trade Capacity Building (TCB) database, which covers a much narrower set of activities. The CRS allows the tracking of aid commitments and disbursements, and provides comparable data across countries and time. The CRS also offers the benefit of an existing data collection - even though the use of this database initially entails the loss of some detail captured in the TCB database. Table A2.4 details the definition and codes of the CRS categories used in this report.

However, the CRS cannot provide data that match exactly all of the above six categories of aid for trade and in some cases it provides proxy measures. Below, we consider the extent of the data coverage for each of the six aid-for-trade categories, as well as ongoing refinements to the CRS data. We also examine why any global data on aid for trade must at this stage be considered approximate and be interpreted with appropriate caution.

i) *Trade development*. The volume of aid committed to trade development is not currently a separate category in the CRS (for this reason, data on trade development in the rest of this report are drawn from the joint WTO/OECD TCB database). Deliberations are ongoing with the donor community regarding approaches to tracking support for trade development in the CRS.

ii) *Trade-related infrastructure*. Aid commitments for trade-related infrastructure are proxied in the CRS by data under the heading "Economic infrastructure". This heading covers data on aid for energy, transport and communications. Why do the CRS data represent a 'proxy' for this Task Force category? The reason is that aid for economic infrastructure might be trade-related in one context but unrelated to trade in another. For instance, an energy project might have a significant trade component in one setting - if primarily servicing a tourism complex for example – but limited or no

trade impact in another – if bringing electricity to rundown urban neighbourhoods. To know how close the CRS proxies are (e.g. how much of the hypothetical energy project relates to trade), the CRS data must be compared with donors' knowledge of the specific features of their infrastructure aid. As noted above, such comparison is a central part of the overall monitoring process.

iii) *Building productive capacity.* Data on commitments of aid for building productive capacity exist under the CRS heading entitled "Building productive capacity". This broad category of aid encompasses some projects that will not have a direct bearing on trade. For example, much support for agriculture involves assistance to subsistence farmers, with little direct impact on trade. Therefore, the approximate character of these data – proxying as they do for trade-specific productive capacity building, and unavoidably overstating this figure – should be borne in mind throughout.

iv) *Trade-related adjustment.* Commitments for trade-related adjustment could be proxied by data under the CRS heading "General budget support". This heading includes data on general contributions to the government budget, support for the implementation of macro-economic reforms (structural adjustment programmes and poverty reduction strategies), and transfers for stabilisation of the balance of payments. Clearly, not all of these have to be trade-related. Work is currently underway with the donor community to create a new CRS code that would specifically distinguish aid commitments for trade-related adjustment.

Tables A2.1, A2.2 and A2.3 in this annex illustrate the magnitudes of flows of aid for general budget across income groups, regions and major recipients. ODA for general budget support averaged USD 5.7 billion a year from 2002-05, some 36% of all the other aid-for-trade categories combined. The World Bank is the largest provider of support in this area, with an annual average of USD 1.7 billion during 2002-05, the European Commission being the next largest donor at USD 0.9 billion. LDCs are by far the largest recipients of general budget support, with more than half the total volume. This predominance reflects weaknesses in a range of economic and institutional conditions in many of the poorest countries. Among the LDCs, Bangladesh, Mozambique, Niger and Tanzania have been major recipients during 2002-05. OLICs and LMICs together accounted for around 20% of all general budget support. The fact that a large number of LDCs are located in Africa explains why, from a regional perspective, Africa is also the major recipient of general budget support.

A noticeable feature in the data is the high degree of concentration of general budget support: in 2005 just ten countries accounted for well over half of all such flows. It is also clear from Table A2.3 that flows within countries over time can exhibit marked variation. Over the 2002-05 period, for instance, flows roughly doubled in Jordan, and halved in Pakistan. The inclusion of general budget support in the overall measure of aid for trade (which is itself an imperfect proxy for trade-related adjustment), would greatly complicate and possibly misinterpret the quantification of aid for trade. Although the flows of general budget support are large, they remain highly concentrated among recipients and volatile.

v) *Other trade-related needs.* No CRS data exist on this category. To estimate the volume of such "other" commitments donors would need to examine aid projects in sectors other than those considered so far – for example in health and education – and indicate what share, if any, of these activities have an important trade component. A health programme, for instance, might permit increased trade from localities where the disease burden was previously a constraint on trade.

Consideration of the above features of the CRS proxies shows that to accurately monitor volumes of aid for trade it is not sufficient to count the volume of aid committed to certain types of programme.

Additional information is needed on specific programme circumstances (for instance what part of an infrastructure project is trade related). Furthermore, data on the Task Force category "Other Trade-Related Needs" cannot be gleaned from the CRS. The estimation of such flows requires that donors indicate the share of activities in social sector programmes deemed to have a significant trade dimension. Overall, comparison of the CRS data with donor and recipient accounts of their aid for trade will help to refine the measurement of aid for trade as defined by the Task Force.

Table A2.1. General budget support by income group
Commitments, USD million (2005 constant prices)

	2002	2003	2004	2005	Average 2002-2005
Least Developed	2857	2766	3135	3171	2982
Other Low Income	2049	907	1586	1062	1401
Low Middle Income	560	1638	465	888	887
Upper Middle Income	232	1083	33	12	340
Unallocated by income	228	119	132	87	142
Total General Budget Support	5925	6513	5351	5220	5752

Table A2.2. General budget support by region
Commitments, USD million (2005 constant prices)

	2002	2003	2004	2005	Average 2002-2005
Africa	3314	2706	3310	3134	3116
America	106	224	311	220	215
Asia	1791	2156	1510	1725	1795
Europe	307	1140	65	17	382
Oceania	181	172	33	40	107
Unallocated/Unspecified	226	115	122	85	137
Total General Budget Support	5925	6513	5351	5220	5752

Table A2.3. Top 10 General budget support recipients
Commitments, USD million (2005 constant prices)

	2002	2003	2004	2005	Average 2002-2005
Pakistan	960	158	435	512	516
Tanzania	378	470	369	418	409
Burkina Faso	274	127	96	391	222
Mozambique	389	98	366	380	308
Ghana	51	460	254	266	258
Bangladesh	0	335	204	200	185
Indonesia	48	22	0	199	67
Viet Nam	12	146	333	197	172
Niger	53	227	13	189	120
Jordan	96	977	36	188	324
% top 10 in total GBS	*38*	*46*	*39*	*56*	*45*

Source: OECD Creditor Reporting System

Table A2.4. CRS categories: codes and definitions

Line Number	Description	Content
TRADE POLICY AND REGULATIONS		
331	Trade Policy and Regulations	Tradepolicy and planning; trade facilitation; regionaltradeagreements; multilateral trade negotiations; multisector wholesale/retailtradeand trade promotion.
ECONOMIC INFRASTRUCTURE		
210	Transport and Storage	Covers road, rail, water and airtransport and storage, whether or not related to transportation.
220	Communications	Includes all communications (post and telecommunications, radio, television, print media), ICT.
230	Energy Generationand Supply	Covers both the productionand distributionof energy. Assistance towards thepeaceful use of nuclear energy is reportable as ODA. This includes the construction and decommissioning of nuclearpowerreactors for civilian power supply, thedevelopment orsupply of medicalisotopes, andfood irradiation and other industrial and commercial applications. Nuclear weapons research and other military applications of nucleartechnology are excluded.
BUILDING PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY		
250	Business and Other Services	Includes business development and activities aimed at improving the business climate; privatisation.
240	Bankingand Financial Services	Covers assistance to finance and banking in both formal and informal sectors.
311	Agriculture	Including agriculture sector policy, agricultural development and inputs, management of landand agricultural waterresources, crops and livestock population, agrarian reform, agricultural credit, co-operatives and research as wellas veterinary services.
312	Forestry	Includes forestry policy, planning and programmes, fuelwood and charcoal projects, forestry education, research and development.
313	Fishing	Includes fisheries policy, planning andprogrammes as wellas fisheries research and education.
321	Industry	Industrialpolicy, smallbusiness and craft development; all types of manufacturing, including agro-processing, chemicals and fertilisers, gas liquefactionandpetroleum refining, fuel wood production, textiles and leather.
322	Mineral Resources and Mining	Includes miningandminerals policy and programmes, geology, and extractionof metals, minerals and fuels.
332	Tourism	Tourism policy and administrativemanagement.
GENERAL BUDGET SUPPORT		
510	General Budget Support	Unearmarkedcontributions to the government budget, support for the implementationof macroeconomic reforms, transfers to stabilise the balance-of-payments and generalprogramme assistance when not allocableby sector.
	From 2008 there will bea new sub-category: Trade-related adjustment	Unearmarkedcontributions to the government budget to assist the implementationof recipients' own trade reforms and adjustments to trade policy measures by othercountries; assistance to manageshortfalls in the balance of payments due to changes in the world trading environment.

Source: OECD/WTO Partner Country Questionnaire

Annex III

List of ODA Recipient Countries by Region and by Income Group

A) Region

AFRICA	AMERICA	ASIA	OCEANIA
AFRICA, NORTH OF SAHARA	***NORTH & CENTRAL AMERICA***	***MIDDLE EAST ASIA***	Cook Islands
Algeria	Anguilla	Bahrain	Fiji
Egypt	Antigua & Barbuda	Iran	Kiribati
Morocco	Barbados	Iraq	Marshall Islands
Tunisia	Belize	Jordan	Micronesia, Fed. Sts
	Costa Rica	Lebanon	Nauru
AFRICA, SOUTH OF SAHARA	Cuba	Oman	Niue
Angola	Dominica	Palestinian admin. areas	Palau
Benin	Dominican Republic	Saudi Arabia	Papua New Guinea
Botswana	El Salvador	Syria	Samoa
Burkina Faso	Grenada	Yemen	Solomon Islands
Burundi	Guatemala		Tokelau
Cameroon	Haiti	***SOUTH & CENTRAL ASIA***	Tonga
Cape Verde	Honduras	Afghanistan	Tuvalu
Central African Republic	Jamaica	Armenia	Vanuatu
Chad	Mexico	Azerbaijan	Wallis & Futuna
Comoros	Montserrat	Bangladesh	
Congo, Dem Rep	Nicaragua	Bhutan	***EUROPE***
Congo, Rep	Panama	Georgia	Albania
Côte d'Ívoire	St.Kitts-Nevis	India	Bosnia-Herzegovina
Djibouti	St.Lucia	Kazakhstan	Croatia
Equatorial Guine	St.Vincent& Grenadines	Kyrgyz Rep	Macedonia
Eritrea	Trinidad & Tobago	Maldives	Malta
Ethiopia	Turks & Caicos Isl	Myanmar (Burma)	Moldova
Gabon	West Indies unallocated	Nepal	Slovenia
Gambia	N. & C. America unalloc	Pakistan	Turkey
Ghana		Sri Lanka	
Guinea	***SOUTH AMERICA***	Tajikistan	
Guinea-Bissau	Argentina	Turkmenistan	
Kenya	Bolivia	Uzbekistan	
Lesotho	Brazil		
Liberia	Chile	***FAR EAST ASIA***	
Madagascar	Colombia	Cambodia	
Malawi	Ecuador	China	
Mali	Guyana	East Timor	
Mauritania	Paraguay	Indonesia	
Mauritius	Peru	Korea, dem.	
Mozambique	Suriname	Laos	
Namibia	Uruguay	Malaysia	
Niger	Venezuela	Mongolia	
Nigeria		Philippines	
Rwanda		Thailand	
St. Helena		Viet Nam	
Sao Tome & Principe			
Senegal			
Seychelles			
Sierra Leone			
Somalia			
South Africa			
Sudan			
Swaziland			
Tanzania			
Togo			
Uganda			
Zambia			
Zimbabwe			

B) Income Group

DAC List of ODA Recipients

Effective from 2006 for reporting on 2005, 2006 and 2007

Least Developed Countries	Other Low Income Countries	Lower Middle Income Countries and Territories	Upper Middle Income Countries and Territories
As per UN classification	(per capita GNI < $825 in 2004)	(per capita GNI $826-$3 255 in 2004)	(per capita GNI $3 256-$10 065 in 2004)
Afghanistan	Cameroon	Albania	■ Anguilla
Angola	Congo, Rep.	Algeria	Antigua and Barbuda
Bangladesh	Côte d'Ivoire	Armenia	Argentina
Benin	Ghana	Azerbaijan	Barbados
Bhutan	India	Belarus	Belize
Burkina Faso	Kenya	Bolivia	Botswana
Burundi	Korea, Dem.Rep.	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Chile
Cambodia	Kyrgyz Rep.	Brazil	Cook Islands
Cape Verde	Moldova	China	Costa Rica
Central African Rep.	Mongolia	Colombia	Croatia
Chad	Nicaragua	Cuba	Dominica
Comoros	Nigeria	Dominican Republic	Gabon
Congo, Dem. Rep.	Pakistan	Ecuador	Grenada
Djibouti	Papua New Guinea	Egypt	Lebanon
Equatorial Guinea	Tajikistan	El Salvador	Libya
Eritrea	Uzbekistan	Fiji	Malaysia
Ethiopia	Viet Nam	Georgia	Mauritius
Gambia	Zimbabwe	Guatemala	■ Mayotte
Guinea		Guyana	Mexico
Guinea-Bissau		Honduras	■ Montserrat
Haiti		Indonesia	Nauru
Kiribati		Iran	Oman
Laos		Iraq	Palau
Lesotho		Jamaica	Panama
Liberia		Jordan	Saudi Arabia (1)
Madagascar		Kazakhstan	Seychelles
Malawi		Macedonia, Former Yugoslav	South Africa
Maldives		Republic of	■ St. Helena
Mali		Marshall Islands	St. Kitts-Nevis
Mauritania		Micronesia,Fed. States	St. Lucia
Mozambique		Morocco	St. Vincent & Grenadines
Myanmar		Namibia	Trinidad & Tobago
Nepal		Niue	Turkey
Niger		Palestinian Adm. Areas	■ Turks & Caicos Islands
Rwanda		Paraguay	Uruguay
Samoa		Peru	Venezuela
Sao Tome & Principe		Philippines	
Senegal		Serbia & Montenegro	
Sierra Leone		Sri Lanka	
Solomon Islands		Suriname	
Somalia		Swaziland	
Sudan		Syria	
Tanzania		Thailand	
Timor-Leste		■ Tokelau	
Togo		Tonga	
Tuvalu		Tunisia	
Uganda		Turkmenistan	
Vanuatu		Ukraine	
Yemen		■ Wallis & Futuna	
Zambia			

■ Territory

(1) Saudi Arabia passed the high income country threshold in 2004. In accordance with the DAC rules for revision of this List, it will graduate from the List in 2008 if it remains a high income country in 2005 and 2006. Its net ODA receipts from DAC Members were USD 9.9 million in 2003 and USD 9.0 million (preliminary) in 2004.

Annex IV

OECD/WTO Donor and Partner Country Questionnaires on Aid for trade

OECD

WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION

DONOR QUESTIONNAIRE ON AID FOR TRADE

WHAT IS YOUR AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY?

1. Do you have an aid-for-trade strategy and what are the key elements in this strategy?
2. How has this strategy evolved since the December 2005 WTO Ministerial Conference?
3. How does this strategy address regional aid-for-trade challenges?

HOW MUCH AID-FOR-TRADE DO YOU PROVIDE?

SCOPE

4. How do you define aid-for-trade (i.e. which types of programme and project do you consider trade-related)?[1]

METHODOLOGY

5. How do you allocate the aid-for-trade share in individual projects and programmes?

COMMITMENTS

6. According to your aid-for-trade definition, what were your commitments by category for the period 2002-2005 and in particular for 2005?[2]

PLEDGES

7. Describe any aid-for-trade pledges you have made at or since the December 2005 WTO Ministerial Conference?
8. What is your medium-term (beyond 3 years) financial plan for aid-for-trade?

HOW DO YOU IMPLEMENT YOUR AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY?

MAINSTREAMING

9. How do you ensure that aid-for-trade is effectively integrated in your overall development strategy and programming both at headquarters and in-country?
10. Have you recently strengthened your in-house aid-for-trade expertise and how is this expertise deployed to link policies with operations?

[1] For your information, the WTO Task Force defined aid-for-trade in the following way: "Projects and programmes should be considered as aid-for-trade if these activities have been identified as trade-development priorities in the recipient country's national development strategies". The Task Force underlined that clear and agreed benchmarks are necessary for global monitoring of Aid-for-Trade efforts. To this end, it identified the following categories: [a] trade policy and regulations (incl. trade facilitation); [b] trade development; [c] trade-related infrastructure; [d] building productive capacity; [e] trade-related adjustment; and [f] other trade-related needs.

[2] In order to facilitate your data reporting, we have attached in the Annex a description of the Creditor Reporting System (CRS) categories, along with a profile of your data for 2002 to 2005, that proxy the WTO Task Force aid-for-trade definition (set out in the preceding footnote). The request for data for 2006 on the same basis was issued in May 2007.

OWNERSHIP

Refers to developing countries exercising effective leadership over their development policies and strategies and co-ordinating development efforts.

11. What approach do you follow in your country assistance plan, when national development strategies lack a strong trade development component?[3]
12. How do you encourage and support policy dialogues on aid-for-trade among key stakeholders in partner countries?

ALIGNMENT

Refers to donors basing their overall support on partner countries' national development strategies, institutions and procedures.

13. Are you using the partner countries' policy planning and budgeting framework as the basis for the provision of your aid-for-trade programmes?

HARMONISATION

Refers to donors' actions being more harmonised, transparent and collectively effective.

14. Do you coordinate aid-for-trade analyses and programming with other donors at the country level, given that its scope often exceeds the capacity of any single donor?
15. Are you increasing the amount of aid-for-trade for regional and or multilateral programmes? (If you are a regional or multilateral agency, are you managing an increasing amount of aid-for-trade?)

MANAGEMENT FOR RESULTS

Refers to both donors and partner countries managing resources and improving decision making for results.

16. What objectives and timeframes do you set for your aid-for-trade strategy and programmes? How do you measure success?
17. What evaluation methodologies do you apply to your aid-for-trade projects and programmes?
18. Do you cooperate with partner countries, other donors and stakeholders in joint monitoring and evaluation of aid-for-trade projects and programmes?

DO YOU PARTICIPATE IN MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY ARRANGEMENTS?

Mutual accountability refers to donors and developing countries providing timely, transparent and comprehensive information in order to jointly assess development results.

19. Do you engage with partner countries, regional organisations, other donors and stakeholders in reviewing progress towards the fulfillment of your aid-for-trade policy and programme commitments?

[3] For example, do you have programmes to build the capacity of recipients to undertake assessments of trade development challenges and opportunities and integrate such assessments into medium-term planning and budgetary frameworks?

You are encouraged to provide summary responses to the questions in this document and to annex more detailed material.

Responses should be sent before 7 September 2007 to the following address:

WTO-OECD.Questionnaire@oecdshare.oecd.org

Please also send any queries to this mailbox.

OECD

WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION

PARTNER COUNTRY QUESTIONNAIRE ON AID FOR TRADE

WHAT IS YOUR AID-FOR-TRADE STRATEGY?

1. What priority is accorded to trade development in your country's economic growth/national development/poverty reduction strategy?
2. Do you have a government-wide trade development strategy and if so what are its main priorities? What time period does it cover?
3. Does your trade development strategy specify aid-for-trade needs?
4. What are the main trade development challenges and opportunities you face which require collaboration with other countries in your region? Are these addressed in your trade development strategy?

HOW MUCH AID-FOR-TRADE DO YOU RECEIVE?

5. Have you costed your trade development strategy? What percentage of your trade development financial requirements do you expect to be funded by ODA?
6. Which activities do you consider are supporting your trade development strategy? Accordingly, how much aid-for-trade have you received by category for the period 2002-2005, and in particular in 2005?[1]
7. Describe any key trade development priorities that are constrained by lack of donors' funding?

HOW DO YOU IMPLEMENT YOUR AID–FOR-TRADE STRATEGY?

MAINSTREAMING

8. Describe the internal governmental coordination process to prepare your trade development strategy.

OWNERSHIP

Refers to partner countries exercising effective leadership over their development policies and strategies and co-ordinating development efforts.

9. What needs assessment tools do you use to formulate your trade development strategies (do you use diagnostic studies, e.g. such as those prepared under the Integrated Framework?)
10. How do you involve key stakeholders (including the private sector and civil society) in the identification of your trade development challenges and opportunities?

[1] Without any prejudice to your answer to this question, and to facilitate responses, we provide in the annex the information we hold on DAC donors' commitments to your country for the following aid categories: Trade Policy and Regulations, Economic Infrastructure, Productive Capacity Building.

ALIGNMENT

Refers to donors basing their overall support on partner countries' national development strategies, institutions and procedures.

11. Are external partners using your policy planning and budgeting framework as a basis for their aid-for-trade support?

12. How well do aid–for-trade flows reflect your government's trade development priorities and what aid management information system do you use?

HARMONISATION

Refers to donors' actions being more harmonized, transparent and collectively effective.

13. How do you encourage external partners to coordinate their trade related analyses and programming? Where, if at all, are the main co-ordination gaps?

MANAGEMENT FOR RESULTS

Refers to both donors and partner countries managing resources and improving decision making for results.

14. How do you measure the success of or your trade development and aid-for-trade strategies?

15. Do you cooperate with donors and other stakeholders in joint monitoring and evaluation of aid-for-trade programmes?

DO YOU PARTICIPATE IN MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY ARRANGEMENTS?

Mutual accountability refers to donors and developing countries providing timely, transparent and comprehensive information in order to jointly assess development results.

16. The WTO Task Force recommended establishing "A National Aid-for-Trade Committee, where necessary, to ensure trade mainstreaming in national development strategies, determine country needs, set priorities, assist in matching 'demand' and 'response', and help in evaluation."[2] Has such a Committee, or an equivalent body, been established in your country?

17. Describe the process and key actors (such as donors, private sector-representatives, etc.) involved in reviewing progress toward fulfillment of your aid-for-trade and trade development commitments?

[2] World Trade Organisation, Recommendations of the Task Force on Aid for Trade, WT/AFT/1, 27 July 2006, p.6.

Responses should be sent before 28 September 2007 to the following address:

WTO-OECD.Questionnaire@oecdshare.oecd.org
Please also send any queries to this mailbox.